

FORMAL COMPLAINT FORM

Attach extra pages as necessary.

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

FILED

DEC 15 2025

Missouri Public Service Commission

Elizabeth Peterson
(Your name here)

Complainant,

v.

MO Energy Vendor

Liberty Electric
(Utility's name here)

Respondent,

File No.

(PSC fills this in)

FORMAL COMPLAINT

1. Complainant resides at:

1221 Euclid Ave.
(Address of complainant)

Joplin Mo 64801
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

2. The utility service complained of was received at:

a. Complainant's address listed in paragraph 1.

b. A different address:

(Address where service is provided, if different from Complainant's address)

(City) (State) (Zip Code)

The Analog needs a second opinion on Repair as there was never an attempt or admission to Repair it. As it is functional they need to simply repair it. Otherwise I will only consent or authorize Removal for the same Exact Model of Analog.

8. The Complainant has taken the following steps to present this matter to the Respondent:

(Please describe in detail what steps you have already taken to resolve this complaint.)

Numerous calls texts and e-mails to Liberty Engineering Manager Jason Osick as well as calls and texts with the Meter Department head Adam Brock Miller. Initially when Liberty linemen older gentlemen showed up to inform me they were here impropriety to take my Analog as they believed somehow they had the jurisdiction to phase the Analogs out! I spent time & was late to work as I tried to cooperate with the insistence that since I was trying to keep my Analog then they wanted to inspect it. The man just happened to have his Calibration equipment handy in a huge bag so he proceeded in my witnessing to quote do some minor calibration. At which point he assured me verbally that it was fine and passed inspection. About a week and a half later a lady & a younger lineman showed up to say because I had told my Senator about the prior visit they had known all along that the Calibration was "NOT" passed inspection. Yet they did not disclose this and were going to let it go. Yet because I called my Senator now the undisclosed Calibration was off so they must forceably Not Repair the Analog.

The Rest is in an e-mail sent to PSC & Liberty

Date 12/13/25

Signature of Complainant Elizabeth Peterson POA

Complainant's Phone Number 417-629-8789

Complainant's Printed Full Name Mike Avery

Alternate Contact Number 417-626-2125

Complainant's E-mail Address BuffyPeterson@hotmail.com

Attach additional pages, as necessary. Attach copies of any supporting documentation. Do not send originals of any supporting documentation.

3. Respondent's address is:

602 S Joplin Ave
(Address of complainant)

Joplin Mo 64801
(City) (State) (Zip Code)

4. Respondent is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the Missouri Public Service Commission.

5. The amount at issue is: \$ N/A
(If your complaint is about money state how much is in dispute here.)

6. Complainant now requests the following relief:

(Explain what you want the Commission to do: the specific results you are seeking in this complaint.)

This household has myself as Elderly as well as a Federally Disabled member. The ADA accommodations is applicable to the Vendors requirement to provide any specialized or specified type of medical pertinent specificity of equipment relevant to the patient's conditions in regards to environment emissions or relative excess toxicity from unwarranted advanced meter equipment. The Disabled person as well must be given all concession and Vendor must adhere to Medically decisions are made by myself for the disabled person. As I hold Power of Attorney and also power of all Medical decisions. I know that the Analog Meter is environmentally the exclusive SAFE METER. Therefore any other meter is clinically inappropriate. The Supercode of Health is in prevention - therefore any environmental unnecessary toxic emission ~~avoid~~ avoid

7. The relief requested is appropriate because Respondent has violated a statute, tariff, or Commission regulation or order, as follows:

(Explain why the Commission should grant the relief you seek: the facts that constitute a violation of a statute, tariff, or Commission regulation or order.)

