

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Lucia Getz	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2023-3041775
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Charece Z. Collins
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Decision dismisses the Formal Complaint filed by Lucia Getz against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation. Ms. Getz failed to satisfy her burden of demonstrating that PPL Electric Utilities Corporation violated the Public Utility Code, a Commission order or regulation or a Commission-approved tariff with respect to the alleged overbilling by PPL for her electric service.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On June 29, 2023, Lucia Getz (Complainant or Ms. Getz) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL).¹ In her Complaint, Ms. Getz alleged that there were incorrect charges on two PPL bills, issued in February and March, 2023. Ms. Getz alleged that

¹ The Formal Complaint is a timely appeal of a decision issued by the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services at BCS Case No. 3895101. A timely BCS appeal is subject to *de novo* review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

no one was home during the periods at issue, and the bills, totaling \$304.78 and \$377.69, respectively, were far from the average bill amounts during the months of February and March. Ms. Getz requested a reasonable explanation for the high bill amounts.

Ms. Getz's complaint was served on PPL on July 18, 2023. On August 7, 2023, PPL filed a timely answer. In its answer, PPL denied that there were incorrect charges on Complainant's bill. PPL averred that Complainant received estimated bills for the December 2022 billing period. PPL further averred that it discovered in December 2022 that while customer meter data was being accurately collected, it was not transferring from the Company's meter data management system to the customer service system. PPL further averred that it fixed the data transfer problem and then issued adjusted bills to reflect the actual usage amounts for the billing period in question. The January 2023 bill was therefore higher as it included actual usage from the current billing period in addition to unbilled usage from the prior billing period. PPL further averred that Complainant's February 2023 bill was based on actual usage. Lastly, PPL averred that Complainant's usage remained high until March 1, 2023.

On August 10, 2023, the Commission served an initial telephonic hearing notice setting a formal call-in telephonic hearing for this matter for October 12, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. and assigning me as the presiding officer. In anticipation of that hearing, I served a prehearing order on August 10, 2023, setting forth hearing information and the rules that would govern the proceeding. On September 7, 2023, the Commission served a second hearing notice, rescheduling the hearing for November 14, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. due to a case scheduling conflict. I served a second prehearing order on September 7, 2023 in anticipation of the rescheduled hearing.

The hearing was held as scheduled on November 14, 2023 at 10:00 a.m. Ms. Getz appeared on behalf of herself, along with three witnesses. Megan E. Rulli, Esquire, attended on behalf of PPL, along with two witnesses for PPL. Ms. Getz submitted two exhibits

that were admitted into the record.² PPL submitted seven exhibits that were admitted into the record.

The transcript of the hearing, with the admitted exhibits from the hearing, was filed with the Commission on December 11, 2023. As only two of the four exhibits presented by Complainant at the hearing were included in the transcript, the record temporarily remained open to ensure that no further exhibits would be submitted.³ The record in this case then closed on December 29, 2023.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Lucia Getz.
2. The Respondent is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.
3. The Complainant's service address for the Complaint is 103 Stone Ledge Drive, Lakeville, PA 18438.
4. Complainant testified that she was away in Florida during the months of December, January and February 2023, the billing periods at issue. Tr. 12-14.
5. Ms. Getz received "large" bills in January and February 2023. Tr. 10-11; PPL Exhibit 1.

² Complainant submitted four exhibits at the hearing, but only two were provided to the court reporter for inclusion with the hearing transcript.

³ Getz exhibits 3-4 were photographs of invoices, that purported to show that Ms. Getz did not receive garbage service at her Pennsylvania home during the winter months. While the exhibits were admitted over PPL's objection, Ms. Getz ultimately did not submit these photos to the court reporter. The parties submitted their hearing exhibits to the court reporter as instructed during the hearing. Tr. 101-102. Ms. Getz confirmed the instruction to submit exhibits 1-4 to the court reporter. Tr. 109-110. Upon review of the evidence, the photographs would not have impacted the outcome of this Initial Decision.

6. Ms. Getz did not turn the electricity off at the main breaker of her Pennsylvania home during the billing periods at issue. Tr. 22-23.

