

IN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Antonio Geatti v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

ANSWER, OPINION AND MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO ORDER AND OPINION FILED BY
Rosemary Chiavetta Secretary, PUC OPINION AND ORDER ON DOCKET C-2023-3043427

ANSWER TO PAGE ONE OF THE ORDER AND OPINION from April 10th. The secretary made a footnote claiming that the parties of record were not served, but the same day on January 21st 2025, the secretary affirmed that all parties were served, as the Commission's Secretary Bureau served everyone involved. The Complainant is Pro Se, and he had been informed that the proceedings were informal. No one was harmed, everybody was served the same day. There is no reason to dismiss the Complainant's formal complaint, or the Exceptions filed by Antonio Geatti, the Complainant. Everyone involved, including PPL was served timely notice, and I believe they received additional time to reply by the PUC. ALJ Charece Collins informed the Pro Se Complainant that the proceedings were informal. and any format would be accepted as far as she was concerned.

ANSWER TO PAGE TWO OF THE ORDER AND OPINON. ALJ Arnold's Initial Decision was flawed due to numerous reasons which were explained in the Exceptions filed by the Complainant. Under Background and procedural History, the Secretary listed or portrayed Charles Stalega as being a Columbia County Code Enforcement Officer. This is completely false, this is a huge mistake, and misrepresentation, and it is pure fraud. Mr. Stalege does not work for any branch of government in Columbia County Pennsylvania. He does not have any authority to execute any type of warrant anywhere in the State of Pennsylvania. He is not an officer or any kind at any level of government, and if he misrepresented that in any way, he would be liable and guilty of impersonating a public servant which is a crime listed in the Crimes Code of Pennsylvania (title 18). Mr. Stalega does not work in Columbia County at all. You will not find him on any Columba County Payroll at any level of government in Columbia County. He works in Luzerne County, for a private construction firm, and he does not have any position in Columbia County government. Mr. Stalega misrepresented the claims that he made. He not only committed the crime of impersonating a public servant when in reality he is a private industry worker, but he also committed the crime of filing false reports to authorities. Also, Mr. Stalega misrepresented

himself to PPL if he claimed to be a township Officer to disconnect the Complainants electric service. That would be again impersonating a public servant, which is a crime in Pennsylvania under title 18, the crimes code of Pennsylvania. The Complainant filed an amended complaint with the PUC. Did the PUC accept the Complainants Amended Complaint?

ANSWER TO PAGE THREE OF THE ORDER AND OPINION. PPL did not state any safety reasons in reference to the disconnection of the service to the Complainant's Home. How can they then claim that the Complainant had to resolve safety concerns, that they never specified ?, also, that is why certified electricians are used to verify safety to the electric box. All PPL requires is that certified electricians check to the electrical box. The alleged demolition order is a complete scam and was never used for anything anyway, so why is a fraudulent document which in addition was never used for anything relating to this case is even mentioned as evidence of anything? It shows the willingness of the The Commission to take fraudulent evidence as facts for the purpose of closing cases but without doing any fact checking or lawfulness verifications of the evidence being provided. Additionally, the home was not ready to collapse, and it was built on steel I-Beams, there was no danger to the public as there is no public, it's a private home on a private lot without surrounding structures or occupants other than the home owner and resident on the property, who is also a senior citizen. There are no adjacent buildings or surrounding structures. This is not a city, it's a small town with homes placed on large lots. This home did not have any surrounding structures or adjacent buildings. That is just ludicrous to find these as the reasons to destroy someone's residence. The alleged demolition order did not have anything to do with the complaint as the complaint was in no way tied to a demolition. That is a fabrication that Miss Rulli, and Miss Bacon came up with to beat this case. Its an example of fabricating and customizing evidence after the fact. Why was evidentiary hearing cancelled and substituted by Prehearing Conference?

Answer to page 4, same nonsense by defendant, Demolition Order, in addition to being invalid, was never used for anything other than to harass complainant, it was never used for a demolition anywhere, by any branch of government. International maintenance code is not usable in the context that the defendant is portraying, as it is copyrighted and cannot be adopted in the way defendant has portrayed. It's someone else's intellectual property and cannot be stolen as it is copyrighted. It would be a copyright violation. In other words a crime to use the international maintenance code in the way it is being portrayed.

Answer to page 5, the case did not pivot around a demolition. PPL can still be liable for the actions with or without a demolition, The complaint and the destruction of the Complainants residence came as a byproduct of the complaint that was filed with the

PUC, because PPL as well as other parties decided to conspire to destroy the Complainants Home, one of them being for example that they could not reconnect the electric service which again is not true. The property could be energized any day of the week. PPL is not entitled to Summary Judgement as they were participants in a conspiracy to destroy the Complainants residence. This is very easily proven, as there was no demolition when the Complainant filed the Complaint with the PUC but once PPL received the Complaint and Miss Rulli Contacted Miss Bacon, suddenly they were claiming a demolition? This was just very convenient for them, if they disappeared the home, then they would not have to answer the Complaint. Is this a new way for Miss Rulli or PPL to process complaints by destroying the Complainants Residence?