ADA Compliance Federal Guidelines
 Also applicable Statute 20 CRS 4240-10.035
 which is in regards to opting out of any Advanced meters and upholds for Traditional "mechanical" meters, I.E. Analog also citing the Final Rule making hearing whereby Expert Building Biologist and EMR Expert testified to the communiza-tive abilities of the NON RF Advanced meter via D.E. communication and also D.E. is putting out unwarranted toxicity up to feet in all walls.

per "Pending" action of submitted litigation via MO PSC Tribunal; Consumer "ask" of Liberty Electric for amicability

From: Buffy Peterson BuffyPeterson@libertyelectric.com

To: nate.hackney@libertyutilities.com, Jay Eastlick jay.eastlick@psc.mo.gov

CC: Geoff Marke geoff.marke@psc.mo.gov

Date: Sat, Dec 13, 2025, 3:04 PM

IMG_6630.jpeg 1.2 MB

IMG_6629.jpeg 977 KB

IMG_6632.jpeg 1.4 MB

Supreme court case to keep ANALOG.PNG 1.1 MB

4 of 14

ATTN: Jay Eastlick I will also be faxing all of these pages to your FAX today so that Tribunal can be executed

Dear Liberty Electric Investigator: Nick Hackney,

Hello thank you for your prior correspondence in texting that you are willingly taking the required steps to provide to your legal about my "Matter" which is actually no longer up in the air as I just flipped to next order of operations per MO PSC process steps that required they finalize the informal steps in order to grant the Tribunal hearing so now we are movant into **pending litigation** of their Tribunal Hearing. I really need to number my paragraphs in order to have your staff follow up accordingly if we are going to settle without need for Litigation let me know and use this e-mail to begin moving forward.

#1 Liberty resolution upon the concluded investigation that you made on the informal complaint as finalized was unfortunately as we last texted about Nate that was- an unsatisfactory outcome for my side as the Consumer. The household is disabled and elderly persons. The disabled is not clinically appropriate to being placed in harms way of Advanced meters in particular the one that I had already told your numerous staff in their impromptu visits as well as phone calls would cause health harm injury and so the only acceptable meter I will as the patients POA and Clinical Medical POA making the medical decisions with his PCP have explained the suggested conclusions your making are Clinically inappropriate due to the patient's conditions. I will also add that myself as elderly do not want the infractions of encroachment that comes with the emission of that radiating D.E. meter even though it is called non RF it is not the safe for our environmentally protection needs and that we are discussing. I have more than explained that to numerous of your non medical experts who are not able to grasp these consequences. But, lets be clear I am not accusing your company yet of intent to harm. In fact Jason Oseik explained that he did not want to harm anyone and I quoted him whilst his name remained anonymous in my testimony at the recent hearing or the new statute regards to all Advanced meters which unfortunately is what your resolution is suggesting as resolve?

#2 Illegitimate findings unfounded for submission Subcontract Tariffs external matter the informal outcome is suggesting that a non RF Advanced meter that is an emergency concern on the part of Liberty and that your legal went so far that it was one of the longest informal explanations on record to date? It went into virtues of some kind of exemplification of compliance matter that was in a sort of clause metaphoric of the existing sub contract called a Tariff sub contract between Liberty as the Vendor and MO PSC. That Tariff sub contract is first and foremost between mostly just you and PSC. So in my household honoring that as applicable to our Tribunal pending hearing, I see it as the Vendor's responsibility to provide first and foremost your obligation to

maintain the original Analog agreement. So by your presenting the Tariff as a piece in your resolution outcome I see this as a form of external and non relevant

