

FILE

BEFORE THE PUBLIC
UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO

PAUL E. FISH,

Complainant,

vs.

THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY
D/B/A DOMINION ENERGY OHIO,

respondent

) Case No. 21-0760-GA-CSS

)

)

) ADDITIONAL RESPONSE TO

) ANSWER

PUCO

2021 AUG 12 AM 11:28

RECEIVED DOMINION ENERGY

Here comes PAUL E. FISH (Mr. Fish) with an additional response to the answer to the complaint filed against **THE EAST OHIO GAS COMPANY D/B/A DOMINION ENERGY OHIO (Dominion)**.

Mr. Fish DOES NOT agree with Dominion's assertions that state that this matter has been settled and that the Complainant has been satisfied, and Mr. Fish wishes to pursue this complaint.

The whole reason for the complaint, and the core of said complaint, was not "how the Dominion personnel are 'attired', NO, the core of the complaint is that Dominion, in its recorded actions, attempted to intimidate Mr. Fish and to coerce Mr. Fish into surrendering his rights in regards to the facial concealment (not attire) that Dominion forces their employees to wear. It was clearly stated in the initial response that says:

"This brings us to the next point. Mr. Fish alleges that Dominion attempted to usurp the rights of Mr. Fish by holding their company policies above established

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.
Technician 88 Date Processed 8.12.21

law by trying to force Mr. Fish and his family to surrender their property rights and their rights to make lawful rules for their property, and, in addition, attempted to ignore the religious rights and the sanctuary status of their home, by attempting to intimidate and to threaten Mr. Fish with utility shutoff if Mr. Fish would not put Dominion's company policy above his, and his family's God-given rights."

Just because Dominion chooses to try to change the terminology of facial concealment to "attire", doesn't make it attire, no more than if we were to say that a dog is a locomotive. In their attempt at changing terminology, they are trying to make it appear as if Mr. Fish is being unreasonable and objecting to something that is as common as pants or shirt, which is far from the truth.

We ask that the PUCO not allow themselves to be manipulated by Dominion, and that the PUCO look into the CORE matter at hand, and that is the intimidation of Mr. Fish and his family, by Dominion, and the subsequent threats of utility shutoff if Mr. Fish was not willing to surrender his rights to Dominion in lieu of their company policy. With this said, Dominion still has yet to address their actions that prompted this complaint as required in **Adm. Code 4901-9-01 (D)**! It would be a miscarriage of justice for the PUCO to dismiss this case, or to close this case, and to allow Dominion to completely ignore **Adm. Code 4901-9-01 (D)**, even though they (Dominion) cited it in their response with no supporting explanation.

FURTHERMORE, IF DOMINION FAILS TO ADDRESS Adm. Code 4901-9-01 (D), again, in full and complete explanative language, we ask that it be considered an admission of guilt and that a verdict of guilty be rendered against them.

There is a recorded timeline of action by Dominion, action that plainly shows that Dominion tried to impose their company policy regarding facial concealment onto Mr. Fish and his family, and even after being told of Mr. Fish and his family's rights regarding the situation, proceeded to ignore the Fish family's rights, and to threaten them with utility shutoff. This is even after Mr. Fish offered compromises such as allowing their tech to conceal their identity while around their equipment, but not while entering or exiting the house, where all

residents of the house would be at least 20 feet away from the tech, allowing him or her to be all alone, which is above and beyond the social distancing requirements.

The fact is that the only legal authority that Dominion has within the home and sanctuary of the Fish family, or any family in a private residence for that matter, is right in the vicinity of their meter, and nowhere else. This is why Mr. Fish provided for the allowance of facial concealment around the equipment of Dominion, so that their tech could still be in compliance with their company's policy WHILE also respecting the LEGAL rights of Mr. Fish and his family. Dominion, however, according to their recent actions, leads one to believe that Dominion believes that they have authority over all property and that the rights of their customers only are applicable if not in conflict with their company policy. If this were to be adjudicated, one needs to ask whether or not the court would uphold company policy over established law. If the judge were competent and lacking in corruption, the judge would most certainly rule on the side of established law as opposed to company policy.

Let it also be known that while Dominion was attempting to force their company policy onto the Fish family, there was no mask mandate by the state, county or city, meaning that the policy that Dominion was forcing was completely organic, and without any outside pressure or influence. This says that Dominion acted on its own volition.

Adm. Code 4901-9-01 (D) Still has not been addressed by Dominion, they have not even attempted to justify or even explain their actions regarding this issue. As said in the original response:

"In the answer by Dominion, they have failed to address their alleged actions that prompted this complaint, as required in (D), so to dismiss this complaint without all evidence being heard and all pleas being made would be premature to say the least. Furthermore, without (D) being satisfied, (F) cannot be legitimately addressed or even considered".

)

This statement appears to have been overlooked by the PUCO, and it is requested that the PUCO orders Dominion to explain their actions. It is also requested by Mr. Fish that this case not be dismissed, and if it is, not with prejudice, because if this case were to be dismissed with prejudice, knowing that the case is in regards to Mr. Fish and his family's human, property, and religious rights, the PUCO would be granting Dominion permission to overrule established law, and to put their company policy in its place, which, if adjudicated, would most likely cause the PUCO to fall under unneeded scrutiny and adverse legal action. It is not within the scope of authority for the PUCO, or any other authoritative body in the United States of America, to grant the usurpation of any of the US citizens' rights, without due process. With this said, any dismissal **WITH PREJUDICE** would, in fact, would deny Mr. Fish of due process, and would in fact, be usurpation of Mr. Fish's rights and of the rights of his family, because it would provide no recourse for Mr. Fish if Dominion were to attempt this same action in the future, and would provide Dominion with established case reference in order to empower the illegal usurpation of Mr. Fish's rights in all future interactions.

Mr. Fish asks that the PUCO holds Dominion accountable for their actions, and that upon a guilty verdict, Dominion is ordered to send letters to all of their customers in all of its 16 states, stating that they promise to keep the rights of their customers above their company policies, and that they will accommodate any and all American citizen's rights, no matter what their company policies might dictate. The letter should also provide a list of the rights that could be violated and the laws that protect those rights, so that everybody is informed. (This is a more than reasonable resolution to this case, and causes absolutely no harm or hardship to any parties involved, and is the most equitable solution for all parties involved.)

If the PUCO were to find it necessary to dismiss this case, which would, in the opinion of Mr. Fish and company would be premature, we ask that the PUCO do so **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**, in order not to overstep the authority of their position by improperly granting a company, wholesale authority over the legal rights of United States Citizens, and to possibly bring themselves into violation of Federal and State constitutional laws, themselves.

)

IN CLOSING, Mr. Fish and company are reasonably confident that the PUCO will do that which is legally proper, constitutionally adequate, and which is satisfactory for all parties involved, and allow this case to be resolved properly and thoughtfully.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul E. Fish

429 Independence St
Fairport Harbor, Ohio
44077

Sunday, August 8, 2021

Mailed via USPS, Monday, August 9, 2021.

2