

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Gladys Nnadozie	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2022-3035981
	:	
Philadelphia Gas Works	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Michael J. Mroczka
Special Agent

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision sustains the Formal Complaint of a gas service customer because Complainant has met her burden of proving that she sustained the onset of a chronic or acute illness resulting in a significant loss in her household income and is therefore eligible for reinstatement of her Commission-issued payment arrangement and an extension of the remaining term of the payment arrangement for an initial period of six months.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On October 7, 2022, Gladys Nnadozie (Complainant or Ms. Nnadozie) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against Philadelphia Gas Works (PGW, Company or Respondent) in which she claimed that her gas service was terminated and requested a payment plan for around \$400 per month to catch up on her bill and that her gas service be reconnected.

On November 2, 2022, PGW filed its Answer to the Complaint of Gladys Nnadozie (Answer) which admitted in part and denied in part various material allegations of the Complaint. PGW also alleged that Complainant has had more than two broken PGW-issued payment agreements and one broken Commission-issued payment agreement. PGW requested the Complaint be dismissed.

By Hearing Notice dated November 8, 2022, an Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was scheduled for December 21, 2022, and the matter was assigned to me.

A Prehearing Order was issued and served on November 18, 2022, advising the parties of the date and time of the scheduled hearing, and informing them of the procedures applicable to this proceeding.

On December 21, 2022, the hearing convened as scheduled. Complainant appeared *pro se*, and testified on her own behalf. Graciela Christlieb, Esquire, appeared on behalf of PGW and presented the testimony of one witness, Jessica Glace, a senior customer review officer with PGW. Ms. Glace sponsored the following eight exhibits, which were admitted into the record:

- PGW Exhibit 1 – Account Statement (Dec. 14, 2020 – Dec. 14, 2022)
- PGW Exhibit 2 – Payment Arrangement History
- PGW Exhibit 3 – Opening & Closing Report for BCS No. 3788825
- PGW Exhibit 4 – July 2, 2021, Customer Contact
- PGW Exhibit 5 – November 16, 2021, Customer Contact
- PGW Exhibit 6 – Opening & Closing Report for BCS No. 3814095
- PGW Exhibit 7 – July 26, 2022, Customer Contact
- PGW Exhibit 8 – Opening & Closing Report for BCS No. 3853071

During the hearing, I provided Complainant 10 days to submit late filed exhibits regarding her PFA and medical condition. Following the hearing, Complainant offered two late-filed exhibits: a PFA docket report and a doctor's letter regarding Complainant's medical conditions. On January 25, 2023, PGW filed in letter form an objection to the admission of the proposed PFA docket report but did not object to admission of the Doctor's letter. On March 16,

2023, I issued an Interim Order overruling PGW's objection and admitting Complainant's late-filed exhibits into the record:

Complainant Exhibit A – PFA Docket Report
Complainant Exhibit B – Doctor's Letter

The hearing produced a 48-page transcript. The record closed on March 16, 2023, upon issuance of the Interim Order admitting Complainant's late-filed exhibits.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Gladys Nnadozie, who resides at 3215 Byberry Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19154 (Service Address). PGW Ex. 1.

2. The Respondent is Philadelphia Gas Works, a jurisdictional public utility, which provides natural gas service to Complainant at the Service Address.

3. Complainant resides at the Service Address along with her four adult children between the ages of 18 and 25. Tr. 12.

4. Complainant's children are in college and not employed. Tr. 12-13.

5. Complainant makes \$48 per hour and works 36 hours per week which equals a gross income of \$7,488 per month.¹ Tr. 13-14.

6. Complainant's income and household size places her between 250% and 300% of the Federal poverty level.²

¹ \$48 x 36 hrs = \$1,728; \$1728 x 52 weeks = \$89,856; \$89,856/12 mo. = \$7,488 per mo.