7. Ms. Getz's oil furnace in her home remained on while she was away, with the thermostat set at 50 degrees. Tr. 23.

8. People had access to Ms. Getz's home while she was away. Tr. 25.

9. Ms. Getz contacted neighbors to check on her house. Tr. 11-12.

10. Dennis Ryan, witness for Ms. Getz, checked on Ms. Getz's home approximately 3-4 times per month during the winter months. Tr. 31.

11. Mr. Ryan "attended Union County Technical Institute to be an electrician," and followed up with DeVry Institute where he graduated with an electronics degree. Tr. 30.

12. Mr. Ryan checked outside of the house, but he did not go inside of the home. Tr. 31-32.

13. Mr. Ryan could not determine what appliances were running inside of the home. Tr. 32.

14. Mr. Ryan did not inspect Ms. Getz's electric meter. Tr. 32.

15. William Bonner, witness for Ms. Getz, checked on the inside and outside of Ms. Getz's house approximately 1-2 times per month, when he was in town, between October and May. Tr. 35.

16. Mr. Bonner is not a licensed electrician or an electrical engineer. Tr. 37.

17. Mr. Bonner testified that the electricity was on inside of the home when he checked on the house. Tr. 37.
18. Mr. Bonner testified that the heat was on inside of the home. Tr. 38.
19. Mr. Bonner inspected the breaker of the home and noted that the refrigerator and water heater were off. Tr. 38.
20. Mr. Bonner did not inspect the home's electric meter. Tr. 39.
21. David Weibel, witness for Ms. Getz, went inside of Ms. Getz's home a couple of times in the month of February 2023, when he was in town. Tr. 40-41, 43.
22. Mr. Weibel testified that the electricity and heat were on when he went into the house. Tr. 44.
23. Mr. Weibel did not inspect the breaker or the meter at the house. Tr. 45.
24. Mr. Weibel is not a licensed electrician. Tr. 43.
25. Mr. Weibel performs minor electrical residential work. Tr. 43.
26. Mr. Weibel did not use a voltmeter or any other device to measure the electric at the outlets inside the house. Tr. 45.
27. Alicia Watkinson, witness and customer contact center supervisor for PPL, testified that Ms. Getz complained that her January 2023 and February 2023 bills contained incorrect charges. Tr. 48-50.
28. Ms. Getz did not request that PPL test her meter. Tr. 24, 81.

29. Ms. Getz did not have an electrician inspect her home for electrical issues. Tr. 25.

30. Ms. Getz received an estimated bill on January 4, 2023, for the December 2022 billing period, because the meter data was not transferring from PPL's command center into the meter data management system (PPL's billing system). Tr. 54, 56; PPL Exhibits 1, 4.

31. The failed data transfer prevented PPL from generating a bill with correct usage, and estimated bills were issued instead. Tr. 54-55.

32. PPL's meters were still communicating and reading electricity usage during the December 2022 billing period. Tr. 64-68, 78; PPL Exhibits 4-7.

33. In January 2022, Ms. Getz's electric bill reflected an actual usage of 362 kWh over 30 days. Tr. 55; PPL Exhibit 1.

34. The January 4, 2023, bill reflected an estimate of 386 kWh over 32 days, based on similar usage for a similar time period from the previous year. Tr. 56, 64-65; PPL Exhibits 1, 4.

35. The actual usage for the December 2022 billing period was 509 kWh. Tr. 56; PPL Exhibit 1.

36. The next bill issued on January 30, 2023 included actual usage during the January 2023 billing period (1,196 kWh) and unbilled usage from December 2022 billing period (123 kWh), for a total of 1,319 kWh. Tr. 13, 57-58, 61-62; PPL Exhibits 1, 5.

37. The next bill dated March 1, 2023, listed 1,763 kWh and was based on actual usage. Tr. 13, 58; PPL Exhibit 1.

38. PPL has access to all the daily readings from the electric meter for the billing periods at issue for the March 1, 2023 bill. Tr. 58; PPL Exhibits 6-7.

39. Ms. Getz is not disputing her meter readings for any months other than January and February 2023. Tr. 24.

40. PPL Exhibit 4 reflects average temperatures of 33 and 39 degrees during the billing periods at issue. Tr. 64; PPL Exhibit 4.

