

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA



OFFICE OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE

555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101-1923
(717) 783-5048
800-684-6560

FAX (717) 783-7152
consumer@paoca.org

September 18, 2014

Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RE: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by Attorney General
KATHLEEN G. KANE, Through the Bureau of Consumer
Protection,
And
TANYA J. McCLOSKEY, Acting Consumer Advocate,
Complainants

v.
IDT Energy, Inc.
Respondent

Docket No. C-2014-2427657

Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed please find the Joint Brief of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Office of Consumer Advocate in Support of Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions, in the above-referenced proceeding.

Copies have been served as indicated on the enclosed Certificate of Service.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Candis A. Tunilo".

Candis A. Tunilo
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. #89891

Enclosures

cc: Honorable Elizabeth Barnes, ALJ
Honorable Joel Cheskis, ALJ
Certificate of Service

*185194

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by Attorney
General KATHLEEN G. KANE, Through the
Bureau of Consumer Protection,

And

TANYA J. McCLOSKEY, Acting Consumer
Advocate,

Complainants

v.

IDT ENERGY, INC.

Respondent

Docket No. C-2014-2427657

JOINT BRIEF OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE OFFICE OF
CONSUMER ADVOCATE IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR INTERLOCUTORY REVIEW
AND ANSWER TO MATERIAL QUESTIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

In this proceeding, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by Attorney General Kathleen G. Kane, through the Bureau of Consumer Protection (Commonwealth) and the Office of Consumer Advocate (OCA) (hereinafter Joint Complainants) filed a Joint Complaint against IDT Energy, Inc. (IDT) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) pursuant to the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C.S. Ch. 28, the Commission's regulations, 52 Pa. Code Ch. 54, 56 and 111, the Unfair Trade Practices and Consumer Protection Law, 73 P.S. § 201-1, *et seq.* (CPL), and the Telemarketer Registration Act, 73 P.S. § 2241, *et seq.* (TRA). The Joint Complaint was filed on June 20, 2014. The Joint Complaint contains seven Counts.

On July 10, 2014, IDT filed Preliminary Objections asserting that Counts VI and VII and the claim for restitution in the Joint Complaint should be dismissed. On July 21, 2014, Joint Complainants filed an Answer to the Preliminary Objections asserting that IDT's Preliminary Objections are unsupported. The Joint Complainants argued that it is clear and free from doubt that the Complaint is legally sufficient and that the Commission has the jurisdiction and authority to hear these claims. See gen'ly Joint Answer to IDT POs.

The matter was assigned to Administrative Law Judges Joel H. Cheskis and Elizabeth Barnes (ALJs). By Order dated August 20, 2014 (August 20 Order), the ALJs granted in part and denied in part IDT's Preliminary Objections.¹ Specifically, the ALJs held: 1) that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to hear complaints under the TRA even though compliance with this Act is required by the Commission regulations, 2) that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to

¹ The ALJs issued Orders on Preliminary Objections in four of the Joint Complaint cases filed by the Commonwealth and the OCA at Docket Nos. C-2014-2427655 (Blue Pilot Energy, LLC), C-2014-2427659 (Respond Power, LLC), C-2014-2427657 (IDT Energy, Inc.), and C-2014-2427656 (Energy Service Providers, Inc. d/b/a Pennsylvania Gas & Electric). On September 8, 2014, Joint Complainants filed a Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions in each case. Joint Complainants note that though similar, the four Orders on Preliminary Objections do not reach the same conclusions as to several counts, so the material questions vary for each case.

determine if the prices charged to customers conformed to the disclosure statement provided to the customer; and 3) that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to consider the equitable remedy of restitution.² As a result, the August 20 Order struck Count VI in its entirety, Count VII in part as it related to claims pursuant to the TRA, and stated that the Commission did not have the power to order restitution.³ On September 8, 2014, the Joint Complainants filed their Joint Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions seeking review of the August 20 Order on these points.

As explained below, the Commission has the jurisdiction and legal authority to decide the controversy as fully set forth in the Joint Complaint. The narrowing of the Commission's legal authority over EGSs, as occurs under the ALJs' August 20 Order, would limit the Commission's ability to protect consumers and provide the oversight it is authorized to provide under the Public Utility Code and its own regulations. Accordingly, the August 20 Order should be reversed, and the Joint Complaint should proceed to a full evidentiary hearing on all Counts.

