

1 Jacoba H. van Mastrigt
2 5447 E. Hacienda Dr.
3 Idaho Falls, Idaho

4 In Sui Juris

5
6 **IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION**
7 **STATE OF IDAHO**
8

9
10 Jacoba H. van Mastrigt

11 Party Complainant

12 vs.

13 ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER &
14 GARY W. HOOGEVEEN, PRESIDENT
15 PACIFICORP; PACIFICORP D/B/A ROCKY
16 MOUNTAIN POWER

17 Party Defendant(s)

Case No: PAC-E-23-04

**OBJECTION AND OPPOSITION
TO 'ANSWER AND MOTION TO
DISMISS'**

18
19 **INTRODUCTION**

20 COMES NOW THE COMPLAINANT, Jacoba H. van Mastrigt, hereinafter called
21 "complainant", in pro per, sui juris, NOT pro se party in regard to this OPPOSITION TO
22 MOTION TO DISMISS. The complainant seeks remedies at common law and NOT within the
23 statutory or policy jurisdiction.

24
25 The complainant submits this brief in objection and opposition to ROCKY MOUNTAIN
26 POWER'S & GARY W. HOOGEVEEN, PRESIDENT PACIFICORP'S, hereinafter called
27 violators, ANSWER AND MOTION TO DISMISS, dated May10, 2023 for failure to state a
28 claim for which relief can be granted.

1 **NATURE OF OBJECTION AND OPPOSITION**

2 Complainant's AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT is CRIMINAL in nature and therefore
3 cannot be dismissed out of hand without addressing all criminal counts/violations therein on a
4 point-by-point basis, providing relief for each count.

5
6 The violators come into this forum with unclean hands and dishonesty in their hearts due to an
7 omission on their part of that which previously ought to have be done, and more specifically, the
8 omission or failure to perform a legal and moral duty with regards to complainant. Violators
9 have knowingly, willfully, and intentionally proceeded ahead with their unclean hands which
10 will only serve to make any and all subsequent proceedings unclean, dishonest and unfit.

11
12 Complainant objects to and opposes violators 'ANSWER AND MOTION TO DISMISS' dated
13 May 10, 2023 on the grounds that the violators have no lawful standing in this forum concerning
14 complainant's AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT as violators are in DEFAULT and know
15 they are in DEFAULT, and have been so since February 15, 2023 (see Exhibit G). Their
16 DEFAULT (silence) is evidence of and signifies their tacit agreement/acquiescence to the
17 position of complainant, thereby losing their legal standing to proceed against complainant any
18 further. In essence, violators have accepted and agreed to complainant's right of refusal of the
19 installation of violator's smart meter (Trespassing Technology) on complainant's home located
20 at 5447 E. Hacienda Dr., Idaho Falls, Idaho, and further;

21
22 As a result of violator's DEFAULT, violators have previously been ESTOPPED on this matter
23 when served with complainant's NOTICE OF ESTOPPEL dated February 15, 2023 (see Exhibit
24 H) which violators have chosen to ignore and violate.

25
26 When a party goes into DEFAULT, such as the violators have done with complainant by failing
27 to answer a lawful and legitimate inquiry/counteroffer, and choosing to remain silent where they
28 have a legal and moral obligation to speak, they lose credibility and standing and therefore

1 cannot lawfully/legally speak against or challenge complainant any further, nor can violators
2 proceed ahead as though complainant is not there or has failed to respond (“*A default is an*
3 *omission of that which ought to be done, and more specifically, the omission or failure to*
4 *perform a legal duty. The term also embraces the idea of dishonesty; or an act or omission*
5 *discreditable to one’s profession.*”) Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition. Violator’s
6 DEFAULT (silence) makes any subsequent actions on the part of violators against complainant
7 illegitimate, null and void. Since violators did not object to or oppose complainant’s
8 CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE of December 1, 2022, and instead chose to remain silent on
9 the matter, violators are not entitled to standing in this forum to challenge complainant’s
10 AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT or motion for a dismissal.

