

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: August 18, 2026 3:56 PM

To: Wallace, Lisa <Lisa.Wallace@novascotia.ca>

Cc: Penney, Nicole <Nicole.Penney@novascotia.ca>; Blake Williams <blake.williams@nspower.ca>; Carley Freeman <carley.freeman@nspower.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: RE: Situation of complaint withdrawal — 15-Day Deadline and Outstanding Questions (Matter M12972)

Hello Lisa,

Thank you for your email and for setting out the 15-day deadline. Before I can respond to that deadline, I need to raise several concerns. I do not believe my prior letter has actually been addressed.

1. My last letter has not been answered

In my previous email, I explained specifically why the Board's answer to question 4(b), "the open court principle", is not a statute, regulation, or Board rule, and I asked the Board to identify one, or confirm none exists.

I also raised a direct contradiction: the Board's own Rule 12 ruling on my file (Matter M12972, Document 331913) found that my civic/mailling address would NOT be made public, yet I was separately told, only after I agreed to the ruling, my address is now suddenly subject to disclosure to the public under the open court principle.

I would point out that the ruling itself already directly addressed this question. It states that my mailing/civic address "does not need to be made public for the purpose of determining this matter" and is "generally of minimal relevance in resolving the issues in dispute." The ruling also draws a clear distinction between my name, which it found should be disclosed under the open court principle, and my other personal identifiers, including my address, which it found should not be.

In other words, the Board has already applied the open court principle to my case and specifically declined to extend it to my address. Respectfully, I do not understand how your recent answer, stating that my address is subject to disclosure under the open court principle, can be reconciled with the Board's own prior finding on this exact point.

I asked the Board to clarify which position governs, and whether the original ruling has been revisited or reversed.

Your email states that "the Board has provided its responses," but it does not engage with either of these points. I do not consider this matter resolved. I do not think it is reasonable to ask me to decide whether to withdraw my complaint while this contradiction remains unaddressed.

2. This is not a side issue, and it is currently holding up the entire complaint

I was copied on an email from NS Power's Regulatory Counsel, Kathleen Murray, requesting that NS Power's response deadline be revised "pending Mr. Nickerson's decision as to whether he wishes to proceed with the appeal." This confirms that my underlying complaint against NS Power (the billing dispute and related issues set out in my Statement of Complaint) is currently paused pending resolution of this address-disclosure question.

This is not a separate, minor matter running alongside my complaint. It is presently blocking it entirely.

Given that, I do not think a 15-day deadline to decide whether to withdraw can fairly begin to run until I have received a substantive answer to the questions I have already raised twice.

3. Who is actually reviewing this file

I understand from the Board's own published process that complaints are assigned to a Board Member for review, supported by advisory staff. See "How the Board Deals with Complaints" Nova Scotia Energy Board <https://nserbt.ca/nseb/complaints/how-board-deals-complaints>. I note that the Rule 12 ruling on my file was signed by Board Member Darlene Willcott. I would ask you to confirm:

(a) Is Board Member Darlene Willcott the Board Member assigned to my complaint?

(b) Has my correspondence on this issue, including my letters of August 7, 15, and 17, been placed before Board Member Willcott for consideration, or has it been handled solely at the staff/Clerk level?

I am asking this because the substance of my argument, including the direct contradiction with the Board's own Rule 12 ruling, does not appear to have been engaged with in either of the Board's responses to date, and I want to understand whether that argument has actually reached the person responsible for deciding my complaint.

4. My request

I would ask that:

- The 15-day deadline be paused until I receive a substantive response to the outstanding questions above.
- The Board confirm whether this correspondence has been placed on the formal record of my complaint and before the assigned Board Member.
- If this correspondence has not been placed before the Board Member assigned to my complaint, I request that it be escalated to a higher level of authority within the Board, whether that is the assigned Board Member directly, the Board's Chair, or another appropriate decision-maker, so that this matter can be properly reviewed and resolved without further delay.

In closing, I continue to stand behind my position that my address being released to the general public is not right, based on reasons I have already explained in previous communications with you, and should not be allowed to happen. To restate my position once more for clarity: I remain willing to withdraw my complaint if the Board can identify the specific legal authority permitting disclosure of my civic address to the public and reconcile that with its own Rule 12 ruling.

Absent that, I intend to continue with my complaint, and I do not consider the current 15-day deadline to be a fair or reasonable basis for that decision given the unresolved contradiction described above, particularly since the Board's own ruling already found my address to be of minimal relevance and declined to require its disclosure.

I would appreciate a substantive response to these points.

Thank you,

David