41. PPL repaired the meter data transfer issue on February 2 and 4, 2023. Tr. 70; PPL Exhibit 2.

42. Meters will record electricity usage whether or not homeowners are in the home. Tr. 71.

43. Complainant is not carrying an ongoing balance associated with the disputed bills. Tr. 70.

44. Tami Roland, witness and senior customer representative for PPL, testified that PPL's meters only run and record usage when electricity is being used. Meters do not record electricity that is not used. Tr. 84, 91, 98.

45. Ms. Getz's meter has not been replaced; the same meter used in December 2022 continues to operate in present time. Tr. 99.

DISCUSSION

Legal Standard

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). "Burden of proof" means a duty to establish a fact by a preponderance of the evidence, or evidence more convincing, by

even the smallest degree, than the evidence presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950). 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 (1990). The offense must be a violation of the Public Utility Code, the Commission's regulations, or an outstanding order of the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701. In this proceeding, Ms. Getz has alleged that her PPL bill contained incorrect charges, and she seeks an explanation for the high bills and a refund of the alleged overpayment. *See* Tr. 97. Therefore, Ms. Getz has the burden of proof in this proceeding.

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) (*Milkie*); *see also*, *Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982).

Moreover, the Commission's decision must be supported by "substantial evidence," which consists of evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 413 A.2d 1037 (Pa. 1980); 2 Pa.C.S. § 704. A mere trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact is insufficient. *Erie Resistor Corp. v. Unemployment Comp. Bd. Of Rev.*, 166 A.2d 96 (Pa. Super. 1960). A complainant cannot establish a case merely by stating his or her personal beliefs, since assertions, personal opinions or perceptions do not constitute evidence. *Pa. Bureau of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987).

In cases of alleged high billing, the Commission applies the *Waldron* rule, which provides that to establish a *prima facie* case of overbilling, a complainant must show: (1) that the number of occupants in the household has not changed, (2) that the potential for energy

utilization was low and (3) that complainant's billing history shows no prior abnormalities. Once the complainant makes out a *prima facie* case, the burden of proof then shifts to the utility; however, the ultimate burden of persuasion always remains with the complainant. *Waldron v. Phila. Elec. Co.*, 54 Pa.P.U.C. 98 (1980); *Repogle v. Pa. Elec. Co.*, 54 Pa.P.U.C. 528 (1980).

In *Milkie*, the Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania further refined the *Waldron* rule by holding:

[w]hile the [Waldron] rule is often explained by stating that the ratepayer must establish certain specific elements in order to make out a *prima facie* case of overbilling by a utility company, we believe this view is too restrictive. Rather the controlling principle is that even where the utility can present evidence that it has tested the customer's meter and found it to be accurate, the customer may nonetheless prove his case by circumstantial evidence, which would support a finding that the metered usage exceeded the actual usage. Thus as our Supreme Court has explained, the rule operates as a device by which the complainant is protected from dismissal because of his inability to marshal direct proof that his meter had malfunctioned.

Milkie, 768 A.2d at 1219-1220 (citing *Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 461 A. 2d 1234, 1235 (Pa. 1983)). In *Thomas v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2187197 (Opinion and Order entered Nov. 15, 2011) (*Thomas*), the Commission explained:

consistent with our holding in *Charisse Bennett v. Peoples Natural Gas Co.*, Docket No. C-2009-2122979 (Order entered October 13, 2010), the *Waldron* Rule allows a complainant to establish a *prima facie* case in a "high bill" Complaint by showing that the disputed bill is abnormally high when compared to prior usage patterns and his or her pattern of usage has not changed or by providing other relevant evidence showing that the disputed bill is unreasonably high. In evaluating a "high bill" Complaint, the Commission may consider such evidence as "the billing history of the account, any change in usage patterns (such as a change in the number of occupants residing in the household or potential energy utilization), and any other relevant facts or circumstances that come to light during the proceeding."

Thomas, at 5 (citation omitted).

The Commission has also considered circumstances where a Complainant contends that their utility bill is inordinately large as compared to their perceived utility usage. In *Kirby v. PPL Electric Utilities Corp.*, the Commission ruled that, “[c]omplainant’s testimony consisted solely of his opinion that these charges are too high. Regardless of how earnestly Complainant believes the complaint allegations to be true, personal opinions or perceptions do not constitute substantial evidence sufficient to permit him to sustain his burden of proof.” *Kirby v. PPL Elec. Util. Corp.*, Docket No. C-20066297 (Final Order entered Nov. 16, 2006).

High Bill Complaint

Ms. Getz testified that she received “large” bills in January and February 2023. Tr. 10-11; PPL Exhibit 1. Ms. Getz testified that she contacted PPL, who advised that it was working on issues with its system. Tr. 10-11; PPL Exhibit 2. Ms. Getz further testified that she was in Florida at the time of the high bills, and she only uses her Pennsylvania home during the summer months. Tr. 10, 12-14, 17; Getz Exhibits 1-2. From the exhibits and witnesses alone, it is not clear that Ms. Getz was away from her Pennsylvania home for the entirety of the winter months. However, Ms. Getz did testify that even while away from her home, appliances in her home remained on. Ms. Getz did not turn the electricity off at the main breaker of her Pennsylvania home during the billing periods at issue. Tr. 22-23. Ms. Getz’s oil furnace in her home remained on while she was away, with the thermostat set at 50 degrees. Tr. 23.

While equipment was running in her home, Ms. Getz did not have an electrician inspect the equipment to determine if there was an issue with her equipment/appliances. Ms. Getz also testified that others had access to her home while she was away. She testified that she contacted neighbors to check on her home. Mr. Ryan, who has completed schooling in electronics, did not enter Ms. Getz’s home or check her meter. Tr. 30-32. Mr. Bonner, who is not an electrician, noted that the breaker was on inside of the home, and he did not inspect the meter. Tr. 37-39. Mr. Weibel entered the home but did not inspect the breaker or the meter. Tr.

44-45. It is not clear from the record if others entered the home, or what appliances may have been used or left on, while Ms. Getz was away.

Ms. Getz testified that she did not request the meter to be tested. Tr. 24. The record reflects that the meter has also not been replaced. The same meter that read data in December 2022 is being utilized in present time, and Ms. Getz does not dispute her meter readings for any months other than January and February 2023. Tr. 24; 81, 99.

PPL's evidence demonstrates that Ms. Getz received an estimated bill on January 4, 2023, for her December 2022 billing period, because meter data was not transferring from PPL's command center into the meter data management system. Tr. 54. The failed data transfer prevented PPL from generating a bill with actual usage, and an estimated bill was issued instead. Tr. 54-55. However, PPL's meters continued to communicate and read electricity usage during the billing periods at issue. Tr. 64-68, 78; PPL Exhibits 4-7. Moreover, PPL Exhibit 4 reflects average temperatures of 33 and 39 degrees during the periods at issue. Tr. 64; PPL Exhibit 4. Ms. Getz testified that her heating system remained on throughout the winter. Tr. 23. PPL testified that its meters record electricity usage whether or not homeowners are in the home. Tr. 71.

The January 4, 2023 bill reflected an estimate of 386 kWh over 32 days, totaling \$99.09, and based on similar usage for a similar time period from the previous year. Tr. 56, 64-65; PPL Exhibits 1, 4. The previous year, in January 2022, the electric bill reflected an actual usage of 362 kWh over 30 days, totaling \$77.86. Tr. 55; PPL Exhibit 1. The actual usage for the December 2022 billing period was 509 kWh. Tr. 56; PPL Exhibit 1. Therefore, Ms. Getz's next bill following the January 4, 2023, bill, which was issued on January 30, 2023, included actual usage during the January 2023 billing period (1,196 kWh) and unbilled usage from December 2022 billing period (123 kWh). Tr. 57, 61-62; PPL Exhibits 1, 5. The total kWh on the January 30, 2023 bill was 1,319, for a billed total of \$304.78. Tr. 57-58; PPL Exhibit 1. PPL testified that it repaired the meter data transfer issue on February 2 and 4 of 2023. Tr. 70; PPL Exhibit 2. The following bill issued on March 1, 2023, reflected an actual usage of 1,763 kWh, for a billed total of \$377.69. Tr. 58; PPL Exhibit 1.

The evidence of record shows that Ms. Getz received an estimated bill in early January 2023, for her December 2022 billing period. Commission regulations permit utilities to issue estimated bills for every other billing month, or issue estimated bills in consecutive months in the event of equipment failure. 52 Pa. Code § 56.12 (2), (3).