II. MATERIAL QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Pursuant to Section 5.302 of the Commission's regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.302, the Joint Complainants request that the Commission grant review of and answer the following questions in the affirmative:

- 1) Does the Commission have authority and jurisdiction to determine whether a violation of the Telemarketer Registration Act (TRA) has occurred when considering whether the Commission's regulations—which require compliance with the TRA—have been violated?

² The Joint Complainants note that the ALJs did not preclude claims pursuant to the CPL in this proceeding but did in the other three proceedings in which the Joint Complainants filed Petitions for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions.

³ The August 20 Order did permit the Joint Complainants to continue their claim for the issuance of refunds.

- 2) Does the Commission have the authority and jurisdiction to determine whether the prices charged to customers by an electric generation supplier (EGS) conform to the EGS disclosure statement?
- 3) Does the Commission have the authority and jurisdiction to order equitable remedies, including restitution?

By answering these questions in the affirmative, the Commission will ensure that all legal claims within the Commission's authority and jurisdiction can be properly pursued.

III. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The Joint Complainants submit that the Commission has authority and jurisdiction to determine whether a violation of the TRA has occurred when considering whether the Commission's regulations requiring an EGS's compliance with the TRA have been violated. To be clear, the Joint Complainants do not ask the Commission to enforce the TRA, as the ALJs appear to have assumed. See August 20 Order at 10. Rather, the Joint Complainants request that the Commission consider whether the EGS has complied with the TRA as it is required to do by the Commission's regulations. The Commission must make such a determination in order to find a violation of its regulations. See Jt. Comp. at ¶¶ 71-77 (TRA). The Commission can make this determination and has done so frequently with regard to overlapping statutes.

The Joint Complainants also submit that the Commission has the authority and jurisdiction to determine whether the prices charged to customers by an EGS conform to the EGS disclosure statement provided to the customer. The Joint Complainants do not ask the Commission to regulate price, as erroneously concluded in the August 20 Order. See August 20 Order at 5-8. Rather, the Joint Complainants request that the Commission determine whether the price charged to the customer was consistent with the description of the basis of the price provided in the disclosure statement. See Jt. Comp. ¶¶ 63-67. The Joint Complainants respectfully submit that the Commission has full authority to determine whether an EGS adhered

to its disclosure statement and charged customers a price reflective of the marketed and disclosed price components.

Further, the Joint Complainants submit that the Commission has the authority and jurisdiction to order equitable remedies, including restitution. The Joint Complainants have not requested damages. Rather, the Joint Complainants requested that the Commission order equitable remedies within its authority. See Jt. Comp. at 16. The Joint Complainants have requested that the Commission consider remedies that would have the effect of putting customers back in the position that they would have been in if not for the violations. The Commission has previously found that it has such authority.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. Compelling Reasons for Review

Interlocutory review of the Joint Complainants' Material Questions is necessary to prevent significant prejudice to the Joint Complainants. The August 20 Order dismissed Count VI in its entirety and Count VII in part, thus depriving the Joint Complainants of their day in court on these claims. Additionally, the August 20 Order has improperly limited the Commission's jurisdiction and authority to consider various claims, which will restrict development of the evidentiary record. If the Joint Complainants are not able to properly pursue their legal claims, significant prejudice and harm to the Joint Complainants and to the interests of the consumers that they represent will result. It is in the public interest and consumer interest to allow the development of an accurate and complete factual record for Commission review.

Furthermore, there is a compelling interest in the Commission reaffirming that it has the authority and jurisdiction over key issues relating to the protection of consumers regarding EGSs' marketing and sales conduct, billing practices, and disclosure statements. The

Commission's oversight on these matters is critical to the integrity of, and confidence in, the retail electric market.

Additionally, the ALJs in this matter issued three other Orders contemporaneously with the August 20 Order that dispose of Preliminary Objections in the Joint Complainants' cases against other EGSs. These four Orders dispose of the same, or similar, Counts in the Joint Complaints in different ways. These differences will lead to the inconsistent development of the factual records in these matters, and lead to confusion in these and future matters as to the permissible scope of the Commission's jurisdiction and authority.

The Joint Complainants submit that resolving these issues now will expedite the conduct of the proceeding and ensure that a full and complete record is developed for the Commission's review.

