

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Ivan Pauline	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2023-3043686
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This decision denies the Formal Complaint of Ivan Pauline because the Complainant failed to appear at the scheduled hearing and prosecute his Complaint.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On October 3, 2023, Ivan Pauline (Mr. Pauline or Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PECO Energy Company (PECO, the Company, or Respondent) alleging that PECO's bills are confusing, and that there are incorrect charges on his bills from PECO.¹ As relief, Mr. Pauline seeks the Commission's assistance in rectifying the situation.

¹ The Complaint is a timely appeal from the determination of the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS), at BCS No. 3911567, which dismissed Complainant's informal complaint. A timely BCS appeal is subject to de novo review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

On November 8, 2023, the Respondent filed an Answer denying all material allegations of fact and conclusions of law in the Complaint.

A Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice dated December 21, 2023, notified the parties that an initial call-in telephone hearing was scheduled for March 7, 2024, at 10:00 a.m. The Hearing Notice stated, “You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present evidence on the issue(s) raised.”

On February 12, 2024, I issued a Prehearing Order. The Prehearing Order directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and warned in bold type: **“You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present evidence on the issues raised.”**

The Hearing Notice and the Prehearing Order were eServed on the Complainant at the email address registered with the Commission by the Complainant.² None of the emails sent by the Commission to the Complainant were returned as undeliverable.

The hearing convened as scheduled on March 7, 2024. Khadijah Scott, Esq. appeared representing the Respondent. The Complainant failed to call in to the hearing. The Complainant was given an additional 15 minutes to call in but failed to do so.

At the hearing, counsel for the Company moved that the Complaint be dismissed for lack of prosecution pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.245. That Motion is granted pursuant to the ordering paragraphs below.

The Complainant has not contacted the Commission to explain why his failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

² Both the Complainant and Respondent have selected to enroll in the Commission’s e-Filing Subscription Service (eService) and were served via eService.

The record in this matter closed on April 2, 2024, upon receipt of the hearing transcript.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Ivan Pauline.
2. The Respondent is PECO Energy Company.
3. On October 3, 2023, Mr. Pauline filed a Complaint alleging that PECO's bills are confusing, and that there are incorrect charges on his bills from PECO.
4. As relief, the Complainant requests the Commission's assistance in rectifying the situation.
5. On November 8, 2023, the Respondent filed an Answer denying all material allegations of fact and conclusions of law in the Complaint.
6. A Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice dated December 21, 2023, notified the parties that an initial call-in telephone hearing was scheduled for March 7, 2024, at 10:00 a.m.
7. The December 21, 2023, Hearing Notice stated, "You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present evidence on the issue(s) raised."
8. A Prehearing Order issued on February 12, 2024, directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and warned in bold type: "**You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present evidence on the issues raised.**"
9. The Hearing Notice and the Prehearing Order were eServed upon the Complainant at the email address he provided to and registered with the Commission.

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

11. The Complainant failed to appear at the March 7, 2024, hearing.

12. The Complainant did not request a continuance, withdraw the Complaint, or otherwise notify the Commission to explain why his failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

DISCUSSION

In his Complaint, Mr. Pauline alleged that PECO's bills are confusing, and that there are incorrect charges on his bills from PECO. As relief, Mr. Pauline seeks the Commission's assistance in rectifying the situation.

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

Administrative agencies, like the Public Utility Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. This requirement is satisfied when the parties are afforded notice and the opportunity to appear and be heard. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984). Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were eServed to the email address registered with the Commission by the Complainant. Neither was returned to the Commission as undeliverable. Accordingly, it must be presumed that these documents sent to Complainant were received by Complainant. *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Order entered Dec. 19, 2019) (*Hu*); *Zirkel v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered Apr. 7, 2017) (*Zirkel*); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered Jan. 24, 2017) (*Morella*).

As the Commission noted in *Strydio v. PPL Electric Utilities Corp.*, Docket No. C-2017-2633043 at 6 (Opinion and Order entered July 18, 2018), "[o]nce notice of a hearing and the opportunity to be heard have been provided by the Commission, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing." (citing, *Mumma v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Opinion and Order entered Jan. 24, 2002)); *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 25, 1993).

The Complainant was notified of the scheduled hearing and did not appear for the hearing. Additionally, the December 21, 2023, Hearing Notice, and the February 12, 2024, Prehearing Order advised the Complainant that the case could be dismissed for failure to call in and participate in the hearing. Both the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations provide that, after being notified, a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing shall be deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted to later reopen the matter or be permitted to recall excused witnesses. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a). Thus, the Complainant has waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing by failing to appear. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995).

Additionally, Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a), places the burden of proof upon the proponent of any request for relief. By failing to appear and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, the Complainant has failed to meet this burden. Consequently, the Complaint will be dismissed on this basis as well. *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995); *El-Ayazra v. W. Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. F-2015-2509292 (Opinion and Order entered June 30, 2016); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245.

Finally, the party who failed to appear at the hearing has the burden of explaining why his failure to appear was unavoidable. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); *Herr v. West Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3028202 (Opinion and Order entered Sept. 15, 2022). When there are no facts in the record that the party's failure to appear was unavoidable, the complaint should be dismissed. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order

entered Apr. 22, 2022); *Little v. Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Auth.*, Docket No. F-2021-3027107 (Opinion and Order entered Feb. 7, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3000734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a). There are no facts on the record that suggest that Complainant's failure to appear was unavoidable. Therefore, the Complaint will be dismissed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

2. The Complainant received notice of the hearing. *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Order entered Dec. 19, 2019); *Zirkel v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered Apr. 7, 2017); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered Jan. 31, 2017).

3. The due process rights of the Complainant have been fully protected in this proceeding and Complainant's failure to appear was not unavoidable. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

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

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

6. If there are no facts in the record that a party's failure to appear at a hearing was unavoidable, the complaint should be dismissed. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 22, 2022); *Little v. Pittsburgh*