11
12 Complainant’s AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT is intended to bring criminal violations
13 of law by violators out in the open for the world to see and for the IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES
14 COMMISSION to address and hold violators accountable for their despicable actions, as well as
15 their inaction(s).

16
17 Ignoring complainant’s legitimate, lawful, and timely response to violator’s letter (see Exhibit B)
18 is considered dishonest, a dishonor, and even fraud (“*Silence can only be equated with fraud*
19 *when there is a legal and moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be*
20 *intentionally misleading.*” U.S. v PRUDDEN 424 F.2d 1021; U.S. v TWEEL 550 F.2d 297,
21 299, 300 (1977)). It is clear for all the world to see – violator’s hands are not clean and their
22 hearts are not pure! Violators come with contempt and malice in their hearts for complainant.

23
24 For some reason, violators seem to think it is perfectly fine to completely ignore complainant’s
25 inquiry/counteroffer and not give a response directly to complainant, but instead choose to
26 respond to the IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION’S SUBPOENA to answer
27 complainant’s AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT. They are clearly and arrogantly
28 operating under a double standard, adopting and promoting the ‘cancel culture’ (bully) mentality.

1 The violators believe that they hold the reigns of complete control of the proceedings at hand and
2 can just run over the top of complainant with impunity and no accountability. Violators have put
3 themselves in the position of Dictator relegating complainant to the lowly status of slave in their
4 minds, adopting a zero-tolerance stance and holding electric power service hostage over the head
5 of complainant in exchange for the installation of their smart meter (Trespassing Technology) on
6 complainant's home, offering complainant no other options. This is extortion at its finest (which
7 is a crime). Violator's message is, "You, complainant, either take the smart meter or else – or
8 else we will shut off your power and you, complainant can just suffer. We really don't care about
9 you, your family, or your welfare. You do as we tell you to do whether you like it or not, and the
10 IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION is on our side so we can do what we're doing to
11 you, and that's all there is to it." – This, my friends is not the American way! This is the way of
12 that bully, the Devil.

13
14 Violators assert that they have not violated any "specific administrative rule", "order", "statute",
15 or "applicable provision" of the Company's tariff, however, there is no specific administrative
16 rule, order, statute, or applicable provision of the Company's tariff that specifically allows
17 violators to remove an existing electric meter on a customer's home and switch it out for an
18 electronic digital smart meter (Trespassing Technology). There is no mention of that type of
19 authority in any specific administrative rule, order, statute, or applicable provision of the
20 Company's tariff.

21
22 Complainant asserts that outside of any specific administrative rule, order, statute, or applicable
23 provision of the Company's tariff, violators have committed and continue to commit criminal
24 acts/violations of law as enumerated in complainant's AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT
25 which cannot be dismissed or set aside as complainant has suffered injuries and continues to
26 suffer ongoing injuries at the hands of the violators as set forth in complainant's AMENDED
27 CRIMINAL COMPLAINT.

1 Further, complainant is still under threat of termination of complainant's electric power service
2 by violators for refusing the installation of violator's smart meter (Trespassing Technology)
3 which would cause complainant to suffer an unwarranted and unjust injury, especially through
4 the winter months. This would amount to intentional negligence with intent to do serious harm.

5
6 **COMPLAINANT'S RESPONSE TO VIOLATOR'S ANSWER, 13 THROUGH 29**

7 **13.** The company is not following applicable rules under the UCRR and Electric Service
8 Regulations in that there is no rule which allows/authorizes/permits violators to terminate
9 complainant's electric power service for refusing a smart meter, nor have they produced such
10 rule(s). Unless and until violators can provide/produce the actual UCRR "rule(s) which
11 specifically authorizes/permits the termination of complainant's power service for refusing to
12 accept installation of their smart meter (Trespassing Technology), violators are not authorized or
13 permitted to make such installation or terminate complainant's power service.

