



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
400 North Street, HARRISBURG, PA 17120

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

October 18, 2024

ALL PARTIES OF RECORD

Re: Exceptions – Bhavin Patel
Docket Number: C-2023-3038563

To All Parties of Record:

On October 17, 2024, my office received Exceptions to the Initial Decision of ALJ Guhl in the above captioned matter. Our review of the filing revealed that no certificate of service or other indication that the parties of record to the case were served with the Exceptions. Therefore, we have enclosed a copy of the Exceptions to constitute service for purposes of 52 Pa. Code §5.533.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary

Enclosure
RC: acg

cc: All Parties of Record
Document Folder

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Docket No. C-2023-3038563

Bhavin Patel vs. UGI Utilities, Inc. – Gas Division

EXCEPTION TO INITIAL DECISION AND ORDER

TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION (Entity):
TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA (Citizens/Lives/Souls):
TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA (Space/Location/Platform):

The complaint that was made against WNA program since it's inception still stands valid and unshaken even after 2 years of WNA data under execution.

This exception is being filed to point out that the initial decision and order has been ruled in bias to protect PUC's incorrect decision to allow implementation of WNA as well as UGI's wrong practices to make profits on the grounds of gambling called WNA with weather prediction as it's dice.

The order keeps stating that the complainant has the burden of proof, however, complainant's proof were not allowed to be entered in it's 100% form, and the complainant wasn't given the fair chance to show (nor explain) their proof in the proceeding. The order also tries to explain that “facts” come before “speculations”, however it emphasizes on John Taylor's speculations and Kimberly Bassininsky's speculations as facts, all the while, it dismisses actual facts (UGI's Late-filed Exhibit No 4) as fiction.

When looked at his case without any bias, “UGI's Late-filed Exhibit No 4” shows very clear evidence of profit making that is addressed in Complainant's direct complaint. Always a charge, never a credit. Proof doesn't get any more clear than this.

Therefore, this proceeding, the initial decision, and order in itself prove to be a pre-planned events to dismiss any complaint from being entered or taken seriously. Therefore, I challenge the PUC, this process, these restrictions upon complainants, and the law itself for allowing harm to be done rather any good. Facts and proofs have not been given the credit it deserves and judgement are made upon speculations instead of clear trend of data.

With that said, I no longer have any faith in these crooked law's, these systems', these biased practices', and whatever faith I had in it is diminishing rapidly with stunts displayed here. As of now, PUC and PUC's legal systems are worth nothing.

Date: October 17, 2024

Bhavin Patel
Bhavin Patel (Complainant)