

LETTER TO THE APPELLATE COURT CLERK

January 12, 2014

The Honorable Daniel E. Shearouse
Clerk, Supreme Court of South Carolina
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

2013-000529

Re: Appeals from Public Service Commission orders for SCE&G Jenkinsville SC project.

Note: their First Order has No. 2009-104(A)

Dear Mr. Shearouse:


Enclosed please find for filing:

1. PETITION to become an active Party in all cases involved SCANA / SCE&G in Appeals pending in the SC Supreme Court of Appeals with Orders issued by Public Service Commission of SC.
2. Exhibits W-07 and W-15
3. ~~Sealed envelope with ENGENNERING, LOGICAL, and COMMON SENSE ANALYSIS of FALSE CLAIM of BLRA used to get INCREASED kWh RATES by SCE&G COMPANY and the CONSEQUENCES. ("Engineering Analysis") (Intent Copyright 2013 by Joseph Edward Wojcicki) - 83 ... Pages.~~

Please note that I alone factually represent over 2 million SC electric energy users and perspective voters in 2014 Elections but who could not be respected as Protestants.

With kind regards,

Yours faithfully,


Joseph Wojcicki - SCANA Shareholder
820 East Steele Road
West Columbia, SC 29170-1125

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2014

S.C. SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

JAN 14 2014

S.C. SUPREME COURT

THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

PETITION

to become an active Party in all cases involved SCANA / SCE&G in Appeals pending in the SC Supreme Court of Appeals with Orders issued by Public Service Commission of SC.

INTRODUCTION.

I, Joseph Wojcicki , the relator/informant of False Claim Actions using SC Base Load Review Act ("FCA of BLRA") to increase kWh rate, do respectfully ask the SC Supreme Court of Appeals to assign me the status of the active party with chance to present fact of invalid claim of BLRA in any / each of cases which are pending on the matter of construction units 2 and 3 in Jenkinsville SC, especially because their costs are covered by SC electricity users outside available US Government secured funds.

My materials will do present proofs of misleading this SC Supreme Court since 2009 and certainly may cause wrong decisions now if not acknowledged and law enforced corrections.

I have done alone, voluntarily long –lasting and time consuming engineering investigations that still have original aspect of technical science works. I believe my **ENGENNERING, LOGICAL, and COMMON SENSE ANALYSIS of FALSE CLAIM of BLRA used to get INCREASED kWh RATES by SCE&G COMPANY and the CONSEQUENCES.** ("Engineering Analysis") (Intent Copyright 2013 by Joseph Edward Wojcicki) shall stop misleading SC Court with suppose to be the legal ground of BLRA and allow returns to overcharged the SC People and businesses sums, now in about 2.5 billion USD.

I have reported this FCA of BLRA fact to SC Attorney General in August 2013. His Office redirected me back to PSC (see Exhibit W-15) where I was already blocked (Exhibit W-07) but doing father research I found presence of Appeals in this court as well as SCE&G preparation to response using again BLRA as a ground for contra argumentation.

FACTUAL ARGUMENTS.

US Supreme Court judge Sonia Sotomayor said:

"We apply law to facts. We don't apply feelings to facts."

The simple fact is: Units 2 and 3 in Jenkinsville SC cannot be Base Load Plant according to BLRA definition.

.....

This fact was never verified by anybody, by any of US and/or SC Commissions or Departments. After rejecting idea of Atlantic Ocean Location (PSC docket 2009-196-E) and blockade of my person as an intervenor I have done investigation of water availability in SC rivers, drought history, legal permitting, physics of cooling, electric energy generating and distribution, process inertia and controls, scientific papers, etc. to finish Engineering Analysis Acting as a Pro se and ex-intervenor in SC PSC hearings, I am ready to fulfill the entire obligation as US citizen and SC resident since 1985 for the behalf of the SC people and State using my knowledge and expertise. Please note that I do respect the good works done each day by SCE&G teams but their legal

tricks are against common sense and justice as well are harmful for Company and Corporation's well being and image (Breach of Trust).

If the first SCANA / SCE&G decision instead of falsely usage BLRA to finance the project by SC electricity users could use available Government secured stimulus funds, specially assigned stimulus for Nuclear Renaissance, such many disturbances in legal processes could be avoided. If that false decision could be seen as an unethical move of Corporation legal team, now it could be seen as a next Enron scandal.

I cannot support / endorse any of Parties / lawyers in this court because their argumentations are on the ground of BLRA. All PSC Orders have always the same error – they assume BLRA. The scale of damages and losses are multiplied by years of robbing ratepayers and SC economy. Keeping this situation is very wrong for state of SC, USA, and the project. Now, silenced public (protesters) and I myself believe in the wisdom of SC Supreme court judges to rule the return collected over 2.5 Billion USD to customers, get funds from DOE / US Government to fulfill all the obligation of False Claim Acts. Following is Breach of Trust.

COPY SERVICE PROBLEM.

I have no information about present parties in Appeals.

Therefore I selected names from your Court's Opinion No. 26856 dated 2010-08-09 and PSC docket to recall then active parties in first hearings. i.e.:

1. SCANA/SCE&G
2. ORS
3. PSC of SC
4. CMC Steel South Carolina
5. Maxine Warshauer and Samuel Baker
6. Pamela Greenlaw
7. South Carolina Energy Users Committee

Above listed addressees will receive printed copy of this Petition via USPS first class mail.

It will be interesting who will try to block the information about FCA of BLRA to be presented to this report as well to the public and try to extend the time of illegal collection money from The SC People and continue to harm SC economy.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph Wojcicki

820 EAST STEELE ROAD
WEST COLUMBIA, SC 29170-1125

JANUARY 12, 2014

Exhibit W-07

Public Service Commission Order No. 2013-481 dated 2013-06-27

From PSC docket 2013-150-E

Enclosed is one page with notes.

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COMMISSION DIRECTIVE**

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|
| ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER | <input type="checkbox"/> | DATE | <u>June 27, 2013</u> |
| MOTOR CARRIER MATTER | <input type="checkbox"/> | DOCKET NO. | <u>2013-150-E</u> |
| UTILITIES MATTER | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | ORDER NO. | <u>2013-481</u> |

THIS DIRECTIVE SHALL SERVE AS THE COMMISSION'S ORDER ON THIS ISSUE.

SUBJECT:

DOCKET NO. 2013-150-E - South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's Annual Request for Revised Rates - Discuss with the Commission South Carolina Electric & Gas Company's Return in Opposition and Objection to the Petition to Intervene of Mr. Joseph Wojcicki.

COMMISSION ACTION:

S. C. Code Sections 58-33-285 (A) and 58-33-285 (C) describe the procedure regarding intervention in requests for approval of revised rates under the Base Load Review Act. Based on these statutes, intervention can only occur by an aggrieved party within thirty days after the Commission issues a revised rates order. The statutes do not allow for intervention at the current time, and the petition to intervene filed by Mr. Joseph Wojcicki is denied. However, Section 58-33-280 (E) allows for the filing of written comments within one month of the filing by the Office of Regulatory staff of its report indicating the results of its review and audit of the proposed revised rates. Mr. Wojcicki may file comments pursuant to Section 58-33-280 (E).

PRESIDING: Hamilton SESSION: Regular TIME: 11:30 a.m.

| | MOTION | YES | NO | OTHER |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| FLEMING | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| HALL | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| HAMILTON | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| HOWARD | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| MITCHELL | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Absent</u> State House |
| WHITFIELD | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| VACANT | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

(SEAL)

RECORDED BY: J. Schmieding



Exhibit W-15

The Copy of letter from South Carolina Attorney General Office.

As a response to Joseph Wojcicki – False Claim relator who sent his report to the SC Attorney General in August 2013.

Enclosed: one page of the letter scanned copy.



ALAN WILSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 18, 2013

Mr. Joseph Wojcicki
820 East Steele Rd.
West Columbia, SC 29170-1125

RE: Your Letter Dated October 24, 2013

Dear Mr. Wojcicki:

The purpose of this letter is to respond to your letter dated October 24, 2013, addressed to the Honorable Alan Wilson. It has been forwarded to me for response. As you are aware, matters regarding the South Carolina Base Load Review Act are administered by the South Carolina Public Service Commission. You also reference making a claim under the South Carolina False Claims Act. Though a false claims act has been introduced in South Carolina, it has not been passed and enacted into law. You may track its status here: http://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess119_2011-2012/bills/1003.htm.

The issues you have raised should be pursued, if you so elect, with the Public Service Commission.

Sincerely yours,

T. Parkin Hunter
Assistant Attorney General