

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Laura Remaley	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2023-3043331
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
John M. Coogan
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision grants in part and denies in part a Formal Complaint that alleges overbilling by an electric utility and requests a payment arrangement. The Formal Complaint is denied in part because the Complainant failed to meet her burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that she was incorrectly charged by the electric utility. The Formal Complaint is granted in part because the Complainant met her burden of proving that she is eligible for a Commission-ordered payment arrangement.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On September 23, 2023, Laura Remaley (Ms. Remaley or Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Company).¹ The Formal Complaint was served on PPL on

¹ The Formal Complaint is a timely appeal of a decision issued by the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) at BCS Case No. 3927476. A timely BCS appeal is subject to *de novo* review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

September 29, 2023. Complainant alleges that PPL is threatening to shut off her service or has already shut off her service, that she would like a payment arrangement, and that there are incorrect charges on her bill. As relief, Ms. Remaley requests that she receive an accurate bill, to be placed on a budget plan that she can afford, that charges for bills for January 2023 and May 2023 be removed, and that any threat to turn off her electric service be removed.

On October 19, 2023, PPL filed an answer to the Formal Complaint. In its answer, PPL denied or admitted the various averments in the Formal Complaint. PPL admitted that Complainant is seeking a payment arrangement with the Company, but denied that PPL issued a termination notice to Ms. Remaley. PPL denied that Complainant's electric service bills contain incorrect charges. PPL admitted that Complainant received an estimated bill for her electric service in December 2022. However, PPL asserted customer usage data was being accurately collected and stored at all times, and PPL denied that the estimated bill was not trued-up to Complainant's actual metered electric usage.

On October 25, 2023, the Commission issued an initial telephonic hearing notice setting a formal call-in telephonic hearing of the Formal Complaint for December 20, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. and assigning the undersigned to this proceeding. In anticipation of the December 20, 2023 hearing, I issued a prehearing order on October 25, 2023, setting forth various rules that would govern that proceeding.

The initial hearing convened on December 20, 2023 as scheduled. Laura Remaley appeared on behalf of herself. The following exhibit offered by Ms. Remaley was admitted into the record:

1. Remaley Exhibit 1 – Fax Cover Letter; Initial Telephonic Hearing Notice; Answer to Formal Complaint; PPL Bill (due date 9/14/23); Formal Complaint with Attachments; and BCS letter dated 8/8/23.

Megan Rulli, Esquire appeared at the hearing on behalf of PPL, along with two witnesses for PPL: Alicia Watkinson, Customer Contact Center Supervisor for PPL, and Kelly Bell, Customer Service Representative for PPL. The following nine exhibits offered by PPL were admitted into the record:

1. PPL Exhibit 1 – Account Activity Statement for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account;
2. PPL Exhibit 2 – Account Contact History for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account;
3. PPL Exhibit 3 – History of Payment Arrangements for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account;
4. PPL Exhibit 4 – Documentation of Ms. Remaley’s informal complaint filed at BCS No. 3927476.
5. PPL Exhibit 5 – Letter dated 7/17/23 from PPL to Ms. Remaley denying her OnTrack application.
6. PPL Exhibit 6 – Customer usage details for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account.
7. PPL Exhibit 7 – Meter reading history for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account.
8. PPL Exhibit 8 – Daily electric usage for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account from November 23, 2022 to December 29, 2022.
9. PPL Exhibit 9 – Daily electric usage for Ms. Remaley’s PPL account from September 29, 2022 to January 26, 2023.

The record in this case consists of the above-referenced exhibits and a transcript of 71 pages. The record closed on January 9, 2024, upon my receipt of the hearing transcript. For the reasons discussed below, the Formal Complaint will be granted in part and denied in part.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant in this case is Laura Remaley.
2. The Respondent in this case is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.
3. The service address at issue in this proceeding is 231 E. 14th Street, Berwick, PA 18603.
4. Ms. Remaley’s PPL account ends in 72048. Tr. 30.
5. Ms. Remaley’s PPL account was opened October 16, 2014. Tr. 31.

6. The winter of 2022-2023 was the first year Ms. Remaley used electric heaters in her house. Tr. 15, 24.

7. Ms. Remaley uses electric heaters because she cannot afford to pay for oil to heat her house. Tr. 15, 23-24.

8. Ms. Remaley received an estimated bill from PPL for the December 2022 billing period (November 23, 2022 to December 29, 2022). Tr. 31; PPL Exh. 1, 7.

