



0000154309

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

RECEIVED

2014 JUN 25 A 10:29

**BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION**

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION  
DOCKET CONTROL

Commissioners  
BOB STUMP, CHAIRMAN  
GARY PIERCE,  
BRENDA BURNS  
BOB BURNS  
SUSAN BITTER SMITH

**ORIGINAL**

Docket No. E-01750A-09-0149

IN THE MATTER OF THE FORMAL  
COMPLAINT OF ROGER AND DARLENE  
CHANTEL

**BRIEFING ON R-14-2-211(A) (5) (6)  
R14-2-202(B) (1) (2) R-14-2-  
208(A) (1) AND (F) (1)**

COMPLAINANTS,

Arizona Corporation Commission

MOHAVE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE  
INC.

**DOCKETED**

RESPONDENT.

JUN 25 2014

DOCKETED BY

Complainants have filed a complaint and motions in this jurisdiction under the authority of the Arizona Constitution and the founding documents of this nation known as the Constitution of the United States of American and the Declaration of Independence, adopted July 4, 1776. The issues in the complaint fall under Common Law of the right to own and use property.

**BACKGROUND OF THIS CASE**

In 2005 the Complainant, Roger Chantel, contacted the Respondent, Mohave Electric Cooperative, Inc., hereinafter referred to as MEC, and asked this company to provide a copy of the width and location of their right of way for their high voltage transmission lines on the property located at 10001 E. Hwy 66. After a number of letters sent to MEC over a period of

1 about a year, one of the MEC employees responded with a very  
2 hostile letter claiming that if I, Roger Chantel/Complainant,  
3 wanted these high voltage transmission lines removed from this  
4 property, I would have to pay MEC to remove them. Complainant  
5 lacked understanding as to why MEC was so hostile about giving  
6 the location of their right of way for these high voltage  
7 transmission lines. Complainant hired a title company to find  
8 the documents that would give the location of the right of way  
9 for these high voltage transmission lines. This title company  
10 claimed there wasn't any evidence of a recorded right of way for  
11 these high voltage transmission lines on said property. It  
12 became clear that MEC did not have a right to have these lines  
13 on said property. During this time period, Complainant  
14 discovered that some of the high voltage transmission lines were  
15 unsafe and a possible hazard to the people using Hwy. 66 and  
16 Complainants' family. The unsafe poles and lines were part of  
17 an important railroad signaling system. The trains transfer  
18 freight, national military equipment and passengers. MEC showed  
19 no concern and did not make any effort to correct the problem.

20 Being trained by the Divine Intelligence in the art of  
21 visionary concepts, Complainant entered into a process to find  
22 out what the Divine Intelligence would reveal about what should  
23 be done. Over a period of time the design of a structure was  
24 revealed. This structure had an unusual shape. The materials  
25 were different and the construction process was unconventional.  
26 The structure was multipurpose in that the design and location  
27 was to protect the lines from whipping onto Hwy. 66 if and when  
28 they would break. This structure would prevent stress that  
29 maybe put on the lines servicing the railroad signal. It served  
30 as a storage area and green house.

31 MEC and its attorneys created a scheme to cover up the fact  
32 that they were using the property occupied by the Complainants

1 without permission. This scheme involved personnel of the Mohave  
2 County Planning Department. MEC's attorneys made claims that MEC  
3 had a recorded right of way to have their high voltage  
4 transmission lines and poles on said property. MEC made claims  
5 to the Director of the Mohave County Planning Department that  
6 the structure did not meet the National Electric Safety Code  
7 (NESC) for line clearance. MEC's personnel and their attorneys  
8 expanded their scheme by disconnecting the Complainants'  
9 electricity and building a new high voltage transmission line  
10 around the entire distance of said property. They then claimed  
11 the Complainants had to pay for the rebuilding of said system.  
12 This part of the scheme was to cause harm and damage to the  
13 Complainants' financial ability to address the issue of MEC  
14 taking and using this property without paying any type of  
15 compensation.

16  
17 **MEC's SCHEME TO CAUSE DAMAGE**  
18

19 MEC and their attorneys' scheme was to enlist the Mohave  
20 County Planning personnel to issue a Disconnect Order to take  
21 the electricity away from the Complainants with the intent to  
22 force the Complainants into giving MEC a right of way without  
23 paying any compensation for the use of said land. The  
24 Complainant made a reasonable offer to resolve the issue, by  
25 suggesting MEC correct the safety issue by adding one pole to  
26 bring their lines and poles into the present ACC standards. This  
27 would have resolved the safety issue, if one existed. The  
28 Respondent's (MEC) response and action was to disconnect the  
29 electricity to the home where the Complainants reside. MEC's  
30 actions were clear that the pretense of a safety violation was  
31 not the issue. They were using their power in a way to cause  
32 harm and financial damage to the Complainants by rebuilding

1 these lines and claiming the complainant had to pay for the  
2 construction of these new lines.

3 It was discovered that many of the utilities in the State  
4 were working with the Arizona Corporation Commission staff to  
5 set the landscape for a much larger action, which is to create  
6 procedural laws to enforce a large rate increase over the next  
7 few years. A close examination of issues and facts of these  
8 issues will support claims that people of title have been  
9 imported into this scheme.

10 MEC's attorneys and the administrative staff of the Arizona  
11 Corporation Commissioner had full knowledge that the  
12 Complainant, Roger Chantel, has Sleep Apnea and needs continuous  
13 electricity to operate his breathing machine. The Complainants  
14 have submitted a number of **EMERGENCY REQUESTS** over the past five  
15 plus years to have their electricity reinstated. This is going  
16 on six years now and the Commissioners, the Arizona Corporation  
17 Commission Utility Director, nor any of the administrative staff  
18 of the Arizona Corporation Commission have taken any action to  
19 reinstate Complainants' electricity. Under the Common Law of  
20 this nation, known as the United States of America, and the  
21 State of Arizona, the people have a right to life, the right to  
22 own property, the right to charge rent for usage of one's  
23 property, the right to have one's electricity reinstated, and  
24 the right to bring attention of safety issues to government  
25 agencies. These laws are part of the system that is allowed by  
26 the government of these United States of America. What has been  
27 discovered is that some people of title are bringing into  
28 existence a new government that governs the people by Procedural  
29 Law, which is created by people of title. When one follows how  
30 procedural law is applied, one will find that corruption is  
31 close by.



1  
2 **DAMAGES THAT OCCURRED AT THE HANDS OF**  
3 **MEC AND THEIR ATTORNEYS**

4 The Complainants have experienced the following damages because  
5 of MEC and its attorney's actions;

- 6 1. MEC unjustly disconnected the Complainants'  
7 electricity. This action has caused the  
8 Complainants damage in the amount of \$90,000. The  
9 Complainants had to install and maintain  
10 equipment to produce electricity that was needed  
11 to survive.
- 12 2. The Attorneys for MEC have created a scheme to  
13 cause large amounts of attorney fees to be  
14 generated and the Complainants have been damaged  
15 in the amount of \$92,000.
- 16 3. MEC has not paid the rent for having their lines  
17 and poles on said property where Complaints  
18 reside. The Complainants are requesting that MEC  
19 pay the rent bill in their possession.
- 20 4. Complainants ask the jury to award damages for  
21 bad faith and malicious conduct and any other  
22 type of damage the jury may determine.

23 It appears that this tribunal does not have jurisdiction in  
24 these areas. Will this tribunal try to use procedure law to  
25 claim its authority in these areas? If this tribunal uses  
26 procedural law in these areas, is this evidence that supports  
27 the concept that the Commission is moving forward in preparing  
28 its procedural laws for large utility rate increases?

29  
30 **ARIZONA CORPORATION ADMINISTRATION PROCEEDURE ORDERS**  
31  
32

1           The Complainants do not wish to amend their complaint to  
2 include the allegations regarding MEC's equipment along Highway  
3 66. A new complaint can be filed by the citizens in the area.

