

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Stephanie Pasley	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2017-2600518
	:	
Philadelphia Gas Works	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

This Initial Decision grants Philadelphia Gas Works’ Motion to Dismiss the Complaint of Stephanie Pasley with prejudice because she failed to appear and prosecute the case.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On April 13, 2017, Stephanie Pasley (Ms. Pasley or Complainant) filed a formal Complaint (Complaint) against Philadelphia Gas Works (Respondent or PGW) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) alleging that the utility has calculated her income incorrectly and has removed her from the Customer Responsibility Program (CRP). As relief, Ms. Pasley requested that the error be corrected and that she be placed back on CRP.

The Complaint is a timely appeal of the Commission’s Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) decision at BCS Case No. 3501005, which denied the Complainant’s informal complaint.

On May 15, 2017, Respondent filed an Answer denying the material allegations of the Complaint.

A Hearing Notice dated May 30, 2017, notified the parties that an initial hearing was scheduled in this matter for Tuesday, August 8, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

A Prehearing Order was issued on July 12, 2017, advising the parties of the date and time of the scheduled hearing, informing them of the procedures applicable to the proceeding, and directing the submission of documents prior to the hearing.

The hearing convened as scheduled on August 8, 2017. Graciela Christlieb, Esq. appeared representing Philadelphia Gas Works. Neither Complainant nor a counsel for the Complainant appeared at the hearing. The hearing reconvened at approximately 9:45 a.m. after I confirmed that the Complainant had not called, or otherwise shown good cause not to appear at the scheduled hearing.

Counsel for PGW moved to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice for lack of prosecution. That Motion is granted pursuant to the ordering paragraphs below.

The record was closed on September 7, 2017.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Stephanie Pasley, whose mailing address is 431 West Penn Street, Philadelphia, PA 19144.
2. The Respondent is Philadelphia Gas Works.
3. On April 13, 2017, Ms. Pasley filed a formal Complaint against PGW alleging that the utility has calculated her income incorrectly and has removed her from the CRP program.

4. As relief, Ms. Pasley requested that the error be corrected and that she be placed back on CRP.

5. On May 15, 2017, the Respondent filed an Answer denying the material allegations of the Complaint.

6. A Hearing Notice dated May 30, 2017, notified the parties that an initial hearing was scheduled in this matter for Tuesday, August 8, 2017, at 10:00 a.m.

7. A Prehearing Order was issued on July 12, 2017, advising the parties of the proper procedure to obtain a continuance to reschedule the hearing date.

8. None of the documents mailed to Complainant at the address provided on her Complaint was returned to the Commission by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable.

9. The Complainant failed to appear at the scheduled hearing.

10. The Complainant did not settle or withdraw this Complaint prior to the scheduled hearing date or obtain a continuance.

DISCUSSION

In this formal Complaint, Ms. Pasley alleged that PGW has calculated her income incorrectly and has removed her from the CRP program. As relief, Ms. Pasley requested that the error be corrected and that she be placed back on CRP. As the party seeking affirmative relief from the Commission, the burden of proof rests on the Complainant. 66 Pa.C.S.A. § 332(a).

Administrative agencies, like the Public Utility Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. This requirement is satisfied when the parties are afforded notice and the opportunity to appear and be heard. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub.*

Util. Comm'n., 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984). Notice mailed to a party's last known address and not returned by the post office is presumed to have been received. *Chartiers Industrial and Commercial Development Authority v. Allegheny County Board of Property Assessment Appeals and Review*, 645 A.2d 944 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1994).

A Hearing Notice and a Prehearing Order were mailed to Ms. Pasley at the address listed on her formal Complaint form. Neither document was returned to the Commission as undeliverable by the post office. Therefore, the Complainant was deemed to have received these documents and had sufficient notice of the day, date and time of the scheduled hearing. Neither the Complainant nor a representative licensed to practice law in this Commonwealth appeared at the hearing on her behalf. To date, there is no further information about the Complainant regarding this hearing. Her failure to appear is unexcused.

Once notice of a hearing and the opportunity to be heard has been provided, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing. *Craig Sentner v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered October 25, 1993). The Complainant waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing by failing to appear. Ms. Pasley's Complaint will be dismissed with prejudice. 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a); *Martin W. Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc.*, 1995 Pa. PUC LEXIS 159.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

2. As the Complainant, Stephanie Pasley had the burden of proof and failed to carry that burden. 66 Pa.C.S.A. § 332(a).

3. Notice mailed to a party's last known address and not returned by the post office is presumed to have been received. *Chartiers Industrial and Commercial Development*

Authority v. Allegheny County Board of Property Assessment Appeals and Review, 645 A.2d 944 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1994).

4. By failing to appear and be heard on this Complaint, Complainant waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing. 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a); *Martin W. Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc.*, 1995 Pa. PUC LEXIS 159.

5. Ms. Pasley has failed to meet her burden of proving that she is entitled to the relief she is seeking from the Commission.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Motion of Philadelphia Gas Works to dismiss the formal Complaint of Stephanie Pasley at Docket No. F-2017-2600518 is granted.
2. That the Complaint filed by Stephanie Pasley against Philadelphia Gas Works at Docket No. F-2017-2600518 is dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute.
3. That the Secretary's Bureau should mark this matter closed.

Date: November 16, 2017

/s/
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge