

Darlene Schmidt, Appellant
140 east Plata Way
Sandy, Utah 84093
801-571-1480
georgeschmidt2000@yahoo.com

IN THE THIRD DISTRICT COURT
OF SALT LAKE COUNTY, STATE OF UTAH

Darlene Schmidt, Appellant Petition
Interloctory Appeal from the Public
Service Commission of Utah

v. District No.:180900755

Rocky Mountain Power Corp, Judge: Judge Faust
Respondent.

Governing Law:

Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 63G-4-402, the district courts have jurisdiction to review all agency actions resulting from informal adjudicative proceedings. The district court determines all questions of fact and law and any constitutional issue presented in the pleadings.

Pursuant interlocutory review of a non-final ALJ order occurs only if a ruling that is denying privileged status to records and where early resolution of a material issue may materially advance the termination of the proceeding.

Issues:

1. No designated Executive Director is found at PSC.

Mr. [REDACTED] did not know who this Person is showing great confusion dominates the PSC court. The PSC staff directory does not identify an Executive Director, forcing me to apply Utah Code Ann. § 63G-4-402.

2. Confusion at PSC is denying me a fair, unbiased, merit-based appeal free from predetermined decisions.

Mr. [REDACTED] speaks English but has no idea what is being communicated. At times Mr. [REDACTED] acts like he is my lawyer, when he is not, yet he changed my motions into exhibits that deny me my day in PSC court to a fair, unbised merit-based appeal. I refiled them with the word motion in the heading.

3. Confusion is so grave there are days I cannot access my PSC digital file.

I do not receive copies of documents. Mr. [REDACTED] sent copies of respondent's motions--after the deadline to reply.

4. Mr. [REDACTED] does not know I am a party to the appeal.

Confusion and chaos cause me to request communication with someone who has been in America long enough to understand our system of communication and adjudication. Mr. [REDACTED] refuses to get someone.

5. PSC exercises a respector of persons instead of the rule of law.

I have filed 2 motions to determine jurisdiction. One about Dec. 19, 2017 and one Jan. 20, 2018. No one knows what they are or how to deal with them. They get shelved so all can concentrate on respondents rambling, ungrounded, unsupported, lacking merit, has no reference point to my complaint and therefore answers nothing in the complaint. Comments come from a from letter that has claims pulled from thin air.

6. PSC's web site is illigal and adds to the confusion at PSC.

I type my docket No. and am taken to the home page or a different page with a field containing my number, when I should have landed on my file page. No instructions tell the field is a button or link. Mr. [REDACTED] said to click the field lacking instructions. Some times it takes me to my digital file and other times to a page stating my digital file does not exist. This confusion is denying my day in court, being heard, defending, in cruel and unusual punishment.

7. PSC does not recognize appeals authority.

The chaos is so confusing no one at PSC's court knows who is the greatest authority. I filed copies of Holy Judge Trease's order and that of the Utah Court of Appeals showing the court must sit as a republic and bar a corporate ghost from winning. The appeals courts' jurisdiction and orders are bared from exercise at PSC.

8. The chaos at PSC results in predetermined decisions and winners.

Only respondent's motions receive adjudication. showing grave confusion and bias. Confusion is so grave the court is processing my appeal in a clever exparte process where I am barred and respondent is not when I have court standing and respondent does not.

9. PSC's confusion cannot identify the facts and law involved.

Mr. [REDACTED] does not know that once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be determined before further action can be taken. The determined time for objection is forbidden. I am afraid Mr. [REDACTED] will delete my digital file so I copied all to have PSC identifiers. After telling Mr. [REDACTED] I had copied the file for the identifiers, I could not access my digital file.

10. Utah Code Ann. § 63G-4-402, allows the district courts to have jurisdiction to review the agencies action that jurisdiction has not occurred because confusion cannot determine the law and facts.

Rule R305-7-215 does not forbid the district court from standing in and correcting the error of jurisdiction and other when the Executive Director cannot be found.

The district court understands the court Holy Judge Trease executed and the Court of Appeals upheld. There is no assurance an Executive Direction would be capable of doing this. See note below

Confusion and chaos keep all agitated and unable to perform their duties. With such intense confusion and chaos, an Executive Director would likely be confused and unable to perform R305-7-215 Interlocutory duties. Agitation would drive this director to do whatever to avoid such responsibility resulting is lengthy litigation to preserve every Utahans' life and quality of their pursuit of happiness.

11. The confusion at PSC mandates this matter be interloctory reviewed before a higher court who can exercise the law and establish law and order in PSC to avoid further uncesearrey adjudication. See R305-7-215

Note: Judge Trease presided over SLC Corp v. Schmidt, 2013, where she affirmed Dartmouth v. Woodward did not authorize corporation to be applied to government. SLC Corp and her internet law were declared repugnant to the US Constitution. SLC Corp was barred from trial or winning. Jurisdiction did not exist when a lawyer claimed to represent a ghost/idol that Dartmouth defined as invisible, intangible, contemplation (praying about) law, an artificial (nonexistent) person. This is the same definition the bible gives to idols. Judge Trease found no human can communicate with a ghost/idol, denying cross examination, true facts and law. God warned me to not disrespect Judge

Trease. I call her Holy Judge Trease because she did God's will on earth as it is in heaven. She refused to conduct a Dartmouth schizophrenic court of delusion which has not been done for 200 years. In fact she separated church and state when she barred the biblical defined nonexistent person from court to insure sanity governed, not Salem's witch trial madness. She submitted to the US Const. Art 3.2 that controversies, court standing, exist between a state, republic, and a citizen, one who votes. Corporate ghosts do not vote. She truly is holy. She commands respect. I have not witnessed such greatness in my entire life. I become awe struck realizing I found God's seed in Third District.

January 27, 2018.