

November 11. 2021

**Mr. Chris O'Riley**, CEO of Corporation BC Hydro  
**Mark Fancourt-Smith** c.c.

We have been awaiting an important response from you urgently, and now it seems that BCHydro has chosen to once again cut off service to us ; not due to non-payment, not due to lateness in payment, but in retaliation for non-compliance to your demands, which is the same old same claims without a shred of evidence that we are obligated to comply with your demands. Up until you decided to cut off public utility to an 88 year old loyal client just ahead of the renowned Canadian Winter, is an act of violence. The Injunction was to turn the electricity on, as per status quo and keep it on.

There is a high probability of harm if service is not restored immediately.

We have submitted, over and over again, relevant information that has been replied to only by the usual copy/paste/canned response from someone named Mark Fancourt-Smith, alleging they represent BC Hydro, a Corporation, and he has not responded in any meaningful way, to the pertinent matters and addressing the valid and relevant issues on the table. No evidence of an obligation has been presented as of now, for the customer to blindly comply with BCHydro demands. Meanwhile, the alleged representative is defaming, labeling and libeling customers, akin to accusing the victim of inciting the assault.. Your loyal customer of many decades has never threatened, nor acted aggressively toward any employee. Choosing to accuse your customer of offenses for which you have presented no factual evidence of, cannot be presumed to exist. Once again, we reiterate that we have no objection to your choice to replace equipment for services, however, as a home owner we do not want this utility device installed upon the structure of our home based on safety, nor do we wish to have your employees trespassing upon our private property, and on our private dwelling. There is an easement and we wish only that BCHydro employees respect that as a right of any customer.

*If your enemy cannot destroy you, his job is to distract you. Derig Muham;*

*Re: Mark Fancourt-Smith alleged ; " that BC Hydro will not tolerate the aggressive behaviour and threats that have been made to it, its employees, and contractors by you in the past."*

This statement gives us cause for great concern. We sincerely hope that our account has been noted as disputed and not unjustly labeling us as difficult or threatening customers, which we are not.. There is simply no evidence to support it. We rely upon continuance of safe service for our very lives, and we have no ill will. We wish to resolve the matter. We wish only to receive meaningful progress in order to resolve the matter completely. We have waited for relevant responses but have only received demands and threats. Resolution should not consist of retaliation by disconnection, we feel we could easily come to an agreement to accomplish our wishes and your goals. Acceptable resolution would include: no extortion fee for installation of your known dangerous meter and installation on your pole, your full liability and within the easement lawfully allowed to BCHydro and not involving our safe property outside of that lawful easement.

Accusing customer common known political tactic;

*"Accuse the other side of that which you are guilty"* Hitlers propaganda minister Joseph Goebbels.

*"Accuse your opponent of what you are doing, to create confusion and to inculcate voters against evidence of your own guilt."* Saul Alinski

Is it ethical to take the money of a customer and use it against them? Is it not a conflict of interest to hire/employ an alleged re-presentative to invalidate, even criminalize, the wishes of a loyal impoverished customer? Is it ethical to label your customer as threatening, absent any evidence of such boisterous claims, when the only communication the customer receives is threats and demands?

Re; "While we do not intend to respond to all the matters raised in your letter we will address three things.."

The "letters" are a NOTICE of LIABILITY. Is it possible that your alleged "representative" can respond to at least one important matter? Once again, you have chosen to make demands, threats and, now have retaliated by cutting off necessary life sustaining utilities which all inhabitants of the Great land of Canada are entitled to. Sadly, instead of responding to the relevant concerns on the table, demands, followed by threats are the only response. We may be open to allowing permission to the premises to install this non-CSA safety tested or approved device on our private dwelling on private property if you can provide evidence of liability for any and all damages that could arise by your actions. We wish

only to receive uninterrupted use of public utility with which our current equipment is completely capable of delivering. You very well know this, and therefore, the recent disconnection can easily be interpreted as unjustified retaliation.

