



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING
400 NORTH STREET
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

April 2, 2026

ALL PARTIES OF RECORD

Re: Alexander Miklos
Docket Number: C-2025-3058173

To All Parties of Record:

On March 24, 2026, my office received Exceptions to the Initial Decision of Administrative Law Judge Hoyer 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.

Due to the failure of Alexander Miklos to provide service on all the parties of record to the case, and in order to avoid prejudice to any party pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.535, the Respondent shall have until April 23, 2026 to file Reply Exceptions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Matthew L. Homsher'.

Matthew L. Homsher
Secretary

Enclosure
MH: acg

cc: All Parties of Record
Document Folder



Alex Miklos <shondor1122@gmail.com>

Fwd:

Alex Miklos <shondor1122@gmail.com>
To: Shondor1122@gmail.com

Wed, Apr 1, 2026 at 3:44 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alex Miklos** <shondor1122@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 31, 2026, 13:05
Subject: Fwd:
To: <Shondor1122@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alex Miklos** <shondor1122@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Mar 31, 2026, 12:21
Subject: Fwd:
To: Alex Miklos <Shondor1122@gmail.com>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alex Miklos** <shondor1122@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Mar 27, 2026, 16:37
Subject:
To: Alex Miklos <Shondor1122@gmail.com>

To: Honorable Deputy Chief Judge Hoyer and all parties
Fr: Alexander Miklos
Re: Exception(s)
Dt: 03/23/26

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I hope everything I'm about to state in this document is of public record.

If I may break, briefly, from attorney-like formality. I would be remiss if I did not mention that I had intended on submitting approximately 30 exhibits as needed to further squash the jurisdiction argument and in support of my overall case. More importantly I intended, and still intend to ask Aqua/Essential to provide, very simply...., ANY documentation or ANY information or ANY evidence to support what they have stated to me over and over. In short, ANY receipts regarding their "investigation" and their findings, and what or who or why informed them to insta-deny my original claim, dismissing me, my doctors, my evidence, and the facts.

I had tooth infection, that became a jaw and blood infection. As such I was....avoiding stress and pretty unproductive until recently.

That said, I felt the argument I made and in particular the sole exhibit provided by the Aqua more than demonstrated my point.

My immediate concern and where I immediately took note, and or Exception are as follows: (I will some, not all)
1- What leaps out is that a statement I made, on record, is edited, condensed, shortened over and over and over throughout the documents.

(Please know and understand that I am not assigning blame on this matter. I am just pointing it out as it is crucial.

My statement is edited, shortened, and not full- some in a way.

My statement is listed, shown, displayed, in a manner that completely mis-characterizes my statement.

It misrepresents my intent.

It misrepresents my point.

It misrepresents my contention.

It misrepresents the facts.

In short, the edited version of my statement...is not my statement.

This is problematic.

The statement to which I refer, is where I respond to the Aqua exhibit, sole exhibit, I believe. The exhibit is a bill. The bill is from Aqua IL/Essential showing my address in Illinois.

I state, and I still state today that I do not dispute where I live.

My next sentence....., and sentences, point out the TOP, left hand corner of the exhibit. Please view.

The exhibit lists

**Aqua, Illinois Inc
762 W LANCASTER AVENUE
BRYN MAWR, PA 19010**

This same address is also at the top the top of ALL mailings, communications, email alerts, text messages, etc, etc. 99.9 % of all employees i have spoken with on the matter at hand, and all matters... Top lawyers I have tw. The risk managers who handled the "investigation" and claim. I have tw, text alerts, news paper articles by the CEO Franklin, etc, etc..... They all reflect the Main hub, the corporate office, the headquarters, as being in PA. Also, all public articles, stories, media, social media, statements on merger plans, regarding Aqua "Illinois" come directly from PA, and not IL.

2- If the exhibit has been accepted as verification of my address then the same exhibit must be used to verify Aqua's address. I will attach and highlight Aqua's address per Aqua.

3- Essential Utilities is also located at 762 W Lancaster, that is fact and beyond dispute.

4- I'm also unclear reading the ruling generally if the decision was based on jurisdiction.

Or was it dismissed as my complaint was deemed..unworthy? If unworthy I will highlight below why my request for oversight is beyond worthy, it's crucial, it's vital and it is needed. I will further compromise, and further narrow my ask from the PUC below, and here briefly.

