

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Jessie Williams Epps	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2023-3041068
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
Arlene Ashton  
Administrative Law Judge

**INTRODUCTION**

This Initial Decision dismisses the Complainant’s Formal Complaint because she failed to sustain her burden of proving that PPL Electric Utilities Corporation violated any Commission statutes, regulations or orders concerning charges on her bill or customer service rendered to her.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On June 23, 2023, Jessie Williams Epps (Complainant or Ms. Williams Epps) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Respondent) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission). In the Complaint, the Complainant indicated that there were incorrect charges on her bills and that she received poor customer service from PPL.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Complainant failed to request a specific remedy to address the issues raised in the Complaint.

On June 21, 2023, Respondent filed an Answer denying the material allegations of the Complaint.

On October 4, 2023, a Hearing Notice was issued which indicated an initial hearing was scheduled in the matter for December 4, 2023, at 10:00 a.m., and assigned to me. I issued a Prehearing Order on October 11, 2023.

The initial hearing in this matter was held as scheduled on December 4, 2023. The Complainant appeared *pro se* and provided limited testimony on her own behalf. Respondent appeared and was represented by Megan E. Rulli, Esq., who was ready to present the testimony of three witness: Holy Hankerson, Senior Customer Service Representative; Joseph Chunko, Supervising Engineer for Metering Support; and Thomas McAteer, Manager of Energy Efficiency. No exhibits were admitted into the record. Shortly after the Complainant began to provide testimony, she requested a continuance to obtain documentation that she wished to enter into the record in support of her case. Respondent objected to the request, however, in light of the Complainant's *pro se* status, her request was granted.

On December 4, 2023, a Further Hearing Notice was issued which indicated a further call-in telephonic hearing was scheduled in the matter for January 24, 2024, at 1:30 p.m.

The Further Hearing in this matter was held as scheduled on January 24, 2024. The Complainant appeared *pro se* and provided testimony on her own behalf. Ms. Williams Epps also presented the testimony of one witness, Khaleem Mohammed. Respondent appeared at the further hearing and was represented by Megan E. Rulli, Esq., who presented the testimony of three witness, Holly Hankerson, Joseph Chunko and Thomas McAteer.

At the Further Hearing, the Complainant offered ten exhibits in support of her testimony and claims. Respondent's counsel raised objections to two of the exhibits. I deferred my ruling on the objections and informed the parties that my ruling would be reflected in the initial decision. In the ordering paragraphs below, one of the Respondent's objections is sustained, one is denied and nine of the Complainant's proposed exhibits are entered into the

record for this matter. The Respondent offered ten exhibits, all of which were entered into the record at the time of the further hearing.

The hearings resulted in a 180-page transcript. The record closed on February 14, 2024, when I received the transcript.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant in this case is Jessie Williams Epps, who resides at 7056 Vista Drive, Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania 18466 (Service Address). Tr. 5-6.

2. The Respondent in this case is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.

3. The Complainant's home is heated and cooled by an electric heat pump system, installed in 2006. Tr. 138; PPL Exh. 8.

4. The Complainant's heating system is equipped with an "emergency heat" setting. Tr. 139, 141.

5. The emergency heat setting can be triggered manually by the homeowner or automatically by the heating system without any action by the homeowner. Tr. 147, 141.

6. The emergency heat setting can be triggered automatically during extremely cold weather, if the system has difficulty maintaining a chosen temperature setting or if there are mechanical issues with the system. Tr. 139, 141.

7. A heating and cooling system equipped with a heat pump should be serviced annually. Tr. 142.

8. Failure to perform preventive maintenance on a heating and cooling system equipped with a heat pump can impact system performance. Tr. 141-142.

9. Air filters for a heat pump system should be replaced on a monthly, quarterly, semi-annual or annual basis, depending upon the quality of the filter installed. Tr. 146.

10. The air filters on the heat pump in the Complainant's home were not changed from 2016 through August 2023. Tr. 56; PPL Exh. 3.

11. The Complainant received an electric bill in January 2023 in the amount of \$1,336.25. Tr. 46; Comp. Exh. 4.

12. The Complainant received an electric bill in February 2023 in the amount of \$1,747. Tr. 46; Comp. Exh. 5.

13. The Complainant's electric bills issued in January and February 2023 were issued based on actual meter readings. Tr. 95; PPL Exh. 12.

