

Motion to order of operations priority of Petition CASE's due process

The tandem necessity to utilize Public Petition Case OX-2026-0180 for Public Interest in the interpretation and proponents of Advanced meter Regulatory via the proponents of the Regulatory and their interplay interaction of Tariff initiatives to influence statute or statute to be interpreted by Tariff interplay and even includes a dangling new Clause amend in the Statute promoted by Vendors and amended in by Regulator. The Public interest was not represented in this Regulatory. Therefore, it is vital to render in the the Public interest in a Petition Case manner.

The Petition Case's has to take a priority to be given due process first prior to the alter case. That is required now as the Judge has opposing Counsel in the altercase demanding that Judge must only rule on the Regulatory that is omit of Public representation and public interest. So, in order of operations the Petition must be addressed first to give the Public an due process to amend or render correct interpretation to not only the opposing Counsel in the alter case but also to confront that PSC Commission as the Regulator as to clarity of the proponents and all moving parts of tariffs clause and statute interplay as well as authentic scientific conclusions of the statute's definition as a the Public interest represents authentic science interpretation of the statute and also finds the new amend clause as an attempt by Vendor and Regulator to extinguish their consent in this triangle of goods and services the public wants quality and safe and medical source suppliers to be addressed for patient medical clinical appropriate physician approved metering. This Petition Case must be given due process prior to any of the alter case in any finalizations. This is due to the influence of the current Regulator and Vendor's interpretation of the Regulatory by which the Judge can rule upon in regard to the altercase.

The two cases have to be given due process in a manner of prioritization of the Petition Case as setting the Regulatory in question to the behalf of the Public

interpretation as the correct interpretation. That is the position of the Public who has not been represented by the Regulator PSC Commission in this Regulatory's interpretation. Since, the PSC opposes the Public interpretation the Public has the right to proceed with the Petition first.

The Judge is the same on both cases and he is also needing to have solid foundation by which to protect the public in the alter case as the opposing counsel is concurring with the incorrect interpretation of the Regulator.

The altercase is a life threatening health emergency case matter. The ALJ Judge is being stipulated by the Opposing Counsel to rule according to the Position of the Regulator's as the Commissions interpretation in the Vendor vs. Public.

The alter case is not just an altercation case of the Vendor vs. the Private Public Party. It is ruled upon by the Regulatory version of the Vendor which **is lacking or in absence of public authentic scientific interpretation** thereof. So, the alter case is vastly disadvantaged as it is currently under consideration of Regulatory that is held in contempt of Public interest as absence of the regulatory proponents by Regulator did not uphold any public interest.

The Regulatory is therefore necessary to be withheld to be subjected upon the altercase EC-2026-0150 as that same Regulatory and it's proponents are already being by proper procedural Petitioned by the Public Petition Case aforementioned.

The Petition case acts as a place card holder necessary for the altercase usage by which only once Petition Case completes can that same Regulatory be utilized by the Judge for solidification of proper interpretatio It is my poistion as the Representative of the Public that the corrected by the Public interpretation of the Public will via the Petition Case render solidification of proper interpretation. It is only then by which can that same corrected Regulatory be used to Rule upon the altercase. This cannot be switched in order of operations.

In order to render the Petition Case's clarification or amend of the Regulatory and it's proponents relationship between distinctly opposite Public Interpretation as the scientific componentry of the statute 386.820 and it's interplay to the Tariff

which also needs corrective amend as well as correction of the clause. There can be no way to advance the altercase outside of the Petition CASE's due process.