

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Gomattie Harilal	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2019-3009714
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Benjamin J. Myers
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This decision dismisses the complaint filed in this matter for failure of the Complainant to appear for the hearing and prosecute the complaint. It also bars the Complainant from filing of any further complaints with the Commission until the Complainant's outstanding account balance has been paid in full due to the Complainant's abuse of the Commission's processes.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On May 6, 2019, Gomattie Harilal (Complainant) filed a complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Respondent). The complaint alleges, among other things, that upon opening an account with PPL, the Complainant's account was improperly charged with the outstanding balance of another customer.¹ By way of relief, the Complainant requested the

¹ The complaint filed in this matter was an appeal from the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) decision issued on March 14, 2019 in BCS No. 3627234. This decision makes reference to previous BCS decisions in BCS No. 3104628 (2013) and BCS No. 33374009 (2016) which addressed the same or similar allegations as those lodged in the instant complaint as well as previous Commission-ordered payment arrangements on which the Complainant defaulted.

criminal prosecution of individuals associated with PPL who had committed violent acts against her, compensation for her distress, monetary relief and free electricity wherever she may live.

On May 28, 2019, PPL filed an answer to the complaint. The answer admitted or denied the various averments of the complaint. However, PPL specifically denied that the Complainant had been improperly billed. PPL added that as of May 2, 2019 the Complainant had an outstanding account balance of \$11,419.99.

By notice dated May 30, 2019 the Commission scheduled this matter for an initial telephonic hearing on July 23, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. and assigned the case to me. A prehearing order was issued on June 4, 2019, addressing, inter alia, requests for continuance, subpoena procedures, attorney representation and the Commission's policy encouraging settlements. Both the hearing notice and prehearing order advised the parties that they may lose this case if they failed to appear for the hearing.

Both the notice of hearing and prehearing order were sent to the Complainant's correct address of record as it appears on the complaint. Neither the notice of hearing nor the prehearing order sent to the Complainant by the Office of Administrative Law Judge (OALJ) were returned as undeliverable by the postal authorities.

The telephonic hearing was conducted as scheduled on July 23, 2019. The Complainant failed to appear and participate in the hearing. Additional time was given for the Complainant to call into the conference number to participate in the hearing; however, the Complainant never appeared.

Upon commencement of the hearing, Attorney Kimberly Krupka, counsel for PPL, moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to appear and prosecute. The Respondent was advised that its motion would be taken under advisement.

The record closed on July 23, 2019, at the conclusion of the hearing.

At 4:39 p.m. on July 29, 2019, the Complainant sent an email to both my office and Respondent's counsel. This email made several allegations regarding the Complainant's awareness of, and failure to participate in, the telephonic hearing. At 5:13 p.m. that same day, PPL replied to Complainant's email and indicated that it objected to a request for any further hearing in this matter and outlined the number of times and manner in which the Complainant had been advised of the date and time of the telephonic hearing as well as the contact information for the OALJ. On July 30, 2019, I emailed both parties indicating that I considered the Complainant's email to be a request to reopen the record and outlined the reasons for my denial. I also indicated that I would further address this ruling in the initial decision which would be issued.² The denial of the Complainant's request to reopen the record in this matter will be discussed below.

Subsequent to the denial to reopen the record the Complainant and/or her husband, Kumar Harilal, continued emailing both the OALJ and counsel for PPL.³ These emails purported to be between the Complainant and Latchmi Persaud, an individual identified by the Complainant as an interested party and witness. As a result of the number and frequency of these emails, and most importantly the allegations being made within them, I decided to reopen the record in this matter and schedule an additional in-person hearing for August 26, 2019.⁴ A notice dated August 5, 2019 was sent to the parties scheduling them for said hearing. The notice was once again sent to the Complainant's address of record and was not returned as being undeliverable by the postal authorities.

The August 26, 2019 in-person hearing was conducted as scheduled. The Complainant did not appear for the hearing. Counsel for PPL and one witness attended the hearing who testified and sponsored six exhibits which were admitted into the record. A total of 14 ALJ exhibits comprising the Complainant's emails referenced above were presented and

² These emails were submitted to the Secretary's Bureau on July 30, 2019 to be made a part of the record in this matter.

