



0000148647

DOCKET NO. E-01750A-09-0149

September 27, 2013

Roger Chantel
10001 E. Hwy. 66
Kingman, AZ 86401

RECEIVED

2013 SEP 30 P 4: 31

ORIGINAL

Belinda A. Martin
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKETED
SEP 29 2013

55-111-111
EJH

Dear Ms. Martin,

You are the Administrative Law Judge that has your office in the Arizona Corporation Commission building. You are probably acquainted with Janice Alward, the Chief Legal Counsel for Steve Olea, the Commissioners and others that share the same lunchroom with you and probably drink coffee out of the same pot. You probably share the same set of law books or computers that are purchased by ACC. The software in these computers more than likely has software- linked connections. Larry K. Udall, attorney for Mohave Electric Cooperative (hereinafter identified as MEC), communicates with special interest groups in the ACC and with legal council of the ACC. I would like to communicate with you in an open and friendly manner. Some of the truths I share may seem a little forward. In many cases absolute truths are hard to accept and usually most people do not want to talk about them.

In many cases when it comes to the legal process known as oral argument on a motion all of the evidence has been submitted and the legal points and authorities have been presented. Your orders were clear that no new pleadings or legal authorities would be considered after September 23, 2013. Your orders were clear in that MEC was ordered to file its Response to the Complainants' Motion to enforce no later than September 23, 2013. It should be noted that I did not receive MEC's response until September 25, 2013. The cancelation of the hearing on September 25, 2013 clearly indicates that MEC's attorneys are working with individuals, more than likely legal staff of the ACC, to come up with some way to get around addressing the issues in the motion for enforcement.

The people of the State of Arizona elect the body that created the Arizona Administrative Code. The laws created by this governing body are clear and the enforcement of the Administrative Codes are required by every person that receives a pay check from the citizens that support the governing body of the State of Arizona.

I am sure you are aware that I am a believer in Divine Intelligence. Divine Intelligence's purpose on this earth is to advance human societies. In my 50 years of training in understanding concepts of a visionary, I have had numerous interactions. I would like to share one with you that may help you move forward in peace of mind and spirit. The event occurred while I was in Viet

Nam. The political forces, at that time, strongly expressed to the military that under no circumstances were children to be shot at or killed. If this were to happen the people connected were to be court marshaled. The Viet Cong used children to deliver explosives onto our convoys. I was on one of these convoys when I saw a child with an explosive pack coming toward the convoy. It was clear as to what his intentions were. If I were to shoot this child I would be court marshaled. If he reached the convoy soldiers would be wounded or killed. I asked God what I should do. In a split second, He revealed this: "Stop the truck abruptly, jump out of the truck, start waving your hands and yell like a mad man." My mind said if you do this, the Viet Cong will shoot you and you will die. I hesitated for a moment, but then I stopped the truck abruptly, the truck behind me hit my truck, I opened the door jumped out start yelling and waving my hands as I ran straight toward the child with the explosives. In the meantime the soldiers jumped out of the trucks with their M-14's in hand. There was so much confusion occurring that the child ran into the crowd. The Viet Cong lacked understanding of what had just occurred and vanish into the jungle. That child was able to return home to his family unharmed, none of the soldiers were hurt, and the Viet Cong soldiers were not part of an action that could have turned deadly for all of the citizens that were in the middle of this action.

Your judicial order has many similarities, in that it takes bravery to place it into action. It will cause some confusion, but it is a peaceful solution to all of the conflict that is surrounding our present government offices. Your judicial order is supported on the basis that MEC did not address the following issues:

1. MEC does not have a right of way to have their poles and lines on this property.
2. MEC makes reference to Chantel v. Mohave Electric Cooperative, but does not give precise quotes or the location of their references in the case that support their claims. This moots their claim to this case.
3. The case Chantel v. Mohave Electric Cooperative failed to address the safety issues outlined in the enforcement order. The enforcement order is a common sense action needed, so people will support the present authorities.
4. This case did not address the issue that Mohave County did not have jurisdiction to issue a disconnect notice. These attorneys used communication that violated their professional conduct codes. This issue moots claims by these attorneys and moves these issues into common sense law, or common law.
5. I am sure you are aware that the phrase of "without merit" does not exist in common sense law.
6. MEC has never presented evidence that the complainants have the ability to pay. They do make unprofessional gestures to you by underlining parts of R14-2-211 "where the customer has an inability pay" "who have an inability to pay"

Let's look at some of the evidence that has been presented to you.