B. Material Questions

1. The Commission has authority and jurisdiction to determine whether a violation of the TRA has occurred when considering whether the Commission's regulations—which require compliance with the TRA—have been violated.

The August 20 Order strikes Count VII of the Joint Complaint as it relates to claims brought pursuant to the TRA. August 20 Order at 11. The ALJs conclude that the Commission does not have the authority to “enforce [] EGS compliance with the TRA.” August 20 Order at 11. The Joint Complainants, however, do not ask the Commission to enforce the TRA. Rather, the Joint Complainants ask the Commission to apply its own regulations requiring compliance with the TRA. The Commission routinely considers overlapping statutes and has concluded that it has the jurisdiction and authority to find violations of these overlapping statutes when it bears on compliance with the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission's regulations at Sections 54.122(3) and 111.12(d)(1), 52 Pa. Code §§ 54.122(3) and 111.12(d)(1), expressly authorize the Commission to prevent an EGS from engaging in misleading or deceptive conduct as defined by State or Federal law, or by Commission rule, regulation or order. Additionally, the Commission's regulations specifically require compliance with the TRA. See 52 Pa. Code § 111.10 (requiring compliance with "the act," which is defined in Section 111.2 as the TRA). Section 54.42(a) requires a licensee to comply with all "requirements of the code and Commission regulations and orders." 52 Pa. Code § 54.42(a). To find a violation of Sections 111.10, 111.12(d)(1) or 54.122(3) of its regulations, the Commission must consider evidence regarding the TRA and determine whether provisions of the TRA have been violated.

The Commission has previously recognized its authority to broadly consider such overlapping statutes. In its recent order on the Use of Fixed Price Labels for Products With a Pass-Through Clause, Docket No. M-2013-2362961, Final Order (Nov. 14, 2013) (November 14 Order), the Commission stated as follows:

[T]his matter does not just concern the Commission or the Public Utility Code – it is a matter that also involves other laws such as the UTPCPL. The Commission cannot focus solely on our regulations and the Public Utility Code to the exclusion of other laws that may also be applicable to the matter at hand. . . . The guidance we provide is not a mandate; however, to the extent that an EGS fails to follow that guidance, *it takes the risk that a consumer or other agency may file a complaint asserting a violation of the Public Utility Code, Commission regulations or the UTPCPL.* Any such case would be decided based on the specific facts and circumstances presented.

November 14 Order at 23-24. (Emphasis added). The Commission's analysis is equally applicable to claims brought pursuant to the TRA because it is a law "applicable to the matter at hand."

Under the Public Utility Code and its regulations, the Commission has the authority, and indeed the duty, to determine whether the conduct alleged constitutes a violation of State or Federal law, including the TRA. 52 Pa. Code §§ 54.43(f) and 111.12(d)(1). See also Elkin v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania, 491 Pa. 123, 133, 420 A.2d 371, 376 (1980). In order to make a determination as to whether the Commission's own regulations and the Public Utility Code have been violated with regard to the TRA, the Commission must utilize the TRA's statutory language and case law, interpret it, and apply it harmoniously as guidance where appropriate. See Duquesne Light Co. v. Borough of Monroeville, 449 Pa. 573, 298 A.2d 252 (1972); Pettko v. PAWC, 39 A.3d 473, 484 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2012).

The Commission has often applied other statutes in proceedings such as the current matter. In MAPSA, a case that the ALJs rely on in denying Count VII, the Commission did exactly what the ALJs in the August 20 Order said the Commission cannot do. In MAPSA, the Mid-Atlantic Power Supply Association (MAPSA) filed a complaint against PECO alleging that the utility's marketing was unfair, deceptive, false, and misleading, and caused customers to remain with PECO rather than enter the competitive electric retail market. The Commission determined that PECO had violated the Electric Generation Customer Choice and Competition Act with regard to unfair/deceptive and anticompetitive acts such that those violations may also be a violation of consumer protection laws. The Commission specifically noted that simply because a violation may be a violation of the Public Utility Code and/or the Commission's regulations, as well as a violation of another law, does not divest the Commission of jurisdiction over the claim *as it relates to a violation of the other law implicated*.

