

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Mary Coleman	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2018-3004780
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision grants PECO Energy Company’s Motion to Dismiss the formal Complaint (Complaint) of Mary Coleman with prejudice because she failed to appear and prosecute the case.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On September 4, 2018, Mary Coleman (Ms. Coleman or Complainant) filed a Complaint against PECO Energy Company (Respondent or PECO) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) alleging that she is unable to make payments on her utility bills to PECO. As relief, Ms. Coleman requested that the Commission establish a payment arrangement on her behalf.

The Complaint was filed as a timely appeal of the Commission’s Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) decision, at BCS Case # 3633027.

On October 4, 2018, Respondent filed an Answer denying the material allegations of the Complaint.

A Hearing Notice dated October 11, 2018, notified the parties that an initial hearing was scheduled as part of the morning session of a call of the docket hearing on Tuesday, November 13, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

A Prehearing Order was issued on October 30, 2018, reminding the parties of the date and time of the scheduled hearing, informing them of the procedures applicable to this proceeding, and directing the submission of documents prior to the hearing.

The hearing convened as scheduled on November 13, 2018. Shawane Lee, Esq., appeared representing PECO. Neither Complainant nor a counsel for the Complainant appeared at the hearing. The hearing convened at approximately 9:47 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 PECO 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 upon receipt of the hearing transcript on November 26, 2018.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Mary Coleman, whose mailing address is 405 10th Street, Upland, PA 19015.
2. The Respondent is PECO Energy Company.
3. On September 4, 2018, Ms. Coleman filed a Complaint against PECO alleging that she is unable to make payments on her utility bills to PECO.

4. As relief, Ms. Coleman requested that the Commission establish a payment arrangement on her behalf.

5. On October 4, 2018, the Respondent filed an Answer denying the material allegations of the Complaint.

6. A Hearing Notice dated October 11, 2018, notified the parties that an initial hearing was scheduled as part of the morning session of a call of the docket hearing on Tuesday, November 13, 2018, at 9:30 a.m.

7. A Prehearing Order was issued on October 30, 2018, reminding the parties of the date and time of the scheduled hearing, informing them of the procedures applicable to this proceeding, and directing the submission of documents prior to the hearing.

8. None of the documents mailed to Complainant at the address provided in her Complaint were 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. Coleman alleged that she is unable to make payments on her utility bills to PECO. As relief, Ms. Coleman requested that the Commission establish a payment arrangement on her behalf.

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 dated October 11, 2018, and a Prehearing Order dated October 30, 2018, were mailed to Ms. Coleman at the address listed on her formal Complaint form. None of these documents 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 have been provided, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing. *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. Coleman's Complaint will be dismissed with prejudice. 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a); *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, Mary Coleman had the burden of proof. 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); *Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc.*, 1995 Pa. PUC LEXIS 159.

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

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Motion of PECO Energy Company to dismiss the formal Complaint of Mary Coleman at Docket No. F-2018-3004780 is granted.

2. That the formal Complaint filed by Mary Coleman against PECO Energy Company at Docket No. F-2018-3004780 is dismissed with prejudice for failure to prosecute.

3. That the Secretary's Bureau should mark this matter closed.

Date: December 26, 2018

_____/s/
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge