

I would like to thank Your Honor, Judge Gail M. Chiodo, and the Public Utility Commission of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (PA-PUC) for the opportunity to submit this written brief to convey my closing argument pertaining to the Telephonic Hearing (Hearing) held on October 1, 2024 and which is on record.

As suggested by Your Honor, I will summarize my testimony referring to the evidence that was presented at the Hearing and present arguments in support of the key issues.

To begin with, as we are all aware, this Hearing was the culmination of an extended series of reports, filings, conversations, an earlier hearing in February this year and actions taken as well as personal experiences involving PECO and us going back to c. 2014 – all addressed in this case - against the larger backdrop of recent legal decisions and rulings in Pennsylvania.

The immediate and long-term implications of Act 129 of 2008, the ensuing interpretations directing actions, regulations, orders, rulings and mandates involving the PA-PUC, the Commonwealth Court, and the Supreme Court of the state of Pennsylvania all have a direct relevance to this case under consideration. As things stand, we all know that the PECO now has the go-ahead from the PA Supreme Court to deploy the so-called smart-meters to every customer regardless of their preference. This new development has effectively closed off consumer choice and freedom of action and thrown the gates open to a host of issues involving consumers' health, quality of life, right to privacy and risk of surveillance, to mention a few, regardless of substantial evidence that continues to accumulate worldwide on the health-endangering effects of high-frequency radiation. Other states, other countries have opted for enlightened and safer consumer-friendly initiatives. This suggests the obvious need to rethink such momentous decisions closer to home to those for whom these things are important.

We are later entrants into a very long line of aware consumers in Pennsylvania who have been voicing their concerns from the beginning, since Act 129 was passed and many of whom continue to express themselves in the hope that they will finally be heard and some enlightened changes made. There have apparently been numerous cases one could cite that have involved litigation and where massive amounts of evidence appear to have been presented. As far as I know, the outcomes of these cases have been quite predictable and none of the plaintiffs have prevailed.

Given this kind of environment, the lack of options and past patterns, in response to Attorney Scott's closing statements (allegations?) about the "legal insufficiency" of what has been presented and described, the "lack of expert testimony" or "evidence" and so forth, I would state in response that knowing how much "evidence" and "expert testimony" have been provided again and again by several, if not scores, of litigants in Pennsylvania's courts referred to above, seemingly to no avail and always the same outcome. We have described over and over our experiences, what we are dealing with on a daily basis; the evidence is there if you choose to see it and take it seriously.

These are the most relevant points that I would like to close on. These have been mentioned before and presented in the testimony and would merit reiteration here:

Since 2014, when the first so-called SmartMeter was installed at our property, we have experienced new and worrying symptoms involving the sensory and nervous systems (described in the testimony provided earlier in this October 1 hearing), received diagnoses of at least if not more serious life-threatening

diseases. There are other passing conditions that come up occasionally - like fragmented vision (presented in the spoken testimony), joint aches, headaches, tremors or buzzing in the ears, etc.

We have lost a large number of electronic devices (a list of which was shared with Peco's attorney) and valuable data, writings, photographs and so on. We run into problems currently with computer screens freezing, losing data, and so on.

We experience hacking where personal information was compromised, emails disappear, and our screens are remotely controlled. These occurrences had lessened during the period when the old meter had begun to malfunction but have returned with full force since March 2024 when PECO forcibly replaced the old meter with a new one.

This brings me to the interactions with PECO. PECO's representatives have been heavy-handed, sly, coercive, rude bordering on insulting and abusive while we have always tried to engage with them in an open-minded and calm manner. And now with the recent PA Supreme Court ruling, we can sense more of these attitudes when we deal with them.

PECO continued to send emails and representatives to warn of impending disconnection of service in the pendency of litigation. On a final note, PECO's representative installed the new meter and removed the old one without any notice. If the old meter could have provided us some additional evidence, that is now an impossibility. PECO has essentially stolen the evidence.

I rest my case. The evidence is there for those who will see it.