[T]he Commission's jurisdiction spans the breadth of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C.S. §§ 101-3316. *Concurrent jurisdiction with another governmental entity does not divest the Commission of jurisdiction retained or exercised under another section of the Code.*

MAPSA v. PECO Energy Co., 1999 Pa.PUC LEXIS 30, 48-49, Docket No. P-00981615 (1999). (Emphasis added). Here, the Joint Complaint has been brought pursuant to Chapter 28 of the Public Utility Code and various Commission regulations that were enacted pursuant to Chapter 28, Sections 501, 504, 1501, and 1504 of the Public Utility Code. MAPSA does not support the ALJs' dismissal of Count VII regarding the TRA.⁴

The ALJs also rely on Harrisburg Taxicab to support their decision, but in so doing have created a distinction between statutory and regulatory authority that the Court did not make in that case. Harrisburg Taxicab plainly supports the Commission's authority to consider overlapping concurrent statutes. In Harrisburg Taxicab, the Commonwealth Court held that the Commission's decision to incorporate another agency's regulations into the Commission's own regulations is in no way inappropriate and such overlap does not divest the Commission of its statutory authority or duty. Harrisburg Taxicab & Baggage Co. v. Pa. PUC, 786 A.2d 288, 292-93 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2001).

The August 20 Order attempts to distinguish Harrisburg Taxicab, stating that it was based on statutory authority, whereas in this matter the Joint Complainants rely only on the Commission's regulations and not statutory authority to support the position that the Commission has jurisdiction to hear TRA claims. This contention is inaccurate. Harrisburg Taxicab was based on both statutory and regulatory violations, with the Complaint "alleging numerous violations of PUC regulations found at 52 Pa. Code §§ 29.314(b)(4) - (6), 29.316(c),

⁴ Moreover, after MAPSA, the Commission added provisions to the Commission's regulations explicitly requiring EGSSs to comply with the TRA. See 52 Pa. Code §§ 54.43(f), 54.122(3), and 111.12(d)(1).

29.402(1) and 29.403(2) as well as a violation of Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code.” Harrisburg Taxicab, 786 A.2d at 290.⁵

In dismissing Count VII in part, the ALJs put weight on the fact that Harrisburg Taxicab was expressly brought under Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code and concerned safety. While Joint Complainants do not agree that this fact is germane, the Joint Complaint was brought pursuant to Chapter 28 of the Public Utility Code and under Chapters 54 and 111 of the Commission’s regulations, which were implemented by the authority granted to the Commission under Sections 501, 504, 1501, 1504, and Chapter 28 of the Public Utility Code and concerns essential consumer protections. While the Court in Harrisburg Taxicab makes no distinction as to whether the claim is based on statutory or regulatory authority, even if such was the case, the Joint Complaint is consistent with Harrisburg Taxicab. More to the point, Harrisburg Taxicab makes it clear that “the decision of the PUC to incorporate DOT’s regulations in its own regulations represents exactly the type of sensible cooperation and mutual adjustment between the agencies advocated by the United States Court of Appeals.” Harrisburg Taxicab, 796 A.2d at 293.⁶

Finally, Section 501 of the Public Utility Code states that “[t]he express enumeration of powers of the commission in this part shall not exclude any power which the commission would otherwise have under any provisions of this part.” In other words, even if the Public Utility

⁵ In its analysis, the Court in Harrisburg Taxicab makes no distinction between statutory and regulatory authority.

⁶ Other examples in which the Commission has considered and reached conclusions regarding overlapping statutes include Barasch v. Bell Tel. Co., 529 Pa. 523, 605 A.2d 1198, 130 P.U.R. 4th 280 (1992) (The Commission considered whether a service violates the Wiretap Act); see also City of Philadelphia v. Pa. PUC, 702 A.2d 1139 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 1997) (The Commission must consider a county’s obligations under Act 78 in implementing telecommunication deregulation under the Public Utility Code and Telecom Act); Pa. PUC v. Columbia Gas of Pa., Docket No. R-2010-2215623, Order (Mar. 15, 2012), aff’d PCOC v. Pa. PUC, 635 C.D. 2012 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2014) (The Commission found that the company’s customer assistance program did not violate the requirements of the federal Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Act).

Code does not “explicitly grant” the Commission “express authority,” this does not mean that the Commission does not have authority. Rather, Section 501 states the Commission has power over those matters that are within its province even if not specifically enumerated, and—*equally importantly*—the enumeration of some powers is not to the exclusion of others.