9. Ms. Remaley received an estimated bill because PPL's meter data management system was not properly communicating with PPL's customer service system that is used to generate monthly bills. Tr. 31.

10. Ms. Remaley's estimated bill was based on the average daily use in the same month from the prior year multiplied by the number of days in the billing period. Tr. 31.

11. Ms. Remaley's PPL bill issued for the December 2021 billing period reflected 3,129 kilowatt hours (kWh) of actual usage for a 30 day period. Tr. 32; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 7.

12. The average daily usage during the December 2021 billing period was 104.3 kWh. Tr. 32; PPL Exh. 6.

13. Ms. Remaley's PPL bill for the December 2021 billing period was used to generate her estimated bill for the December 2022 billing period. Tr. 32.

14. Ms. Remaley's estimated PPL bill for the December 2022 billing period was based on estimated usage of 3,755 kWh for a 36 day bill period, which reflects an average daily use of 104.3 kWh. Tr. 33; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 7.

15. The total bill amount for Ms. Remaley's estimated PPL bill for the December 2022 billing period was the budget bill amount of \$367. Tr. 33; PPL Exh. 1.

16. Ms. Remaley’s actual kWh usage for the December 2022 billing period was 6,430 kWh. Tr. 33; PPL Exh. 8.

17. PPL did not issue a bill to Ms. Remaley during January 2023. PPL Exh. 1, 6.

18. Ms. Remaley’s PPL bill issued on February 24, 2023 reflected usage of 5,302 kWh for the January 2023 billing period (December 29, 2022 to January 26, 2022) and unbilled usage of 2,675 kWh for the December 2022 billing period. Tr. 34-35; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9.

19. Ms. Remaley’s PPL bill issued on March 27, 2023 reflected actual usage of 9,700 kWh from January 26, 2023 to March 27, 2023. Tr. 35; PPL Exh. 1, 6.

20. Ms. Remaley received a Commission-ordered payment arrangement starting September 29, 2023 (2023 Commission payment arrangement). Tr. 58; PPL Exh. 1, 3, 4.

21. Ms. Remaley’s gross household income at the time she was provided a Commission-ordered payment arrangement was \$5,902 for five adults. PPL Exh. 4.

22. The current gross monthly income for her household is approximately \$4,200 for four adults. Tr. 11, 13-15, 63.

DISCUSSION

Burden of Proof

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. §§ 332(a), 701. In this proceeding, Ms. Remaley filed a Complaint against PPL alleging overbilling and seeking a payment arrangement. Ms. Remaley, therefore, bears 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, Burlison v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982).

Any 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. Dept. of Pub. Welfare, White Haven Ctr.*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

Overbilling Complaint

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).

Although Ms. Remaley is disputing the accuracy of her PPL bills, she did not specify exactly what span of dates she was disputing, e.g., whether she disputed the bills issued in January and February 2023, or charges incurred during the months of January and February 2023. Additionally, PPL did not issue a bill during January 2023. Rather, PPL issued bills to Ms. Remaley on the following dates for the following periods:

- Bill issued December 30, 2023 for the period November 23, 2022 to December 29, 2022. Tr. 31; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 7, 8;
- Bill issued February 24, 2023 for the period December 29, 2022 to January 26, 2023. Tr. 34-35; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 7, 9;
- Bill issued March 27, 2023 for the period January 26, 2023 to March 27, 2023. Tr. 35; PPL Exh. 1, 6.

Therefore, for clarity, this decision analyzes Ms. Remaley's dispute in the context of all three billing periods shown above.

PPL witness Watkinson acknowledged that Ms. Remaley did receive an estimated bill issued December 30, 2023, reflecting 3,755 kWh of estimated usage for the December 2022 billing period. Tr. 31. However, PPL witness Watkinson testified that Ms. Remaley's actual usage for the December 2022 billing period was 6,430 kWh. Tr. 33; PPL Exh. 8. Therefore, the next bill issued by PPL on February 24, 2023 reflected both usage of 5,302 kWh for the January 2023 billing period (December 29, 2022 to January 26, 2023) and the remaining unbilled usage of 2,675 kWh for the December 2022 billing period. Tr. 34-35; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 8, 9. PPL witness Watkinson testified that the PPL bill issued on March 27, 2023 reflected actual usage of 9,700 kWh from January 26, 2023 to March 27, 2023. Tr. 35; PPL Exh. 1, 6.

PPL Exhibit 6 displays the following billing data for comparing billing for the December 2022, January 2023, and February 2023 billing periods with the December, January, and February billing periods for the prior three years:

Billing period	Billing date	Days in bill	Total kWh used	Avg. kWh per day	Total electric service costs	Avg. Temperature
December						
	12/30/2019	32	2139	67	\$356.84	34
	12/30/2020	34	2406	71	\$322.13	32
	12/30/2021	30	3129	104	\$439.42	37
	12/30/2022	36	3755	104	\$712.47	33
January						
	1/28/2020	31	1931	62	\$239.06	40
	1/28/2021	30	2090	70	\$254.97	32
	1/28/2022	30	2552	85	\$348.43	27
	2/24/2023	28	7707	275	\$1,490.96	38
February						
	2/28/2020	30	1803	60	\$301.95	35
	3/01/2021	32	2381	74	\$288.09	28
	2/28/2022	31	2026	65	\$279.05	29
	3/27/2023	60	9700	162	\$1,887.57	38

PPL Exhibit 6.

PPL records do show that Complainant’s electric usage and associated costs for the December 2022, January 2023, and February 2023 billing periods do appear abnormally high when compared to previous years’ billing periods. However, I find that Complainant’s testimony that, for the first time, she used multiple space heaters in her house as a heating source during the winter of 2022 to 2023 provides important context to explain why her electric usage has changed from prior years’ usage. Specifically, Ms. Remaley testified as follows:

Q: Was last year the first year that you used space heaters in the home?

A: Yes, it was.

Q: And how many space heaters did you use?

A: Okay. That’s what I’m trying to explain. One, two, three, four. Four downstairs, and a real small like little clearing in my bedroom and niece and other niece has real little ones though. They don’t turn them on – only for bedtime, that’s it, for a little bit.

Q: And for the space heaters that are downstairs, how often are they plugged in and running?

A: Well, let's see. As cold as it has been right now, I try to keep them on medium. And that would be during the daytime and nighttime. But when it's nice out, the temperatures are up between the 40s and the 50s, I turn them off. And then I'll turn them back on at night.

Q: So on colder days you would run the space heaters all day and all night?

A: Correct, yes.

Tr. 24.

Ms. Remaley also explained that she uses space heaters because she cannot afford to pay for oil to heat her house. Tr. 15. Given this important context providing a basis for increased electric usage, I do not find that Ms. Remaley established a *prima facie* case of overbilling. PPL's witnesses also presented credible and convincing evidence that, despite PPL issuing an estimated bill for the December 2022 billing period, PPL ultimately correctly billed Ms. Remaley for her actual usage for the December 2022, January 2023, and February 2023 billing periods. Tr. 33-35; PPL Exh. 1, 6, 7, 8, 9. Although Ms. Remaley was initially provided an estimated bill for the December 2022 billing period, 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). Here, PPL witness Watkinson testified that Complainant received an estimated PPL bill for the December 2022 billing period because PPL's meter data management system was not properly communicating with PPL's customer service system that is used to generate monthly bills. Tr. 31. PPL witness Watkinson further explained that the bill issued on February 24, 2023 included both actual usage for the January 2023 billing period, as well as the remaining unbilled portion for actual usage during the December 2022 billing period. Tr. 34-35. Additionally, PPL Exhibits 8 and 9 provided the actual usage data for the December 2022 and January 2023 billing periods. Utilities are allowed to render a make-up bill for previously unbilled public utility service. 52 Pa. Code § 56.14. Finally, the PPL

bill issued on March 27, 2023 reflected actual usage of 9,700 kWh from January 26, 2023 to March 27, 2023. Tr. 35; PPL Exh. 1, 6.

Therefore, after considering both parties' evidence, I do not find that Ms. Remaley met her burden of proof to demonstrate that her January and February 2023 bills with PPL were inaccurate.

Payment Arrangement

The Responsible Utility Customer Protection Act, 66 Pa.C.S. §§1401-1419 (Chapter 14), applies to this proceeding. The Commission has the authority to establish a payment arrangement pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(a), within the strict guidelines set forth in 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(b) based on where the household's gross income falls in relation to the federal poverty level guidelines.

Ms. Remaley was granted a Level 2 Commission-ordered payment arrangement totaling \$746 per month in September 2023 when her gross monthly income was reported as \$5,902 for a household of five. PPL Exhibit 4. A Level 2 Commission-ordered payment arrangement is granted to households with a gross monthly household income level exceeding 150% but not exceeding 250% of the Federal poverty level. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(b)(2). PPL witness Bell testified that Ms. Remaley defaulted on her Commission-ordered payment arrangement. Tr. 58. However, Ms. Remaley timely appealed the BCS decision at Case No. 3927476, and a customer cannot be deemed in default of a timely appealed payment arrangement directed by a BCS informal decision until the formal complaint on appeal is ultimately adjudicated and a final order is issued by the Commission. *Kalamets v. Columbia Gas of Pa. Inc.*, Docket No. Z-01701441 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 14, 2005).