³ Many of these emails were subsequently made a part of the record as ALJ Ex's 1-14 at the further hearing held on August 26, 2019. The allegations made within them will not be addressed in this initial decision

⁴ This matter was rescheduled for an in-person hearing on August 26, 2019, as the Complainant had indicated in one of the emails that she had never requested an initial hearing by telephone.

admitted into the record without objection. The hearing concluded at which time the record was again closed.

This matter is now ready for disposition. For the reasons discussed below, the Respondent's motion to dismiss the complaint for failure to prosecute will be granted. In addition, the Complainant will be barred from filing additional complaints regarding this matter until such time as the Complainant's outstanding account balance with the Respondent has been paid in full.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant in this case is Gomattie Harilal.
2. The Respondent in this case is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.
3. The Complainant's service address is 106 Waterway Lane, Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania.
4. On May 6, 2019, the Complainant filed a complaint with the Commission against the Respondent.
5. The Respondent filed an answer to the complaint on May 28, 2019.
6. By hearing notice dated May 30, 2019, the Commission scheduled this matter for an initial telephonic hearing on July 23, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.
7. The hearing notice advised the parties that the hearing would be conducted by telephone and provided the toll-free telephone number and conference code to enter in order to participate in the hearing.

8. The hearing notice was sent to the Complainant's correct address of record and was not returned as undeliverable by the postal authorities.

9. On June 4, 2019, a prehearing order was issued to the Complainant at the same address as the hearing notice and again reminded the parties that the hearing would be conducted by telephone and that they would be required to call in to participate.

10. The prehearing order was not returned as undeliverable by the postal authorities.

11. Both the hearing notice and the prehearing order provided the parties with the contact information for the Office of Administrative Law Judge.

12. Both the hearing notice and the prehearing order advised the parties that failure to attend the hearing may result in the absent party losing the case.

13. The Complainant failed to participate in the July 23, 2019 telephonic hearing.

14. The Complainant's first contact with the Office of Administrative Law Judge occurred on July 29, 2019, six days after the telephonic hearing had been conducted and the record had closed.

15. In the July 29, 2019 email, the Complainant provided two reasons for her failure to participate in the July 23, 2019 telephonic hearing: 1) She did not receive a letter informing her that the hearing was scheduled to occur on July 23 until July 29, 2019; and 2) She had received a letter from counsel for PPL on July 23, 2019 which had the date and time of the hearing but did not provide a telephone number.

16. By hearing notice dated August 5, 2019, this matter was scheduled for an in-person hearing on August 26, 2019 at 10:00 a.m.

17. The August 5, 2019 hearing notice was sent to the Complainant's correct address of record and was not returned as undeliverable by the postal authorities.

18. The Complainant failed to appear and participate in the August 26, 2019 in-person hearing.

19. At the time of the August 26, 2019 hearing, the Complainant's account at Account No. 58679-89058 had an outstanding account balance of \$11,517. Tr. at 13; PPL Exhibit 1.

DISCUSSION

Complainant's Failure to Appear

Administrative agencies, such as the Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n., 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984). This due process requirement is satisfied, however, when the administrative agency provides the parties notice and the opportunity to be heard. Id.

The Commission sent notice of the telephonic hearing in this case to the Complainant on May 30, 2019, by regular first-class mail to the address of record. This notice scheduled the parties for a call-in telephonic hearing on July 23, 2019. This notice specifically advised the parties that the hearing would be conducted by telephone and provided the toll-free telephone number and conference code in order to participate in the hearing. This notice was never returned to the Commission as being undeliverable by the postal authorities. The notice also advised the parties that they may lose this case if they fail to appear and participate in the hearing.

A prehearing order was issued on June 4, 2019, which again provided the parties with information on how to participate in the hearing by telephone. The prehearing

order, which was again mailed to the Complainant at her address of record, was never returned as being undeliverable by the postal authorities.

A second notice of hearing was sent to the Complainant on August 5, 2019, scheduling this matter for an additional, in-person hearing on August 26, 2019. It was again mailed to the Complainant at her address of record and was never returned as being undeliverable by the postal authorities.