² See, Federal poverty guidelines, 88 Fed. Reg. 3424 (Jan. 19, 2023); <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/98087be2f7c9586ee24c35a011bc7ac8/guidelines-1983-2023.xlsx> .

7. Complainant has an active serious medical condition.³ Tr. 17; Compl. Ex. B.
8. Complainant's medical condition can cause Complainant to experience episodes of fatigue lasting three to four days at a time, causing her to be unable to complete work responsibilities. Tr. 17-20; Compl. Ex. B.
9. Complainant was diagnosed with the condition on or around August 20, 2021. Compl. Ex. B.
10. Complainant made a \$2,000 payment to PGW in October 2021. Tr. 11; PGW Ex. 1.
11. Complainant has had three broken PGW-issued Payment arrangements dated April 30, 2015; June 19, 2017; and October 29, 2018. PGW Ex. 2; Tr. 29-30.
12. Complainant has one broken Commission-issued payment arrangement which was dated December 16, 2021. PGW Ex. 2; Tr. 30.
13. Complainant was working at the time of the December 2021 Commission-issued payment arrangement. PGW Ex. 6; Tr. 34.
14. Complainant lost income due to her medical condition after the December 2021 Commission-issued payment arrangement. Tr. 18-19.
15. Complainant's balance is \$7,812.56. Tr. 28; PGW Ex. 1.
16. Complainant's Protection from Abuse Order expired. Compl. Ex. A.

³ Due to the public accessibility of a Public Utility Commission decision, I will not disclose Complainant's personal medical information/diagnoses here as it is detailed in the record.

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). As a matter of law, a complainant must show that the named utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the complaint in order to prevail. *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (Opinion and Order entered Feb. 8, 1990); *Feinstein v. Phila. Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 6, 1976). Such a showing must be by a preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 578 A.2d 600 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990). A complainant can meet that burden if he presents evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that evidence presented by Respondent. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950). The offense must be a violation of the Public Utility Code (Code), a Commission Regulation or Order, or a violation of a Commission-approved tariff. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

The decision of the Commission must be supported by substantial evidence. 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 & W. Ry. Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 413 A.2d 1037 (Pa. 1980); *Erie Resistor Corp. v. Unemployment Comp. Bd. of Rev.*, 166 A.2d 96 (Pa. Super. 1961); *Murphy v. Pa. Dep't of Pub. Welfare, White Haven Ctr.*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

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 the complainant. *Milkie v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 768 A.2d 1217 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001); *see also, Burlison v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982).

As the Complainant, Ms. Nnadozie has the burden of proof to show that she is eligible for a Commission-issued payment arrangement, or an extension of her prior one.

Protection From Abuse - § 1417. Nonapplicability

While the Responsible Utility Customer Protection Act, 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1401-1419 (Chapter 14), applies to complaints alleging inability to pay and requesting a Commission-issued payment arrangement, Section 1417 of Chapter 66 of the Public Utility Code (the Code) states that the Chapter does not apply to domestic abuse victims. Section 1417 of the Code states, “This chapter shall not apply to victims under a protection from abuse order as provided by 23 Pa.C.S. Ch. 61 (relating to protection from abuse) or a court order issued by a court of competent jurisdiction in this Commonwealth, which provides clear evidence of domestic violence against the applicant or customer.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1417. Verification of the existence of an active protection from abuse order (PFA) or active order providing clear evidence of domestic violence is necessary for the Commission to determine whether Chapter 14 applies to a proceeding. *Mueller v. PECO Energy Co.*, C-20066246 (Final Order entered Oct. 26, 2006); 66 Pa.C.S. § 1417.

