

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

Thomas Baker

v.

PECO Energy Company

Public Meeting November 8, 2018

2573166-OSA

Docket No. C-2016-2573166

MOTION OF COMMISSIONER JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.

Before the Commission for disposition are Exceptions filed to the Initial Decision (ID) dismissing the above-captioned Formal Complaint filed against PECO Energy Company (PECO). Upon review of the evidentiary record, I find no merit or basis to the Complainant's allegations of bias that were raised in his Exceptions.


Moreover, the Complainant did not meet his burden of proof that PECO provided unsafe, unreasonable, or inadequate service in response to a hot socket alarm that occurred at the service location. I agree with the ID that PECO's personnel acted appropriately in response to the alarm.

The Complainant also did not meet his burden of proof that the \$2,500 security deposit required by PECO constitutes unreasonable service. The Complainant alleges the security deposit requirement is unreasonable because his failure to pay his electric bills was caused by PECO's inadequate service in response to the hot socket meter alarm. However, as previously noted, PECO's response to the alarm was reasonable.

THEREFORE, I move that:

1. The Complainant's Exceptions be denied, consistent with this Motion.
2. The Initial Decision be adopted, consistent with this Motion.
3. The Office of Special Assistants prepare an Opinion and Order consistent with this Motion.

DATE: November 8, 2018


JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.
COMMISSIONER