To the PUC, the public, John q citizen, and all parties:

I'm simply asking Aqua/Essential for their supporting evidence.

That's it, that's all. Very reasonable and common sense me thinks.

5- I understand the entire scope, the large scope of my complaint, including damages, etc, could be cumbersome. My entire complaint is also correct and just. This is why I previously made concessions, and I will do so, again in this format to limit the scope for what is within the PUC'S purview....and is DIRECTLY about actions, inactions, etc involving all parties located in PA, Bryn Mawr PA, and literally not one person from Illinois.

6- Ultimately I know and have known, that my original complaint which involves, (the short version.) I drink/drank contaminated water provided by Aqua/Essential, became deathly I'll, was told by Aqua repeatedly the contaminated water only affected pregnant persons or infants. I was neither. I suffered illness, damages, lost wages, lost job, and more..... Aqua/Essential in PA.....and not and NOT in IL, overrode my doctors, me, the evidence, the facts and Essentially told me to pound sand. THIS is why, among many other things, that this matter before the PUC is very worthy. It is necessary. A lack of review, a lack of oversight on this matter, gives this 46 Billion dollar company explicit consent, to treat its customers, the citizens, the public, the way they treated me....indeed Aqua treated me as UNWORTHY from day one. They treated me as unworthy as I called, emailed, messaged 100's of times as I simply wanted to confirm they had received my complaint. They treated me as unworthy, when they literally tampered with, altered, misdirected, and sabotaged, my federally protected certified letter. The letter was ONLY acknowledged 30 days later, after the USPS launched its investigation.

They treated me as unworthy, when they finally responded, to my emails on if they received my complaint, with a denial letter. Having claimed to have done a thorough investigation...LITERALLY before seeing any of the evidence, zero interviews. By definition, NOT an investigation.

It all continue(d), then with a company they use, ESIS. Much like Aqua, ESIS was actually working for Ace American....Ace American and ESIS are both owned by CHUBB.....

Anyway ESIS violated the PID insurance laws under article 149....about 10 times. All these statutes relate directly to the sentiment if being made to feel, unworthy.

They treated me, and my claim... on behalf of AQUA as unworthy when I quite mistakenly learned that ESIS received my claim, created an erroneous claim #, and closed the claim all on the same day and about 7 days prior to viewing the evidence. The corporate cs agent literally gasped when she relayed this info to me.

There's lots more....lots, LOTS more.

In summary, and in my view. Aqua treated me, my claim, and will treat others without PUC oversight, in my view, with a.....

"Let them eat cake" mantra.

7) Aqua/Essential, as well as, their paid third party affiliates ESIS...

Have provided exactly ZERO evidence, zero documents, zero policy, zero supporting information, zero test results, zero compliance results, zero information on what medical experts overruled my doctors, etc, etc etc.

They simply regurgitate but also change the wording that and I paraphrase, "AQUA did not put the Nitrates in the water and therefore bears no responsibility". 1- this is ridiculous on its face.

2- Let me clarify as the words Nitrates is used, even by me, quite casually throughout...

Nitrates means shit. It means fesus, sewage, human and or animal waste.....

3- AQUA has never identified the source, and has never taken steps to avoid further occurrences.

4- The action step they have taken is to NOT test the water for 1-3 years.....?

Aquas second part of the statement and I paraphrase is "We don't believe you, we don't believe you were made sick" "and they followed all regulations."

WHAT regulations??...

WHO exactly in PA has diagnosed my illness and dismissed it?

WHAT are this persons medical qualifications?

WHO in PA determined that ONLY infants or pregnant persons could have been effected? (generic responses or finger pointing to other organizations is not an acceptable response)

IF finger pointing is deemed acceptable, which it is not,

WHAT is the name of the person from the other agency or org that concluded that ONLY pregnant persons and or infants..... were solely at risk.

What are there medical credentials?

I have Polycythemia (thick blood). As I explained in my complaint and after much research AND in consult with my Hematologist...

When someone with Polycythemia consumes water contaminated with high Nitrates. There is a LIFE threatening, "synergistic" effect.

