

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: August 15, 2026 8:10 PM

To: Penney, Nicole <Nicole.Penney@novascotia.ca>

Cc: Blake Williams <blake.williams@nspower.ca>; Carley Freeman <carley.freeman@nspower.ca>; Wallace, Lisa <Lisa.Wallace@novascotia.ca>; Chris Lanteigne <chris.lanteigne@nspower.ca>; Jennifer Ross <jennifer.ross@nspower.ca>; Lisa Forsey <lisa.forsey@nspower.ca>; Sofia Reiner <sofia.reiner@nspower.ca>; Sonia Liao <sonia.liao@nspower.ca>; Kathleen Murray <kathleen.murray@nspower.ca>

Subject: Re: M12972 - NSPI Complaint - Billing Issues - David Nickerson

**** EXTERNAL EMAIL / COURRIEL EXTERNE ****

Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking on links / Faites preuve de prudence si vous ouvrez une pièce jointe ou cliquez sur un lien

Subject: Situation of complaint withdrawal

Hi Lisa,

Thank you for confirming the outcome upon withdrawal. However, I have not received an answer to two questions from my August 7 letter, and these are determinative for me:

4(b): On what specific legal authority — statute, regulation, or Board rule — does the Board disclose a complainant's civic/mailling address to a member of the general public upon request?

4(c): Would I receive advance notice before such disclosure, if I remain in this complaint?

This is not a trivial distinction. I believe it is important for the Board to understand that other Canadian administrative tribunals operating under the same open court principle draw a clear distinction between public access to hearings and decisions on one hand, and disclosure of specific personal identifiers such as home addresses on the other.

Relying solely on staff discretion, exercised on a case-by-case basis, as the only safeguard against public disclosure of a complainant's civic/mailling address is not consistent with how comparable tribunals handle the same situation, as set out below. This is especially relevant given the recent Nova Scotia Power data breach, which underscores the current importance of sound information-handling practices. I would ask that the Board consider whether its internal policy on this point should be reviewed and updated to reflect the approach taken by peer tribunals.

Sources:

The Social Security Tribunal of Canada's public policy on this point states: "We protect your personal information from public access. If we give someone access to your appeal record, we will first remove any information that reveals your identity," specifically listing "dates of birth, addresses, or identification numbers and documents" as excluded.

(See: <https://www.sst-tss.gc.ca/en/decisions-laws-rules-and-policies/open-justice-and-privacy>)

The Public Servants Disclosure Protection Tribunal's Policy on Openness and Privacy addresses public consultation of case files at its premises directly, stating: "These files are available to the public for consultation at the Tribunal's premises with appropriate notice. However, information such

as an individual's home address, personal email address, personal phone number, date of birth, financial details, SIN, driver's license number, or credit card or passport details is not available for consultation."

(See: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2016/tpfdc-psdptc/PE2-15-2014-eng.pdf, p.3–4)

The Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada has likewise confirmed that "the open court principle...does not necessitate the limitless disclosure of personal information," and recommends that materials made available to the public exclude identifiers such as addresses where not relevant to the matter at hand.

(See: https://www.priv.gc.ca/en/privacy-topics/privacy-laws-in-canada/the-privacy-act/privacy-act-compliance-help/gd_trib_201002/)

I have not found an equivalent public-interest justification here for disclosing my civic/ mailing address specifically, as opposed to the substance of the complaint itself.

I also reiterate, for the record, **that the Board's confirmation that my address would be accessible to the public came only after the Board's Rule 12 decision** — a decision which explicitly stated that my mailing/civic address, NS Power account number, personal email address, telephone number, and meter number **would not be made public**, and that only my full name would be publicly available. I had already elected to proceed on the basis of that decision before this clarification was provided. I do not consider it appropriate for the Board to continue making my address available to the public on this basis, particularly given the security and privacy expectations of 2026, and in light of the practices of comparable tribunals cited above.

To be clear about my position: if the Board can identify the specific legal authority requiring or permitting disclosure of my address to the public, I will withdraw. If no such authority exists, I intend to continue with my complaint and fight against the release of my address at the same time and/or from a different avenue, and I would ask the Board to confirm in writing that my address will not be disclosed to the public while the matter proceeds.

Thank you,

David