

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Laura Farina	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2022-3030803
	:	
Metropolitan Edison Company	:	

**CONTINUANCE ORDER**

On December 9, 2021, Laura Farina (Ms. Farina or Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint against Metropolitan Edison Company (Met-Ed or Company). The Formal Complaint was served on Met-Ed on February 9, 2022. The Complainant alleges that Met-Ed’s smart meter is unsafe and unhealthy. As relief, Ms. Farina requests that the smart meter be replaced with an analog meter at no cost, and that she not be charged a monthly fee for having an analog meter.

On March 2, 2022, Met-Ed filed a letter, stating that Met-Ed would respond to the Formal Complaint when the Commission lifts its stay on smart meter formal complaint proceedings at Docket No. M-2009-2092655.<sup>1</sup>

On April 5, 2023, Ms. Farina filed a letter with the Commission inquiring about the status of her case.

---

<sup>1</sup> By Order entered November 4, 2020, the Commission ordered that any formal complaint filed with the Commission on or after November 4, 2020, challenging an electric distribution company’s deployment of smart meter technology as being in violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501 is to be stayed until the Commission takes further action to lift the stay. *See, Smart Meter Procurement and Installation*, Docket No. M-2009-2092655 (Order entered November 4, 2020).

On May 11, 2023, I was assigned to preside over this proceeding. Also on May 11, 2023, I issued an order advising the parties that this matter was stayed until further direction by the Commission.

By order entered November 14, 2023, the Commission lifted the general stay of smart meter proceedings and directed the Office of Administrative Law Judge to proceed with pending formal complaint proceedings as directed by the presiding administrative law judge.

On December 4, 2023, Met-Ed filed an answer and new matter to the Complaint. In the answer, Met-Ed denied that the smart meter installed at Ms. Farina's service location is unsafe or unhealthy. Met-Ed further alleges that it is legally required to install the smart meter, and that a customer cannot opt-out of, or rescind, a smart meter installation. In its new matter, Met-Ed asserts that, consistent with the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's decision in *Povacz*,<sup>2</sup> Met-Ed customers may only receive a smart meter related accommodation ordered by the Commission if they are able to establish a violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 1501. Met-Ed further asserts that it is willing and available to discuss with Complainant the option under its tariff that a customer may request that the meter be relocated to a mutually agreeable location, subject to the customer bearing the related expenses.<sup>3</sup> However, Met-Ed reiterates that its tariff does not allow customers, such as Complainant, to opt-out of the smart meter installation. Met-Ed's new matter included a notice to plead. The Complainant did not file a reply to Met-Ed's new matter.

On January 5, 2024, the Commission issued a telephonic prehearing conference notice setting a call-in telephonic prehearing conference for this matter for March 1, 2024 at 10:00 a.m. In anticipation of that prehearing conference, I issued a prehearing conference order

---

<sup>2</sup> *Povacz v. Pa. PUC*, 2022 Pa. LEXIS 1598 (Pa. 2022). In *Povacz*, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court resolved many of the outstanding legal issues in many smart meter cases. The court held, among other things, that under Act 129, customers have no right to refuse smart meter installation. *Id.* at 997. The court further clarified the burden of proof required to support a claim that the installation of a smart meter violates the safe and reasonable service requirement of Section 1501 of the Public Utility Code. 66 Pa. C.S. § 1501. Specifically, the court held that to prove that a smart meter is unsafe service under Section 1501, a complainant must support that allegation with expert testimony. *Id.* at 1006.

<sup>3</sup> See Met-Ed Tariff Rule 4, Electric Pa. P.U.C. No. 52, Original Page 32.

on January 5, 2024, setting forth various rules that would govern the March 1, 2024 prehearing conference.

The March 1, 2024 prehearing conference was held as scheduled. Counsel for Met-Ed, Daniel Garcia, appeared at the prehearing conference. Ms. Farina did not appear.<sup>4</sup> As was stated in the prehearing conference order, failure of a party to participate in the conference, after being served with notice of the date, time, and location thereof, without good cause shown, shall constitute a waiver of all objections to the agreements reached, and an order or ruling with respect thereto. 52 Pa.Code § 5.222(e). At the prehearing conference, I directed that, before an evidentiary hearing is scheduled, several steps should take place, including identification of expert witnesses, which is a requirement per *Povacz*. During the prehearing conference, I also granted counsel for Met-Ed's request that written testimony be permitted in this proceeding.<sup>5</sup> Accordingly, on March 1, 2024, I issued an order directing the parties to: identify by April 26, 2024 any experts they may wish to provide testimony in this proceeding, along with a summary of the expected testimony of each expert; submit a status report, as well as written direct testimony and proposed exhibits by June 14, 2024; submit written rebuttal testimony and proposed exhibits by July 19, 2024; and confer and propose to me evidentiary hearing dates for August and/or September 2024.

On April 26, 2024, Met-Ed submitted a letter, identifying one expected witness, along with the expected subject matter of the witness's testimony. Ms. Farina did not submit information regarding any potential witness by April 26, 2024.

On June 14, 2024, Met-Ed submitted a letter, identifying a new witness that it expected to present at an evidentiary hearing, and noting that the Company had not, to date, received Ms. Farina's witness information. Met-Ed's letter also requested a one-day telephonic

---

<sup>4</sup> The prehearing conference convened at 10:00 a.m. but did not start until 10:15 a.m. to provide Ms. Farina additional time to appear.

