

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Angela Cocivera	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2016-2576662
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
Marta Guhl  
Administrative Law Judge

**INTRODUCTION**

This initial decision grants the Respondent’s Motion to Dismiss the Complainant’s Complaint for lack of prosecution because the Complainant failed to appear for the scheduled hearing in this matter.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On October 27, 2016, Angela Cocivera (Complainant) filed a formal Complaint (Complaint) against PECO Energy Company (PECO or Respondent) alleging that there were incorrect charges on her bills and requesting that a meter check be performed.

On December 7, 2016, PECO filed its Answer, denying the material allegations of the Complaint.

This Complaint is the untimely appeal of an informal complaint at the Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS), Case No. 3440485, in which the BCS dismissed the complaint

indicating that the bills were based on actual meter readings and usage was in line with potential usage.

By Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice dated January 24, 2017, an initial telephonic hearing was scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 2017 at 10:00 a.m., and the matter was assigned to me. The Hearing Notice advised the parties of the procedure to call-in for the hearing, as well as the date and time of the scheduled hearing and warned in bold and underlined type: “**At the above date and time, you must call into the hearing. If you fail to do so, your case will be dismissed. You will not be called by the Administrative Law Judge**”

A Prehearing Order was issued on January 25, 2017. The Prehearing Order directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and directed that a request to change the scheduled hearing should be sent to me at least five days prior to the hearing date, be in writing and state the agreement or opposition of the other party. It warned both parties of potentially serious consequences if they failed to obtain a continuance and failed to contact the toll free telephone number to participate in the hearing, including the dismissal of the complaint. It also explained that the Complainant bears the burden of proof to establish that the Respondent violated its tariff, the Public Utility Code, or a Commission Order or regulation, and that she is entitled to the relief requested in the Complaint.

The hearing convened as scheduled on March 2, 2017. Counsel for PECO was present via telephone with one potential witness and was prepared to proceed. Ms. Cocivera was not present, and had not contacted this office to indicate that she would or would not participate.

No witnesses were presented and no exhibits were introduced into the record. Respondent’s counsel moved that the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice for lack of prosecution (Motion) pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.245. In accordance with Commission policy, I am granting the Motion.

The record was closed on March 2, 2017 at the conclusion of the hearing.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant in this case is Angela Cocivera whose mailing address is 1800 Bethlehem Pike, Apartment 2A, Flourtown, Pennsylvania 19031.
2. The Respondent in this proceeding is PECO Energy Company.
3. By Hearing Notice dated January 24, 2017, a hearing was scheduled for Thursday, March 2, 2017 at 10:00 a.m., with both parties given notice.
4. Both parties were advised of the procedures for requesting a continuance of a scheduled hearing, as well as the date, time, and location by Prehearing Order dated January 25, 2017.
5. The Complainant was advised that the Complaint would be dismissed if she failed to participate in the scheduled hearing by the January 24, 2017, Hearing Notice and the January 25, 2017, Prehearing Order.
6. Respondent participated in the hearing at the scheduled date and time by legal counsel and a proposed witness and was prepared to proceed.
7. Complainant failed to participate in the scheduled hearing.
8. Complainant did not settle or withdraw the Complaint nor obtain a continuance prior to the scheduled hearing.
9. The Hearing Notice, which contained the date, location, and time of the scheduled hearing, was not returned by the postal authorities as undeliverable.

## DISCUSSION

The Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), places the burden of proof upon the proponent of a rule or order. As the proponent of a rule or order, Complainant has the burden of proof in this matter pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

To establish a sufficient case and satisfy the burden of proof, Complainant must show that the Respondent public utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the Complaint. *Patterson v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa. PUC 196 (1990), *Feinstein v. Philadelphia Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa. PUC 300 (1976). Such a showing must be by a preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 578 A.2d 600, 602 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1990), alloc. den., 602 A.2d 863 (Pa. 1992). That is, by presenting evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 364 Pa. 45, 70 A.2d 854 (1950). Additionally, any finding of fact necessary to support the Commission's adjudication must be based upon substantial evidence. *Mill v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 447 A.2d 1100 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1982); *Edan Transportation Corp. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 623 A.2d 6 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1993); 2 Pa.C.S. § 704. More is required than a mere trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact sought to be established. *Norfolk and Western Ry. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 489 Pa. 109, 413 A.2d 1037 (1980); *Erie Resistor Corp. v. Unemployment Compensation Bd. of Review*, 194 Pa. Super. 278, 166 A.2d 96 (1960); *Murphy v. Commonwealth, Dep't of Public Welfare, White Haven Center*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984).