At the hearing, Ms. Nnadozie testified that she had at one point had a PFA protecting her. Tr. 14, 16. Ms. Nnadozie stated that the PFA was entered in November 2017, but she was not sure if the PFA was still in effect. Tr. 16. After the hearing, Complainant submitted a late-filed exhibit regarding her PFA Order which was admitted to the record. Compl. Ex. A. Complainant’s exhibit A shows that Ms. Nnadozie filed the PFA on November 14, 2017, and that a final PFA was entered by the Court on March 22, 2018, for the period of one year, expiring March 21, 2019. *Id.*

Ms. Nnadozie’s PFA expired on March 21, 2019, and she is no longer “under a protection from abuse order as provided by 23 Pa.C.S. Ch. 61.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1417; Compl. Ex. A. Ms. Nnadozie has not met her burden of proof that she is currently under a protection from abuse order, or a court order issued by a court of competent jurisdiction in this Commonwealth, which provides clear evidence of domestic violence against her. Therefore, Chapter 14 applies to Complainant. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1417; 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

Payment Arrangement

Complainant requests a Commission-issued payment arrangement. Chapter 14 provides strict guidelines that the Commission must follow when determining whether a payment arrangement can be issued. Section 1405(a)-(b) of the Code reads as follows:

§ 1405. Payment arrangements

(a) General rule.—The commission is authorized to investigate complaints regarding payment disputes between a public utility, applicants, and customers. The commission is authorized to establish payment arrangements between a public utility, customers, and applicants within the limits established by this chapter.

(b) Length of payment arrangements.—The length of time for a customer to resolve an unpaid balance on an account that is subject to a payment arrangement that is investigated by the commission and is entered into by a public utility and a customer shall not extend beyond:

- (1) Five years for customers with a gross monthly household income level not exceeding 150% of the Federal poverty level.
- (2) Three years for customers with a gross monthly household income level exceeding 150% and not more than 250% of the Federal poverty level.
- (3) One year for customers with a gross monthly household income level exceeding 250% of the Federal poverty level and not more than 300% of the Federal poverty level.
- (4) Six months for customers with a gross monthly household income level exceeding 300% of the Federal poverty level.

66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1405(a)-(b).

Ms. Nnadozie testified that she currently makes \$48 per hour and works three days a week for 36 hours per week which equals a gross income of \$7,488 per month. Tr. 13-14, 19. However, Ms. Nnadozie has a diagnosis of a serious medical condition. Compl. Ex. B. Because of her condition, she sometimes must miss work due to episodes of fatigue, leaving her unable to do work activities. Tr. 17-18; Compl. Ex. B. Therefore, she obtained her current job working three days a week for 36 hours per week. Tr. 19. Prior to her current job, she was on leave through the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) from the end of June 2022 through August 2022, when she started her current employment. Tr. 19. Complainant still needs to take days off from time to time based on her doctor's recommendation. Tr. 20.

Complainant lives in her home with her four children between the ages of 18 and 25. The children are not employed and are enrolled in college. Based on Complainant's gross income of \$7,488 per month, and her household size of five, she falls between 250% and 300% of the Federal poverty level. Absent further restrictions, Ms. Nnadozie would qualify for a Level 3 payment arrangement. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1405(b)(3). However, as explained below, due to restrictions placed on the Commission by the Code, I cannot provide Complainant with a new Commission-issued payment arrangement.

Second or Subsequent Payment Arrangement

If the Commission has not previously ordered a payment arrangement for a complainant, the Commission has the authority to establish a payment arrangement, pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(a), on a complainant's arrearages within the strict guidelines set forth in 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(b), as stated above. However, the Code restricts the Commission from issuing a second or subsequent payment arrangement if a customer defaults on a previous Commission-issued payment arrangement. The Code addresses second or subsequent payment arrangements as follows:

(d) Number of payment arrangements. — Absent a change in income, the commission shall not establish or order a public utility to establish a second or subsequent payment arrangement if a customer has defaulted on a previous payment arrangement

established by a commission order or decision. A public utility may, at its discretion, enter into a second or subsequent payment arrangement with a customer.