<sup>5</sup> Use of written testimony in Commission proceedings is encouraged, especially in connection with the testimony of expert witnesses. 52 Pa. Code § 5.412.

evidentiary hearing. Also on June 14, 2024, Met-Ed submitted exhibits that it intends to present at a future evidentiary hearing. Met-Ed did not submit written testimony by June 14, 2024.

On June 18, 2024, I received a letter from Ms. Farina dated June 7, 2024 (June 7 letter), which stated that she did not receive any mail advising her to respond to any hearing or advise of witnesses by a set date. Ms. Farina's June 7 letter identified two witnesses. Ms. Farina's letter also requested to be advised of a hearing date. Ms. Farina did not submit written testimony by June 14, 2024.

Also on June 18, 2024, I forwarded the June 7 letter to counsel for Met-Ed by e-mail, copying Ms. Farina, and informed parties that I would like to issue a modified scheduling order, changing the requirement from submitting written testimony to the expectation that parties will present their testimony orally at an evidentiary hearing. On June 21, 2024, I issued an order modifying the March 1, 2024 Order Establishing Litigation Schedule, and provided instructions on how to participate in a telephonic evidentiary hearing scheduled for September 27, 2024, beginning at 10 a.m.

On June 26, 2024, I received a letter from Ms. Farina dated June 19, 2024 (June 19 letter), stating that she is not available for a hearing between August 5, 2024 and August 7, 2024, or between September 25, 2024 and September 30, 2024. Also on June 26, 2024, I forwarded the June 19 letter to counsel for Met-Ed by e-mail, copying Ms. Farina, stating that I would treat Ms. Farina's letter as a request for continuance of the September 27, 2024 hearing, and asked that counsel for Met-Ed let me know as soon as possible if there were any objections to granting a continuance. I informed parties that if there were no objections, I would reschedule the September 27, 2024 hearing to September 13, 2024, beginning at 10 a.m. I have received no objections to rescheduling the hearing to September 13, 2024. The purpose of this order is to formalize the continuance of the September 27, 2024 hearing.

Section 5.483 of the Commission's regulations provides presiding officers with the authority to regulate the course of proceedings. 52 Pa.Code § 5.483(a). Presiding officers are required to conduct fair and impartial hearings and maintain order. 52 Pa.Code § 5.485(a).

Furthermore, the Commission's regulations are to be liberally construed to secure the just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action or proceeding and the presiding officer may, at any stage, disregard an error or defect of procedure which does not affect the substantive rights of parties. 52 Pa.Code § 1.2(a). Except as otherwise provided by statute, requests for continuance of hearings or for extension of time in which to perform an act required or allowed to be done at or within a specified time by this title or by order of the Commission or presiding officer, shall be by motion in writing, timely filed with the Commission, stating the facts on which the application rests. 52 Pa.Code § 1.15(b). Only for good cause shown will requests for continuance be considered. *Id.*

In this case, there is good cause for a continuance to be granted. Ms. Farina is unavailable for the September 27, 2024 hearing date. Administrative agencies, such as the Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n.*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984). This is Ms. Farina's first request, the request is timely, and Met-Ed does not object to the request for a continuance. Therefore, good cause exists to grant the continuance. The hearing scheduled for September 27, 2024 is cancelled, and is rescheduled for September 13, 2024, beginning at 10 a.m.

In the interim, the parties are encouraged to continue to pursue settlement discussions. As cited above, Commission policy promotes settlements. Even if the parties are unable to settle this case, they may still resolve some of the questions or issues during their discussions. If the parties reach an agreement on all issues, a formal hearing will not be necessary. The parties are also reminded that the presiding officer may participate in settlement discussions upon agreement of all parties. 52 Pa.Code § 5.223(c); *see also*, 52 Pa.Code § 5.231(c).

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the evidentiary hearing scheduled for September 27, 2024 is canceled and rescheduled to September 13, 2024, starting at 10 a.m.
2. That to participate in the evidentiary hearing scheduled for September 13, 2024, starting at 10 a.m., parties shall call the Toll-free Bridge Number at 888-459-7411, and enter PIN Number 95632432 when prompted.
3. That parties shall continue to comply with the instructions provided in ordering paragraphs 3 through 17 of the June 21, 2024 Order regarding participation in an evidentiary hearing.

Date: June 28, 2024

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
John M. Coogan  
Administrative Law Judge

**C-2022-3030803 - LAURA FARINA v. METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY**

LAURA FARINA

Served via email and first-class mail.

DANIEL A GARCIA ESQUIRE  
FIRSTENERGY  
800 CABIN HILL DRIVE  
GREENSBURG PA 15601  
**724.838.6416**  
**724.433.1569**  
[dagarcia@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:dagarcia@firstenergycorp.com)

Accepts eService  
*(Counsel for MetEd)*

JAMES A. MEEHAN ESQUIRE  
FIRSTENERGY  
76 SOUTH MAIN STREET  
AKRON OH 44308  
**610.921.6783**  
[jameehan@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:jameehan@firstenergycorp.com)

Accepts eService  
*(Counsel for MetEd)*

TORI L GIESLER ESQUIRE  
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY  
2800 POTTSVILLE PIKE  
READING PA 19605  
**610.921.6658**  
[paregulatorycomplaints@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:paregulatorycomplaints@firstenergycorp.com)

Accepts eService