4           The ACC report indicates that there is an unsafe condition  
5 on this property. This can be resolved by MEC filing an  
6 application in compliance to R14-2-202 B (1) and (2). The issue  
7 in front of this administrative body is:

- 8           1. Will MEC voluntarily file for application to remove  
9           their abandoned poles, lines and equipment? or;
- 10          2. Will the administrative body have to issue the order  
11          to file an application to remove the abandoned poles,  
12          lines and equipment?

13          The Complainants will be willing to draw up an agreement to  
14 allow MEC to enter said property to remove the poles that are in  
15 the application on file with the ACC.

16          The issue in front of this jurisdiction is whether this  
17 jurisdiction will honor the founding documents of the State of  
18 Arizona and that of the United States. This tribunal has  
19 questioned "Citizens' Jurisdiction". Citizens' Jurisdiction is  
20 presented in a number of ways in the Declaration of  
21 Independence, adopted in Congress on July 4, 1776. This document  
22 clearly gives the governed people the right and the duty to  
23 abolish a government agency that claims the right to make  
24 decisions that cannot be appealed. Another way is trial by jury.  
25 The federal and some state elected officials are examining the  
26 need for new laws allowing Private Citizens' Courts. It is not  
27 clear as to whether this tribunal will recognize the VII  
28 Amendment of Constitution of the United States. The  
29 Complainants ask this tribunal to honor to the VII Amendment and  
30 the Articles in the Arizona Constitution of due process of law  
31 by transferring all of the Common Law issues to a court that can  
32 conduct a trial by a 12 person jury, or to a Private People's

1 Court for a trial in front of a body of private citizens. Trial  
2 by jury has been legally supported for hundreds of years along  
3 with the right to appeal a decision.

4 Under Common Law, MEC can resolve the issues of damage it  
5 has created.

6 It appears that this tribunal is moving toward Procedural  
7 Law. Procedural Law is the decision of one person. That person  
8 can easily be persuaded by other people of title. In the world  
9 of common people this is called corruption. If one looks at  
10 this group of people, their actions appear to be corrupt. The  
11 easiest way to address this kind of corruption is to abolish the  
12 present ACC, terminate its employees and install a new ACC.

13  
14 The Common Law approach to the reinstatement of the  
15 Complainants' electricity is to determine if an actual distance  
16 violation even occurred. What kind of damage did this "so  
17 called" violation create, if any? Did it really merit the  
18 action MEC took? This claimed violation occurred on a high  
19 voltage transmission line. High voltage transmission lines are  
20 under the jurisdiction of the Arizona Corporation Commission.  
21 There is no record that the ACC issued a disconnect order.  
22 These attorneys knew that the Mohave County Planning staff did  
23 not have the authority to issue a disconnect order. This is a  
24 crime when one looks at the oaths, cannons and damages that have  
25 occurred.

26 If an agency uses Procedural Law to set aside Common Law  
27 issues, which in this case are the reconnection of electricity,  
28 the use of property without compensation, entering property  
29 without permission of the owner, failing to file application for  
30 removal of abandoned poles, in accordance to R14-2-202 B (1) and  
31 (2). Will the action of this body give the State Legislature the  
32

1 right to terminate a destructive agency and terminate its  
2 employees without retirement benefits?

3 The procedural order fails to address a number of issues in  
4 the complaint, such as the EMERGENCY REQUEST FOR REINSTATEMENT  
5 OF ELECTRICITY, the plan for reinstatement of electricity and  
6 how it will affect the present electric system.

7  
8 **MOTIONS AND ENFORCEMENT ORDER**

9  
10 To the people of the nation, the Common Sense procedure  
11 would be to place value on Common Law.

12 1. MEC shall comply with R14-2-202 B (1) and (2).

13 In many cases people using procedural law do so with the  
14 intent to protect one of the parties from experiencing damages.  
15 In many cases procedural law will cause more damages and create  
16 mistrust in and for people of title.