66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(d). “Change in income” is defined by the Code as “[a] decrease in household income of 20% or more if the customer's household income level exceeds 200% of the Federal poverty level or a decrease in household income of 10% or more if the customer's household income level is 200% or less of the Federal poverty level.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1403.

Ms. Nnadozie was previously provided with a Commission-issued payment arrangement in December 2021 at BCS No. 3814095 (December 2021 PAR). PGW Ex. 6. The December 2021 PAR provided Complainant with a Level 3 payment arrangement on her balance of \$8473.66. *Id* at 3. In granting the December 2021 PAR, Ms. Nnadozie’s income was determined to be \$6,000 per month with a household size of five. *Id* at 1. Complainant defaulted on the December 2021 PAR. PGW Ex. 2; Tr. 35.

Currently, as explained above, Ms. Nnadozie’s household income is \$7,488 per month, which is an increase of \$1,488 per month from the income determined in the December 2021 PAR. Because Ms. Nnadozie has had an increase in household income instead of a decrease of 20% or more, the Commission is not permitted to grant her a second or subsequent payment arrangement under the Code. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1403, 1405(d).

Reinstatement of Prior Payment Arrangement

Although Ms. Nnadozie is not eligible for a second Commission-issued payment arrangement, she may be eligible for reinstatement and extension of the December 2021 PAR. Chapter 14 authorizes the Commission to reinstate and extend a Commission-issued payment arrangement on which a customer has defaulted as a result of a significant change in circumstance:

(e) Extension of payment arrangements. — If the customer defaults on a payment arrangement established under

subsections (a) and (b) as a result of a significant change in circumstance, the commission may reinstate the payment arrangement and extend the remaining term for an initial period of six months. The initial extension period may be extended for an additional six months for good cause shown.

66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(e). A “significant change in circumstance” is defined in the Code as follows:

“Significant change in circumstance.” Any of the following criteria when verified by the public utility and experienced by customers with household income less than 300% of the Federal poverty level:

- (1) The onset of a chronic or acute illness resulting in a significant loss in the customer's household income.
- (2) Catastrophic damage to the customer's residence resulting in a significant net cost to the customer's household.
- (3) Loss of the customer's residence.
- (4) Increase in the customer's number of dependents in the household.

66 Pa.C.S. § 1403.

Ms. Nnadozie has an active serious medical condition. Tr. 17; Compl. Ex. B. Ms. Nnadozie was diagnosed with the condition on or around August 20, 2021. Compl. Ex. B.

PGW does not object to the admission of Complainant’s Exhibit B but “notes that [Complainant’s Exhibit B] indicates that Ms. Nnadozie’s most recent diagnosis in the list of ‘Active Ambulatory Problems’ is from August 20, 2021, and, as such, predates [the December 2021 PAR].” Obj. to Ex. n. 1. The August 20, 2021, diagnosis is the diagnosis of the serious medical condition. Compl. Ex. B. I will interpret PGW’s note regarding Ms. Nnadozie’s condition starting in August of 2021 as an argument that she was diagnosed prior to the December 2021 PAR and therefore has not had a significant change of circumstances as defined under Section 1403 of the Code. PGW’s argument would be correct if the definition ended at “the onset of a chronic or acute illness.” However, the relevant part of definition of significant change of circumstances fully defines it as “[t]he onset of a chronic or acute illness *resulting in a*

significant loss in the customer's household income.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1403 (emphasis added). “The plain language of a statute is the best indication of the General Assembly's intent... [and we are to] read the words of a statute in context, not in isolation, and in a manner so as to give meaning to each and every provision.” *Phila. Gas Works v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 249 A.3d 963, 970 (Pa. 2021) (citing *Gavin v. Loeffelbein*, 205 A.3d 1209, 1221 (Pa. 2019)); 1 Pa.C.S. § 1921(b).