5 of 14

#3 Original Contract of service agreement services were authorized and consented to by the Disabled person many years ago prior to all this quote equipment upgrading and so forth. You as the Vendor have on file that the household is disabled and that is because otherwise you will charge a late fee. There is no secret this is an Disabled household and so in knowing the individual became disabled in the midst of the current ANALOG service line contract I must procure that is why under ADA accommodations you are not allowed to charge for your Tariff and that is why the Tariff is actually for those who are not disabled and simply choose as prevention for their health to opt out. I have spoken to numerous individuals whomsoever wanted to opt out not as a medical disabled status household would need to incur the FEE which was then applicable to commence a new contractual for those paying the FEE as reinitializing them into your opt out contractual for those paying the FEE. Our household is exempt from that program due to the household is already a disabled household. No written formula on the Tariff subcontract required that those exempt be required to submit any kind of documentation and that is what Senator White and your Program Director discussed. It has been so long ago now but it was Director at the time Patsy Mulvaney who after my Senator White's chief of Staff Mike Kelley worked all weekend on my soccer and the same Sunday on her day off, just to reassure me that in fact there was not any obligation no formulary of protocols for my household as a disabled ADA and we chatted about what the opt out applicability was for our household. She was reassuring she marked us as exempt from that program and it's contractual just by the fact of a disabled individual living here disabled since 2015. So it is still my position that the sub contract Tariff did not include any formulary form etc. that would need filled out and that the ANALOG service was uninterrupted as a continuum of the original contract with my household. That original terms was not required to adhere to this Tariff or anything that was written in fine print to require participation of that programs sub contract with Vendors as their go to for their general non ADA customers who are construed as opt out Tariff Sub contract customers per as it was by the delineation that those who were paying the Tariff were participating in the program and they would be given that contract to ensure they knew they were obliged a new set of terms now according to their desire to simply opt out as those ones were not eligible to be construed as exempt from the opt out fee. During the Covid May 2020 deployment whilst Senator White was my Senator you all went about upgrading those houses who did not opt out. But, when it came to our contract the individual was already Disabled in 2015 and therefore according to my understanding under my Representation with my Legislators at the time Senator White and his Chief of Staff informed your top Liberty program Manager like I said Patsy knew the disability was already on file with liberty in order to avoid the late fees. She said she just needed to note this house was already disabled and therefore would not need or be required to opt out program participation. The opt out again is for those who arbitrate that they would like to sign up for that program and compliances in regards to the Tariff arrangements with Vendors and PSC. So I ask you why would someone disabled participate in opt out? That particular Tariff from #2 item paragraph.

#4 The pending action the Vendor Manager Jay Eastlick on Nov. 12th when he would not allow me to move to Tribunal and had stated that he did not know why the FAX did not work on that Nov. 12th. He and I realized that it was good that it was needing REPAIR... a that he was going to give him the ability to recite the terms of MO PSC complaints processes so in STEP 1 the informal phase you receive 30 days for outcome and then actually Jay commented what is the need to do a Tribunal as he filed the informal complaint with confidence he said "I will simply put down that you want an ANALOG" and he was seriously not expecting any trouble from Liberty as the vendor to fulfill this request. So Jay was great and he really assured me that this was going to take care of things.

But, if not, no worries because there would be an additional 30 days from the time of the Tribunal as the second layer of remedy those are fairly fast track. Exhibit enclosed the e-mail from Jay is enclosed and describes as well that he finally did check on the FAX and as he had just told I.T. Yesterday to check on that now the FAX is "REPAIRED" and that we are proceeding to a Formal complaint.

6 of 14

#5 my meter that was reportedly out of compliance? Jay Eastlick explained that by standards of responses this according to the investigator told me actually the longest most detailed they had ever seen. So, as this excessively lengthy response from Liberty was insisting to place relevance upon their Tariff contract with PSC that in this drawn out scenario Liberty had somehow brought in an "external" contract agreement to illicitly impose upon my contract with Liberty as leverage? Hmm and that Liberty was trying to arbitrarily imply that in the Tariff they had a concerns about compliance of the Tariff that PSC must uphold or something arather... that it was due to something in the Tariff that somehow effectively they had an "emergeing compliance reference they scaped to paste into the Liberty hypothesis that at some level of binding contract my household was to be subjected inadvertently with regards to something within that sub contract Tariff contract that would subject my household to not have my current Analog meter due to a level or something that mysteriously had cropped up but that fortunately even though Liberty had told me nothing was wrong with my Analog after inspecting it that indeed they had back dated on that matter and effectively raised up an issue that was never diagnosed in my one and only witnessing of their lineman testing my ANALOG?? This all sounds very suspect to me and anyway that is my point right now Liberty you are just one party in a myriad of parties involved who have inspection rights including my own Master Electrician who I already told you would be happy to have the city of Joplin inspector as Referee standing by whilst your lineman can witness to allow my Master Electrician to perhaps repair the Analog for us. But, for you Liberty as the just "one party" and just by your testing results that are now appearing out of thin air etc I well cannot without a JUDGE involved permit you to police your own inspections that is why the City of Joplin provides inspectors for FREE and that is also why I offered since your Engineering manager and I have spoken at length about this to arrange for a fair repair with a referee and your lineman there to make sure my 3rd party master electrician isn't cheating if he passes my Analog for the 2nd opinion that I am informing you I require regardless if you own the equipment it is permanent in the easement structure on my house and it will take a permit to remove it right. So, lets back track to get that permit to remove it as your guy Adam a has been anxious to come and do lets first and foremost get a FAIR analysis that even if it is not calibrating properly, that in fact there is not a way to repair it. If there is after all these parties witness that it is hopeless and that it is broken? Because right now it's functional and it is not broken. But lets just say if there is an actual emergency and it's broken in that case I will only authorize another ANALOG and this is under the terms of our original contract as an ANALOG line. If you have not any that you able to locate then I will find one that is suitable to the courts discretionary as appropriate and fully functional to the likings of your little calibration's tools etc. ANALOG is the only permanent contract with this disabled household and the individual has had service with you under these ANALOG lines that is not your prerogative to substitute or alter as the original contract holds to ANALOG on it's face. is stating the equipment is in need of repair? even though the ANALOG meter is perfectly functional and operational and its not causing type of hazard. The fact is I explained that by removing the ANALOG it would subsequently create an actual liability of ADA violation and through environmental association as causation create for the disabled person being already accommodated in the household to instead be subjected to a D.E. Toxicity in breaking of the current accommodation mode of equipment as the item qualified as eligible with the PCP. So, as to force a non RF Advanced meter emitting D.E. Is to with intent break Federal ADA law and with forethought present dangerous toxicity causing the disabled person to have infliction of health harm. I'm not sure but I think we are moving in the wrong direction and if Liberty provokes this ADA infraction which is actually illegal to inflict harm and that is classified with MO and most states what is called torture or something of a calibration of negligence on my part as the caregiver if I allow this type