**The relevant important matter and issue is:**

*“As you are by now aware, you, and your employees have disconnected the power to your “dear customer, Kata” the 88 year old lady that your company attempted to damage, injure, and or kill in 2017, and again as of September 21 2021, for which you are liable. You continue to assault a customer in good standing for not wanting to put your known dangerous meter on her bedroom wall / house...Are you not responsible for causing more damage and injury knowing there is an injunction on BC Hydro? ”*

*3.2-7 A lawyer must not engage in any activity that the lawyer knows or ought to know assists in or encourages any dishonesty, crime or fraud. [1] A lawyer should be on guard against becoming the tool or dupe of an unscrupulous client, or of others, whether or not associated with the unscrupulous client.[2] A lawyer should be alert to and avoid unwittingly becoming involved with a client engaged in criminal activities such as mortgage fraud or money laundering. Vigilance is required because the means for these, and other criminal activities, may be transactions for which lawyers commonly provide services [3] If lawyers have suspicions or doubts about whether they might be assisting a client in any dishonesty, crime or fraud, before accepting a retainer, or during the retainer, the lawyers should make reasonable inquiries to obtain information about the client and about the subject matter and objectives of the retainer. These should include making reasonable attempts to verify the legal or beneficial ownership of property and business entities and who has the control of business entities, and to clarify the nature and purpose of a complex or unusual transaction where the nature and purpose are not clear.*

Dishonesty, fraud when client an organization

*3.2-8 A lawyer who is employed or retained by an organization to act in a matter in which the lawyer knows or ought to know that the organization has acted, is acting or intends to act dishonestly, criminally or fraudulently, must do the following, in addition to his or her obligations under rule 3.2-7: ... proposed conduct is, was or would be dishonest, criminal or fraudulent and should be stopped.*

Will you continue to ignore the most important and only thing that's relevant on the table? A woman whose very life that depends on heat during winter is now in great jeopardy because you chose to disconnect her just before the winter season. Is this a good business model for a public utility, acting ethically in what one would reasonably expect to act, with “clean hands” and “good faith”? Is that how you treat all of your customers for a few “shekels” ? showing your malicious violent actions again is another obvious attempt to punish and then fail to provide uninterrupted safe service to your customer and kill them instead, is this part of your “ethical” code of conduct?

*BC Hydro would first like to reemphasize that safety is an overarching, §organization-wide, §core value for us. We place “**safety above all**” and that reflects the expectation we have of our workforce, contractors and the §public that safety requirements are always followed. <https://docs.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2021/> [by **forcing UNSAFE smart meters on the whole public?**]*

Why is disconnection even an option for a public utility provider? Even telephone services allow the use of the phone line for emergency purposes. Why isn't there any other option other than complete and total tyrannical shutdown of a loyal customer, the only option offered when an issue is in dispute such as we are?

***Safety above all.** At the outset, we wish to emphasize that **safety is very important** at BC Hydro. We place “**safety above all**”, which means **safety** is an **overarching, organization-wide, core value for us**. It reflects the expectation we have of our workforce, contractors and the **public that safety** requirements are followed at all times. It also reflects our obligation to keep our workplace and assets safe through our design and construction, operations and maintenance, and asset investment programs. This approach integrates **safety** into how we plan, design, construct, maintain and run our operations throughout the company. This ensures consistency and clarity of **safety** requirements thereby **improving our safety** performance. **Safety is extensively regulated** and there is no need for additional regulatory oversight. [NOT when it comes to millions of smart meters?] <https://docs.bcuc.com/Documents/Proceedings/2020/>*

If your equipment were safety certified, and we have no evidence that they are, but if they were, why have you not yet provided that information to us? What is your validation for exercising threats, demands and coercion to your customers more beneficial to responding to the valid concerns not provided? Cui bono is most assuredly relevant because no other evidence has been provided to us other than threats or the like. Where is acceptance of transparency/legitimacy to install equipment that is contrary or even dangerous to the private dwelling and private property of your customer that it would be validly beneficial to them in any way? Disconnection of services is paramount to acceptance that BCHydro

would prefer to kill their “customer” as opposed to taking liability for their equipment? The goal of BCHydro and their longtime customer is disconnected so long as our safety is not part of that goal. Is it the goal of BCHydro just to push your known dangerous device agenda or is it to safely provide public utilities? We emphasize the word safety, because although you can claim safety, we have neither received nor been offered assurance of this alleged fact. The question on the table is: can you provide liability or guarantee of safety?