Given that none of the documents sent to the Complainant's address of record was ever returned as undeliverable, it must be presumed that these documents were received by the Complainant. Berkowitz v. Mayflower Securities, Inc., 317 A.2d 584 (Pa. 1974); Meierdierck v. Miller, 147 A.2d 406 (Pa. 1959); Samaras v. Hartwick, 698 A.2d 71 (Pa.Super. 1997); Judge v. Celina Mutual Insurance Co., 449 A.2d 658 (Pa.Super. 1982).

Both parties were properly notified of the date and time of the July 23, 2019 telephonic hearing in this matter as well as the manner in which to call in to participate in the hearing. Despite multiple notices providing that information, the Complainant did not call into the conference number on the scheduled date and did not participate in the hearing despite being given additional time to do so. It was not until July 29, 2019, six days after the hearing (and the close of the record), that Complainant contacted OALJ via email regarding her failure to appear.

Because the record had closed at the conclusion of the hearing, Complainant's email will be viewed as a request to reopen the record.

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure permit a party to petition to reopen the record in a proceeding at any time after the record is closed but before a final decision is issued for the purpose of taking additional evidence. 52 Pa.Code § 5.571(a). The party seeking to reopen the record has the burden to set forth the grounds requiring reopening the record, including a material change of fact or law that has occurred since the conclusion of the hearing. 52 Pa.Code § 5.571(b). The presiding officer may reopen the record if the presiding officer has not issued a decision or certified the record to the Commission and

determines that there has been a material change of law or fact or that it is in the public interest to reopen the record. 52 Pa.Code § 5.571(d).

The Complainant's July 29, 2019 email does not comply with 52 Pa.Code § 5.571, as it does not fulfill the general requirements of a petition set forth in 52 Pa.Code § 5.41. The regulation at 52 Pa.Code § 1.2(a) provides that the presiding officer or the Commission may disregard an error or defect of procedure which does not affect the substantive rights of the parties.

I will ignore the procedural defects of the Complainant's request and treat the July 29, 2019 email as a petition to reopen the record filed pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.571 in order to secure a just, speedy and inexpensive determination of this proceeding pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 1.2(a). This will not adversely affect the Respondent's substantive rights, pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 1.2(c), since it had notice of the Complainant's request for another hearing and an opportunity to respond.

Having decided to treat the Complainant's July 29, 2019 email as a petition to reopen pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.571, I will now address the merits of the Complainant's request. As stated above, the Complainant was scheduled to participate in the July 23, 2019 hearing by telephone. The Complainant did not call in to the hearing as scheduled and this therefore constitutes a failure to appear by the Complainant.

The Commission has addressed reopening the record where the complainant failed to be available for a telephonic hearing. In Nestorick v. UGI Utilities, Inc., Docket No. C-2010-2202901 (Order entered February 16, 2012) (Nestorick), the Commission denied a complainant's request to reopen the record where the complainant was not home at the time scheduled for a telephonic hearing. In support of her request to reopen the record, the Complainant claimed that the Commission had not notified her of the hearing.

In denying the complainant's request to reopen the record, the Commission in Nestorick observed that it had mailed a hearing notice to the complainant at her address and that the hearing notice had not been returned to the Commission as undeliverable. The Commission

in Nestorick therefore concluded that the complainant received notice of the hearing. The Commission in Nestorick stated that, once the Commission provides notice of a hearing, it is the responsibility of the parties to be present for the hearing. As discussed above, the Complainant had notice and the responsibility to be present for the July 23, 2019 telephonic hearing.

However, the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure recognize that there may be circumstances where the complainant's failure to appear at a hearing may be beyond her control and reopening the record is appropriate. Pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a), where the complainant has failed to appear for a hearing, she shall not be permitted to reopen the record unless the presiding officer determines that the failure to appear was unavoidable and the interests of the other parties would not be prejudiced.

The Commission has discussed what constitutes an unavoidable failure to appear. In Bethay v. PECO Energy Company, Docket No. F-2011-2266250 (Order entered August 2, 2012) (Bethay) the Commission denied the complainant's request to reopen the record where the complainant did not appear for a hearing because she was hospitalized for knee replacement surgery.

In Bethay, the Commission found that the Commission had mailed a hearing notice to the complainant at her address and that the hearing notice had not been returned to the Commission as undeliverable. The Commission therefore concluded that the complainant received notice of the hearing and that it was her responsibility to be present for the hearing. The Commission stated that, while it appeared that the complainant would have had good cause to request a continuance, she had not done so. The Commission also noted that the complainant had the time and opportunity to request a continuance and notify the Commission of her scheduled surgery but failed to do so. The Commission therefore concluded that the complainant's failure to appear at the hearing was not unavoidable.

In the Complainant's July 29, 2019 email request, the Complainant made several allegations regarding her alleged lack of awareness of, and failure to participate in, the telephonic hearing. First, the Complainant argued that it was not until July 29, 2019 – 61 days after the

notice of hearing was mailed to the Complainant – that she received a letter informing her that a hearing had been scheduled for July 23, 2019.⁵ Given that the notice of hearing was mailed to the Complainant on May 30, 2019 and the prehearing order was mailed on June 4, 2019, and neither were returned to the Commission as being undeliverable, the Complainant’s allegation that she did not receive notice of the scheduled hearing in this matter until July 29, 2019 is not credible.

In addition, the Complainant alleged that she was unaware of the July 23, 2019 hearing until July 29, 2019. This is contradicted by the other assertions the Complainant made in her July 29, 2019 email request. The Complainant indicated in her email that she received a letter from PPL’s counsel on July 23, 2019 which advised her of “the date and time of the hearing” but “no phone number”. On one hand the Complainant has alleged she was unaware of the July 23, 2019 hearing until July 29, 2019 while on the other she received correspondence from PPL on July 23, 2019 – the day of the hearing – indicating the hearing was occurring that very day.

Last, the Complainant failed to provide a reasonable explanation for her delay in contacting OALJ with her request to reopen the record. In PPL’s answer to the Complainant’s request, counsel indicated that upon returning to her office after the hearing on July 23, 2019, she received an email from the Complainant which had been sent to her at 10:15 a.m.⁶ In response at 10:52 a.m., counsel informed the Complainant that the hearing had been conducted as scheduled and advised her to contact OALJ regarding her failure to attend the hearing. Counsel further provided the Complainant with the telephone number for OALJ at that time. Despite receiving this information from Respondent’s counsel via email at 10:52 a.m. on July 23, 2019, the Complainant did not contact OALJ until the late afternoon of July 29, 2019. The Complainant failed to provide a reasonable explanation for such a delay.

⁵ Given that the Complainant’s email also makes reference to correspondence she received from PPL which included the date and time of the hearing, the “letter” to which the Complainant is referring must either be the notice of hearing or prehearing order issued on May 30 and June 4, 2019 respectively.

⁶ It is noted that despite Complainant’s allegation that she was unaware of the date and time of the hearing, the Complainant was coincidentally sending this email at the exact time the hearing was being conducted.

The Complainant as the party seeking to reopen the record has the burden to set forth the grounds which require the reopening the record, including a material change of fact or law that has occurred since the conclusion of the hearing. 52 Pa.Code § 5.571(b). The Complainant has provided no such credible grounds. While the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure recognize that there may be circumstances where the Complainant's failure to appear at a hearing may be beyond her control and reopening the record is appropriate. Pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a), where the complainant has failed to appear for a hearing, she shall not be permitted to reopen the record unless the presiding officer determines that the failure to appear was unavoidable and the interests of the other parties would not be prejudiced. The Complainant has failed to demonstrate any such unavoidable circumstances or any reason for the long delay in contacting OALJ with her request to reopen the record which closed at the conclusion of the July 23, 2019 hearing.

The Complainant's July 29, 2019 request to reopen the record was therefore properly denied.

Respondent's Motion to Dismiss

Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), places the burden of proof upon the proponent of any request for relief. As the party bringing this complaint, the Complainant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to relief. By failing to participate at two scheduled hearings and proffer any evidence to support her complaint, the Complainant has failed to meet this burden. Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc., Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered December 26, 1995); El-Ayazra v. West Penn Power Company, Docket No. F-2015-2509292 (Opinion and Order entered June 30, 2016); 52 Pa.Code § 5.245.