According to the testimony of PPL's witness Watkinson, whom I found to be credible, on January 30, 2023, Ms. Getz's bill reflected the difference between the estimated usage and actual usage for December 2022 billing period, and the actual usage for January 2023. The meter data transfer issues were fixed in February 2023, and the following March 1, 2023 bill fully reflected actual usage. Ms. Getz's meter has not been replaced and continues to record usage. The usage went down following the March 1, 2023 bill. Average temperatures were in the 30s during the time period at issue, and Ms. Getz's heating system remained on.

Ms. Getz did not establish through a preponderance of the evidence that she had been billed incorrectly. The cumulative testimony of her witnesses establishes only that they were keeping an eye on her residence while she was away. Nothing in their testimony establishes that Complainant was incorrectly billed. Ms. Getz did not have an electrician inspect her home for potential issues with running appliances. Ms. Getz did not request that her meter be tested. The basis for the Complaint is, essentially, a contention that in the opinion of the Complainant, she was overbilled. Mere opinion, without more, is insufficient to meet the Complainant's burden. *Kirby v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-20066297 (Final Order entered Nov. 16, 2006) (citing *Pa. Bureau of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987)). Bald assertions, personal opinions or perceptions do not constitute evidence. *Rivera v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2010-2164222 (Order entered Jan. 12, 2012) (citing *Pa. Bureau of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987)).

I note that Ms. Getz is not carrying an ongoing balance associated with the disputed bills. Tr. 70. Ms. Getz has not met her burden of proving that PPL Electric Utilities Corporation violated the Public Utility Code, a Commission order or regulation or a

Commission-approved tariff with respect to the alleged overbilling by PPL for her electric service. Accordingly, Ms. Getz's complaint is dismissed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties to this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

2. 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).

3. 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 (1990).

4. "Burden of proof" means a duty to establish a fact by a preponderance of the evidence, or evidence more convincing, by even the smallest degree, than the evidence presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

5. The offense must be a violation of the Public Utility Code, the Commission's regulations, or an outstanding order of the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

6. 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).

7. The decision of the Commission must be supported by substantial evidence. 2 Pa.C.S. § 704.

8. "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).

9. In cases of alleged high billing, to establish a prima facie case of overbilling, a complainant, must show: (1) that the number of occupants in the household has not changed, (2) that the potential for energy utilization was low and (3) that complainant's billing history shows no prior abnormalities. Once the complainant makes out a prima facie case, the burden of proof then shifts to the utility; however, the ultimate burden of persuasion always remains with the complainant. *Waldron v. Phila. Elec. Co.*, 54 Pa.P.U.C. 98 (1980); *Repogle v. Pa. Elec. Co.*, 54 Pa.P.U.C. 528 (1980).

10. The *Waldron* Rule allows a complainant to establish a prima facie case in a "high bill" complaint by showing that the disputed bill is abnormally high when compared to prior usage patterns and his or her pattern of usage has not changed or by providing other relevant evidence showing that the disputed bill is unreasonably high. *Thomas v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2187197 (Opinion and Order entered Nov. 15, 2011).

11. Utilities are allowed to estimate the bill of a customer if extreme weather conditions, emergencies, equipment failure, work stoppages or other circumstances prevent actual meter reading. 52 Pa. Code § 56.12(3).

12. Utilities are allowed to render a make-up bill for previously unbilled public utility service. 52 Pa. Code § 56.14.

13. A timely BCS appeal is subject to *de novo* review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

14. Mere opinion, without more, is insufficient to meet the Complainant's burden. *Kirby v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-20066297 (Final Order entered Nov. 16, 2006) (citing *Pa. Bureau of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987)).

15. Bald assertions, personal opinions or perceptions do not constitute evidence. *Rivera v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2010-2164222 (Order entered Jan. 12, 2012) (citing *Pa. Bureau of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987)).

16. Ms. Getz has failed to satisfy her burden to demonstrate that PPL has violated the Public Utility Code, a Commission order or regulation or a Commission-approved tariff. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Formal Complaint filed by Lucia Getz at *Lucia Getz v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, Docket No. F-2023-3041775, is hereby dismissed.
2. That Complainant's Exhibits Nos. 3-4 are stricken from the record as they were not submitted to the court reporter.
3. That the Secretary's Bureau shall mark this case as closed.

Date: March 27, 2024

/s/
Charece Z. Collins
Administrative Law Judge