*Corix appreciates the initiative taken by the BCUC to launch this Safety Inquiry. Corix and CMUS are active in British Columbia's utility sector and therefore have a material interest in the outcome of this Safety Inquiry. In particular, Corix is interested in obtaining clarity regarding the BCUC's jurisdiction for the regulation of safety with respect to: **utility customers**; the utility, its employees and its assets; and members of the **general public** that are not customers of the utility. Corix Nov. 2020.*

*UCA grants the BCUC jurisdiction to: make orders it considers necessary for “the safety ... of the public”; make regulations requiring a public utility to conduct operations in a way that “does not unnecessarily interfere with, or cause unnecessary damage or inconvenience to, the public”; if the BCUC finds that the service of a public utility is unsafe, determine what is safe service and order the public utility to provide it; and appoint a supervisor or inspector to supervise or inspect the system, works, plant, equipment or service of a public utility with a view to establishing and carrying out measures for the safety of the public and of the users of the utility's service. CB Hydro to BCUC about “safety”.*

### **Undisputed Facts:**

February 2017 BC Hydro employees from metering services cut off electricity while the biggest cold storm occurred and was the coldest winter in decades, whereas those violent actions almost killed the “customer”, Kata S. with the excuse of an alleged “legacy meter charge”, The extortion, which was mainly for punishment and penalty for not submitting to the new tyrannical agenda to what? Threaten the customer with no utilities unless they comply with Hydro demands to replace a fully functioning analog meter with an inferior, unendorsed replica. Notwithstanding that not a single shred of evidence has been presented that “customer” has any obligation to do so.

*“Men are not governed by justice, but by law or persuasion. When they refuse to be governed by law or persuasion, they have to be governed by force or fraud, or both” George Bernard Shaw.*

The damage caused by the last BC Hydro cut off in 2017 due to willful malfeasance caused other issues such as, black mould, fridge and freezer fried and full of food over \$3k worth, interference with current medical requirements for comfort and dignity, and most important of all almost killed the 88 year old “customer” which has put her into a state of extreme vulnerability, which has accelerated her aging condition and causing her to be bed ridden requiring a caregiver full time job.

Pursuant to Freedom of information and constant Notices of liability specifically asking how “customer” is obligated and how the “Tariff act” applies, and claims by Hydro that the “customer” is obligated to install a known dangerous device upon their own private dwelling and private property, all of these reasonable, relevant clarification have been ignored. No factual evidence even exists that “customers” are obligated to opt in or opt out of this ponzi scheme, therefore, based on the lack of evidence provided by Hydro, “customer” we have simply chosen not to participate. Yet BCHydro has made a choice to punish their customers by preventing their ability to access a public utility. Again, this is not due to non-payment [notwithstanding 2 extortion charges of “failure to install”, whereas no evidence has been provided by anyone with 1st hand knowledge how those charges apply and we are obligated to pay the new extortion charge, please CORRECT your records, and remove the erroneous extra extortion charges] or lateness in maintaining payments, but in retaliation for not obeying BCHydro who, as yet, cannot prove their authority over the customer nor any breach by us.

### **Undisputed Facts from FOI**

After dealing with dozens of your “customer service” employees, uniform response letters of demands and threats, no advocates have reached out to resolve the issue, no witnesses, nor any factual evidentiary documentation over an entire decade has ever been provided to factually establish our obligation to comply with imaginary or invented reasons why we should be subject to being forcefully held to entertain these unjustified demands.

We have made little progress to be left safe and not harassed and remedy seem to be getting nowhere. BC Hydro insists on replacement of a functioning analogue meter and yet have failed to address the customer concerns or

requests of SAFETY in this important matter. BC Hydro seems to find no issue with terminating services without valid reason, which on its face, appears to be retaliatory in its purpose. Many undocumented reasons for the termination include but are not limited to “failure to install, (where no obligation has been established), expiration of current functioning equipment without a shred of evidence, and BCHydro’s claim that it owns the Plaintiffs property or equipment, again without a shred of evidence.

All correspondence thus far failed to address the customer concerns. Every effort to resolve this matter has been ignored. Customers filed a FOIA request form on February 20, 2020, and as a result, not one person with 1st hand knowledge under penalty of perjury in the matter has appeared who can provide this non-existent evidence.