14. On February 27, 2023, the Complainant hired an electrician to determine if there was any irregularity with the Complainant's home that could account for the change in her recent electric bills. Tr. 66, 68, 77-79.

15. The Complainant's electrician did not find anything irregular with the electrical panel or uncommon with the load at the Complainant's home. Tr. 67-68.

16. The Complainant's electrician advised the Complainant to contact PPL and to have the meter replaced. Tr. 68-70; Comp. Exh. 1.

17. On March 27, 2023, the Complainant contacted PPL and reported to a customer service representative that based on an inspection by an electrician, her meter was not running correctly, that the off-balance light was flashing, the meter numbers did not match the meter number on her bill, and that her usage shown on her bill was at a level used by a large building. Tr. 107-108; PPL Exh. 13.

18. On March 27, 2023, the Complainant requested a meter test. Tr. 108; PPL Exh. 13.

19. On March 30, 2023, PPL tested the Complainant's meter, found that it was functioning properly and issued a letter to the Complainant informing her of the test results. Tr. 123 - 124, 108; PPL Exh. 4, 13.

20. The Complainant contacted PPL by telephone on January 25, 2023, to discuss her high bills. Tr. 107.

21. PPL responded to the Complainant's January 25, 2023 call by providing information concerning energy provider shopping, budget billing, establishing a payment agreement, contacting PPL's CARES program via email, providing information about PPL's WRAP program, and providing contact information for third-party customer assistance programs. Tr. 107; PPL Exh 5, 9.

22. The Complainant enrolled in budget billing, with a monthly rate of \$506 for bills issued in February, March and April 2023. Tr. 96, 107. PPL Exh. 12, 13.

23. The Complainant made payments of \$300 rather than the budget amount of \$506 with respect to PPL bills issued in the months of February, March, and April 2023. Tr. 47, 97-98; PPL Exh. 12.

24. PPL conducted an energy audit of the Complainant's home on August 7, 2023. Tr. 54-55, 137; PPL Exh. 8.

25. PPL's energy audit found that no preventative service or maintenance had been done on the Complainant's heat pump system since 2016, the heat pump air filter was extremely dirty, the home was not well insulated, there was "moderate" air leakage, and the blower motor needed to be replaced. Tr. 139-141, 160; PPL Exh. 7, 8.

## DISCUSSION

### Legal Standard

The Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), places the burden of proof upon the proponent of a rule or order. As the proponent of a rule or order, complainant has the burden of proof in this matter pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

To establish a sufficient case and satisfy the burden of proof, complainant must show that the respondent public utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the Complaint. *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (1990), *Feinstein v. Phila. Sub. Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (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 preponderance of the evidence is evidence that is more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950). Additionally, any finding of fact necessary to support the Commission's adjudication must be based upon substantial evidence. *Mill v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 447 A.2d 1100 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982); *Edan Transp. Corp. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 623 A.2d 6 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993); 2 Pa.C.S. § 704. More is required than a mere trace of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact sought to be established. *Norfolk and W. Ry. 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. 1960); *Murphy v. Dep't of Pub. Welfare, White Haven Ctr.*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

Upon the presentation by the complainant of evidence sufficient to initially satisfy the burden of proof, the burden of going forward with the evidence to rebut the evidence of the complainant shifts to the respondent. If the evidence presented by the respondent is of co-equal weight, the complainant has not satisfied his burden of proof. The complainant would be required to provide additional evidence to rebut the evidence of the respondent. *Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982).

While the burden of persuasion may shift back and forth during a proceeding, the burden of proof never shifts. The burden of proof always remains on the party seeking affirmative relief from the Commission. *Milkie v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 768 A.2d 1217 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001).

The burden of proof for “high bill” complaints has been explained in *Waldron v. Philadelphia Electric Co.*, 54 Pa.P.U.C. 98 (1980) (*Waldron*), and its progeny. In *Waldron*, the Commission adopted the Michigan Public Service Commission’s (PSC’s) policy announced in *Hallifax v. O & A Electric Co-Op*, Case No. U-5825, May 1979, which stated that, while the accuracy of the meter is an important factor in resolving billing disputes, it is not the sole criterion. The Commission stated that it will also consider the following factors: the billing history of the complainant; any change in the number of occupants residing at the household; the potential for energy utilization; and any other relevant facts or circumstances that are brought to light during the complaint proceeding. *Waldron* at 100.

The Commission explained the burden of proof set forth in *Waldron* as follows:

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 v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2187197, at 5 (Opinion and Order entered Nov. 15, 2011).

Utility companies are required by law to provide the Complainants with adequate and reasonable service. Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code Section states:

**§ 1501. Character of service and facilities.**

Every public utility shall furnish and maintain adequate, efficient, safe and reasonable service and facilities, and shall make all such repairs, changes, alterations, substitutions, extensions, and improvements in or to such service and facilities as shall be necessary or proper for the accommodation, convenience and safety of its patrons, employees and the public. Such service also shall be reasonably continuous and without unreasonable interruptions or delay. Such service and facilities shall be in conformity with the regulations and orders of the Commission.

66 Pa.C.S. § 1501. This section does not require utility companies to provide perfect service. *Elkin v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 372 A.2d 1203 (Pa. Super 1987).

Evidentiary Issues

As noted above, at the Further Hearing held on January 24, 2024, the Complainant offered ten exhibits in support of her testimony and claims. Respondent's counsel raised objections as to two of the exhibits. I deferred my ruling on the objections and informed the parties that my ruling would be reflected in the initial decision. My rulings on the Respondent's objections are discussed below and reflected in the ordering paragraphs of this decision.

Respondent's counsel raised a hearsay objection with respect to Complainant's proposed Exhibit 1, a PROTECH ELECTRIC, LLC. (ProTech) Job Work Order dated 2/27/2023. Responding to the objection, the Complainant conceded that the person who wrote the document did not appear at the hearing. However, she argued that the document should come into the record because she "had no choice in that decision. But he wrote it, and I think that it should stand." Tr. 90.

In his testimony, the Complainant's witness, Khaleem Mohammed, indicated that he did not prepare Complainant's proposed Exhibit 1 and was not physically present at the

Service Address when the work was performed. However, he established that: (a) he is a licensed electrician employed by ProTech, (b) he dispatched the technician who performed the work and is familiar with the work performed by the technician, (c) the document was prepared in the ordinary course of business on the date of the inspection, (d) on the day of the inspection he spoke to the technician who performed the work at the Service Address before and after the inspection was completed, and (e) he discussed the recommended action shown on the invoice. Accordingly, Complainant Exhibit 1 will be entered into the record. Tr. 18-19, 68-69, 78-80.<sup>2</sup>

Counsel raised a relevance objection with respect to Complainant's proposed Exhibit 10, a Commission Press Release dated November 22, 2023, entitled "Joint Settlement Proposed by PUC's Independent Bureau of Investigations and Enforcement and PPL Addresses Missing Bills, Inaccurate Bill Estimates, and Customer Service Shortcoming."<sup>3</sup> Counsel argued that "nothing in the press release relates to Ms. Epps' case." Tr 86-87. Counsel also observed that under the terms of the settlement, "PPL has made no confession or admission of fact or laws and can dispute all issues of fact and law for all purposes in all proceedings that may arise as a result of the circumstances described in the settlement agreement." Tr. 87. Responding to the objection, the Complainant indicated that she felt that the press release was relevant because "it speaks to what was happening to me." Tr. 88.

While the Press Release briefly summarizes certain facts and circumstances investigated by the Commission's Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E) which may be similar or even identical to those presented by Ms. Williams Epps in this matter, the outcome of that investigation has resulted in a proposed settlement, which has not yet received final Commission approval. Even if the proposed settlement receives the Commission's final approval, by its terms it would not dictate the result in this case because, as counsel observed,

---

<sup>2</sup> See Pa.R.E. 803(6), *Ganster v. W. P. Water Co.*, 504 A.2d 186 (Pa. Super. 1985); *Gasparro v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-00015482 (Opinion and Order entered April 22, 2002). While the document is part of the record, the Complainant's testimony as to her discussion with the technician who conducted the inspection was ruled hearsay and was not considered in rendering this decision. Tr. 71.

<sup>3</sup> The case discussed in the Press Release is at Docket # M-2023-3038060. By Commission Opinion and Order dated January 18, 2024, the Settlement Agreement was published in the Pennsylvania Bulletin on February 3, 2024 to provide an opportunity for interested parties to file comments regarding the proposed Settlement on or before February 28, 2024.

PPL made no admission of fact or laws. Therefore, the Press Release concerning the Settlement Agreement is not relevant to this matter and will not be admitted into the record.

The Complainant's remaining nine proposed exhibits are entered into the record for this matter.