The Respondent's motion to dismiss the complaint as a result of the Complainant's failure to prosecute will therefore be granted.

Complainant's Email Correspondence

It should be noted that the record in this matter was later reopened *sua sponte* as a result of the various continuing allegations the Complainant and/or her husband made via a chain of emails which have been admitted to the record as ALJ exhibits 1 through 14.⁷ Due to the ongoing inappropriate nature of those emails and allegations made within them, a second hearing was scheduled for August 26, 2019 by hearing notice dated August 5, 2019, which was sent to the Complainant at her address of record. That August 5, 2019 notice was never returned as being undeliverable by the postal authorities. The Complainant was therefore duly notified of the August 26, 2019 hearing but again chose not to appear.

As discussed at the August 26, 2019 hearing, the Complainant's course of conduct with respect to this email chain is troubling. This chain purports to be between the Complainant and an individual named Latchmi Persaud, identified by the Complainant as an interested party and witness in this matter. In fact, in this email chain the Complainant and Latchmi Persaud repeatedly allege that the Respondent is improperly attempting to make the Complainant responsible for an outstanding account balance belonging to Ms. Persaud.

However, PPL Ex. No. 4 is an obituary that identifies Ms. Persaud as the Complainant's deceased mother who passed away on February 12, 2016, and that the Complainant's husband is Kumar – the same name used in the email address in correspondence with Ms. Persaud.

In short, the Complainant and her husband have engaged in a type of identity fraud. The Complainant has pretended to correspond with Latchmi Persaud, who is deceased, in an attempt to mislead the Commission into believing that Ms. Persaud is 1) a material witness in this matter who was prevented from providing testimony at a hearing, and 2) the person actually

⁷ The emails contain allegations that the Complainant was denied notice and the opportunity to participate in a hearing as a result of racism, discrimination, inappropriate *ex parte* communication and corruption as well as various other allegations. These allegations are not addressed in this initial decision as it is based solely on the Complainant's failure to appear and prosecute her complaint at two separate scheduled hearings and her abuse of the Commission's processes by engaging in the fraudulent behavior described herein.

responsible for the Complainant's outstanding account balance. The Complainant has attempted to manipulate and abuse the Commission's processes by engaging in behavior clearly designed to perpetuate a fraud and attempt to escape responsibility for an outstanding account balance in excess of \$11,000.

There is ample Commission precedent to support the preclusion of a party from filing further informal or formal complaints when the party has abused the regulatory process.⁸ See, Seidenstricker v. Metropolitan Edison Co., Docket No. F-2008-2019388 (Final Order entered July 28, 2009) (Seidenstricker). In Seidenstricker, the Commission precluded the filing of further complaints pertaining to the same account until the arrearage was paid in full after finding that Complainant had abused the system by using the Commission's provisions to prevent termination of service while receiving utility service and accruing a large outstanding balance. See also, Thomas v. The Peoples Natural Gas Co., Docket No. C-2009-2102194 (Opinion and Order entered June 17, 2010); Mazza v. PECO Energy Co., Docket No. C-2012-2318472 (Opinion and Order entered April 23, 2014); Argento's Pizza v. Philadelphia Gas Works, Docket No. C-2009-2138055 (Final Order entered October 1, 2010).

Deceptively creating a chain of emails between a complainant and a person who is deceased serves no other purpose but to perpetuate a fraud and wastefully expend the Commission's resources. Fraudulent behavior intended to delay a proceeding, obtain an additional hearing, mislead the Commission or escape responsibility for an outstanding utility account balance are clear abuses of the regulatory process. Such abuses are an attempt to use the Commission's provisions to prevent termination of service while continuing to receive utility service and accrue an ever-larger outstanding account balance. The Complainant and her husband will therefore be barred from filing any further informal or formal complaints pertaining to the account with Respondent until such time as the outstanding balance on the account is paid in full.