Adrian DIX letter to BC Hydro, short version;

*...expenditure of more than \$1 billion of ratepayer’s money. The Smart Meter Program was exempted by the Liberal Cabinet from BCUC review and approval....Have the \$732 million in electricity theft benefits over the past 3 years and the next 17 years from the Program gone missing? The \$100 million figure doesn’t appear as any separate entry in a BC Hydro’s Annual Report from 2004 to the present. BC Hydro claims it is included in the Annual Report under “Unaccounted for energy and line losses.” This item is where BC Hydro records the losses that occur when electricity moves through the wires and other electrical devices such as transformers. If BC Hydro was losing a \$100 million a year to grow operators, one would expect it would have told the public about this other than when it needed to justify the Smart Meter Program...If BC Hydro is to achieve its financial goals with respect to smart meters, we should see clear evidence of success three years into the program. And yet, there is nothing in subsequent annual reports, public filings or on BC Hydro’s website to indicate any major reduction in electricity theft. None. In the SMI Program Business Case, the Liberal government and BC Hydro claimed the following: there was a \$100 million of electricity theft due to marijuana grow-ops in BC Hydro territory and that this involved the theft of 850 GWh/yr in fiscal 2012. BC Hydro then claimed that “realization of theft benefit is estimated at an initial 75%, declining to about 67% by 2027.” There is little evidence of any realization of these promises – no media articles and no BC Hydro public reports. And there is little evidence of an increase in the number of marijuana growing operations shut down by police. Nor is there any evidence of a significant difference between New Westminster, an electricity system without smart meters and Burnaby, which has since had them installed. My questions are simple: 1. BC Hydro continues to publicly stand-by the exaggerated claim of \$732 million in net benefits of the Smart Meter Program to reduce electricity theft compared to the pre-2012 system. What money has been saved to date? Is the realization of theft benefits anywhere near the claimed “initial” 75%? And if not, why does BC Hydro continue to mislead the public about the benefits of its investment? What impact will this have on rates should this initial failure continue? The Liberal cabinet, not BC Hydro, made the decision to proceed with smart meter spending. It refused to see those assumptions tested before the BCUC. And now, after the Northwest Transmission Line, deferral account, IT investments and the Clean Energy Act, it is ratepayers that are forced to pay the price. Similar claims are being made about the Site C dam, also exempted from legal review by the BCUC. BC Hydro then claimed that “realization of theft benefit is estimated at an initial 75%, declining to about 67% by 2027.” The customers who paid for smart meters deserve to know the truth about BC Hydro claims about the program, whether the business case presented was credible or not, whether BC Hydro advertising was truthful or not. It appears that \$732 million of BC Hydro claimed benefits of smart meters may be missing. I look forward to an explanation as to what has happened to date.*

Sincerely, Original Signed Adrian Dix MLA

The failures of BCHydro thus far are as follows;

#1 Evidence “customers” meter #6567209 [bought new, replaced in 2003], is the property of BC Hydro and does not belong to the owner of private dwelling on the private property, Regarding the dispute of said meter, the current functioning meter : No evidence has been provided that it is not safe, reliable, non-functioning, expired, or any other random claim by BCHydro to justify replacement and forced to accept a known dangerous “smart” device on a safe premises, and therefore any claims by BCHydro do not exist in facts, and are therefore irrelevant.

#2 Evidence of “customers’ obligation to be forced into a known dangerous plastic “smart meter” [transmitter/radio on/off] : No evidence has been provided, and after a decade of requests it does not exist.

#3 Missing factual evidence the "Tariff Act" applied to Plaintiff aka “customer”. Defendant aka BC Hydro has failed to provide any witness with personal first hand knowledge that the Tariff Act applies to Plaintiff / customer, they have merely provided a copy of the act itself, which is circular.

"Tariffs, quotas and other import restrictions protect the business of the rich at the expense of high cost of living for the poor. Their intent is to deprive you of the right to choose, and to force you to buy the high-priced inferior products of politically favored companies." ~ Alan Burris

re:(a) The Interim Order required you to serve the application and a copy of the Interim Order on BC Hydro. You did not do so.