As I explained in my complaint. As I began to feel ill, I also began to drink mass amounts of green tea. Because the water had a strange taste, and as I explained in my complaint....I began boiling the water in a cased but also for the purposes of making the tea.

In hindsight, and as verified by my doctors and my own research....

Boiling water with high Nitrate levels, once again is potentially deadly to a person with even moderate polycythemia.

Its dangerous as it CONCENTRATES the Nitrates.

Any of the above are dangerous. When all are combined, it can and will cause serious and life threatening illness. I can personally confirm this. Experts confirm this. I literally felt like I was sea sick, terribly, green color, sea sick....for weeks.

Over a period of 30 years, as I recall, I believe i missed in total, 2 days of work due to illness. On this occasion I not only was unable to work, I missed over 10 consecutive days, and ultimately lost my job.

Given the above, I again ask, and it must be asked.

WHO in PA, and not in IL, determined that my having Polycythemia combined with drinking water contaminated with high Nitrates, was not relevant?

WHAT are their credentials?

WHO in PA, determined that my consuming boiled water was not relevant?

WHO in PA, determined that my drinking MASS amounts of green tea, also boiled, was not relevant?

On the contention that Aqua/Essential follows and followed all compliance and or regs....

Aqua has failed every audit in the last two years and they STILL have not complied, and released the water safety report that was DUE on July 1 2025.

And they have no intention to do so. That's not compliance. That's the opposite of compliance.

Also, SUPER relevant, COMMON sense which I asked over and over again. Just a fraction, a few more and I'll wrap.

On things like testing....again just common sense and facts that anyone would need to conclude as part of their

"investigation" to my claim. Or in order to rule against my claim. Or to override my doctors and the evidence I provided.

Like... WHAT were the Nitrate levels in the drinking water before, during, after my illness?

How often do you test?

What was the source of the Nitrates? Where was the source? What was done to prevent it again? etc, etc,

What else was in the water? Barium? (High levels of Barium (a radio active substance i believe....) were reported)

Were NITRITES tested for? Nitrites, I understand are almost always found with Nitrates. Nitrites are much, much, more dangerous.

This/these are just some of the questions that

In my previous life I was an HR manager for a fortune 500 company. Let's say an employee said they were injured at work. We acted immediately, investigated, sent employee for treatment, showed concern...., showed empathy....., took care of all medical trips, expenses, care.... If the employee had a personal doctor's note, that contended, as an example, that said employee could work but with restrictions.....We would then arrange for said employee to see a specialist. IF the specialist agreed we would follow that recommendation to the letter and accommodate said employee. If the specialist had a difference of opinion, perhaps that they were able to work but recommended physical therapy. Then we would once again take care of all recommendations, costs, therapy, or accommodations recommend by that specialist. What we did not do is to say, I don't believe you, I'm a medical expert and smarter than your doctor, go pound sand.

A second and final example of how I as an HR manager, the prestigious company I worked for, and how every company should handle a claim.

In this instance, an employee, our internal customer, files a claim. A claim stating for the sake of this example, that they were discriminated against because they were from planet Mars.
We would immediately launch a prompt, and THOROUGH investigation following the facts, conducting interviews, taking written statements, seeking and stating all regulations, medical expertise, etc,etc, etc.
We treated the employee with respect. We put action plans in place. We followed up before, during, and after on preventative measures. We submitted a formal response when the investigation was complete. In that response.....Nearly every sentence that was written was supported by an exhibit or exhibits. Any statement, or conclusion was facts and the facts were supported by said exhibits.

In summary,

I am asking the PUC in this response for some very narrow oversight. I'm asking for some help, and again I will focus or re-focus on just the matters that are directly under the PUC's purview.

Given what I have laid out above, I reckon I'm just asking the PUC to weigh in on how my complaint was handled and mishandled. My complaint was accepted at the corporate office in PA. My complaint was filled in PA.

I'm not asking the PUC for compensation. I'm not asking the PUC to rule on the case in terms of damages, etc..

I think it is fair for the PUC to evaluate how Aqua/Essential in PA, and not in IL.... handled this matter.

At minimum I would just ask the PUC to compel Aqua for their receipts.

The "Let them eat cake" or we don't believe you, and we've got time, resources, and billions in cash, and you do not.... must not stand.

Ty and Sincerely,
Alex Miklos