

RECEIVED

C-2018-3004294

019 OCT 21 AM 10:16

PA PUC
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

TO THE HONORABLE,
ELIZABETH BARNES
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS
MY REPLY TO SUNOCO'S
MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS
OF COMPLAINANTS REPLY
BRIEF'S.

DATED OCTOBER 1, 2019

IN CASE

WILMER J BAKER
VS
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.
(C-2018-3004294)

I, WILMER J BAKER
RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS
YOUR HONOR TO DENY
THEIR MOTION IN THIS
MATTER.

AGAIN YOUR HONOR,
OF THEIR REQUESTS
USING THEIR COPY OF
MY BRIEFS.

1. SINCE I DON'T KNOW
WHAT THEIR COPY PERTAINS
TO, I REQUEST THAT
THE PRESIDING OFFICER,
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
JUDGE ELIZABETH H BARNES,
MAKE THE CHOICE ABOUT
WHICH COPY TO USE.
2. THE MOTION TO STRIKE
PORTIONS OF MY MAIN
BRIEF WAS ANSWERED
(EXTRA EXHIBITS) WAS
MEANT TO BE EXTRA
INFORMATION (AMICUS CURIAE)
ON THIS MOTION TO
STRIKE PORTIONS OF
COMPLAINTS REPLY BRIEFS
(NEW EXHIBITS)
PAGE 170 IS PART OF
EVIDENCE COMPLYING
WITH PREHEARING ORDER.
DATED DECEMBER 18 2018.

ELIZABETH BARNES
BY FEB. 8 2018,
WITNESS'ES, AND. SUBJECT
MATTER OF THEIR TESTIMONY,
BY JUNE 27, 2019
EXPERTS SURREBUTTAL
TESTIMONY (PAGES, 168, 170)
ARE IN THERE.

PAGE 169 WERE NOTES
THAT WERE IN MY RECORDS.
PAGE 6, OF THEIR MOTION
TO STRIKE, SAYS 3 PAGES
OF LAWS THAT WERE BROKEN,
SUNOCO HAD THESE
RECORDS SINCE JUNE.

HOW DOES THIS INFERFERE
WITH THEIR DUE PROCESS
RIGHTS?

I MAKE A MOTION
THIS EVIDENCE BE ALLOWED
TO STAY IN THE RECORD,
PAGES (106, 107) KIM FLEETS
REBUTTAL PAGE (DATED, 6/24/2019)
WAS INSERTED TO PROVE
THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE
PHOTO'S (C-24) SHE TOOK

THIS WAS PART OF THE EVIDENCE OF (C-24) THIS WAS A REBUTTAL PAGE, NOT A WITNESS STATEMENT!

PAGE 167 OF WRITTEN TRANSCRIPT QUESTIONS THIS BACK TO THEIR MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF COMPLAINTS REPLY BRIEFS

PAGE 136, 137, (EXHIBIT 21, FOR BOTH PICTURES) (AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS)

WRITTEN TRANSCRIPT SAID EVIDENCE NOT RECEIVED, GIVEN AN EVIDENCE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EXHIBIT 21) SO I SENT IT ALONG

NO WHERE WAS I TRYING TO ADMIT MS. DIGUILIO'S WRITTEN STATEMENTS THIS WAS HER RESUME WHICH IS (C-25) ALREADY IN EVIDENCE

PAGE 4 (PARENTHESIS) WERE MY THOUGHTS, OPINIONS

PAGE 5 (EXHIBIT 21) ○
GIVEN IDENTIFICATION
NUMBER SO I INCLUDED THIS.
PAGE 6 TWO OF THE PAGES
WERE SENT TO SUNOCO
EARLIER, ONE WERE MY
NOTES I SENT ALONG.

SUNOCO'S LAWYERS SAYING
MY STUBBORN INTENT TO
DISREGARD YOUR HONORS
RULING, IS FAR FROM TRUTH,
I RESPECT YOUR AUTHORITY.

AGAIN I MUST SAY I'VE
MADE MISTAKES, BUT THIS
WAS UNINTENTIONAL. ○

I RESPECTFULLY
REQUEST THAT THIS
NOTION BE DENIED

SINCERLY YOURS
WILMER J BAKER

WILMER BAKER
VS

SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.
(C-2018-3004294)

(DATED OCT/18/2019 ○

Wilmer J Baker

TO THE HONORABLE,
ELIZABETH BARNES
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

PLEASE ACCEPT THIS AS
MY REPLY TO SUNOCO'S
MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS
OF COMPLAINANTS REPLY
BRIEF'S.

DATED OCTOBER 1, 2019

IN CASE

WILMER J BAKER
VS
SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.
(C-2018-3004294)

I, WILMER J BAKER
RESPECTFULLY REQUESTS
YOUR HONOR TO DENY
THEIR MOTION IN THIS
MATTER.

AGAIN YOUR HONOR,
OF THEIR REQUESTS
USING THEIR COPY OF
MY BRIEFS.

1. SINCE I DON'T KNOW
WHAT THEIR COPY PERTAINS
TO, I REQUEST THAT
THE PRESIDING OFFICER,
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
JUDGE ELIZABETH H. BARNES,
MAKE THE CHOICE ABOUT
WHICH COPY TO USE.
2. THE MOTION TO STRIKE
PORTIONS OF MY MAIN
BRIEF WAS ANSWERED
(EXTRA EXHIBITS) WAS
(MEANT TO BE EXTRA
INFORMATION/AMICUS CURIAE)
ON THIS MOTION TO
STRIKE PORTIONS OF
COMPLAINTS REPLY BRIEFS
(NEW EXHIBITS)
PAGE 170 IS PART OF
EVIDENCE COMPLYING
WITH PREHEARING ORDER
DATED DECEMBER 18 2018.

ELIZABETH BARNES
BY FEB. 8 2018,
WITNESSES, AND SUBJECT
MATTER OF THEIR TESTIMONY,
BY JUNE 27, 2019
EXPERTS SURREBUTTAL
TESTIMONY (PAGES, 168, 170)
ARE IN THERE.

PAGE 169 WERE NOTES
THAT WERE IN MY RECORDS.
PAGE 6, OF THEIR MOTION
TO STRIKE, SAYS 3 PAGES
OF LAWS THAT WERE BROKEN,
SUNOCO HAD THESE
RECORDS SINCE JUNE.

HOW DOES THIS INFERFERE
WITH THEIR DUE PROCESS
RIGHTS?

I MAKE A MOTION
THIS EVIDENCE BE ALLOWED
TO STAY IN THE RECORD,
PAGES (106, 107) KIM FLEETS
REBUTTAL PAGE (DATED, 6/24/2019)
WAS INSERTED TO PROVE
THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE
PHOTO'S (C-24) SHE TOOK

THIS WAS PART OF THE EVIDENCE OF (C-24) THIS WAS A REBUTTAL PAGE, NOT A WITNESS STATEMENT!

PAGE 167 OF WRITTEN TRANSCRIPT QUESTIONS THIS BACK TO THEIR MOTION TO STRIKE PORTIONS OF COMPLAINTS REPLY BRIEFS

PAGE 136, 137, (EXHIBIT 21, FOR BOTH PICTURES) (AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS)

WRITTEN TRANSCRIPT SAID EVIDENCE NOT RECEIVED, GIVEN AN EVIDENCE IDENTIFICATION NUMBER (EXHIBIT 21) SO I SENT IT ALONG

NO WHERE WAS I TRYING TO ADMIT MS. DIGUILIO'S WRITTEN STATEMENTS THIS WAS HER RESUME WHICH IS (C-25) ALREADY IN EVIDENCE

PAGE 4 (PARENTHESIS) WERE MY THOUGHTS, OPINIONS

PAGE 5 (EXHIBIT 21) ○
GIVEN IDENTIFICATION
NUMBER SO I INCLUDED THIS.
PAGE 6 TWO OF THE PAGES
WERE SENT TO SUNOCO
EARLIER, ONE WERE MY
NOTES I SENT ALONG.

SUNOCO'S LAWYERS SAYING
MY STUBBORN INTENT TO
DISREGARD YOUR HONORS
RULING, IS FAR FROM TRUTH,
I RESPECT YOUR AUTHORITY. ○

AGAIN I MUST SAY I'VE
MADE MISTAKES, BUT THIS
WAS UNINTENTIONAL. ○

I RESPECTFULLY
REQUEST THAT THIS
MOTION BE DENIED

SINCERLY YOURS
WILMER J BAKER

WILMER BAKER
VS -

SUNOCO PIPELINE L.P.
(C-2018-3004294)

(DATED OCT/18/2019) ○


Wilmer J Baker



Mr. Wilmer Baker
430 Run Rd.
Carlisle, PA 17015-7732



1000



17120

U.S. POSTAGE PAID
FROM LG ENV
PLAINFIELD, PA
17091
OCT 19 19
AMOUNT

\$1.30

R2305K140101-10

ROSEMARY CHIAVETTA, SECRETARY
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING
400 NORTH STREET, FILING ROOM
HARRISBURG PA. 17120