17 When a government agency moves from Common Law, the  
18 people/citizens, who are governed under that agency, have the  
19 right under The Declaration of Independence, "that whenever any  
20 form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the  
21 right of the people to alter it or to abolish it." The  
22 procedural orders themselves are evidence of how corruption  
23 becomes existent in procedural law. The administrative staff of  
24 the Arizona Corporation Commission issued a procedural order,  
25 which refers to R14-3-113. This law states that the purpose of  
26 this law is **for hearing before the Arizona Power Plant and**  
27 **Transmission Line Sighting Committee.** This law does not refer to  
28 any power of denying citizens their right to a fair just trial  
29 under law or their right to appeal a decision of an  
30 administrative tribunal. For this agency to issue an order to  
31 use their power to dismiss an action, so they can avoid their  
32 responsibility to issue an order to MEC to file an application

1 of abandonment and remove unused poles, lines and equipment, is  
2 grounds for action by the people. The people wish for a  
3 peaceful abolishment of this agency. This action is grounds for  
4 the State Legislature to protect the people of the State, the  
5 governing cities and counties in the State of Arizona from  
6 experiencing financial damages far greater than the Complainants  
7 are experiencing. As this agency creates the new government and  
8 governing policies that use procedural laws and orders, it will  
9 cause State Legislature to lose their power to act on larger  
10 rate increases planned by utilities. The use of procedural law  
11 is grounds for State Legislature to disable the Arizona  
12 Corporation Commission and terminate the Commissioner and  
13 employees without retirement benefits. There is substantial  
14 evidence that this agency is moving from its responsibilities to  
15 protect citizens' property rights, their right of happiness, the  
16 right to safe transmission of electricity and the right to  
17 reasonable price utilities.

18 The administrative staff of the Arizona Corporation  
19 Commission should know their boundaries of jurisdiction.  
20 Everyone reviewing these pleadings will make their judgment as  
21 to the fairness, the justice, the right of citizens, veterans  
22 and people in need to be given due process of law, as well as a  
23 trial by jury.

#### 24 25 **CONCLUSION**

26  
27 Everyone must ask the question: Why MEC will not file an  
28 application to remove these abandoned poles and lines? Why MEC  
29 will not reconnect Complainants' electricity? Why the  
30 Administrative Staff does not issue an order to MEC to file an  
31 application in accordance with R14-2-202 (B) (1) and (2)? Why  
32 the Administrative Staff will not issue an order to reinstate

1 the Complainants' electricity? Why the Administrative Staff  
2 seems to act in a bias and prejudice manner towards citizens  
3 seeking justice of electricity and the rates they pay?  
4 Dismissing this complaint and claiming that there is no  
5 appealable right is a direct violation of DUE PROCESS OF LAW OF  
6 THE LAND AND THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

7  
8 WHEREFORE, the Complainants pray that this Court grant them  
9 a trial by jury in a Private Peoples' Court or transfer to a  
10 Common Law Court for a jury trial.

11 WHEREFORE, the Complainants furthermore pray that this  
12 authority issue an order to file an application for removal of  
13 abandoned lines, poles and equipment in accordance to R14-2-202  
14 B (1) (2).

15 WHEREFORE, the Complainants furthermore pray that this  
16 authority issue an order to MEC to reinstate Complainants'  
17 electricity.

18  
19  
20  
21 Dated this 24 day of June 2014

22  
23   
24 Roger Chantel  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

Proof of and Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that on the <sup>24<sup>th</sup></sup>~~25<sup>th</sup>~~ day of June, 2014, I caused the foregoing documents to be served on the Arizona Corporation Commission by mailing the original and (13) copies to:

Docket Control  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Copy of the foregoing mailed this 25<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014 to:

Janice Alward, Chief Counsel Legal Division  
Lyn Farmer, Belinda A. Martin, Steven Olea  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Bob Stump, Gary Pierce, Brenda Burns,  
Susan Bitter Smith, Bob Burns  
Arizona Corporation Commission  
1200 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Curtis, Goodwin, Sullivan,  
Udall & Schwab, P.L.C.  
501 East Thomas Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Darlene Chantel

A. C. C. Employees may want to read this brief because it may affect them.