While Ms. Nnadozie was diagnosed in August of 2021, there is no evidence on the record that her diagnosis had yet caused her to miss work prior to the December 2021 PAR. Ms. Nnadozie stated that COVID-19 caused her to miss work prior to the December 2021 PAR but stated that she went back to work. Tr. 17. At the time she was granted the December 2021 PAR, Ms. Nnadozie was working, as evidenced by her \$6,000 per month income at that time. Tr. 34; PGW Ex. 6. Since the December 2021 PAR, her condition has caused Ms. Nnadozie to miss work. Tr. 17-18. In fact, Ms. Nnadozie had to take FMLA for an extended period of time in 2022 which resulted in a significant loss of income. Tr. 19. Further, while she is back to work now, she still must take days off to rest due to significant fatigue caused by her condition. Tr. 17-18.

Ms. Nnadozie has met her burden of proving that she sustained the onset of a chronic or acute illness resulting in a significant loss in her household income. As mentioned above, her household income falls below 300% of the Federal poverty level. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1403. Therefore, she has experienced a significant change in circumstances and the Commission may reinstate her previous payment arrangement and extend the remaining term for a period of six months. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(e). The remaining term of the December 2021 payment arrangement appears to be twelve months as it seems there was an immediate default of the December 2021 payment arrangement for nonpayment. PGW. Ex. 1. Therefore, her payment agreement may be reinstated for a total of eighteen months. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(e).

Ms. Nnadozie's current arrearage is \$7,812.56.⁴ Tr. 28; PGW Ex. 1. Her payments under a reinstated and extended payment agreement will be her budget bill plus \$434.⁵

Reconnection of Gas Service

Ms. Nnadozie's gas was disconnected in October 2022, prior to her filing the instant Complaint. PGW Ex. 1. It is not clear how much PGW was requiring Complainant to pay to reconnect her gas service though they required a catch-up payment of \$5,776 to return to a payment arrangement prior to disconnection. Tr. 36. However, the Code provides guidance on what PGW may have required to reconnect her service. Section 1407 of the Code states what fees a utility may require for reconnection as follows:

§ 1407. Reconnection of service.

(a) Fee. — A public utility may require a reconnection fee based upon the public utility's cost as approved by the commission prior to reconnection of service following lawful termination of the service.

(c) Payment to restore service. —

(1) A public utility shall provide for and inform the applicant or customer of a location where the customer can make payment to restore service.

(2) A public utility may require:

(i) Full payment of any outstanding balance incurred together with any reconnection fees by the customer or applicant prior to reconnection of service if the customer or applicant has an income exceeding 300% of the Federal poverty level or has defaulted on two or more payment arrangements. If a customer or applicant with household income exceeding 300% of the Federal poverty level experiences a life event, the customer shall be permitted a

⁴ A significant amount of Ms. Nnadozie's arrearage is comprised of late payment charges (\$1749.64) which seems to include repeated late payment charges on accounts long closed. PGW Ex. 1. Waiver of the late payment charges under 66 Pa.C.S. § 1409 would reduce her arrearage payment by nearly \$100 per month and would make her payments significantly more affordable and closer to what Ms. Nnadozie said she could pay in her Complaint. However, because her household income exceeds 150% of the Federal poverty level, I am unable to waive these charges.

⁵ $\$7,812.56/18 = \$434 + \text{Budget bill}$ (Ms. Nnadozie's budget bill had previously been \$165. PGW Ex. 1.).

period of not more than three months to pay the outstanding balance required for reconnection. For purposes of this subparagraph, a life event is:

(A) A job loss that extended beyond nine months.

(B) A serious illness that extended beyond nine months.

(C) Death of the primary wage earner.

(ii) Full payment of any reconnection fees together with repayment over 12 months of any outstanding balance incurred by the customer or applicant if the customer or applicant has an income exceeding 150% of the Federal poverty level but not greater than 300% of the Federal poverty level.