The Commission should determine that it has jurisdiction and authority over this issue—as provided for in the Public Utility Code and the Commission’s regulations—so as to meaningfully protect consumers as enunciated by the Code and regulations.

2. The Commission has the authority and jurisdiction to determine whether the prices charged to customers by an electric generation supplier (EGS) conform to the EGS disclosure statement provided to the customer.

The August 20 Order dismisses Count VI of the Joint Complaint on the basis that the Commission cannot regulate the price an EGS charges. See August 20 Order at 5. The Joint Complainants are not asking the Commission to regulate price. The Joint Complainants are asking the Commission to determine whether the price charged to customers was consistent with the pricing terms contained in the EGS’s disclosure statements. The August 20 Order also states that no averments in Count VI put billing practices and the disclosure statements at issue. See August 20 Order at 6. This conclusion is inaccurate, as the disclosure statement is specifically put at issue in Count VI of the Joint Complaint. See Joint Complaint ¶ 67.

IDT’s disclosure statement states, in relevant part, that “[t]he price for electric generation sold is established on an approximately monthly basis upon electric generation market pricing as furnished by PJM clearinghouse, transportation or transmission, and other market and business price related factors.” Joint Complaint ¶ 53 (incorporated into Count VI by Para. 63). In Count VI at Paragraph 67 of the Joint Complaint, Joint Complainants aver that IDT’s prices charged to its variable rates customers did not conform to the basis for pricing stated in the disclosure

statement, as required by the Commission's regulations. See 66 Pa. C.S. § 2807(d)(2); 52 Pa. Code §§ 54.3(1), 54.43.

The August 20 Order dismissed Count VI of the Joint Complaint, saying that it sought to regulate price. See August 20 Order at 6-7. This is not an accurate description of the claim. The Joint Complainants, to establish facts in support of the allegation, presented an analysis of electric generation market pricing as furnished by PJM, since the disclosure statement conveys that the pricing is to be based on PJM market pricing. The Affidavit attached to the Joint Complaint presents this analysis. See Estomin Affidavit, ¶5. Simply because Count VI uses numerical pricing information does not make the Count a request to regulate price. Rather, it provides evidence that the price charged was not in compliance with the elements that were to form the basis of the price as defined in IDT's Disclosure Statement. The determination of whether the marketed and disclosed price conforms to the price actually charged to the customer is squarely within the Commission's authority. See e.g. 52 Pa. Code § 54.4(a).

Additionally, the August 20 Order incorrectly states that the Joint Complainants do not aver violations of billing practices and disclosures, and do not tie the Affidavit to the Disclosure Statement in either the Joint Complaint or Answer to Preliminary Objections. As an initial matter, Paragraph 63 of Count VI incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully pled, which includes Paragraph 53, which recites the Disclosure Statement. Further, the Joint Complaint and Answer to Preliminary Objections specifically stated as follows:

- It is averred, upon information and belief, that the aforementioned prices do not conform to the variable rate pricing provision of the Respondent's Disclosure Statement. Joint Complaint ¶ 67.
- Joint Complainants allege that IDT's prices charged . . . did not conform to IDT's price disclosure and have provided an expert's affidavit. Answer to Preliminary Objections ¶ 24.

- Dr. Estomin analyzed the day-ahead and real-time market prices [in categories] comparable to the categories in IDT's pricing disclosure term. Answer to Preliminary Objections ¶ 25.

The Joint Complainants make numerous other references to billing practices and disclosure statements and tie them to the Affidavit and Count VI and their Answer to Preliminary Objections. See Joint Complaint at ¶¶ 63-67; Joint Answer to Preliminary Objections ¶¶ 24-25.

In a case directly on point, Grmusa v. Dominion Retail, Inc., the Commission asserted its jurisdiction over the misrepresentations of an EGS. The complainant alleged that the EGS Dominion Retail enticed him to switch from Duquesne Light to Dominion Retail with promises of 10% savings. Grmusa v. Dominion Retail, Inc., Docket No. C-2009-2124359, Initial Decision at 1 (Dec. 1, 2009). The presiding officer granted the EGS's preliminary objections on the basis that the Commission did not have jurisdiction because the matter concerned price. Id. at 2-3, 7-9. The Commission reversed the presiding officer's initial decision, noting:

The Complaint alleged that the Complainant was charged a higher rate than what was represented to him by Dominion Retail. The Commission's jurisdiction over electric generation suppliers, such as Dominion Retail, is contained within the Competition Act. 66 Pa. C.S. §§ 2801 *et seq.* Furthermore, the Commission has promulgated rules for EGSs to follow as a condition of receiving a license to operate. 52 Pa. Code § 54.43. One of these conditions is that an EGS' advertised prices must match its billed prices, and that billed prices must reflect marketed prices. 52 Pa. Code §§ 54.4(a) and 54.7(a). This Commission has set forth rules that EGSs must follow and has the obligation, and, therefore, the jurisdiction, to enforce those rules.