⁸ While previous Commission decisions regarding abuse of process have typically involved complainants who file multiple complaints, request multiple continuances and/or continually fail to appear at scheduled hearings, the course of conduct by the Complainant here is no less of an attempt to abuse the Commission's provisions and hearing process. The Complainant's sole purpose is to prevent or delay termination of service while continuing to receive utility service and accrue - and ultimately escape - an even larger outstanding account balance.

Conclusion

The Respondent's motion to dismiss the complaint in this matter for failure to prosecute will be granted. This dismissal will be with prejudice as the Complainant has engaged in a course of behavior to delay and disrupt the adjudication of this matter and therefore unnecessarily expended both the Commission's and the Respondent's time and resources. To prevent the needless expenditure of future additional Commission resources, the Complainant and her husband will be barred from filing any further formal or informal complaints with the Commission pertaining to the account with Respondent until such time as the outstanding balance on the account has been paid in full.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter of and the parties to this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.
2. The Commission's duty as an administrative agency to provide due process to the parties appearing before it is satisfied when it provides the parties notice and the opportunity to be heard. Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n., 479 A.2d 10 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1984).
3. Mail which has never been returned as undeliverable must be presumed to have been received by the Complainant. Berkowitz v. Mayflower Securities, Inc., 317 A.2d 584 (Pa. 1974); Meierdierck v. Miller, 147 A.2d 406 (Pa. 1959); Samaras v. Hartwick, 698 A.2d 71 (Pa.Super. 1997); Judge v. Celina Mutual Insurance Co., 449 A.2d 658 (Pa.Super. 1982).
4. By failing to participate in the hearing and proffer any evidence to support the complaint, the Complainant has failed to meet her burden of proving that she is entitled to the relief that she seeks from the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

5. Failure by a complainant to appear for a scheduled hearing of which the complainant had notice warrants dismissal of the complaint with prejudice. Jefferson v. UGI Utilities, Inc., Docket Number Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered December 26, 1995; Jones v. The Peoples Natural Gas Company d/b/a Dominion Peoples, Docket Number C-20054885 (Opinion and Order entered February 14, 2006).

6. There is ample Commission precedent to support the preclusion of a party from filing further informal or formal complaints when the party has been an abuser of the system. Seidenstricker v. Metropolitan Edison Co., Docket No. F-2008-2019388 (Final Order entered July 28, 2009). See also, Thomas v. The Peoples Natural Gas Co., Docket No. C-2009-2102194 (Opinion and Order entered June 17, 2010; Argento's Pizza v. Philadelphia Gas Works, Docket Nos. C-2009-2138055 and C-2010-2167822 (Final Order entered October 1, 2010).

7. Complainant has abused the Commission's administrative processes by deceptively creating a chain of emails between the Complainant and a person who is deceased to delay, mislead and expend the Commission's resources in order to prevent termination of service while attempting to escape responsibility for an outstanding account balance.

8. Complainants who have engaged in the abuse of the Commission's administrative processes may be precluded from filing further complaints with the Commission and Commission staff, including the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services and the Secretary's Bureau, may reject any complaint that a complainant or any person acting on their behalf may attempt to file with the Commission until the entire outstanding account balance has been paid in full. Mazza v. PECO Energy Co., Docket No. C-2012-2318472 (Opinion and Order entered April 23, 2014).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the motion of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to dismiss the complaint for failure to prosecute is granted.

2. That the complaint of Gomattie Harilal against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation at Docket No. C-2019-3009714 is dismissed with prejudice.

3. That Gomattie Harilal, and her husband Kumar Harilal, are precluded from filing any further complaints with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, whether of an informal or formal nature, regarding the arrearages on Account No. 58679-89058 for electric service rendered by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, until such time as the entire outstanding account balance has been paid in full.

4. That the filing of any complaint pertaining to the arrearages which are the subject of this proceeding shall be dismissed without further proceedings.

5. That Commission staff, including the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services and the Secretary's Bureau, shall reject any formal or informal complaint that Gomattie Harilal or her husband Kumar Harilal, or any person acting on their behalf, may attempt to file with the Commission, pertaining to Account No. 58679-89058, until the entire outstanding account balance has been paid in full.

6. That the filing of any other pleadings in this case concerning the same subject matter shall not be deemed a stay on the implementation of this order.

