

Lawrence Kingsley
2161 West Ridge Drive
Lancaster, PA 17603
file@research-1.com
646-543-2226

Sept. 9, 2021

PA Public Utilities Commission
Via: eFiling

Dear Sir/Madam:

I am resubmitting my accompanying document addressed to The Hon. Dennis Buckley. Captioned "letter," this document is an email message, dated Sept. 7, 2021, regarding Case No. C-2020-3019763.

This information was included in the header or dialog required for eFiling, but you wrote:

Your eFiling that was filed on Tue Sep 07 06:47:26 EDT 2021 on Docket Number C-2020-3019763 has been rejected due to the following reason.

Not a Qualified Document Type : Filing must contain a cover letter that includes the date, docket number & what the filing is.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

/S/

Lawrence Kingsley

Lawrence Kingsley

To: Buckley, Dennis (debuckley@pa.gov); Dennis
Cc: kkrupka@grossmcginley.com
Subject: Court's 7/21/21 order

Pursuant to Your Honor's 7/21/21 order, I have propounded new Interrogatories to PPL and hope to receive a response by 9/16/21.

In this endeavor I have been very conscious of the order's warning against misuse of discovery by me, and I scrupulously have adhered to your instructions. However, I am unaware of any faults on my part that require this warning—if I am overlooking something, I would like to learn how I can improve.

I believe that PPL also is worthy of the court's attention, as in completely ignoring my First Set of Interrogatories, failing to abide by its covenants with PUC (e.g. obligation to notify property owners of intended vegetation management, which often is mismanagement); misbilling the hundreds of customers who have complained about PPL to the Better Business Bureau, as well as to PUC directly, poisoning wells and waterways; destroying trees that absorb carbon, combat erosion, provide shade and hospitality to songbirds, and otherwise enhance the Commonwealth's environmental appeal; and exercising no effective oversight over contractors whose increased pay comes with increased tree amputation and destruction.

In noting these selective deficiencies, which could be expanded, I merely am attempting to meet my burden of showing PPL's fault. I am sorry if my emphasis of indisputable facts appears, in Your Honor's words, to be "invective" against PPL.

I, of course, would welcome any further guidelines that the court would like to provide, and I hope that they will provide at least some restraint on PPL. As the victim in this case, I have to think that the totality of fault lies there.

Lawrence Kingsley
646-543-2226