of non RF Advanced meter to be put on the house and therefore by my not intervening with placing the patient into harms way. I would actually become in a hotline case due to the circumstances questioned as to why I did not intervene or call them for an investigation by now? As these types of incidences with nursing home neglect cases and etc as it goes anyone who gets implicated in colution that is considered criminal negligence, So that motivation is always going to be on the back end of the charges filed by DHSS investigators if I need to call them in the event that somehow Liberty actually decides to without my authorization remove the ANALOG? Well that will involve another state agency and waste their precious funding on my pleas to that state entity that Liberty just forced this other toxic meter after I told them I did not give my consent or authorization and from there the next Agency will be drawn into the investigatory that will be plausibly per the Health and Human Services for reports to be made to rectify that Liberty not I is the one who is neglecting the health of this disabled person and causing harm injury impact due to that concern I must take it upon this statement to you Liberty to address what I meant by liability. I must and do assume health care responsibility of this individual and if you harm injury him I must in fact make sure I do not get into the line of fire that is done with the original DHSS intake make sure that as POA I was using my Administrative procedures and notifying my proper authorities at all times to the conduct of what Liberty is attempting to conclude as acceptable resolutions which are actually tottering on abuse of a disabled person as well as discrimination.

#6 So, anyway and how that there would not be any unauthorized removal or changes in our existing type of meter that is by my consent that we would remain ANALOG. The formulary is simple ANALOG customer cannot be phased out? The Liberty Vendor has no authorization or Jurisdiction to proclaim phasing out ANALOGS. So, again as this household of disabled individual who has long term binding contract as an ADA accommodation is already by standards of assumptive actively enforced. So why would a ADA disabled accommodated person opt in to an OPT OUT so that they could be in an opt out Tariff agreement? These households are exempt from opt out Tariffs or Tariff agreements the household never entered into an opt out contract as the household was excluded from any obligation to that sub contract between the Vendor and MO PSC so any Tariff arrangement Consumers currently paying Fee's are yes in that program as a sub contract between Liberty as the Vendor and MO PSC. This rationale is not applicable and so I'm not sure what they are trying to dissuade the Manager at Consumer's side that they are substantiating, but that is why this will need to go into Tribunal.