Positions of the Parties

Here, the Complainant contends that the PPL bills she has received since January 2023 are incorrect because she had never received bills of such a high amount in the past. Tr. 17, 47. Ms. Williams Epps testified that she was so shocked by the amount of her PPL bills for January and February 2023 that she contacted an electrician to determine if there was any irregularity with her home or electric meter that could account for the change in her recent electric bills. Tr. 17-18, 47, 66, 68, 77-79. Ms. Williams Epps also testified that the technician advised her to contact PPL and to have the meter replaced. Tr. 68-70.

The Complainant's witness, Mr. Mohammed testified that the technician examined the electric panel at the Complainant's home and tested every load on the panel but did not find anything irregular with the electrical panel or uncommon with the load at the Complainant's home. Tr. 66-68.

Testimony and evidence presented by Respondent demonstrate that compared to the bills for January and February in 2020-2022, the Complainant's 2023 bills were significantly higher. PPL records reflect the following charges for service to the Complainant for the months of January and February for the years 2020 through 2023.

<u>Mo. Bill Issued</u>	<u>Year</u>			
	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>
January	\$ 602.50	\$ 312.06	\$ 488.05	\$ 1,747.18
February	\$ 346.91	\$ 253.68	\$ 914.67	\$ 1,953.18

Tr. 95-97; PPL Exh. 12.

PPL's Senior Customer Service Representative, Ms. Hankerson testified that because the Complainant's bills were based on actual, not estimated, meter readings they accurately reflect the service provided to the Complainant based on usage. Tr. 95-97, 112. Mr. Chunko, another PPL witness testified that at the Complainant's request, her meter was removed and tested on March 30, 2023. Tr. 124. He also testified that the meter was found to be within all applicable tolerances and was accurately recording electric consumption. Tr. 123-124; PPL Exh. 4. Commenting on the increase in the Complainant's usage in early 2023, he suggested that the increase in the Complainant's usage may have been attributable to the condition of the home and the condition and operation of the heat pump in the home. Tr. 129-130.

The testimony of Thomas McAteer, PPL's Manager of Energy Efficiency supported Mr. Chunko's testimony. Mr. McAteer discussed in detail the operation of a heat pump for "regular" and "emergency" heat<sup>4</sup> and noted that the energy audit conducted by PPL at the Complainant's home in August 2023 revealed problems and issues with the Complainant's HVAC system, the motors used by the system and the "stack effect" taking place in the house.<sup>5</sup> Tr. 139, 148.

In the Complaint and in testimony at the hearing, Ms. Williams Epps also alleged that PPL provided poor customer service. Tr. 47; Complaint Attachment. In her testimony, she stated that when she contacted PPL customer service concerning her high bills "they really weren't listening to what I was saying." Tr. 47.

---

<sup>4</sup> Mr. McAteer described "emergency heat" as a setting that operates "when the heat pump can't effectively heat the home or it's inoperable . . . a series of electric resistance coils." Tr. 139. He noted that, at the time of the audit, the thermostat was set to emergency heat. Tr. 139. He observed that use of emergency heat during cold weather could raise consumption on a system "by three to five times what the standard heat pump operation would be." Tr. 140.

<sup>5</sup> According to Mr. McAteer, the "stack affect" refers to the loss of hot air through areas in the upper part of a building or home caused by the intake of cold air at a lower level. Tr. 148-149.

PPL witnesses Holly Hankerson and Joseph Chunko responded to the Complainant's claims of poor customer service. Ms. Hankerson provided detailed testimony as to PPL's efforts to respond to concerns raised by Ms. Williams Epp in conversations with PPL customer service agents by the Complainant concerning her bills and her meter beginning on January 24, 2023. Based on Ms. Hankerson's testimony, it appears that PPL responded to each of the Complainant's calls and promptly provided assistance and guidance as to resolution of the issue or concern through PPL resources and third-party resources. Moreover, the record demonstrates that as a result of PPL's actions, the Complainant was enrolled in budget billing and was provided information on PPL's debt forgiveness program. In addition, PPL provided her with information on energy savings, conducted a home energy audit and arranged for home weatherization assistance for her home, without charge to her. Tr. 105-111; PPL Exh. 4, 11, 13.

Mr. Chunko testified that the meter test was conducted on March 30, 2023, just three days after Ms. Williams Epps requested it. In addition to promptly testing the meter, by letter dated April 5, 2023, the Complainant was informed of the test results and provided with information on energy conservation measures that could be taken to reduce energy consumption. Tr. 124; PPL Exhibit 4, 13.