Mr Lawyerman you make a lot of claims. Will you provide first hand knowledge of these claims under penalty of perjury ? You claim to know that we somehow “know” that you are the “representative” of BcHydro. Please provide evidence that you do indeed “re-present” your “client” and that this wild accusation which seems to presume we are being dishonest somehow, because without said evidence, that statement is only your opinion and nothing more: therefore is objectionable and irrelevant, serving only to cause discord, defamation and slander or libel the customer for disingenuous purposes. How this is assisting in resolving the issue overall is unclear. Claiming that you personally did not receive Notice, note we filed it to BC Hydro, who is the aggressor and Defendant in the matter. We have no evidence you are BC Hydro, or the alleged re-representative.

Re:(c) The Interim Order required you to serve the application on BC Hydro as soon as possible and to file an affidavit explaining that service. You did not do so.

You claim you did not get the Notice, see above.

*Doctors are just the same as lawyers; the only difference is that lawyers merely rob you, whereas doctors rob you and kill you too.~ Anton Chekhov*

The Injunction was made on or about 2017, against this violent act perpetrated by BC Hydro employees with the consent of CEO and others bellow his/her alleged authority , against the innocent and peaceful “customer/ratepayer”, Kata the Victim of abuse and extortion and penalizing her for not accepting a dangerous device to be forced upon her SAFE home.

The injunction against BC Hydro and its employees, was only agreed to under duress and by proxy of Judge, who gratefully intervened to ensure that Kata, who could not likely survive the cold winter without services, would possibly survive. The injunction did succeed in preventing Hydro from perpetuating the murder of their “customer”. Therefore the extortion fees in favor of life were accepted in an effort to preserve her life, therefore, agreement was established to pay this extortion known as “legacy charge” as a means to mitigate the damage, injury and violations against Kata your “customer”, and to not be forced to use a dangerous “smart” product forced upon the private dwelling on private property of her home and to allow her to continue in the peace of a ” SAFE home environment; to have peace and security with utility services in her home . The injunction stating to turn electricity back on doesn't mean to not keep it on, or for a time being. Where is the mediator to offer and discuss resolution? That BcHydro has absolved itself of this obligation is baffling and it seems this new tactic of force through termination of services will suffice as an excuse for disconnect in retaliation for non-compliance, with the sole intent of alleged authority and power as opposed to offering a resolution to the dispute.

Re: (b) The Interim Order required you to schedule the matter to be heard on the merits in a 2 hour hearing pursuant to the Court Rules. You did not do so. you failed to comply with the conditions, have elected to treat that interim relief as permanent while misinterpreting its scope.

If BC Hydro wants to file a Notice of claim against us, with persons who have 1st hand knowledge, signs an affidavit under penalty of perjury how their Tariff act and or legacy charge applies just cause we are customers, which would allow the “customer” to at least minimally complete the last part of the injunction, without BC Hydro's claim there is no need to schedule a hearing.

In 2017 may/june Injunction made against BC Hydro. power to be turned back on. and Customer will in turn pay the extortion known as “Legacy Charge”. That BcHydro has a political agenda is not recognized by the “customer” who only wishes to receive the SAFE uninterrupted electricity as one of the people of a great resourceful land. Extorting the people in an effort to sustain and maintain a political agenda could be a violation of RICO/Racketeering/unjust where undue and unjust corporate enrichment comes to mind. I am sure you are aware the meter lady/person gets \$1.40/read and BC Hydro charges \$65 for that read. If reading took a maximum 3 minutes BC Hydro gets \$1300/hour. This is cruel and unusual punishment and unjust enrichment and abuse of the “customer” who is a people of the land whom all own the land, the rivers/dams and BC Hydro and its equipment.

Re: prevent BC Hydro from exercising its powers pursuant to the Tariff and applicable statutes, as well as to prevent BC Hydro from complying with its own requirements under statute.

#1 No evidence Tariff applies nor evidence Your Tariff say customers will be forced to install known dangerous devices on the structure of a private dwelling, which we do not consent to, whether we like it or not.

#2 BC Hydro can install their “radio on/off smart meter” on their easement provided pole set aside for such purpose. To disconnect a customer solely upon the premise that they MUST have access to the structure of the private dwelling is unacceptable. BC Hydro cannot simply do what it wants under its own rules it makes. This doesn't mean we are refusing anything or that we are obligated to their arbitrary capricious and forceful edicts of being forced to their insistence of a known dangerous device being installed on our safe home, known as a private dwelling. We ask only that our private dwelling be respected.

