

Notice to the Court

Complaint F-2024-3052032

Donna L. Shawfield Bennett Complainant v. Duquesne Light Company Respondent  
Public Utilities Commission Honorable Alphonso Arnold III Presiding

The Complainant has received the Prehearing Order for Telephone Hearing, Initial Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice, and Interim Order#1 documents on March 24, 2025.

A correction needs to be made to the way the PUC has chosen to assign my status. I am the trustee of the Darryl S. Shawfield Special Needs Trust, who has been paying this electric bill. I am not the Trustee of Darryl S. Shawfield. I have not corrected this previously, as abbreviating the title is a frequent occurrence to accommodate the Postal Service.

Darryl S. Shawfield has a cognitive issue, and is assigned as a disabled person within the Social Security System. This is the reason the initial complaints, both informal and formal stated the correct title as Special Needs. *Title II of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. Section 12131, et seq., prohibits disability-based discrimination by public entities, including local and state courts.* Your order requiring representation by a lawyer rather than an individual acquainted with and participating in the events of the complaint, while acting on behalf of the account holder, discriminates against a disabled person, who has not been paying this electric bill. He is aware of the situation and has been involved in the information process but did not carry out all the events presented in the complaint to the court.

The additional label of Complainant being adversarial as a reason for an order to retain representation is questionable at best. This is an action brought before a court to be judged; the Respondent is also adversarial as defined by the very issue at hand. The timing of the order falling after rulings in favor of the Respondent, when only the utility had representation, eliminating the availability of compensation to the Complainant for legal fees, or any punitive damages creates a situation of further loss to the Complainant. The issue of representation should have been brought forth before any rulings were made, not after putting the Complainant at further disadvantage. This assessment and the timing of the order are both prejudicial and discriminatory.

The last motion made to the court was well within the descriptions of the PUC Authority and purpose Title 66 §506, Title 66 § 308.1, Title 66 § 313. The motion for an audit is essential to determine the complete and unbiased history of the account in question. There has been no ruling on this motion. The court has ruled in favor of the motions from the Respondent, leaving the only matter to be resolved before this court, the bill accounting. Which requires an impartial audit to resolve all questions of correctness.

Based on the obvious prejudice and bias the court has exhibited in its Order#1, previous rulings in favor of the Respondent, and lack of any ruling on the Complainant's motions for an impartial audit or the motion to transfer this matter to the District Attorney, I see it is futile to continue in this course of action.

The PUC has shown by its rulings it is a feckless impotent entity with limited if any authority to adjudicate matters of consumer challenge to the utility monopoly. Furthermore, it is unwilling to use the limited authority it does have to support the consumer, or to investigate and support the truthfulness of statements the utility makes. My reply to the utility's statements made correcting the utility with documentation generated by the utility has been deemed as adversarial, when I agreed with several of its statements. This was used as reasoning for ordering the Complainant to hire a lawyer. Frankly this matter was presented to be judged by a court, the very definition of an adversarial situation. The issue of hiring representation should have been presented at the start of this complaint, not after rulings in favor of the Respondent were made.

The prejudice against a challenger to the utility company is clear. Therefor the Complainant withdraws from this court action, however, the complaint is not withdrawn. I retain the right to transfer the complete contents of this complaint to an agency or court which has the authority to investigate and the ability to take action on this matter.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Donna L. Shawfield Bennett". The signature is cursive and fluid.

Donna L. Shawfield Bennett  
Complainant

date March 28, 2025