Administrative agencies, such as the Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984). However, this due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to appear and be heard. *Id.*

Notice of the March 2, 2017 hearing in this case was sent to the Complainant on January 24, 2017, by regular first-class mail to the address stated on the Complaint. This piece of mail was never returned to the sender, the scheduling staff for the Office of Administrative Law Judge (OALJ) in Harrisburg. Notice mailed to a party's last known address and not returned by the

post office is presumed to have been received. *Meierdierck v. Miller*, 394 Pa. 484, 147 A.2d 406 (1959); *Berkowitz v. Mayflower Securities, Inc.*, 455 Pa. 531, 317 A.2d 584 (1974). Therefore, the Complainant is deemed to have received this document and had sufficient notice of the location, date and time of the scheduled hearing.

The Complainant was notified of the scheduled hearing date and time, as well as how to contact the OALJ office for the hearing. Despite this, she made no attempt whatsoever to notify me that she did not plan to participate in the hearing. Under these circumstances, it appears Complainant had ample opportunity to be heard in this proceeding, but voluntarily chose not to do so. Therefore, the due process rights of the Complainant have been fully protected.

By not appearing for the scheduled hearing, the Complainant failed to bear her burden of proof. Consequently, the Complaint must be dismissed.

As the Commission stated in *Mumma v. PPL Electric Utilities Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Opinion and Order entered January 24, 2002), “It is well-established law that once timely notice of a hearing and the opportunity to be heard have been provided, it is the responsibility of the parties to be present and participate in the hearing.” See, *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984); *Plummer v. Columbia Gas of Pa., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00847836 (Opinion and Order entered September 27, 2001). The Pennsylvania Commonwealth Court has made it clear that in administrative hearings, “a party’s own negligence is not sufficient good cause as a matter of law for failing to appear at a . . . hearing.” *Eat’N Park Hospitality Group, Inc. v. Unemployment Compensation Board of Review*, 970 A.2d 492, 494 (Pa.Cmwlth. 2008).

Due to the waste of the Commission’s and Respondent’s time, money, and energy occasioned by the Complainant’s failure to appear at a hearing of which she had notice, this Complaint will be dismissed with prejudice in accordance with well-established Commission precedent. *Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered December 26, 1995); *Evans v. Bell Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc.*, Docket No. C-00957229 (Opinion and Order entered July 12, 1996); *King v. PECO Energy Co*, Docket No. C-00967919 (Opinion and

Order entered January 16, 1997); *Kenny v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, Docket No. C-20042399 (Final Order entered October 13, 2004); *Jones v. The Peoples Natural Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Peoples*, Docket No. C-20054885 (Opinion and Order entered February 14, 2006); *El-Ayazra v. West Penn Power Company*, Docket No. F-2015-250-2509292 (Opinion and Order entered June 30, 2016).

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties to and subject matter of this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

2. Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), the burden of proof in this proceeding is upon the Complainant.

3. By failing to appear at the scheduled hearing and failing to present any evidence, the Complainant has failed to satisfy the burden of proof.

4. Notice properly mailed to a party's last known address and not returned is presumed to have been received. *Meierdierck v. Miller*, 394 Pa. 484, 147 A.2d 406 (1959); *Berkowitz v. Mayflower Securities, Inc.*, 455 Pa. 531, 317 A.2d 584 (1974).

5. The Complainant had notice of the date, location and time of the scheduled hearing.

6. The due process rights of Complainant have been fully protected in this proceeding. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984).

7. A formal Complaint may be dismissed if, after notice and opportunity to be heard, a Complainant fails to appear and prosecute the Complaint. *Mumma v. PPL Electric Utilities Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Opinion and Order entered January 24, 2002).

