

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Eileen Dewey	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2017-2633966
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Mary D. Long
Administrative Law Judge

A formal complaint filed by a customer of an electric distribution company is dismissed because the complainant failed to appear for the hearing without good cause.

HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

Eileen Dewey (Complainant) filed a formal complaint against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (Respondent) on November 8, 2017. Her complaint requested a payment arrangement. She also checked boxes noting that she was having a reliability or safety problem and “other.”

The Respondent filed an answer on December 6, 2017, which denied that Complainant was having a reliability or safety problem and took the position that she has the most advantageous payment arrangement to which she is entitled.

By hearing notice dated January 8, 2018, this matter was assigned to me and scheduled for a telephonic hearing on Friday, March 2, 2018. On January 9, 2018, I issued a prehearing order which also provided the date and time of the hearing as well as other procedural

requirements related to hearings, including instructions for requesting a continuance if the hearing date and time were not convenient.

The hearing convened as scheduled. Graig M. Schultz, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the Respondent along with one witness, Jan Brett. The Complainant did not call the conference call number. Mr. Schultz represented that the utility had attempted to contact the Complainant but the calls had not been returned. After a brief recess to provide the Complainant additional time to call, the hearing proceeded in her absence. The Company made a motion to dismiss, which was taken under advisement. The record closed upon receipt of the transcript, by order dated March 15, 2018.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Eileen Dewey.
2. The Respondent is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, a jurisdictional public utility.
3. The Complainant did not call the conference number at 10:00 a.m. on Friday, March 2, 2018.
4. The Complainant did not contact the Commission to explain her failure to appear.
5. Neither the hearing notice nor the prehearing order were returned as undeliverable by the U.S. Postal Service.

DISCUSSION

Administrative agencies, such as the Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them.¹ However, this due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to appear and be heard.² The Complainant had adequate notice of the time and date of the hearing, yet she failed to appear or explain why she could not attend her hearing at the scheduled time. Therefore, it is appropriate to dismiss her complaint.

A hearing notice and prehearing order were sent to the Complainant. Paragraph 10 of the prehearing order informed the Complainant that if she failed to appear for the hearing she could lose her case. Paragraph 8 of the order provided instructions for contacting the Commission to request a change of the scheduled hearing date. None of these pieces of mail were returned by the U.S. Postal Service. Notice mailed to a party's last known address and not returned by the post office is presumed to have been received.³ Therefore, the Complainant is deemed to have received these documents and had sufficient notice of the Commission's procedures and notice of the location, date and time of the scheduled hearing.

Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code⁴ places the burden of proof upon the proponent of a rule or order. As the proponent of a rule or order, the Complainant has the burden of demonstrating that the facts alleged in her complaint are true and that she is entitled to the relief that she requested. By not appearing for the scheduled hearing to present evidence, the Complainant failed to meet her burden of proof. Consequently, the complaint must be dismissed.

¹ *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwth. 1984).

² *Id.*

³ *Berkowitz v. Mayflower Securities, Inc.*, 455 Pa. 531, 317 A.2d 584 (1974); *Chartiers Industrial and Commercial Dev. Auth. v. Allegheny County Bd. of Property Assessment Appeals and Rev.*, 645 A.2d 944 (Pa.Cmwth. 1994); *Geary v. Verizon Pennsylvania Inc.*, Docket No. C-2009-2118625 (Commission Opinion and Order entered September 16, 2010).

⁴ 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

The Complainant was notified of the scheduled hearing location, date and time, as well as how to contact the Office of Administrative Law Judge, but failed to appear without explanation. Under these circumstances, the Complainant had ample opportunity to appear and be heard in this proceeding, but voluntarily chose not to do so. The due process rights of the Complainant have been fully protected. The motion to dismiss of the Company is granted, and the complaint is dismissed with prejudice.⁵

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

2. By failing to appear at her scheduled hearing, the Complainant has waived her claims and has failed to sustain her burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the motion to dismiss the complaint of Eileen Dewey at Docket No. F-2017-2633966, is granted.

2. That the complaint of Eileen Dewey at Docket No. F-2017-2633966, is dismissed with prejudice.

⁵ 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f).

3. That this docket be marked closed and discontinued.

Date: March 27, 2018

_____/s/_____
Mary D. Long
Administrative Law Judge