

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**  
**Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105-3265**

**Michael Kline**  
v.  
**Pennsylvania Electric Company**

**Public Meeting held April 3, 2014**  
**2356809-ALJ**  
**Docket No. C-2013-2356809**

**MOTION OF COMMISSIONER GLADYS M. BROWN**

Before the Commission is the complaint of Michael Kline (Complainant) against Pennsylvania Electric Company (Company or Penelec) alleging, *inter alia*, that the Company placed incorrect charges on his bills.

The record in this proceeding shows that on June 18, 2012, the Company notified the Complainant that his account would be rebilled for the period from December 12, 2011 to June 11, 2012. Penelec had incorrectly used estimated meter reads for the Complainant's December 2011, February 2012, and April 2012 bills.<sup>1</sup> This resulted in an under collection of \$2,049.36.

The record in this case indeed proves that Penelec is correcting an error that will allow the Company to collect revenues for actual service rendered. As such, there is no disputing that the Company is correctly charging the Complainant for the amount of electricity consumed. However, the record also shows that the billing correction was caused by an admitted error by the Company.

As detailed above, Penelec incorrectly billed the customer for estimated readings when it should have used actual readings. This resulted in the Complainant being billed five billing periods in a row based on estimated reads. Consequently, the Complainant received improper billing signals over a five-month period.

I believe that Penelec failed to comply with the Commission's Regulations requiring that estimated bills only be rendered every other billing period. 52 Pa. Code §56.12. Further, I submit that Penelec's failure to send the Complainant proper billing signals over the five-month period constitutes a failure to comply with the mandate under §1501 of the Public Utility Code to provide adequate and efficient service. 66 Pa. C.S. § 1501. In addition, the record in this proceeding fails to provide any good faith explanation as to why the Company made these billing errors. As such, I believe the

---

<sup>1</sup> For each of these months actual meter readings were obtained by Penelec, However, Company employees revised these actual readings to reflect estimates. This caused further errors in the estimates for the months of January and March 2012.

circumstances of this proceeding justify the placement of a \$500 civil penalty on the Company.

**THEREFORE, I MOVE THAT** the Office of Special Assistants draft an appropriate Order consistent with this Motion.

April 3, 2014

Date



Gladys M. Brown, Commissioner