

**BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Shasta-Patrice Brown

Docket No. C-2024-3050761

Complainant

v.

Philadelphia Gas Works

Respondent

---

**REPLY EXCEPTION AND DEMAND FOR JUDGMENT BASED ON FRAUD, BAD FAITH, AND MATERIAL MISREPRESENTATION**

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.535, Complainant Shasta-Patrice Brown submits this Reply Exception to the April 3, 2025 filing by Philadelphia Gas Works (“Respondent” or “PGW”) in response to Complainant’s Exceptions to the Initial Decision issued on March 18, 2025.

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Respondent’s reply is materially defective and procedurally dishonest. PGW falsely asserts that the Complainant was not a customer, despite PGW billing the Complainant and her daughter at 3051 N. Stillman Street, Philadelphia, PA, and mailing multiple bills in their names. These documents remain in the Complainant’s possession and will be submitted as exhibits in support of this Reply Exception. PGW’s blanket denial of a known customer relationship constitutes fraud in factum, material misrepresentation, and bad faith in an administrative proceeding.

PGW’s response continues a pattern of obfuscation, refusing to acknowledge Complainant’s standing as an investor under SEC interpretations, denying access to the full accounting, and refusing to return interest, dividends, or closure documentation related to the mishandled account. Complainant also notes that the account was improperly reported on her daughter’s credit report, constituting further commercial injury and misrepresentation.

Further, PGW's own audited financial statements and SEC-referenced documents acknowledge:

- \* Revenues are derived from customer accounts
- \* Customer deposits are held as liabilities and are to be refunded upon account closure
- \* PGW is subject to oversight by the Pennsylvania PUC, which governs billing and customer service

These facts directly contradict PGW's position in this matter.

## II. POINT-BY-POINT REBUTTAL

### **Exception 1 – Mischaracterization of Claims as “Sovereign Citizen”**

PGW's Reply mischaracterizes Complainant's claims as sovereign citizen arguments in an attempt to deflect from the actual legal and commercial foundation of the Complaint. Complainant has never invoked sovereign citizenship ideology. Rather, the Complaint clearly rests on:

- \* Contract law
- \* Equity and trust principles
- \* SEC investor standing (based on PGW's own financial disclosures)
- \* Commercial liability and billing fraud

Complainant operates in equity and asserts commercial standing. This is materially distinct from the false narrative PGW is attempting to construct.

### **Exception 2 – Fraudulent Denial of Customer Relationship**

PGW's denial that Complainant was ever a customer is demonstrably false. Complainant is in possession of multiple unopened PGW bills addressed to both herself and her daughter at 3051 N. Stillman Street, Philadelphia, PA. These bills will be submitted as Exhibits.

Moreover, Complainant filed PUC Informal Complaint BCS Case #3912343 regarding the same account while it was still active. PGW has actual knowledge of this matter and is misrepresenting its own records to the Commission.

Additionally, PGW's 2024 and 2023 audited financial reports clearly indicate:

- \* Customer accounts are a source of revenue
- \* Customer deposits are listed as liabilities

\* PGW must return deposits upon account closure

The fact that PGW closed the account and failed to return interest, while allowing it to damage the credit of Complainant's daughter, amounts to willful and actionable commercial injury.

### **Exception 3 – Sufficiency of Pleading**

Contrary to PGW's assertions, the Amended Formal Complaint is sufficiently pled and states:

- \* That the application was endorsed in blank under duress
- \* That the note was securitized and should be liquidated with return of value
- \* That billing errors occurred post-move, while the account was supposedly closed
- \* That PGW failed to return the interest or dividends on account closure
- \* That Complainant and her daughter were improperly listed as liable

Complainant also demanded:

- \* Setoff and settlement
- \* Return of all proceeds
- \* General ledger access
- \* Full reconciliation and credit correction

These are specific demands falling well within the jurisdiction of the PUC and supported by the utility's own financial disclosures and SEC reporting obligations.

### **II-A. CONSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FOUNDATIONS**

Complainant and her daughter operate under Divine Law and not under the jurisdiction of Article I corporate courts. Any claim by PGW, a municipal corporate utility, over the living woman or her estate must be proven by contract and full disclosure, not presumption.