14
15 As it stands, neither the violators or the IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION have
16 produced the actual UCRR or Electric Service Regulation rule or rules which authorizes/permits
17 the termination of complainant's power service for complainant's refusal to accept a smart meter
18 (Trespassing Technology).

19
20 **14.** The violators are misrepresenting the truth when they claim that they have not used threats,
21 duress, or coercion in an attempt to induce complainant to submit to the installation of their
22 smart meter (Trespassing Technology). Evidence of their threats is in their own words as found
23 in violator's two "threatening" letters, dated March 1, 2023 and March 15, 2023 respectively.
24 (See Exhibits A & I) where violators state that claimant's electric power service will be
25 terminated if they fail to allow a smart meter (Trespassing Technology) to be installed. THOSE
26 ARE "THREATS". With regards to duress, violator's, through the use of threats are
27 attempting/tending to coerce the will of complainant to induce complainant to do an act contrary
28 to complainant's free will and better judgment. There is the threats, duress and coercion.

1 Hanging the threat of termination of power over complainant's head in order to coerce the free
2 will of complainant to induce complainant to submit to acceptance of their smart meter
3 (Trespassing Technology) contrary to complainant's free will is more than enough to instill fear
4 in the mind of complainant, and is not only duress and coercion but extortion as well (*To*
5 *constitute "extortion," the wrongful use of fear must be the operating cause producing consent.*
6 **People v. Biggs**, 178 Cal. 79, 172 P. 152, 153).

7
8 **16.** In accordance with Electric Service Regulation No. 6(2)(d), complainant has always abided
9 with the Company's (violators) tariff, as describes in said Regulation, including providing safe,
10 unencumbered access to Company's representative at reasonable times, for the purpose of
11 reading the electric meter, inspections, and repairs or removing metering devices and wiring of
12 the Company. Nowhere in Electric Service Regulation No. 6(2)(d) does it mention anything
13 about or authorize the Company (violators) to remove existing electric meter in order to replace
14 it with a smart meter (Trespassing Technology), and further;

15
16 The complainant is not the aggressor here and has committed no overt act(s) against violators at
17 any time, nor has complainant caused any harm or injury to violators or violators property at any
18 time. It is the violators who initiated aggression upon complainant for simply refusing to accept
19 their dangerous and potentially lethal RF microwave radiation emitting surveillance device
20 known as a smart meter (Trespassing Technology), and further;

21
22 The notion that by complainant simply refusing violators smart meter (Trespassing Technology)
23 upgrade "is not safe and unencumbered access" as defined in Electric Service Regulation No. 6
24 is preposterous and utter nonsense. The issue of safety and access has nothing to do with
25 complainant's refusal of violators smart meter (Trespassing Technology) as Electric Service
26 Regulation No. 6 makes no mention of a "smart meter" (Trespassing Technology).

27
28 **17.** Violators state that Electric Service Regulation No. 7 allows for the Company to "furnish and

1 maintain all meters and other metering equipment.” Complainant maintains that violators have
2 already previously furnished and maintained complainant’s electric meter, which is still in
3 working condition. Violators also state that “The rule does not prohibit the upgrade of any
4 meters.” But there is no rule that specifically authorizes violators to install a device (smart meter)
5 on complainant’s home which is known to emit extremely high levels of dangerous and harmful
6 RF microwave radiation which is harmful to humans, or one that serves as a transmit and receive
7 “relay station”, or one which in actuality is an illegal wiretapping device which monitors,
8 receives, gathers, stores, transmits, and shares personal information/data of the private habits and
9 routines of complainant and others in complainant’s household, and further;

10
11 Violators claim and admit that the implementation of AMI (smart meter Trespassing Technology)
12 provides improved customer service through enhanced information and billing options. This is
13 violator’s admission that they are illegally going to wiretap complainant’s home’s electrical
14 wiring system in order to monitor, receive, gather, store, transmit, and share personal
15 information/data of the private habits and routines of complainant and others in complainant’s
16 home in order that they may “provide improved customer service through enhanced information
17 and billing options”, and further;

18
19 Complainant does not consent to the installation of a device known as a smart meter
20 (Trespassing Technology) which continuously emits very high levels of dangerous and harmful
21 RF microwave radiation, or a transmit and receive “relay station”, or an illegal wiretapping
22 device on complainant’s home or private property.