1. Did MEC have a right to disconnect the complainants' electricity?
The answer is NO. This can be verified in a number of ways.
MEC's claim, that is in front of you, is that I constructed a building

under their lines in their right of way and this building was to close to their high voltage transmission lines. To make these claims a utility has to have a granted right to be present on the property. If you would examine the evidence submitted to your jurisdiction you will find that evidence exists showing that MEC does not have a right a way across the south portion of said property. MEC has not verified their claim nor have they submitted any evidence supporting their claims that they had a right to transmit electricity over the building. Since they failed to prove that they did not have a right to transmit electricity over that building, then they acted in bad faith and violated their profession code of conduct in the area of securing justice for all.

2. If you were to examine the pleading just submitted by MEC you will find that they refer to a case Chantel v. Mohave Electric Cooperative. They claim to you that the issue surrounding the termination or the reinstatement of electricity is without merit. The attorneys that have presented these pleading to you claim the issues surrounding R14-2-211 (A) (5) (6) has been resolved adverse to the Complainants. These attorneys make the claim, but they do not provide you with any proof that the Appeals Court clearly addressed the issue that is underlined on page 2 of their response. "where the customer has an inability to pay." If you were to refer to R14-2-201 (18) "Inability to pay"
 - a.) Is not gainfully employed and unable to pay, or
 - b.) Qualifies for government welfare assistance,
 - c.) Has an annual income below the published federal poverty level and can produce evidence of this, and
 - d.) Signs a declaration verifying that the customer meets one of the above criteria and is either elderly, handicapped or suffers from illness.

A large amount of evidence has been submitted that the complainants appeared to be unable to pay "Inability to Pay" in 2008 and is still there. The evidence submitted would be equal to a declaration. This alone is grounds for the issuance of the enforcement order.

The first issue of R14-2-211 (A) (5) (6) is, MEC did not present substantial evidence proofing they had a legal right to disconnect Complainants' Electricity. If this jurisdiction were to examine the complaint they would find that MEC has not provided absolute evidence to this jurisdiction that any type of safety violation occurred. If this jurisdiction would examine evidence submitted it would find that MEC had no right to be present on this property. If they have no right to be present on this property, they have no right to claim that a violation occurred. It becomes clear that these two attorneys acted outside of their professional code of conduct. The reconnection of complainants' and reinstatement of their electricity can only be resolved by you issuing the Order of Enforcement.

On page 3, Michael A. Curtis and Larry K. Udall made a statement that MEC did not disconnect the Chantel's electrical service because of an unpaid bill.

These two attorneys are presumed to be competent in the laws of the State of Arizona. They know that Mohave County does not have jurisdiction to issue an order to disconnect power that has not gone through a meter and into a building. If you were to examine all of the pleadings in this case one would find that these attorneys used their professional title to coerce Mohave County offices to issue the disconnect even though these attorneys knew it was outside of Mohave County's jurisdiction to issue this disconnect. This is a gross violation of rules of professional conduct. These attorneys go on to make statements referring to some kind of violation that they claimed occurred and that violation affects the health of the consumer or the general population. In the enforcement order it is ordered that Steven Olea, Director of the Arizona Corporation, conduct an inspection from mile marker 66 to mile marker 80 outside of Kingman AZ along Hwy 66. This inspection will provide documented evidence as to where and what the safety issues are and where they exist. It becomes clear to the citizens that there is something very bad happening when a public employee will not conduct a safety inspection or if an important person like yourself will not issue an Enforcement Order.

These two attorneys claim that issue in this complaint are being res judicata. They may have been able to submit this claim if they would not have acted outside of their professional code of conduct to get the courts to give them a summary judgment that did not resolve the issues in the complaint that they submitted as Exhibit A.

There are a large number of other issues that could be presented to you in support of MEC's misrepresentation to the issues to this jurisdiction. A sensible way to address the issues is to issue the Enforcement Order as it is written.

I am requesting that you issue this Order of Enforcement within seven days of the date of this letter. I am sorry for the short time table. You have evidence in your possession that I need continuous electricity. That will only happen if you issue the Enforcement Order.


The Enforcement Order:

1. Supports the Governor's responsibility to assure that the citizens are protected from unsafe conditions.
2. It reassures the citizens that the Attorney General and his staff are supporting the laws that the Legislature has passed.
3. The Enforcement Order assists the Secretary of the State of Arizona in his responsibility to manage the affairs of the State in the best interest of its citizens.
4. It protects the Commissioner and the staff of the Arizona Corporation Commission from claims of existing corruption.
5. It requires MEC to move forward in resolving the issues. This will cause the dismissal of the complaint.
6. This gives Steven Olea the power to work with MEC in the way he thinks is in the best interest of the citizens of the State of Arizona.

The only reason that this Enforcement Order would not be issued would be because you believe that MEC would not honor your order.

May God be with you in helping you make your decision.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger Chantel
Union Carpenter/ Visionary
Veteran and Concerned Citizen

Copies sent to Attorney General Tom Horne and his staff,
Governor Janice K. Brewer & Secretary of State Ken Bennett