This matter implicates serious questions of authority, jurisdiction, and commercial fraud. The following legal authorities, codes, and maxims support Complainant's demand for remedy:

- \* 28 U.S.C. § 455 – Mandates recusal of any judge whose impartiality may reasonably be questioned.
- \* 28 U.S.C. § 607 – Forbids judges from practicing law from the bench.

\*Trinsey v. Pagliaro, 229 F. Supp. 647 (E.D. Pa. 1964) – Attorneys cannot testify or introduce evidence into court without being sworn witnesses. Judicial actions based on unsworn statements are invalid.

\*Penhallow v. Doane’s Administrators, 3 U.S. 54 (1795)– The United States, as an artificial entity, cannot attain parity with the living man. The court can only operate with legal fictions.

\*Elliott v. Piersol, 26 U.S. 328 (1828) – Orders from a court acting without jurisdiction are void ab initio and create no lawful obligation.

\*Cooper v. Aaron, 358 U.S. 1 (1958)– No government official, including a judge, may act in violation of the Constitution.

\*Liteky v. U.S., 510 U.S. 540 (1994)– Mandates disqualification of a judge when impartiality is compromised.

\* United States v. Sciuto, 521 F.2d 842 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996)– Due Process requires unbiased adjudication; disqualification is mandatory.

\*Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States, 318 U.S. 363 (1943)– When the U.S. or its subdivisions enter commerce, they are subject to the same obligations and rules as private corporations.

\*Maxims of Law:

\* “Truth is expressed in the form of an affidavit.”

\* “An unrebutted affidavit stands as truth in commerce.”

\* “Fraud vitiates everything it touches.”

\* “Fraus et jus nunquam cohabitant – Fraud and justice never dwell together.”

The judge is bound by his or her oath under Article VI, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which mandates upholding the supreme law of the land—not corporate policy.

The Complainant, as a living woman, does not consent to administrative jurisdiction and stands in her full capacity as beneficiary and executor of her estate.

### **III. DEMAND FOR RELIEF**

Complainant respectfully requests the following:

1. That the Commission **\*\*reject PGW’s Reply as fraudulent\*\*** and adopt this Reply Exception as truth on the record.

2. That the Commission **\*\*grant judgment in favor of Complainant\*\*** based on PGW's material misrepresentation and failure to respond in good faith.

3. That PGW be compelled to:

- \* Acknowledge the account and customer history
- \* Return all dividends and interest
- \* Submit the full accounting and general ledger
- \* Correct credit reporting violations

4. That this matter be referred to the full Commission for further review, sanctions, or civil referral.

#### IV. VERIFICATION

I, Shasta-Patrice Brown, hereby verify that the statements made in this Reply Exception are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, belief, and understanding. I affirm that I am competent to state the matters set forth herein and have personal knowledge of the facts stated. I make this verification in good faith, invoking Divine Law and equity, under penalty of perjury of the laws of the united States of America.

Executed this 14<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Shasta-Patrice Brown  
5233 Heston Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19131  
[Shastapbrown@gmail.com](mailto:Shastapbrown@gmail.com)

# Philadelphia Gas Works

P.O. Box 3500, Philadelphia, PA 19122-0500

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

014139 000013267



ARIANA MARTIN  
SHASTA P BROWN  
5233 HESTON ST  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19131-3615



234

EXHIBITS

Presorted  
First-Class Mail  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Philadelphia Gas  
Works



# Philadelphia Gas Works

P.O. Box 3500, Philadelphia, PA 19122-0500

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

037532 000006000



ARIANA MARTIN  
SHASTA P BROWN  
3051 N STILLMAN ST  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19132-1306



23

Presorted  
First-Class Mail  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Philadelphia Gas  
Works





**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Reply Exception and Demand for Judgment was served upon:

Graciela Christlieb, Esquire  
Philadelphia Gas Works  
800 W. Montgomery Avenue  
Philadelphia, PA 19122  
graciela.christlieb@pgworks.com

On this 14th day of May, 2025, by electronic mail.

Shasta-Patrice Brown