23
24 Complainant’s current existing electric service is and has been working for all these years and
25 complainant sees no reason to make these unnecessary changes and is not interested in
26 “improved customer service through enhanced information and billing options.” Complainant
27 desires to continue on as always, where their meter reader simply reads complainant’s electric
28 meter each month, and then send complainant the electric bill.

1 18. Violators claim that "Safety" is ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER'S first concern. This is
2 patently false. If this were true, violators would honor and respect complainant's claim that they
3 are very hyper electro-sensitive and that they have been harmed in the past by RF microwave
4 radiation from various devices. Since violators do not honor and respect complainant's
5 DECLARATION IN THE FORM OF AN AFFIDAVIT, violators are calling complainant a liar
6 when in fact violators are the liars (this includes violators attorneys). Violators cannot prove that
7 complainant and others in complainant's family are not very electro hyper sensitive and that
8 complainant and other family members have not been injured by RF microwave radiation
9 emitting devices, including smart meter technology in the past, and further;

10
11 Again, it is patently clear that violators have no respect for complainant and complainant's input
12 on health and safety concerns. In fact, violators couldn't care less about complainant's health and
13 safety concerns, as well as of those similarly situated. Complainant's claim that violators smart
14 meter (Trespassing Technology) (or what violators call AMI meters) are unsafe is based upon
15 first-hand knowledge and experience of not only complainant but complainant's son (an EMF
16 Consultant) who was seriously injured and incapacitated by a smart meter (Trespassing
17 Technology) of the type used by P G & E in California, and further;

18
19 The smart meters (Trespassing Technology) being installed by violators in this area of Idaho are
20 of the "Generation 5" technology (or 5G) and are even more dangerous than the first generation
21 smart meters (Trespassing Technology) used by P G & E in California, regardless of what
22 violators and the IPUC claim, and consistently emit continuous power densities of 1000 uW/m²
23 or higher, especially at the rear of the smart meter which in most cases is emanating this harmful
24 RF microwave radiation far into the home. According to the International Building Biologist
25 Radio Frequency/Microwave Exposure Guidelines, 1000 uW/m² and higher is in the
26 "EXTREME CONCERN" range which is known to be very hazardous to the human physiology.
27 On-site and "boots on the ground" power density readings, at various local locations are far and
28 away exponentially higher from what the violators, the IPUC, and all their phony baloney studies

1 claim their smart meters (Trespassing Technology) emit.

2
3 The health and safety of complainant is not the exclusive job or the right of the violators, IPUC,
4 and government. Since they do not have lawful authority over complainant, they cannot deem
5 anything, let alone a smart meter (Trespassing Technology) safe and non-harmful for
6 complainant and those similarly situated and then mandate/order that complainant and others
7 must accept it or take it, whether complainant likes it or not. The only one who can lawfully
8 deem anything safe for complainant and others, and whether or not they will accept it or not, is
9 the exclusive right of complainant and others themselves.

10 What violators and the IPUC are claiming is that complainant, and others similarly situated do
11 not have a say about what will be allowed onto their own private property, nor do they have a
12 right to determine for themselves what is safe and what is not safe or what is healthy or what is
13 harmful to their own body.