Grmusa, Order at 5 (Apr. 16, 2010). Again, the Joint Complainants have not, and are not, asking the Commission to *regulate price* as stated by the August 20 Order. See August 20 Order at 5-8. The Joint Complainants' aver that the aforementioned prices *actually charged* by IDT to its variable rate customers *do not conform to the variable rate pricing provision* of the Respondent's Disclosure Statement and provide evidence in support of the claim.

The Commission has jurisdiction to determine if the price charged to the customer conforms to the advertised and disclosed price. The Commission should affirm its authority as enunciated by the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations.

3. The Commission has the authority and jurisdiction to order equitable remedies, including restitution.

The August 20 Order disallowed the Joint Complainants from seeking restitution, an equitable remedy, partially on the basis of the Utility.com case.⁷ Utility.com, however, supports the Joint Complainants' position. Further, the Commission has ordered equitable remedies, including refunds, in numerous cases.⁸ See e.g. Ely v. Pennsylvania Water, Docket No. C-20055616, Order at 1 (July 10, 2006) (The Commission determined this was a classic case for the application of equitable estoppel when Respondent damaged Complainants' asphalt driveway while replacing a water line on the neighboring property and made countless verbal assurances that the driveway would be restored); C.S. Warthman Funeral Home, et. al. v. GTE North, Inc., Docket No. C-00924416 (June 4, 1993) (Complainants were permitted to introduce into evidence the letter and promise of Respondent that it would provide toll free calling to support a claim of equitable estoppel); Electric Distribution Company Procedures for Processing Pilot Customer Supplier Selections, Docket No. M-00960890, 1998 Pa. PUC LEXIS 49 (Jan. 15, 1998) (discussing the Commission's broad authority under Ch. 28 of the Commission's regulations, including ordering restitution); Scheffer v. Columbia Gas of Pennsylvania, Inc., Docket No. C-2010-2153353, Order (Nov. 1, 2011) (illustrating the Commission's equitable authority under

⁷ On September 2, 2014, Energy Service Providers Inc. d/b/a Pa. Gas & Electric, filed a Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions at Docket No. C-2014-2427656, wherein it seeks that the Commission answer the material question as to whether the Commission has the authority and jurisdiction to order refunds. In their Brief in Support of their Joint Petition filed September 12, 2014, Joint Complainants discuss at length the Commission's authority and jurisdiction to order refunds. The Joint Complainants also filed a Brief in Opposition to IDT's Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions on September 18, 2014.

⁸ The August 20 Order recognized the Commission's authority to issue refunds pursuant to Section 1312(a) of the Public Utility Code but found that the Commission could not consider restitution. August 20 Order at 14-15.

Ch. 56 of the Commission's regulations where a complainant incurred gas supply costs during the time period in which Columbia failed to help the complainant switch); Pa.PUC v. Reed, 1972 Pa. PUC LEXIS 40; 46 Pa. PUC 19 (1972) (Commission directed Respondent, who was authorized to transport as a class D carrier, to refund overcharges to his customers); Grmusa v. Dominion Retail, Inc., Docket No. C-2009-2124359, Order (Apr. 16, 2010) (Commission asserted its jurisdiction over, and authority to, provide equitable remedies based on the misrepresentations of an EGS).

The August 20 Order incorrectly finds that the Joint Complainants' restitution claim, while an equitable remedy, is somehow also a breach of contract claim. See August 20 Order at 14.⁹ Restitution, however, is defined as "a body of substantive law in which liability is based not on tort *or contract* but on the defendant's unjust enrichment." Black's Law Dictionary, Ninth Ed. At 1428. (Emphasis added). Unjust Enrichment is an equitable doctrine. Styer v. Hugo, 422 Pa. Super. 262, 619 A.2d 347 (1993), aff'd 535 Pa. 610, 637 A.2d 276 (1994). The Pennsylvania Supreme Court held that "[i]n enforcing restitution the purpose is to require the wrongdoer to restore what he or she has received and thus put the injured party in as good a position as that which would have been enjoyed but for wrongful act." Sack v. Feinman, 495 Pa. 100, 106, 432 A.2d 971, 974 (1981). The Commission has the authority to order equitable relief and has done so in other instances. See the discussion supra.¹⁰ The Joint Complainants submit that the Commission should affirm this authority.