At the time Ms. Remaley was granted a Level 2 payment arrangement by BCS, her household income of \$5,902 for five people was between 200% and 225% of the Federal

poverty level.² PPL Exhibit 4. At the time of the hearing, the gross monthly income for her household had decreased to approximately \$4,200 for a household of four, which is between 150% and 175% of the Federal poverty level.³ Tr. 11, 13-15. Notwithstanding my *de novo* review of the BCS determination, even considering Ms. Remaley's decrease in household income and size, her Commission-issue payment arrangement would remain a Level 2 payment arrangement as it is still more than 150% but less than 250% of the Federal Poverty Level. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(b)(2).

During the hearing, Ms. Remaley stated that, if I found that PPL did not render inaccurate bills to her, she would like to be considered for a payment arrangement if both the payment arrangement for her arrears as well as her current bill were approximately \$150 a month. Tr. 17-18. However, Chapter 14 limits the types of payment arrangements that the Commission may order. Therefore, to resolve Ms. Remaley's unpaid balance, the Commission may establish a payment arrangement for three years. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(b)(2). At the time of the hearing, Ms. Remaley's unpaid balance with PPL was approximately \$6,000. PPL Exhibit 1. Payments on a Commission-ordered payment arrangement for Ms. Remaley's unpaid balance alone are likely to exceed \$150 per month.⁴ Nonetheless, this is the only type of payment arrangement that Ms. Remaley can be provided under Chapter 14. It is notable that Ms. Remaley has a generally consistent history of making regular payments in full on her account. PPL Exhibit 1. Ms. Remaley is implored to adhere to the Commission payment arrangement to return her PPL account to current status, considering the Commission is limited in providing types of payment arrangements as discussed above.

² See Federal Register, Vol. 88, No. 12 at 3424 (January 19, 2023). See also, <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1c92a9207f3ed5915ca020d58fe77696/detailed-guidelines-2023.pdf>.

³ See Federal poverty guidelines, 89 Fed. Reg. 2961 (Jan. 17, 2024); <https://aspe.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/documents/7240229f28375f54435c5b83a3764cd1/detailed-guidelines-2024.pdf>.

⁴ \$6,000 / 36 months = \$166.67 per month.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

2. The party seeking relief from the Commission has the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

3. "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).

4. 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.

5. 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).

6. 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).

7. 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).

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

9. The Responsible Utility Customer Protection Act, 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 1401-1419, applies to this proceeding.

10. The Commission is authorized to establish a payment arrangement between a public utility and a customer. 66 Pa.C.S. §1405(a).

11. Complainant has failed to satisfy her burden of proof in this proceeding to demonstrate that her PPL bills were not accurate. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

12. A customer cannot be deemed in default of a timely appealed payment arrangement directed by a BCS informal decision until the formal complaint on appeal is ultimately adjudicated and a final order is issued by the Commission. *Kalamets v. Columbia Gas of Pa. Inc.*, Docket No. Z-01701441 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 14, 2005).

13. Complainant has met her burden of proving she is entitled to a Level 2 Commission ordered payment arrangement on her balance. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(b), (d).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Formal Complaint filed by Laura Remaley at *Laura Remaley v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, Docket Number F-2023-3043331, is granted in part and denied in part consistent with the above discussion.

2. That Laura Remaley shall make monthly payments consisting of her current budget bill plus one-thirty-sixth (1/36th) of the arrearage owed on the account, beginning with the first billing due date following the entry of the Commission's Final Order in this case, and continuing thereafter on the due date for the payment of each regular monthly bill.

3. That as long as Laura Remaley maintains the terms of the payment arrangement stated herein PPL Electric Utilities Corporation shall not suspend or terminate her utility service except for valid safety or emergency reasons or assess late payments or finance charges against her account.

4. That if Laura Remaley does not keep the payment schedule stated herein PPL Electric Utilities Corporation is authorized to suspend or terminate her utility service in accordance with the Public Utility Code and Commission regulations.

5. That the Secretary's Bureau shall mark this case as closed.

Dated: April 4, 2024

/s/
John M. Coogan
Administrative Law Judge