#3 As stated over and over, If BC Hydro wants to force an installation of a “smart meter transmission/radio on/off” , no one is stopping them, they can install it on POLE # 2311973 which is in their easement and the the owner of the private dwelling need not grant nor consent to any further intrusion which is the same pole beside the property fence where **DAVID SILVER of ATC POWER** wearing a BC Hydro on his uniform cut 2 wires off all within BC Hydro's easement [the right of way] , they can install it themselves without any punishment or penalty or other extortion charges on their own pole, on their easement property, on their own liability, to force others to pay for something that's already been paid for by “customer/ratepayer”, is another form of extortion, penalty, punishment and unjust enrichment. **Cui Bono? Definitely Not the “customer”!**

#4 BC Hydro offers only one choice. Could this be an Antitrust law violation; “customers choice is a smart meter or a smart meter [radio on/off]”, disconnection of a utility SERVICE, utilizing intimidation of the customer, controlling the market by violating allocation, suppressing or failing to test the safety of said meter [not UL , Canada Electrical Code standards or CSA approved] , controlling information of data or testing of a utility device, whether it can be shown and has been known to cause damage, injury or loss. That said meter includes installation, if granted, of a potentially unsafe device to the structure of a private dwelling and, if it should fail, the “customer” is liable for all damages accepting the dangerous device which we don't agree with. Where is the informed consent? Where is the assurance, liability and benefit to us in accepting such an agreement.

A GTA resident recently came home to find his hydro smart meter fully engulfed in flames. Kevin Zeller soon found out he was responsible for most of the hardware used by Hydro One and was slapped with a bill for \$5,000.  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AvjEk\\_LDwys](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AvjEk_LDwys) 404,068 views. Since 2017.

Is the only choice “Comply or we will disconnect you? OH, and by the way, if anything goes wrong you the customer will have to pay for it, but, we will replace the dangerous device with another dangerous device.” Zero full disclosure to the customer of the private dwelling, to the extent of any and all damages that might result to their homes or their lives are catching on fire, coercion and wilful economic gain, collusion, insider information/trading, predatory acquisition policy, offensive felony violations while hiding behind the corporate veil, just one example would be removing smart meters from a crime scene, which is a prima facie case of felony manipulation incurring civil and criminal liability. offering only one choice that doesn't allow for personal accommodation to customer, but in favor of Hydro corporate goal, where BC Hydro sets the rules, the only choice, and the gain solely benefits BC Hydro with no consideration for the recipients. prima facie establish protections to the customer without any obligation whatsoever. This is an offence and felony under the law against racketeering. This is willful manipulation of the market and complicit with the potential to cause harm without care or concern.

*It is not the goal that renders the system oppressive; it is always the methods by which the goal is pursued. Whenever a government claims to have the people's interest at heart, you need to think again. In the entire history of mankind, there has never been a political elite sincerely concerned about the wellbeing of regular people. What makes any of us think that it is different now? If the AGe of Enlightenment has brought forth anything, it is certainly this: Never take anything any government tells you at face value. Always question everything any government does or does not do. Always look for ulterior motives and always ask: Cui bono? Who benefits? Whenever a political elite pushes an agenda this hard, and resort to extortion and manipulation to get their way, you can almost always be sure your benefit is definitely not what they have at heart. MEP Christine Anderson*

re:As you are aware, the reason for the disconnection of power to the Property on or about September 21, 2021 was that you have refused to permit an expired meter to be replaced, contrary to the Tariff, the Clean Energy Act, S.B.C. 2010, c. 22 (the “CEA”)

#1 Mr. Lawyer you again assume we are aware, the only thing we are aware of is you will use whatever means and do whatever you want and force a known dangerous product on our safe home, regardless of evidence, regardless of

rightful jurisdiction, with dirty hands, and bad faith. There is no evidence we are obligated to install a known unsafe smart dangerous meter on our safe private dwelling on our private property. That is no excuse to attempt to intimidate, coerce and cause harm and damage to your “customer” to force them to accept unsafe devices that's surmounting to reckless endangerment of life and property.