14
15 **19.** As a matter of law, neither the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) or the Congress
16 has any lawful or Constitutional authority/jurisdiction over complainant, including lawful or
17 Constitutional authority/jurisdiction what-so-ever to deem safe or approve anything for any
18 purpose for complainant. Complainant was never included in any government or private research
19 studies to see what effect the so-called standards of the FCC and other government agencies has
20 upon complainant's health and safety, neither can the FCC and other government agencies prove
21 that those studies relied upon are not flawed, skewed, or intentionally misleading. No one,
22 including government and corporations can lawfully force complainant to accept something
23 without recourse or options which complainant believes is unsafe, harmful, or detrimental in
24 some way, in the same way that neither the government or corporations can force complainant to
25 eat only certain foods, or purchase a particular car, or what church complainant must attend, or
26 who and what complainant must vote for.

27
28 **20.** The guidelines associated with human exposure of radio frequency energy compiled by

1 industry research standards agencies, such as the American National Standards Institute
2 (“ANSI”) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (“IEEE”), and those
3 adopted by “the industry” are all flawed, intentionally skewed and twisted, one-sided, financed
4 by government and the communications industry, and failed (intentionally) to include customers
5 and people like complainant in their actual research studies. All these government and corporate
6 entities, including Occupational Safety and Health Administration (“OSHA”) are operating in
7 conflict of interest with each other as there is/was no representation of power company
8 customers and people like complainant in any of their so-called research studies. The
9 government and corporations come up with their own standards to support what they are
10 cramming down the throats of the power company customers and people like complainant and
11 call it legitimate when in fact it is all fraudulent.

12
13 All of their so-called industry standards are far in excess of what is reasonable and safe.

14 **21.** Again, the guidelines associated with human exposure of radio frequency energy compiled
15 by industry research standards agencies, such as the American National Standards Institute
16 (“ANSI”) and the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (“IEEE”), and those
17 adopted by “the industry” are mostly flawed, intentionally skewed and twisted, one-sided,
18 financed by government and the communications industry (not by customers and people like
19 complainant), and failed (intentionally) to include customers and people like complainant in their
20 actual research studies. The resulting MPE levels incorporated by the FCC into the safety
21 requirements claiming a 10:1 safety ratio is pure junk science propagated by the government’s
22 own paid employees known as scientists (serious conflict of interest). Their junk science is
23 always skewed and one-sided tending to prejudice power company customers and people like
24 complainant and those similarly situated, and further;

25
26 The figures for RF exposure given by utilities are time-averaged numbers which hide the
27 peak power of the “smart” meter, and disguise the fairly continuous nature of pulses. The
28 duration of the “spiked” pulses from smart meters are about ½ millisecond each (2/1000th

1 of a second), and can go off at a rate of 2 to 20 per second. At least 90% of the pulses are
2 not data of the customer's, but the "mesh network" talking to itself-also known as network
3 chatter", and further;

4
5 The power companies claim that smart meters emit RF radiation only about 45 seconds per
6 day. But, since smart meters emit individual pulsed RF radiation spikes that are about 2
7 milliseconds in duration, that would produce about 22,500 pulses per day over the 24-hour
8 period. At the rate of twice per second, the pulses would be going off for a total of about 3
9 hours per day, spread over the whole day.

10
11 **22.** When the government and its government instrumentalities known as corporations come up
12 with their own funded research to support the crimes they are committing or attempting to
13 commit against power and communications company customers and people like complainant
14 with no real and legitimate input from customers and people like complainant, nothing is
15 believable and everything is suspect even what they deem safe.

16
17 **23.** This is an outright lie. Smart meters today emit up to 60 (60,000 uW/m²) times greater
18 microwave radiation than the U.S. safety limit of 1,000 microwatts per square meter. Smart
19 Meters are dangerous because they expose the occupants of the home or office to highly toxic
20 amounts of RF Radiation and Dirty Electricity. In 2011, RF radiation was classified by the
21 International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) as "possibly carcinogenic for humans". In
22 addition, there is no data to show that radiofrequency radiation is safe. In fact, no one has done
23 any studies on the health of people living in homes with smart meters. In May, 2011, the World
24 Health Organization/IARC classified radiofrequency (RF) electromagnetic fields as possibly
25 carcinogenic to humans.