⁹ "The Commission does not have such additional authority here over a breach of contract claim." August 20 Order at 14.

¹⁰ The ALJs also seek to distinguish the Utility.com case referenced by the Joint Complainants. In Utility.com, the OCA sought equitable remedies for service not received and for "lost savings" on behalf of customers. Utility.com, Final Order at 262. The August 20 Order cites Utility.com for the proposition that the Commission can order restitution only in cases in which the parties have submitted to the jurisdiction of the Commission. August 20 Order at 14. According to the August 20 Order, the parties in Utility.com submitted to the Commission's jurisdiction through the Terms of Service. The August 20 Order then goes on to state that no such

V. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, the Office of Consumer Advocate and Office of Attorney General, Bureau of Consumer Protection respectfully request that the Commission answer the material questions in the affirmative, allow Counts VI and VII to be fully developed and considered, and allow the Joint Complainants to seek the equitable remedy of restitution.

Respectfully submitted,



John M. Abel
Senior Deputy Attorney General
PA Attorney I.D. 47313

Margarita Tulman
Deputy Attorney General
PA Attorney I.D. 313514

Bureau of Consumer Protection
Office of Attorney General
15th Floor, Strawberry Square
Harrisburg, PA 17120
T: (717) 787-9707
F: (717) 787-1190
jabel@attorneygeneral.gov
nbeck@attorneygeneral.gov

Counsel for:

Kathleen G. Kane, Attorney General
Bureau of Consumer Protection

DATE: September 18, 2014
191331



Candis A. Tunilo
PA Attorney I.D. 89891

Kristine E. Robinson
PA Attorney I.D. 316479
Assistant Consumer Advocates

Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street
5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
T: (717) 783-5048
F: (717) 783-7152
ctunilo@paoca.org
krobinson@paoca.org

Counsel for:

Tanya J. McCloskey
Acting Consumer Advocate

agreement exists in the instant matter. IDT's Disclosure Statement (Terms of Service), however, includes a clause entitled "Dispute Procedures" that states, in part, "If you are not satisfied after discussing your terms with us you may call or write the Public Utility Commission." Joint Complaint at Appendix B. IDT includes the same type of clause the ALJs found compelling in Utility.com. On the basis of the August 20 Order's reasoning (while still incorrect in Joint Complainants' view), the Joint Complainants' situation is analogous to that in Utility.com.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, by
Attorney General KATHLEEN G. KANE,
Through the Bureau of Consumer Protection,

And

TANYA J. McCLOSKEY, Acting Consumer
Advocate,

Complainants

v.

IDT ENERGY, INC.,
Respondent

Docket No. C-2014-2427657

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document, the Joint Petition of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Office of Consumer Advocate in Support of Petition for Interlocutory Review and Answer to Material Questions, in the manner and upon the persons listed below:

Dated this 18th day of September 2014.

SERVICE BY E-MAIL & INTER-OFFICE MAIL

Michael Swindler, Esq.
Stephanie M. Wimer, Esq.
Wayne T. Scott, Esq.
Bureau of Investigation & Enforcement
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

SERVICE BY E-MAIL & FIRST CLASS MAIL, POSTAGE PREPAID

Michael A. Gruin, Esq.
Stevens & Lee
17 N. 2nd Street, 16th Fl.
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Sharon Webb, Esq.
Office of Small Business Advocate
Commerce Building, Suite 1102
300 North Second Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Candis A Tunilo

Candis A. Tunilo
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 89891
E-Mail: CTunilo@paoca.org

Kristine E. Robinson
Assistant Consumer Advocate
PA Attorney I.D. # 316479
E-Mail: KRobinson@paoca.org

Counsel for
Office of Consumer Advocate
555 Walnut Street, 5th Floor, Forum Place
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1923
Phone: (717) 783-5048
Fax: (717) 783-7152
185176