#7 The current rebuttals of a long winded retort by Liberty to MO PSC seem like distraction and the fact is Liberty is trying to secure some kind of illegitimate urgency about phasing out ANALOGs and my household is proving to be a stumbling block.. So, until the ANALOG in question has an outside party second opinion of what is wrong and that fact is established beyond the current papers turned in by Liberty who is now stating they found a weak spot in the calibrations. Until that evidence is even admissible it must be proved as not unfounded and as the party in objection to the findings I will not entrust that Liberty is not in need of immediate oversight of a 3rd party Joplin City meter Inspector as well as my own official party of inspections person as a Master Electrician I can acquire to establish the findings of Liberty as valid. This comes from my easement rights the Analog is was and will be the considered line of service and so therefore is part of my rights to proper diagnostic rather than suppositions of the the party who is bent on phasing out their ANALOGS as their agenda. I shall be granted if necessary, by request of the Judge to acquire a 3rd party there. This concession is mandatory as the position Liberty is placed me in as protecting the disabled person from harm impact. To give me this right does not conflict with the quote "ownership" that Liberty is trying to claim over the equipment but rather gives me the environmentally backed right to qualify and keep running a piece of equipment that is already currently working as such and since this is on an easement of my property and a permanent fixture in my home dwelling wall right next to my sink it is perfectly appropriate just to keep everybody involved honest

that we in this terms and conditions of an original contract with this type of equipment as ADA compliant etc that under these current and established contractual arrangement with Liberty. If it needs repaired or replaced with the exact same ANALOG as I have told Liberty numerous times, that is the only authorization of consent that I will make. The rest of these excuses that are being observed by Liberty are superseded of this matter of HEALTH concerns to harm injury impact liability and that is the higher presidency of this entirety of this MATTER... which is now becoming a threat of health harm as an infraction and that it was imperative that the ANALOG remain intact. At that time of initial intake with Jay Eastlick I did not go into ADA accommodation request because Jay Eastlick advised as long as we did the proper protocols to pending litigation thereby until the formal litigation was over the ANALOG was considered not to be disturbed by Vendor.

#7 The minute I got the Paper in the mail from MO PSC for the informal complaint it was at that point I put it on file with the City of Joplin in the division called Permit. The City Manager and I had a long conversation about my concern that they please place a block in that division as soon as I was able to obtain the "STATUS OF STAY" occurring with Liberty under the protection of MO PSC order of operations we were not yet in need to obtain a hearing until the proper protocols of first doing the informal complaint were administered. The way I understand it with the Vendors is they have a quick form of there own that they can pull with the Cities. So, it was confirmed with that Division at Joplin City by the main building biologist that the City was cooperating with the State level authority in this matter MO PSC who had protocols prior to actual litigation. So, the City of Joplin did place a block on the permit not to be granted with Liberty until this matter receives due process litigation if that was provend to be required. Therefore, I have done my due diligence to notify the local authorities to cooperate with the State entity process of acquiring a formal hearing Tribunal as litigation has to be granted pending informal outcomes.

#8 The state PSC has to provide the avenue of litigation in these matters. Moreover, both the state and the local and the Vendor have to be in Federal compliance as far as ADA accommodation requests. However, since the PSC is in the midst of final rule making voting on the new rule for Traditional meters I.E. Analog I did not foresee that there would be a gap between this old tariff agreement as current for Liberty with PSC whereby the outcome of the nformal complaint is attempting to be exercised by Liberty for just cause to force upon a Disabled person a toxic environment as health harm injury is now pending and liability thereof it again my position and approach that the Federal supersede of ADA accommodations to ensure safe equipment according to the need for the patient as a Disabled person the Analog meter must be requested as a STAY in this ask pending the outcome of litigation that is now apparently going to need to transpire as the Liberty has made given an outcome of their initial decision not to provide the requested informal specificity of the ANALOG meter. The failure of the Liberty to address the toxicity of the non RF meter is disappointing as I had e-mailed the Engineering Director and personally spoken at length to him about the health harm of D.E.; Dirty Electricity which is why the non RF Advanced meter is unacceptable as under ADA protocols the specificity is ANALOG and that is Federally recognized as the only SAFE non toxicity for such a class of persons known as protected persons. Protected persons have invisible disease or condition and unfortunately the non RF Advanced meter emissions of D.E.; Dirty Electricity are known to be toxic. The burden of proof that the non RF Advanced meter in this matter with Liberty would first require that Liberty provide that burden of proof and that takes years of scientific medical studies. I would however, still insist that the Consumer has choice in this matter already provided to in MO and that the opt out meter is indicative of CHOICE of the Consumer accordingly the Consumer and the new legislative piece is actually already in existence as A LAW it is merely going through the proper stages of protocols so that the Vendors have time to prepare with their Traditional ANALOG meters to be supplied according to consumer choice.