26 Further, the Bioinitiative Report recommends a level of 0.1 microwatt per centimeter squared
27 (uW/cm²) for human exposure, about 10,000 times less than the FCC number/standard, and
28 further;

1 The World Health Organization has adopted the classification of the International Agency for
2 Research on Cancer's (IARC) classification on radio frequency electromagnetic fields (FR-
3 EMF's) as a 2B possible human carcinogen.

4
5 **24.** The company (violators) can deny complainant's allegations all the want. That won't change
6 the fact that violators are attempting to unlawfully intrude onto and into complainant's property
7 and home by way of a which violators know is an illegal wiretapping device and a transmit and
8 receive "relay station" which violators are attempting to install on complainant's home. The fact
9 that their smart meter (Trespassing Technology) will gather information for the power company
10 (violators) and monitor any "smart" device and appliance in complainant's home is prima facia
11 evidence that said meter is capable of transmitting personal and private information about
12 complainant's habits and routines, including when complainant comes and goes from the home,
13 what appliance is being used and when, what television program is being watched, and even
14 what is being said/talked about in complainant's home, etc. This, in reality would be a takeover
15 of complainant's property and home for their commercial use and benefit.

16
17 **28.** First of all, it is not the authority or business of the Commission, regardless of their own self-
18 imposed rules and regulation to order or uphold the utilities installation of their so-called AMI
19 meters (Trespassing Technology) and at the same time disallow complainant's and those
20 similarly situated to "opt out" of said installation as neither the Commission or the utility
21 (violators) have any lawful/Constitutional authority to order, allow, or disallow complainant
22 anything. Complainant has no contract or relationship with the Commission and visa versa. The
23 Commission's job is to regulate the utilities (violators), not the customers or people like the
24 complainant, to make sure the violators are not violating their customers and keeping violators
25 within the constraints of state law which applies to the utilities (violators). Anything other than
26 this is a gross misuse of power. Again, the Commission was not created to regulate the people,
27 customers, or complainant, but the activities of the utilities (violators).

1 29. Just because all these agencies have determined that AMI smart meter (Trespassing
2 Technology) is safe and provide no threat or harm to the public does not make it so. What all
3 these agencies decide is their business, but when it comes to deciding what is safe for
4 complainant, is not their business nor do they have the lawful/Constitutional authority to impose
5 their safety standards upon complainant. Complainant reserves the right to determine what is safe
6 for complainant and what complainant will accept and allow on complainant's private property,
7 and further;

8
9 Violators are lying when they say they do not intend to wiretap complainant's home. Anyone with
10 half a brain can figure that one out. Violators know full well that their smart meter (Trespassing
11 Technology) is an illegal wiretapping device because of the way it was designed to gather and
12 disseminate information. It is no different than government agents tapping a phone line of a
13 private homeowner.

14 When violators say they have not violated any contract, rule, or procedure by requiring a smart
15 meter (Trespassing Technology), they are using clever words of art to deceive the beholder(s).
16 Complainant's allegation is that violators are "attempting" to violate an implied contract by use
17 of threat, duress, and coercion. If violators succeed in unlawfully compelling complainant to
18 submit to accepting their smart meter (Trespassing Technology) contrary to complainant's free
19 will, that is when the violators will have violated an implied contract with complainant.
20

21 **RELIEF SOUGHT**

22 **(FROM AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT)**

23 Therefore, complainant seeks the following relief in order to maintain complainant's
24 Constitutionally secured Rights under the FIRST, FOURTH, and FIFTH AMENDMENTS, in
25 order for complainant to continue exercising complainant's religious right to make complainant's
26 own determination and decisions as to what is and is not safe or harmful, and what complainant
27 will be exposed to without interference from outside third parties, and that complainant will
28 continue to be secure and protected in complainant's person, house, papers, and effects, against

