

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Chastity Mosser	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2019-3009015
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
Alphonso Arnold III  
Special Agent

**INTRODUCTION**

This Initial Decision dismisses the Complaint because the Complainant failed to appear for the hearing to prosecute her Complaint.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On April 8, 2019, Chastity Mosser (Complainant or Ms. Mosser) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (Respondent or PPL) seeking to be reenrolled in PPL's Customer Assistance Program, known as OnTrack.

On April 29, 2019, PPL filed an Answer to the Complaint, alleging that Ms. Mosser defaulted on her OnTrack payment arrangement on January 4, 2019. PPL requested that the Commission deny the Complaint.

By Hearing Notice served upon the parties on May 7, 2019, the Commission scheduled this matter for a call-out telephonic hearing on Tuesday, June 17, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. and assigned the case to me.

By Hearing Type Change Notice served upon the parties on May 14, 2019, the telephonic hearing was changed from a call-out telephonic hearing to a call-in telephonic hearing. Furthermore, the Hearing Notice stated the following: “*Attention: You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present facts on the issues raised.*” (emphasis in the original).

A Prehearing Order, served upon the parties on May 14, 2019, reminded the parties of the date and time of the hearing and addressed, *inter alia*, the procedures applicable to the hearing and the method by which a party could request a change of the scheduled hearing date if the date was not convenient for them. Furthermore, the Prehearing Order stated the following: “**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.**” (emphasis in the original).

The June 17, 2019 hearing was held as scheduled. Ms. Mosser did not call into the June 17, 2019 hearing at 10:00 a.m. The attorney for PPL, Graig M. Schultz, Esquire, called into the hearing along with one witness and was ready to proceed.

The hearing was delayed until 10:15 a.m. to give Ms. Mosser additional time to call into the hearing. At 10:15 a.m. Ms. Mosser still had not called into the hearing; therefore, the hearing began without her presence. No witnesses were presented, and no exhibits were introduced for the record. PPL made a Motion to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice for failure to prosecute.

The record<sup>1</sup> closed on June 17, 2019, following the conclusion of the hearing. As of the date of this Initial Decision, no communication has been made to the Office of

---

<sup>1</sup> The telephonic hearing was recorded over the phone by means of a tape recorder. No Court Reporter was present.

Administrative Law Judge on Ms. Mosser's behalf to explain her absence from the hearing. For the reasons discussed below, PPL's Motion will be granted, and the Complaint will be dismissed with prejudice.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Chastity Mosser.
2. The Respondent is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.
3. The Complainant filed a Complaint against the Respondent on April 8, 2019.
4. The Respondent filed an Answer to the Complaint on April 29, 2019.
5. By Hearing Type Change Notice served upon the parties on May 14, 2019, a call-in telephonic hearing in this matter was scheduled for June 17, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.
6. The Hearing Type Change Notice additionally stated the following: "*Attention: You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present facts on the issues raised.*" (emphasis in the original).
7. By Prehearing Order served upon the parties on May 14, 2019, the parties were again informed of the date and time of the telephonic hearing and were provided with the method by which a party could request a continuance of the hearing date, if needed.
8. The Prehearing Order additionally stated the following: "**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.**" (emphasis in the original).

9. Neither the Hearing Type Change Notice nor the Prehearing Order were returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

10. The Complainant did not call into the hearing on June 17, 2019.

11. The Complainant did not withdraw or settle her Complaint with the Respondent, nor did she request a continuance of the hearing date.

### DISCUSSION

Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code provides that the party seeking relief from the Commission has the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a). To satisfy this burden, the Complainant must show that the named 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). This must be shown by a preponderance of the evidence, that is, by presenting evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 578 A.2d 600 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1990), alloc. den., 602 A.2d 863 (Pa. 1992); Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

If a Complainant establishes a *prima facie* case, the burden of going forward with the evidence shifts to the utility. If a utility does not rebut that evidence, the Complainant will prevail. If the utility rebuts the Complainant's evidence, the burden of going forward with the evidence shifts back to the Complainant, who must rebut the utility's evidence by a preponderance of the evidence. The burden of going forward with the evidence may shift from one party to another, but the burden of proof never shifts; it always remains on a Complainant. Milkie v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 768 A.2d 1217 (Pa.Cmwlth. 2001); see also, Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1982).

Additionally, this Commission's decision must be supported by substantial evidence in the record. 2 Pa.C.S. § 704. "Substantial evidence" is such relevant evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. More is required than a mere

trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact sought to be established. Norfolk & Western Ry. Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 413 A.2d 1037 (Pa. 1980).

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.Cmwlt. 1984).