#9 The rationale to be in more completeness of what PHASE or step that this case matter is at as far as a

litigation ACTION I assure you I already once attempted to fax the Formal form for the Tribunal so anything hindering how far this case matter has gotten is because I have followed the order of operations of protocol required before the Tribunal could be granted. Now, since we are moving into the Tribunal phase all parties involved need to cease and desist from any further attempts to override that this litigation as pending is substantial enough under Federal jurisdiction to require that under ADA accommodation if there is indeed in the meantime during this due process for litigation a need to retrieve the ANALOG the only Judge at MO PSC that has heard the side of the plaintiff as far as EMR expert testimony that the non RF advanced meter is harmful needs to respect that experts opinion as Liberty has not brought anything to oppose or retract from that testimony which is already a matter of public record on that pending piece of final rule making on a law that would offer Traditional ANALOG meters here in MO by choice without need for an ADA accommodation request. 9.8.14

#9 The only reason why people need to use ADA accommodation requests in general is in STATES where the STATE themselves does not offer an opt out choice from Advanced meters. So, let me bring in the most poignant fact that one of these STATES Pennsylvania is currently forced the Consumer to work outside the box and use Civil court process instead of Public Service Tribunal. This particular case is now on it's way to the Supreme Court it was done in U.S. court and there is much to glean as a quote Citation Case matter that will actually set the new presidency for ALL STATES including MO.

#14 This young lady is a law student and she has gotten her Judge to give her assurances that if her ANALOG breaks during the proceedings and the trail etc. that if the Vendor will not adhere to her request to replace ANALOG WITH ANALOG then the Judge will remedy that matter by informing the Vendor that they must whilst case is in process of trail etc. provide the only replacement as ANALOG. This Judge is very clear and this is a Federal level Judge.

So, it is with this case citation in hand and with no real assurances from Liberty as to whether they are going to try and attempt in the pending litigation to interfere with my ANALOG and call it as an EMERGENCY then if that is going to happen I need for the Tribunal Judge now to defend that will not be permissible as I have from the onset followed all the protocols of the due process of the Tribunal and I find this first outcome from the informal as very disturbing. The person who is disabled deserves to be left alone without harm impact from these ridiculous advanced meters that cause illness and aggravate and worsen persons with disabilities including heat palpitations increased from the D.E.; Dirty Electricity. But, I don't need to prove that I just know that Liberty cannot prove that these non RF Advanced meters won't cause harm. The expert at the hearing on Nov. 13 testified in brief he had 6 more things he could have provided but he did not want to get cut short. But, his first words were important, he said the burden of proof is on the Vendors as there is no evidence that these NON RF Advanced meters are safe no medical HIA Harm impact assessments not one medical studies proving these are safe. In fact if you test the equipment with a long duration you will actually find it peaks and actually often it peaks and when it does it emits RF. So, they are far from full proof and the UL industry does not do medical studies so why would they people who accept these non RF meters are not even informed about the dirty electricity they emit and that they actually do communicate with your interior appliances and yes that get registered by the little smart chip inside and yes that is invasion of privacy. So, many factors that I could go on and on about but if you need all them a please just watch the recent hearing and take notes from the Expert. There is more that the expert never got to due to time concerns with the hearing. So, many that I cannot count, but if they are needed for the Tribunal additionally I will find them all. However, since the other Rule making hearing is still out and it would plausibility that Bill will settle this matter to require that no one regardless of ADA exception or not has to accept from Vendors these non RF Advanced meters well then that in fact MO PSC is going to uphold the intention of the Bill. Which the intention was to

restoration of mechanical meters known as Tradition meters called Analogs as the right of choice of the Mo Consumers.

10 of 14

#15 Many findings make manufacturers requirements restorative to safe devices Just like Trump in an emergency for patient needs had to get manufacturers to start making rapidly the ventilator machines during covid. The lates gambit of dangerous serious health consequences as well as cause of death is the led headlights on cars. Do you understand that the mañufacturers under new regulatory are going to be required to stop putting these dangerous headlights on the new vehicles in production. My point is regulatory moves the arm of production. When the new regulatory for the Advanced meters fulfills it will put the presidency for the manufacturers to start putting the ANALOGS back into production, It is the cost of doing business Liberty you just need to tell Canada that in the U.S.A. here in MO there is a requirement for ANALOG meters to be supplied in order to stay in compliance with the Consumers who want safe technology only and do not wish to be harm injured. The regulatory drives the manufacturers and they should comply so that you Liberty can also stay in compliance with ANALOG distribution as the restoration of the health of Americans is at stake we do not want smart meters and we do not want non RF Advanced meters that are digital with D.E. Etc. etc. etc. It is not an excuse to say you do not have any ANALOGS it is your job as a business to get your manufacturers put on notice that is what you need to be supplied and in fact they need to feel the same pinch that the car manufacturers are feeling what will they do with all their precious LED headlights? I do not care as they will not kill one more person and the same is true with all this ADVANCED meter technology that is so unsafe and yes it does kill persons some who have EHS as teenagers commit suicide but no I'm not going to go there today.

#16 I have attach the Formal complaint so that everyone can see it has been filed by this e-mail so that we are all clear that there is pending litigation which I was granted after I fulfilled the prerequisite of the informal complaint under the required steps to acquire litigation with MO PSC. By my following due process any parties involved also need to respect that there is outlying ruling matters in addition to this formal complaint and that now everyone including my City have the understanding that even if Liberty needs to hold to some concern they have about repairing the ANALOG or ordering another ANALOG from a supplier that will be the only acceptable advances as I have litigation in place now with MO PSC and that requires to follow the ADA compliance and that is supersede Federal Compliance which again is higher than some concerns that Liberty is addressing with a state tariff matter of contract with PSC. Furthermore, I am requesting a STAY on this matter in that there is pending litigation and so anything done on my premises in the meantime needs to go through all the proper channels and be granted by the upcoming Judge assigned to this action. To watch dog my State action I have requested MO's J.S. DOJ in K.C. Environmental Attorney there Charles Thomas to also invoke if necessary that MO PSC Judge be aware that there is Federal Level supremacy law that requires a protected class of persons with Disability to be given special equipment and in this instance that special equipment is called an ANALOG meter.

Since, everything was left up in the air it is pertinent now that I make sure ALL parties understand that no permit would be granted to Liberty by my City for exchanging my meter unless it is first arranged that it would be for an ANALOG meter. The need for this ask to be confirmed by Liberty is vital otherwise MO PSC Judge will need to be expedited and look over the request I have to ask of Liberty to refrain from health harm injury liability per there informal answer is to promote improper equipment upon a Disabled person.

supreme court case citation on its way after a federal win!!!



11 of 14

STL for Safe Technology

+ Invite Share



Peterson Buffy

Rising contributor · Yesterday at 4:26 AM ·


This one is heading to the Supreme Court! We need these smart meters gone!



Pennsylvanians for Safe Technology

November 5 ·

<https://childrenshealthdefense.org/.../pennsylvania.../>



CHILDRENSHEALTHDEFENSE.ORG
Pennsylvania Woman Scores Temporary Win Against Smart Meter Mandate

4 1 comment

Like Comment Share



Robert Workman · Rising contributor

Looking observational studies and my own personal professional

About

MISSION STATEMENT:
To bring to the public, timely, acc

Public
Anyone can see who's in the post.

Visible
Anyone can find this group.

Learn more about

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1CA2kFDHnT/>

link to learn the exacts but the case already won at U.S. Circuit court

so, Liberty are you going to grant my ask? That you affirm my request for injunction of removal of my ANALOG or repair or replace with ANALOG this is all I consent or authorize under the terms of the original Analog line of service that is our current line of service that you as the Vendor hold no jurisdiction to phase out -Yes or NO? In

other words Do I need to get the Judge at MO PSC involved immediately to inform and render for US a decision on my ask based on prior rule making hearing evidence of harmful D.E. Emit from the suggested remedy of the non-RF Digital Advanced meter instead. What is your answer?

12.08.14

Thank you,
Elizabeth Peterson
417-629-8789


Health Risks Associated with Smart Meter Wireless Emissions

Posted on October 2, 2016 by SkyVision Solutions

by K.T. Weaver, SkyVision Solutions

Article Key Points

- There is a "reasonable basis" for concern regarding health risks associated with smart meter wireless emissions.
- It is "unreasonable" to involuntarily and chronically expose consumers to the electromagnetic energy emitted by smart meters.