1 unreasonable searches and seizures, as well as continuing complainant's right to not be deprived
2 of life, liberty, and property without due process of law. Further, relief is sought from the
3 harassment, abusive demands, threats, and tactics as enumerated in the COUNTS above, and that
4 violators **be so ordered:**

5
6 **1. To CEASE AND DESIST** in sending out to complainant any further deceptive letters/notices
7 and/or any statement(s) with false representations of fact concerning the Electric Service
8 Regulations, Numbers 6 and 7 in particular, claiming that violators have authority, as per Electric
9 Service Regulation No. 6 to install a smart meter (Trespassing Technology) on complainant's
10 home against the free will of complainant, and that complainant, as per said Regulation is
11 required to comply and accept said meter.

12 **2. To CEASE AND DESIST** in claiming that violators have authority, as per Electric Service
13 Regulations No. 6 and 7, and UCRR 302.01, and using such to threaten termination of
14 complainant's electric power service for refusing a smart meter (Trespassing Technology) where
15 no such specific authority exists.

16
17 **3. To CEASE AND DESIST** in violator's false claim that complainant has previously denied
18 and is continuing to deny violators "access" to the meter base, when they have had it all along,
19 and further;

20
21 **4. To CEASE AND DESIST** in any further attempts to install a smart meter (Trespassing
22 Technology) on my home located at 5447 E. Hacienda Dr., Idaho Falls, Idaho, and further;

23 **5. To CEASE AND DESIST** in any further use of harassment, deception, threats, strong-arm
24 intimidation tactics, trickery, duress, and/or coercion to compel complainant to submit to
25 accepting the installation of their smart meter (Trespassing Technology), and further;

26
27 **6. To CEASE AND DESIST** in making any further false claim(s) that violators and the IDAHO
28 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION have the exclusive right to deem something (smart meter

1 Trespassing Technology in this case) safe and nonharmful for complainant, and that complainant
2 must accept violator's smart meter (Trespassing Technology) because violators believe
3 complainant has no say in the matter, and further;

4
5 7. To **CEASE AND DESIST** in any further threats to terminate electric power service at
6 complainant's home located at 5447 E. Hacienda Dr., Idaho Falls, Idaho for refusing the
7 installation of their hazardous RF emitting smart meter (Trespassing Technology), and further;

8
9 8. To not terminate/shut off electric power service to complainant's home located at 5447 E.
10 Hacienda Dr., Idaho Falls, Idaho, as there is no lawful/legal authority found in any of the Electric
11 Service Regulations or otherwise, to shut off power for complainant's refusal to allow the
12 installation of a hazardous RF microwave radiation emitting smart meter (Trespassing
13 Technology), and further;

14 9. To acknowledge and accept (in addition to the so-called evidence and studies that they post on
15 their website that smart meters are safe) the overwhelming evidence put forth by hundreds, if not
16 thousands of independent studies showing the harmful and detrimental effects of RF microwave
17 radiation, and further;

18
19 10. To recognize and accept the fact that complainant, and complainant alone reserves the
20 exclusive right to determine and decide in this life what is safe and what is not safe for
21 complainant, and that it is not for violators or anyone else for that matter to determine and decide
22 what is good for complainant and what complainant must live with and be continually subjected
23 to, such as exposure to the extremely high and dangerous continuous RF microwave radiation in
24 this case.

25
26 **CONCLUSION**

27 The IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION'S responsibility at this time, includes
28 addressing all criminal counts/violations committed by violators and ordering violators to cease

1 and desist in their criminal acts/behavior towards complainant. If the IDAHO PUBLIC
2 UTILITIES COMMISSION does not do so, then they are in essence saying that they condone
3 this type of criminal behavior of the violators, which would make the IDAHO PUBLIC
4