The Complainant did not participate in the June 17, 2019 hearing. The date and time of the hearing were provided in the Hearing Type Change Notice and the Prehearing Order. The Notice and Order informed the Complainant that she was to call into the hearing on June 17, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. The Complainant did not call into the hearing at 10:00 a.m. The hearing was delayed until 10:15 a.m., and proceeded at that time after the Complainant still had not called into the hearing. Both the Notice and Order warned the Complainant of the potential consequences that could result from choosing to not participate in the scheduled hearing, including dismissal of the Complaint.

The Hearing Type Change Notice and Prehearing Order were sent separately to the Complainant by regular first-class mail. Neither the Notice nor the Order were returned to the Commission as undeliverable. Accordingly, it must be presumed that these documents, which were sent to the Complainant in the ordinary course of business, were received by her. Berkowitz v. Mayflower Securities, Inc., 455 Pa. 531, 317 A.2d 584 (1974); Meierdierck v. Miller, 394 Pa. 484, 147 A.2d 406 (1959); Samaras v. Hartwick, 698 A.2d 71 (Pa. Super. 1997); Judge v. Celina Mutual Insurance Co., 303 Pa. Super. 221, 449 A.2d 658 (1982). Therefore, the Complainant is deemed to have had sufficient notice of the day, date and time of the scheduled hearing and for whatever reason chose not to appear at the hearing to prosecute her Complaint.

Under these circumstances, the Complainant had ample opportunity to appear and be heard in this proceeding but chose not to do so. Once notice of a hearing and the opportunity to be heard have been provided to the parties, it is the responsibility of both parties to appear and participate in the hearing. Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlt. 1984). Therefore, the due process rights of the Complainant have been fully protected. Sentner v. Bell

Tel. Co. of Pa., Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered October 25, 1993). The Complainant did not appear, and the hearing proceeded in her absence. 66 Pa.C.S.A. § 332(f) and 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a) provide that a party that fails to be represented at a scheduled hearing shall waive the opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted thereafter to reopen the disposition of any matter accomplished thereat.

**§ 332. Procedures in general.**

**(f) Actions of parties and counsel.**--Any party who shall fail to be represented at a scheduled conference or hearing after being duly notified thereof, shall be deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in such conference or hearing, and shall not be permitted thereafter to reopen the disposition of any matter accomplished thereat, or to recall for further examination of witnesses who were excused, unless the presiding officer shall determine that failure to be represented was unavoidable and that the interests of the other parties and the public would not be prejudiced by permitting such reopening or further examination. . . .

66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f).

**§ 5.245. Failure to appear, proceed or maintain order in proceedings.**

(a) After being notified, a party who fails to be represented at a scheduled conference or hearing in a proceeding will:

(1) Be deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in the conference or hearing.

(2) Not be permitted thereafter to reopen the disposition of a matter accomplished at the conference or hearing.

. . .

52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

As the party seeking relief from the Commission, Ms. Mosser bears the burden of proof. By choosing not to participate in the hearing and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, Ms. Mosser failed to meet this burden.

The due process rights of the Complainant have been protected. The Complainant had notice of the scheduled hearing and failed to appear to prosecute her Complaint. Therefore,

the Respondent's Motion to dismiss the Complaint is granted. Accordingly, the Complaint in this matter will be dismissed in its entirety with prejudice. El-Ayazra v. West Penn Power Company, Docket No. F-2015-2509292 (Opinion and Order entered June 30, 2016); Volgstadt v. UGI Penn Natural Gas, Inc., Docket No. F-02266429 (Opinion and Order entered September 12, 2008) and Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc., Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered December 26, 1995).

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter and parties to this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.
2. The burden of proof in this proceeding is on the Complainant. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).
3. Administrative agencies 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).
4. 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. Sentner v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered October 25, 1993).
5. By failing to appear at her scheduled hearing, the Complainant waived her opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted thereafter to reopen the disposition of any matter accomplished thereat, or to recall for further examination of witnesses who were excused. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

6. The Complainant's due process rights have been fully protected. Sentner v. Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania, Docket No. F-00161106 (Order entered October 25, 1993); 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a).

7. By failing to appear and proffer any evidence in support of the Complaint, the Complainant has failed to meet the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Motion of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to dismiss the Complaint at Docket Number C-2019-3009015 for failure to prosecute is granted.

2. That the Complaint filed by Chastity Mosser against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation at Docket Number C-2019-3009015 is hereby dismissed with prejudice.

3. That the docket at Docket Number C-2019-3009015 is marked closed.

Date: June 20, 2019

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Alphonso Arnold III  
Special Agent