

January 7, 2022

Rosemary Chiavatti
Pennsylvania PUC
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Dominic Raneri v. UGI Industries Inc.
Complaint Docket No. C-2021-3030082

Dear Ms. Chiavetta:

Please accept my reply to Mr. Cranye's objections to my referenced formal complaint. As the items 1 through 3 have not been contested, I will begin by addressing Mr. Crane's assertions regarding item 4.

Mr, Cranye has asserted that the area of the complaint - 1900 block of Fairview Avenue - was 1 of 7 areas posted with restricted parking signage on December 7 and December 8 of 2021. I am in agreement that the 1900 block of Fairview Street was posted with the restricted parking placards. I reserve my concurrence that this area was 1 of 7 areas in the city of Reading, PA that was the subject to parking restrictions on said dates. I have instituted a RTK (Right to Know) request to the Reading Parking Authority (RPA) to ascertain if this assertion is factually accurate. Said RTK was electronically delivered to the RPA and is included as an attachment with this correspondence.

The assertion that 5.25 hours were expended removing vehicles will also be investigated to validate once the RTK with the RPA is obtained, as this information is required to direct the Reading Police Department to provide me their documentation for the aforesaid areas. Once the required information is obtained from the RPA an RTK will be written and directed to the RPD for the required information. If the assertion is actually found to be correct, Mr. Cranye offers no reasoning as to why 5.25 hours of delay resulted in 20 hours of absence (2 days x 10 hours /day; 7a.m till 5 p.m) and resultant inability to perform work in said area. Under a separate filing I will petition the court to compel UGI to provide documentation of work scheduled, work contracted for, work accomplished and any documented evidence of police removal of vehicle impacting their schedule.

Hence, Mr. Cranye's assertions are currently under review for accuracy.

Mr Cranye further asserts that only the RPA has the ability to remove the placards and that that agency will not remove them until the expiration of the original ending date. RPA ordinance 576-419 neither specifies nor makes any reference to Mr. Cranye's assertions, and therefore is highly questionable of being true and accurate.

Mr. Cranye further postulates a denial that UGI Industries Inc. (UGI) has no history of long-term and continuing abuse of posting frivolous parking restrictions in the City of Reading, PA

I assert that this also is incorrect and have every intention of providing documentation at the time of a court hearing to prove my contentions with several examples of UGI's callous, malicious and history of abuse in this procedure. I will show a pattern of rampant abuse of these procedures and show just reasoning for my request to have UGI regulated by a 3rd party going forward. Some confusion may be evident as my request is not for the PUC to act in the capacity of a 3rd party oversight entity but rather a request to have a non-biased agency to fill this requirement. Additionally, it is acknowledged that any 3rd party must work within the confines of the RPA.

Item 5 has been address above

Item 6 is non-applicable

Item 7b has been satisfied.

Beginning with "B" in Mr. Cranye's argument regarding my right in filing this complaint, I sternly object to his assertion(s) that these infractions are not germane to me and therefore not mine to file and litigate. Just in the most simplistic sense, if the residence of the 1900 block of Fairview are displaced from their parking, they are going to parking in the adjoining residential blocks. I further contend that any and all injustices are a matter for all people to stand up and object to malicious tyranny. These positions are indicative of "The White Supremacy" that pervades those that are immune to these injustices. Hence, I have the absolute right to hold this utility to task for these infractions, and they have an obligation to provide punitive damages to those they have routinely oppressed.

Lastly, consider the handicapped individual that is deprived of their mean of transportation and therefore unable to enjoy the basic freedoms afforded them by the constitution of the United States; they should be financially compensated for these egregious violations.

I assert that this complaint is warranted and request that an in person hearing be scheduled, as my experience with telephonic procedures have been less than adequate.

Thank You

Dominic C Raneri



Standard Right-to-Know Law Request Form

Good communication is vital in the RTKL process. Complete this form thoroughly and retain a copy; it may be required if an appeal is filed. You have 15 business days to appeal after a request is denied or deemed denied.

SUBMITTED TO AGENCY NAME: _____ (Attn: AORO)

Date of Request: _____ Submitted via: Email U.S. Mail Fax In Person

PERSON MAKING REQUEST:

Name: _____ Company (if applicable): _____

Mailing Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Email: _____

Telephone: _____ Fax: _____

How do you prefer to be contacted if the agency has questions? Telephone Email U.S. Mail

RECORDS REQUESTED: *Be clear and concise. Provide as much specific detail as possible, ideally including subject matter, time frame, and type of record or party names. RTKL requests should seek records, not ask questions. Requesters are not required to explain why the records are sought or the intended use of the records unless otherwise required by law. Use additional pages if necessary.*

DO YOU WANT COPIES? Yes, printed copies (*default if none are checked*)
 Yes, electronic copies preferred if available
 No, in-person inspection of records preferred (*may request copies later*)

Do you want **certified copies**? Yes (*may be subject to additional costs*) No
RTKL requests may require payment or prepayment of fees. See the [Official RTKL Fee Schedule](#) for more details.

Please notify me if fees associated with this request will be more than \$100 (or) \$_____.

ITEMS BELOW THIS LINE FOR AGENCY USE ONLY

Tracking: _____ Date Received: _____ Response Due (5 bus. days): _____

30-Day Ext.? Yes No (If Yes, Final Due Date: _____) Actual Response Date: _____

Request was: Granted Partially Granted & Denied Denied Cost to Requester: \$_____

Appropriate third parties notified and given an opportunity to object to the release of requested records.