*“Technological progress has merely provided us with more efficient means of going backwards” Aldous Huxley.. “There are only two means by which men can deal with one another: guns or logic. Force or persuasion. Those who know that they cannot win by means of logic, have always resorted to guns.” Ayn Rand*

If I forced my customer to accept a known dangerous device on their private dwelling and property would I be considered a criminal? YES. If I did business like you do, would I lose my licence, be charged and jailed? YES. Why do you people think the corporate veil will make you immune from prosecution?

#2 If your meter on your dwelling or property expired then replace your meter, but we do not have your equipment on our property, we have our own Analogue meter bought new in 2003 and your own records agree with that, and as we keep repeating this over and over yet you fail to see that and ignore the obvious. No evidence has been introduced to the contrary.

#3 And again you claim “refusal”, which again for the umpteenth time implies an obligation, yet no evidence of such obligation exists. As for your own Tariff and Clean energy act, zero evidence provided it applies to us, Mr. Lawyer will you go on the stand, swear under penalty of perjury and swear also on an affidavit that you are an expert in the interpretation and application of the “Tariff Act” ?

5.2 The Lawyer as witness Submission of evidence 5.2-1 A lawyer who appears as advocate must not testify or submit his or her own affidavit evidence before the tribunal..[1] A lawyer should not express personal opinions or beliefs or assert as a fact anything that is properly subject to legal proof, cross-examination or challenge. The lawyer should not, in effect, appear as an unsworn witness or put the lawyer’s own credibility in issue. The lawyer who is a necessary witness should testify and entrust the conduct of the case to another lawyer. There are no restrictions on the advocate’s right to cross-examine another lawyer, however, and the lawyer who does appear as a witness should not expect or receive special treatment because of professional status. 5.6-1 A lawyer must encourage public respect for and try to improve the administration of justice. A lawyer should take care not to weaken or destroy public confidence in legal institutions or authorities by irresponsible allegations. ...First, a lawyer should avoid criticism that is petty, intemperate or unsupported by a bona fide belief in its real merit, since, in the eyes of the public, professional knowledge lends weight to the lawyer’s judgments or criticism. Second, if a lawyer has been involved in the proceedings, there is the risk that any criticism may be, or may appear to be, partisan rather than objective. Future harm / public safety exception 3.3-3 A lawyer may disclose confidential information, but must not disclose more information than is required, when the lawyer believes on reasonable grounds that there is an imminent risk of death or serious bodily harm, and disclosure is necessary to prevent the death or harm. Dishonesty, crime or fraud of client 4-6. A lawyer must not engage in any activity that the lawyer knows or ought to know assists in or encourages any dishonesty, crime or fraud.

#4 The Tariff Act, notwithstanding no evidence of its application to us has been provided is vague and on its face prima facie unenforceable on anyone but yourselves if you so choose to. NO evidence exists that is applicable to our private dwelling or any customers or utility recipients to expand authority outside of the easement allotted.

#5 As stated numerous times, you can install your smart hazardous meter on your pole [# 2311973] on your property [easement], but we do not entertain having that dangerous plastic fire-causing meter attached to our dwelling/property, especially on the bedroom wall where the new 2003 Analogue meter has been safely installed and works safely for decades without causing any harm or damage.

Re; “our legacy meter” : *“If you tell a lie big enough and keep repeating it, people will eventually come to believe it”* Joseph Goebbels.

I look forward to your prompt response to all these relevant issues, particularly as they relate to safety of “customers”, restoration of expected services, and peaceful transparent resolution. You have 15 days to properly respond to what damages you are committing, and correct what your cause of action will be to not maim, harm or kill your customer. And further, I trust you will out of good faith and clean hands turn the electricity back on without any penalties or punishments, also correct and remove the 2 “failure to install charges”, and choose if you wish to install your smart meter

on your pole # 2311973 on your property which is beside the customers fence on your own time without penalty or cost to harm the customer,

Thank you so much, I await your confirmation of a timely resolution, before you intentionally kill your "customer".

Mise le meas , Your "Dear Customer"

November 11 2021 Registered postal # \_\_\_\_\_ Autograph \_\_\_\_\_