

From: Fred Quinto <fredricquinto@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2023 6:02 PM
To: Michael Duval <michael.duval@puc.idaho.gov>
Cc: Jan Noriyuki <jan.noriyuki@puc.idaho.gov>; aglabrador@ag.idaho.gov
Subject: Quinto Case VZN-T-23-01

CAUTION: This email originated outside the State of Idaho network. Verify links and attachments BEFORE you click or open, even if you recognize and/or trust the sender. Contact your agency service desk with any concerns.

Mr. Duval,

Thank you for your quick reply.

I notice that the first part of your letter contradicts the last part. You stated that all written communication must contain a request for posting, yet the Ziplly response should have been posted but "inadvertently" was not.

Since you are new to this matter a brief summary is needed. My informal complaint was dismissed by McCuen and my Formal Complaint was directed to the Attorney General as well as the PUC. The Attorney General issued a summons to Ziplly Fiber on March 28th to be forwarded by the PUC for a response not more than 21 days. The PUC sent it to Ziplly by certified mail on April 11th, 12 days later, and received a response at 1:39PM on April 20th, but was not posted as you said it should have been.

A letter I sent to the PUC on April 21st would imply that I was unaware of Ziplly's April 20th response. Furthermore, a telephone call I made to Johann on May 2nd confirms that I was still unaware of Ziplly's response. Interestingly, right after my phone call with Johann the response was then posted to the case file. A disinterested person would now assume the Ziplly letter was posted on April 20th, the day it was received and was supposed to be posted. However, if need be, with today's technology I can prove it was not posted on April 20.

As I see these events it is quite apparent to me that McCune has been trying to sabotage this process by deliberately holding Ziplly's response so that the case will be quickly dismissed, which would add credibility to his decision to dismiss the informal complaint.

At this point this entire matter has been simplified and reduced to Ziplly's response. I am of the opinion that the response document itself may be construed as a "Genuine Issue of Material Fact", which is of course, disputable. It consists of five separate provable and intentional lies.

- 1) The line is not permanently installed.
- 2) Access to my house was never requested or needed because the lines on the outside of my house.
- 3) There is no proof that my house is unsafe.
- 4) The condition of my house is not relevant under any circumstances.
- 5) The personal attack on me that I am "Confused".

Dementia has no bearing on the complaint. What would I be confused about? What Ziplly is trying to do is neutralize what their technician did to me March 8, 2022. This comment should confirm to the Attorney General how these people have tormented me for 4 years now. In effect, my "Dementia" is the only reason service has not been properly restored.

This letter and the letters I sent on April 2nd and May 5th are to be immediately posted.

Fred Quinto