Answer to page 6, there are third party misrepresentations and inaccuracies being cited by Miss Rulli, and the PUC in which the Complainant is being charged with making certain statements, but they modified what was said slightly by the complainant to give it a different sound or twist. Those statements are not 100% accurate. Additionally on page 6 its stated by Secretary Chiavetta that there are no material facts in dispute, when she ignored the discrepancies on purpose, and she accepted fraudulent documents to be accepted as evidence and she accepted fraudulent documents and testimony being given at hearings without any facts checking at all. Mr. Geatti filed and is filing again a Motion to Keep Record Open and to Continue Hearings, requesting that the record in this proceeding be open or reopened. I have also requested to have the case reassigned to a competent court if the PUC is not equipped or competent to process this case, but again I was ignored. I am also at this point requesting that the case is transferred to Commonwealth Court should the PUC not have the resources to handle this case. The Defendant/PPL became involved in soliciting the destruction of the Complainants Residence but not necessarily limited to just that, and that needs to be investigated, and not swept under the rug which is what is happening now under Secretary Chiavetta! It also makes you wonder how many other outrageously fraudulent and illegal case proceedings has she or they closed to clear their case load with complete disregard as to the damage they are doing. In this case, the Complainants Residence was destroyed, his personal belongings were stolen, his lot was severely damaged, his reputation tarnished, and the Secretary and the Commission just takes it as a joke. Did anyone destroy their home, and steal their belongings? Apparently not as if that was the case, they would not be so happy to close this case.

Answer to Page 7, yes the Complainant filed motions and possible resolutions, and answer to PPLS reply to exceptions, all of which have been ignored by the Commission and the Secretary. The Legal Standards, Discussion, Burden of proof sections does not apply as defendant introduced and presented fraudulent evidence, and fraudulent and illegal witnesses and alleged proof, which is nothing but fraud which is a crime, which the

commission is more than willing to take in order to clear their case load, instead of filing criminal charges against the Defendant for the crime of filing deceiving fraudulent information, not legally acceptable in order to obscure their tracks. That would be filing false reports to authorities among other violations. Here the authorities are more than willing to accept false reports to close their case load.

Answer to pages 8 to pages 20. Same as answers to page 7 in that claims are being made about a case built of fraudulent, illegal evidence and testimony fabricated by the Defendant PPL, and that renders all the arguments as tainted and MOOT.

Answer to pages 20 and 21

The Conclusion on page 20 is flawed in that it relies on fraudulent, illegal, unverified, un-factchecked claims by the defendant, which the commission is willing to take just to close the docket as they do not know what to do with the complaint. They claim they do not have authority? Well then it can be sent to Commonwealth Court for processing, and not just closed because the PUC does not know what to do or may not have resources or jurisdiction. Reassigning it to the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania would solve that problem.

The orders on pages 20 and 21 are flawed in that (item 1) The PUC informed the Complainant that He could file exceptions but now the PUC is unwilling to take them. The PUC had informed the Complainant that he could file excerpts and now the PUC is unwilling to process them?, also other filings since that point have been filed with the PUC, which again are not being considered? They are being ignored. This seems very once sided and shows favoritism towards the Defendant PPL. The Complainant is requesting that the Exemptions that he properly filed at the direction of the PUC are considered in this case. Also the Complainant is requesting that the additional filings that he made, that are being ignored, are acknowledged and processed, like for instance, his amended complaint.

Answer to page 21 (Item2), The Complainant disagrees with the order because it is based on fabrications and illegalities without doing any fact checking by the PUC. The introduction of false reports, fraudulent documents, and fabricated witnesses was introduced by PPL for the purpose of destroying the Complainants' home/residence for among other purposes retaliation. This order should be abolished as it is an abomination.

Answer to page 21 (Item3), The Complainant disagrees with the order because the PUC has done nothing for the consumer. Closing a case in which the PUC just made things worse

does not make any sense. The Complainant encourages the PUC to honor their responsibilities to the public, and keep this complaint open for processing. The complainant still has no power to his property and residence. Is the PUC going to leave a senior citizen with no electric power to his residence?

Answer to page 21 (Item4), The Complainant disagrees with the order because proceeding or Docket C 2023- 3043427 has not been resolved, the resident on the property, and a senior citizen still has no power to his residence; the PUC has done nothing to help him and instead has accepted fraudulent evidence provided by the defendant PPL Electric to try and close the case and sweep it under the rug. This case needs to be investigated by criminal authorities to discover why fraudulent and illicit activities are accepted by the PUC in order to close their cases?

Sincerely,

Antonio Geatti

Complainant Pro Se

20 Shawnee Rd.

Bloomsburg PA, 17815

CC: Megan Rulli/PPL Electric Attorney Via Email