5 UTILITIES COMMISSION duplicitous in said crimes against complainant and others similarly
6 situated. If this turns out to be the case, then other crime/violations could be added to the
7 already lengthy list of crimes, to possibly include fraud, collusion, conspiracy, racketeering,
8 violation of oaths of office, etc. The IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION is supposed
9 to be the watchdog of the utility companies to make sure they don't do anything to harm utility
10 customers. They are to protect utility customers from the unethical, unfair, one-sided, and
11 abusive policies and behaviors of the utility companies. In fact, all IDAHO PUBLIC
12 UTILITIES COMMISSION members swore an oath to the Constitution(s), and the Bill of
13 Rights just happens to be included in that oath. What this means is that all IDAHO PUBLIC
14 UTILITIES COMMISSION members swore to uphold and support the rights of the people
15 (which includes utility customers), not the utility companies. The utility companies
16 (corporations) have no rights in and of themselves, but are regulated by government, whereas
17 the people (customers) are not regulated by government because the people are the source and
18 authors of the law. The government cannot be greater than that which created it – the people. So,
19 it stands to reason that the government does not have lawful authority to order or mandate
20 anything to the people without due process of law, but they do have authority to order and
21 mandate the utility companies to operate within the bounds of the law without violating the
22 rights of their utility customers, as well as to not commit crimes against its customers.
23


24 If the IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION rules against complainant by granting
25 violator's 'ANSWER AND MOTION TO DISMISS', that would leave no remedy or option for
26 complainant which would be unlawful as the rights of complainant would stand violated. The
27 IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION cannot lawfully make a ruling which would result
28 in the diminishing, limiting, curtailing, and/or destruction of complainant's unalienable Rights

1 and Constitutionally secured and protected rights, including complainant's private property
2 rights, as they swore an oath of office that they would not do so. Further, the law does not
3 provide that a corporation or government can implement a "do or die" or "comply or else" policy
4 and then enforce such on complainant and others similarly situated.


5
6 **Therefore**, in the interest that justice will be served, complainant strongly urges the IDAHO
7 PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION to enforce the law and rights of complainant, to include,
8 but not limited to complainant's FIRST, FOURTH, and FIFTH AMENDMENT rights as
9 articulated in complainant's AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT, and thus deny/dismiss
10 violators "ANSWER AND MOTION TO DISMISS", dated May 10, 2023, with prejudice for
11 reasons stated above and for failure to state a lawful claim for which relief can be granted.


12
13 All Right reserved; none waived, and without prejudice.

14
15 Respectfully Submitted,

16
17
18 
19 _____
20 Jacoba H. van Mastrikt, Sui Juris

21
22 
23 _____
24 Date

25
26
27 
28 _____
Witness to signature #1

29
30 
31 _____
Witness to signature #2

PROOF OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY and affirm that I, Frits van Mastriegt did personally

E-mail the following document(s):

1. AMENDED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT of Jacoba H. van Mastriegt, dated 5/20/23, with DECLARATION OF Jacoba H. van Mastriegt IN THE FORM OF AND AFFIDAVIT, dated 3/20/23, with Exhibits A through I, and PROOF OF SERVICE.
2. OBJECTION AND OPPOSITION TO ANSWER AND MOTION TO DISMISS of Jacoba H. van Mastriegt, dated 5/20/23, with PROOF OF SERVICE,

to the following:

JAN NORIYUKI, COMMISSION SECRETARY
IDAHO PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0074
Email: secretary@puc.idaho.gov & jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov

Data Request Response Center
Rocky Mountain Power
825 NE Multnomah St., Suite 2000
Portland, OR 97232
Email: datarequest@pacificorp.com

Mark Alder
Idaho Regulatory Affairs Manager
Rocky Mountain Power
1407 West North Temple, Suite 330
Salt Lake City, Utah 84116
Email: mark.alder@pacificorp.com

Joe Dallas (ISB# 10330)
Senior Attorney
Rocky Mountain Power
825 NE Multnomah, Suite 2000 Portland, OR 97232
Email: joseph.dallas@pacificorp.com

on this 22nd day of May, 2023.



Frits van Mastriegt