Unfortunately, smart meter deployments continue throughout the world and in some locations consumer refusals are not allowed. Such is the case in the state of Pennsylvania where consumers are not permitted by the Public Utility Commission (PUC) to retain safer analog meters.

Based upon my review of peer-reviewed literature over the past few years, one of the studies that helped convince me that exposure to low-level electromagnetic fields (EMFs) could indeed be harmful included "Electromagnetic Hypersensitivity: Evidence for a Novel Neurological Syndrome." One of the authors of that study was Andrew A. Marino, Ph.D. [1]

Recently, it is my understanding that Dr. Marino submitted an "expert report" as part of a case before the Pennsylvania PUC. In this proceeding several consumers have alleged that their health is being negatively affected by smart meters installed by PECO Energy Company [2].

The conclusions reached by Dr. Andrew Marino and presented in his expert report are as follows:

"First, [there] is a reasonable basis in established science for the Complainants' concern regarding risks to human health caused by man-made electromagnetic energy in the environment, including the type of electromagnetic energy emitted by smart meters. These health risks are heightened in the very young, the very old, and in those with preexisting diseases or disorders.

Second, electromagnetic hypersensitivity is a documented neurological condition in which the affected person experiences musculoskeletal, immunological, and/or neurological symptoms that noticeably flare or intensify upon exposure to man-made electromagnetic energy in the environment. About 5-10% of the general public are self-reported to suffer from this disorder.

Confidential

14 of 14

One of the things I sued for was a restraining order. This was to restrain FirstEnergy from putting the "smart" meter on my house or from shutting off my electricity for refusing the "smart" meter.

Yesterday, I had a deliberation (discussion) with Defendant FirstEnergy in the courtroom. The outcome is that FirstEnergy reluctantly agreed to give me my ask during the pendency of the litigation. Judge Wilson then wrote it up as an order (attached to this email). In addition, if the mechanical meter breaks for any reason, then Judge Wilson ordered that it would be replaced with another mechanical meter, not a "smart" one.

The outcome was the same as if I had indeed been given the restraining order against FirstEnergy. I also feel that had FirstEnergy not agreed to this, that Judge Wilson would have indeed given the restraining order to protect me. (Judge Wilson stated that she did not want to leave me in a state of emergency. She said that if FirstEnergy and I could not reach an amicable resolution for the (pendency of the litigation), then she would make a decision on what would happen in the meantime to protect me. I feel that her decision was going to be in my favor. I expect that Judge Wilson's strong actions persuaded FirstEnergy to do the right thing, in this instance. What happens next is that if I win the litigation, then the mechanical meter on my house becomes permanent.

This is my first win in court! I expect to have more wins in the near future. Overall, I got one of the main things that I was asking for! The rest will be decided later, after discovery, more litigation, and a trial. This is a big federal case, and it will set a nationwide precedent. I researched this, and I have not seen any other cases like this anywhere in the country. It's a landmark case. Therefore, I expect the final judicial opinion to be published as a binding precedent.

I was proud that I, as a student member of the PA Bar, symbolically walked past the actual "bar" at a federal court that separates those who are bar members and those who are not. Actually walking past the "bar" in the courtroom is symbolically a meaningful endeavor. My recognition of this symbolic meaning at that moment in time made it all the more important. Everything on this day came together like a beautiful symphony or a hymn. This was because of our prayers and God's glory!

along with my support team being my dad, Lexi, and Donna, were up against 4 eager attorneys
not arrived in defense. The defense included

Confidential



Joplin Public Library

FAX

1901 E 20th Street, Joplin, MO 64804

Fax (417) 624-5217 Library (417) 623-7953 Reference & ILL (417) 624-5465

ATTENTION Jay Eastlick

DATE 12/13/25

³²⁶⁻¹⁵⁰⁰

COMPANY MO PSC Consumer Services FAX # 573-~~751-3160~~

From: Elizabeth Peterson

Total pages, including cover sheet 15

Message:

Jay reminds as P.O.A. for Mike Avery I will be
doing the Representation for the Tribunal