### Analysis and Disposition

#### *Incorrect Billing*

The Complainant's claims of incorrect billing are grounded in the spike in her PPL bills for January and February 2023, which she found shocking.<sup>6</sup> Evidence presented by the Respondent demonstrates that that her bills for those months were, indeed, more than double the highest amount for the same month in any of the prior two years. The increase alone is sufficient to support a *prima facie* case of incorrect billing. However, the Respondent rebutted Complainant's *prima facie* case of incorrect billing through clear and convincing testimony and

---

<sup>6</sup> The Complainant specifically testified that she was not contesting the PPL bill for December 2022. Tr. 112; *see also* Tr. 46 -47.

evidence that the Complainant's bills were based on actual usage as reported by her electric meter, which was functioning properly.

As noted above, under *Waldron* the accuracy of the meter is an important factor in resolving billing disputes, but other factors including the potential for energy utilization and other relevant facts or circumstances may be considered where improper billing is alleged. PPL witness McAteer provided extensive testimony and sponsored documentary evidence in support PPL's argument that the Complainant's high bills were the result of poor heating system maintenance and/or conditions at the home.

The Complainant failed to present additional evidence to rebut the Respondent's evidence as to the accuracy of the meter or the conditions in the home that may have led to the spike in her bills. Indeed, the Complainant's own testimony confirming that there had been little to no system maintenance for many years lends credibility to the testimony and evidence presented by PPL.

It is well established that mere traces of evidence or a suspicion of the existence of a fact sought to be established do not constitute evidence. Therefore, a complainant cannot establish a case merely by stating his or her personal beliefs.<sup>7</sup> The evidence of record suggests that the Complainant's bills are the result of a heating system installed in 2006 and poorly maintained since 2016, as well as other conditions in the home impacting the operation of the system. As such, the Complainant has failed to meet her burden to demonstrate that her bills were incorrect, and this portion of her Complaint must be dismissed.

#### *Unreasonable Service*

The Complainant also alleged that PPL provided poor customer service. However, PPL provided extensive testimony and documentation demonstrating that it responded

---

<sup>7</sup> *Mid-Atl. Power Supply Ass'n of Pa. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 746 A.2d 1196, 1200 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000) (citing *Pa. Bur. of Corr. v. City of Pittsburgh*, 532 A.2d 12 (Pa. 1987)); see also *Steffy's Pattern Shop v. Frontier Commc'n of Pa., Inc.*, Docket No. R-00994808 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 3, 2000).

promptly and fully to each of her customer assistance calls and inquiries. Ms. Williams Epps did not refute, dispute or discredit testimony of PPL's witnesses' testimony on the issue of customer service. As a result, I must conclude that the Complainant has failed to carry the burden of proving that PPL provided unreasonable service to her.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

2. Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), the burden of proof in this proceeding is upon the Complainant.

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); *Murphy v. Pa. Dep't of Pub. Welfare, White Haven Ctr.*, 480 A.2d 382 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

9. The accuracy of the meter is an important factor in resolving billing disputes, but it is not the sole criterion. The Commission will also consider other factors, including the potential for energy utilization and any other relevant facts or circumstances that are brought to light during the complaint proceeding. *Thomas v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2187197 (Opinion and Order entered Nov. 15, 2011), *Waldron v. Phila. Elec. Co.*, 54 Pa.P.U.C. 98 (1980).

10. Utility companies are required to provide reasonable service. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

11. Section 1501 of Title 66 of the Public Utility Code does not require utility companies to provide perfect service. *Elkin v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 372 A.2d 1203 (Pa. Super 1987); 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

12. The Complainant failed to satisfy the burden of proving that she was incorrectly billed for service provided by Respondent. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

13. Respondent provided reasonable service consistent with Section 1501 of Title 66 of the Public Utility Code. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Respondent's objection to Complainant's proposed Exhibit 10 is sustained;
2. That the Respondent's objection to Complainant's proposed Exhibit 1 is denied;
3. That the Complainant's proposed Exhibits 1-9 are entered into the record;
4. That the Complaint of Jessie Williams Epps at Jessie Williams Epps v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, Docket No. C-2023-3041068 is denied and dismissed; and
5. That the record at Docket No. C-2023-3041068 be marked closed.

Date: May 15, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Arlene Ashton  
Administrative Law Judge