66 Pa.C.S. § 1407.

The Commission, in *Crawford v. National Fuel Gas Distribution Corp.*, Docket No. C-20066348 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 6, 2007) (*Crawford*), considered whether Section 1407 of the Code precluded the Commission from ordering a payment arrangement under Section 1405. The Commission concluded that:

while Subsection 1407(c) delineates the terms a utility may impose upon a customer/applicant seeking restoration of service, Subsection 1407(c) in no way divests the Commission of its duty to act as the final arbiter of a utility consumer's rights with respect to payment disputes. If the consumer petitions the Commission for further relief, Subsection 1405(b) delineates the payment arrangement terms the Commission may then impose.

Crawford at 14. The Commission also concluded that it:

has a responsibility to exercise its authority very judiciously when a utility has lawfully terminated a customer for nonpayment. Specifically, [the] Commission should exercise its discretion only on behalf of customers who have demonstrated some evidence of good faith efforts to pay their utility bills, or who have experienced a significant change of circumstances outside their control.

Id. at 15-16.

As mentioned above, Ms. Nnadozie has experienced a significant change in circumstances through “the onset of a chronic or acute illness resulting in a significant loss in the customer's household income.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1403. Further, Ms. Nnadozie has recently made a good faith effort to pay her bill by providing a \$2,000 payment on October 21, 2022. PGW Ex. 1; Tr. 11. Therefore, I will reinstate the December 2021 PAR as outlined above, and will require PGW to reconnect Ms. Nnadozie’s service. However, to ensure further good faith effort on Ms. Nnadozie’s behalf, I will not require PGW to reinstate the service until Ms. Nnadozie has made full payment of the reconnection fee in accordance with 66 Pa.C.S. § 1407(a) and payment of a deposit in accordance with 66 Pa.C.S. § 1404.⁶

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. This Commission has jurisdiction over the parties to and subject matter of this case. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.
2. The burden of proof in this proceeding is upon the Complainant. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).
3. The Responsible Utility Customer Protection Act applies to this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1401-1419.
4. The Commission is authorized to establish a payment arrangement between a public utility and a customer. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(a).
5. Absent a change in income, the commission shall not establish or order a public utility to establish a second or subsequent payment arrangement if a customer has

⁶ “A public utility may require a reconnection fee based upon the public utility's cost as approved by the commission prior to reconnection of service following lawful termination of the service.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1407(a). “In addition to the right to collect a deposit under any commission regulation or order, the commission shall not prohibit a public utility, from requiring a cash deposit, payable during a 90-day period in accordance with commission regulations, in an amount that is equal to one-sixth of the applicant's estimated annual bill, at the time the public utility determines a deposit is required[.]” 66 Pa.C.S. 1404.

defaulted on a previous payment arrangement established by a commission order or decision. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(d).

6. If the customer defaults on a Commission-issued payment arrangement as a result of a significant change in circumstance, the Commission may reinstate the payment arrangement and extend the remaining term for an initial period of six months. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(e).

7. Complainant has experienced a significant change in circumstances through “the onset of a chronic or acute illness resulting in a significant loss in the customer's household income.” 66 Pa.C.S. § 1403.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Formal Complaint filed by Gladys Nnadozie in Gladys Nnadozie v. Philadelphia Gas Works at Docket No. C-2022-3035981 is sustained.

2. That, in accordance with Section 1405(e) of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(e), the payment arrangement issued by the Bureau of Consumer Services on August 7, 2017 in BCS Case No. 3814095 is reinstated, and the remaining term is extended for an initial period of six months following the entry of a final Commission order in this case.

3. That Philadelphia Gas Works shall reconnect Complainant’s gas service within 72 hours of Complainant’s payment of the reconnection fee in accordance with 66 Pa.C.S. § 1407(a) and payment of a deposit in accordance with 66 Pa.C.S. § 1404.

4. That Docket No. C-2022-3035981 be marked closed.

Date: April 5, 2023

_____/s/
Michael J. Mroczka
Special Agent