

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI**

The Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission,	)	
	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b><u>Case No. WC-2015-0330</u></b>
	)	
Fawn Lake Water Corp. and	)	
Rachel Hackman,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**STAFF MOTION FOR DEFAULT DETERMINATION**

**COMES NOW** the Staff of the Missouri Public Service Commission (“Staff”), by and through counsel, and for its *Motion for Default Determination* pursuant to Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.070(10), states as follows:

1. Respondents own and operate a “water corporation” as defined by Section 386.020(59), RSMo., and a “public utility” as defined by Section 386.020(43), RSMo, and thus is subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission pursuant to Section 386.250(3), RSMo.

2. Section 386.390.1, RSMo authorizes the Commission to entertain a complaint “setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any...public utility...in violation, or claimed to be in violation, of any provision of law, or of any rule, or order or decision of the commission.”

3. On June 11, 2015, Staff filed its *Complaint*,<sup>1</sup> asserting that Respondents Fawn Lake water Corp. and its owner and registered agent, Ms. Rachel Hackman, own and operate an unauthorized water corporation, in violation of § 393.170.2, RSMo.

4. On June 12, 2015, the Commission issued its *Notice of Complaint* in Case No. WC-2015-0330, directing Respondents to answer by July 13, 2015.

5. On June 23, 2015, the Commission's Data Center received return receipts showing successful delivery of its *Notice of Complaint* in Case No. WC-2015-0330 to Rachel Hackman as Registered Agent for Respondent Fawn Lake Water Corp. and to Rachel Hackman as an individual respondent. Rachel Hackman signed the return receipts.<sup>2</sup>

6. Respondents did not file an answer by July 13, 2015.

7. On September 2, 2015, Staff filed a motion for default determination due to Respondents' failure to answer the *Complaint*.

8. On September 16, 2015, the Commission issued its *Order Granting Motion for Default Determination*. As provided for by regulation, the *Order* allowed Respondents until September 30, 2015 to set aside the *Order*.

9. On September 30, 2015, counsel retained by Respondents filed a *Motion to Set Aside the Default Judgment and to File Answer to Complainants' Petitions Out Of Time*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Staff notes that OPC filed a similar complaint against Respondents on June 19, 2016, and that a Motion to Consolidate was subsequently filed and denied. Therefore, Staff's reference to the *Complaint* herein is only to Staff's *Complaint*, and not the pending OPC action.

<sup>2</sup> See, EFIS Items 3, 4.

10. Staff agreed to the Respondents' counsel's motion. Accordingly, on October 8, 2015, the Commission set aside the *Order Granting Motion for Default Determination*.

11. Generally, when a default determination is set aside, the movants file an answer. Respondents, however, did not file an Answer to the *Complaint*, but filed a *Motion to Stay Cases*. Staff did not object to that *Motion*.

12. The *Motion to Stay* was granted on November 3, 2015.

13. On November 4, 2015, the Missouri Secretary of State formally administratively dissolved Respondent Fawn Lake Water Corp. for failing to file necessary registration documentation.

14. Through various *Status Reports* filed with the Commission, Staff had the understanding that Respondents were either attempting to sell the unauthorized water corporation to an authorized public utility, or reorganize their unauthorized water corporation into an entity falling outside of Commission jurisdiction.<sup>3</sup> Staff hoped to resolve the *Complaint* amicably by providing Respondents ample time and opportunity to complete a transition or sale.

15. Nearly a year later, on September 26, 2016, counsel for Respondents requested to withdraw from the action. The request was granted on September 27, 2016.

16. Due to concerns about clear communication, Staff sought for Respondents an extended opportunity to file a missing answer to the *Complaint*.

17. On November 9, 2016, the Commission sent its *Order Sending Final Notice and Setting Time for Filing Answer* to known addresses previously used by

---

<sup>3</sup> See, *Status Reports*. EFIS Items, 27, 28, 30, 32, 33, 35, and 39.

Respondents. The *Order Sending Final Notice* provided a deadline to Respondents of December 7, 2016 by which to file an answer to the *Complaint*.

18. On December 2, 2016, Staff received a customer complaint about billing and water service by Respondents. \*\* \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ \*\*

19. At the time of this filing, Respondents have neither filed an answer, nor filed any other type of responsive pleading. Respondents continue to charge for service.

20. Staff remains concerned about the safety and adequacy of service, and the system's continued operation without the protections for the company or the customers afforded by regulation.

21. Commission Rule 4 CSR 240-2.070(10) provides, "If the respondent in a complaint case fails to file a timely answer, the complainant's averments may be deemed admitted and an order granting default entered."

22. Section 386.600, RSMo provides, "an action to recover a penalty...under this chapter or to enforce the powers of the commission under this or any other law may be brought in any circuit court in this state in the name of the state of Missouri and shall be commenced and prosecuted to final judgment by the general counsel to the commission."

23. The original "Wherefore" clauses of Staff's *Complaint* sought an order from the Commission to "authorize its General Counsel to seek in Circuit Court the

penalties allowed by law; *and grant such other and further relief as is just in the circumstances.*” Emphasis added.

24. Staff suggests that in addition to directing the General Counsel to seek civil penalties for the ongoing violations, that “other and further relief as is just in the circumstances” in this matter should include injunctive relief pursuant to § 386.360, RSMo., to (1) prohibit Respondents from any operations as a water corporation; or alternatively, (2) prohibit Respondents from receiving any further remuneration from the customers, as Respondents continued to charge for service while operating unlawfully as a water corporation, without a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Commission.

**WHEREFORE,** the Staff prays that the Commission will grant default determination of its Complaint filed herein and enter its order (1) finding that the Respondents own and operate unauthorized water corporation in violation of § 393.170.2 RSMo, and (2) authorizing the General Counsel’s Office to bring an action for civil penalties and injunctive relief against Respondents in an appropriate circuit court as provided in Sections 386.600, 393.140(6), and 386.570 RSMo; and granting such other and further relief as the Commission deems just.

Respectfully submitted,

**/s/ Jacob T. Westen**

Jacob T. Westen  
Deputy Counsel  
Missouri Bar No. 65265  
Attorney for the Staff of the  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
P.O. Box 360  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
573-751-5472 (Voice)  
[jacob.westen@psc.mo.gov](mailto:jacob.westen@psc.mo.gov)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was hand delivered, served by U.S. Mail, or served electronically on this 5<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2017, to the parties of record.

**/s/ Jacob T. Westen**