

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Shi Xin Chen

v.

Philadelphia Gas Works

:
:
:
:
:

C-2020-3019363

INITIAL DECISION

Before
F. Joseph Brady
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision dismisses the Complaint of Shi Xin Chen against Philadelphia Gas Works because the Complainant failed to appear for the hearing and prosecute the Complaint.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On March 30, 2020, Shi Xin Chen (Complainant) filed a formal Complaint (Complaint) against Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW or Respondent) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission). In the Complaint, the Complainant alleged that there were incorrect charges on his gas bill. The Complainant requested that the charges be reduced.

On July 7, 2020, PGW filed an Answer to the Complaint. In its Answer, PGW either admitted or denied the various averments of the Complaint and requested that the Complaint be dismissed.

By Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice dated July 8, 2020, a telephonic hearing was scheduled for August 19, 2020, at 10:00 a.m., and the matter was assigned to me. The Hearing Notice advised the parties of the date and time of the scheduled hearing and warned in bold and underlined type: “**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.**”

I issued a Prehearing Order on July 29, 2020. The Prehearing Order directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and also warned in bold and underlined type: “**You must call into the hearing on the scheduled day and time. If you fail to do so, your case may be dismissed. You will NOT be called by the Administrative Law Judge.**”

The hearing began on August 19, 2020, as scheduled. Counsel for the Respondent called in with a witness available to testify. The Complainant failed to call into the hearing. The Complainant was given an additional ten minutes to call and participate in the hearing but failed to do so.

No witnesses were presented and no exhibits were introduced into the record. Counsel for PGW moved that the Complaint be dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.245. In accordance with Commission policy, I am granting the Motion.

The record closed on August 21, 2020, upon my receipt of the transcript.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Shi Xin Chen.
2. The Respondent is Philadelphia Gas Works.
3. On March 30, 2020, the Complainant filed a Complaint with the Commission against the Respondent.

4. On July 7, 2020, the Respondent filed an Answer to the Complaint.

5. By Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice dated July 8, 2020, a telephonic hearing was scheduled for August 19, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.

6. On July 29, 2020, I issued a Prehearing Order that directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements.

7. Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order warned in bold and underlined type: “**You must call into the hearing on the scheduled day and time. If you fail to do so, your case may be dismissed. You will NOT be called by the Administrative Law Judge.**”

8. Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were sent to the Complainant by the Commission’s eService.

9. Neither the Hearing Notice nor the Prehearing Order were returned as undeliverable.

10. The Complainant failed to appear at the August 19, 2020 hearing.

DISCUSSION

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.Cmwlt. 1984). This due process requirement is satisfied, however, when the administrative agency provides the parties notice and the opportunity to be heard. *J.P. v. Dep't of Human Servs.*, 150 A.3d 173 (Pa.Cmwlt. 2016).

On July 8, 2020, the Commission sent notice of the Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing to the Complainant via the Commission’s eService system. The Hearing Notice advised

the parties of the location, date and time of the scheduled hearing and warned in bold and underlined type: “**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.**”

Here, eService was the method of delivery of notice for the hearing and prehearing order. Notice electronically served to a party with no notification that service failed is presumed received. *Zirkel v. Philadelphia Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered April 7, 2017) (*Zirkel*); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered January 31, 2017) (*Morella*); and *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Final Order entered December 19, 2019).

None of the documents sent by eService to the Complainant were returned as undeliverable. It is therefore deemed that the Complainant had notice of the date and time and participation information for the August 19, 2020, hearing. *Zirkel; Morella*.

As the Commission noted in *Strydio v. PPL Elec. Util. Corp.*, 2018 Pa. PUC LEXIS 258, *8, Docket No. C-2017-263304, p. 6 (Opinion and Order entered July 18, 2018) “[o]nce notice of a hearing and the opportunity to be heard have been provided by the Commission, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing.” *citing, Mumma v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Order entered January 24, 2002); *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Order entered October 25, 1993).

The Complainant was notified of the scheduled hearing and did not appear for the hearing. Additionally, the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order advised the Complainant that the case could be dismissed for failure to call-in and participate in the hearing. Thus, the Complainant has waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing by failing to appear. 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a); *Jefferson v. UGI Util., Inc.*, 1995 Pa. PUC LEXIS 159 (Opinion and Order entered December 26, 1995).

Finally, 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. By failing to appear and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, the Complainant has failed to meet this burden. Consequently, the Complaint will be dismissed on this basis as well. *Jefferson v. UGI Util., Inc.*, Docket No. Z 00269892 (Opinion and Order entered December 26, 1995); *El-Ayazra v. W. Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. F 2015-2509292 (Opinion and Order entered June 30, 2016); 52 Pa.Code § 5.245.

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 Complainant received notice of the hearing. *Chartiers Indus. and Commercial Dev. Auth. v. Allegheny Cnty. Bd. of Prop. Assessment Appeals and Review*, 645 A.2d 944 (Pa.Cmwlth. 1994), *appeal den.*, 653 A.2d 1234 (Pa. 1994).

3. The due process rights of the Complainant have been fully protected in this proceeding. *J.P. v. Dep't of Human Servs.*, 150 A.3d 173 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2016); *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered October 25, 1993); 52 Pa.Code § 5.245(a).

4. As the party seeking affirmative relief from the Commission, the Complainant bears the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

5. The Complainant did not participate in the hearing, failed to appear for the hearing, did not present any evidence and, therefore, failed to meet the Complainant's burden of proving eligibility for the relief sought from the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Motion of Philadelphia Gas Works to dismiss the formal Complaint filed by Shi Xin Chen at Docket No. C-2020-3019363 is granted;
2. That the formal Complaint of Shi Xin Chen against Philadelphia Gas Works at Docket No. C-2020-3019363 is dismissed; and
3. That Docket No. C-2020-3019363 be marked closed.

Date: October 29, 2020

/s/
F. Joseph Brady
Administrative Law Judge