



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
400 North Street, HARRISBURG, PA 17120

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

December 2, 2024

ALL PARTIES OF RECORD

Re: Exceptions– Sarah Aed

Docket Number: C-2024-3047793

To All Parties of Record:

On December 2, 2024, my office received Exceptions to the Initial Decision of Administrative Law Judge Brady in the above captioned matter. Our review of the filing revealed that no certificate of service or other indication that the parties of record to the case were served with the Exceptions. Therefore, we have enclosed a copy of the Exceptions to constitute service for purposes of 52 Pa. Code §5.533.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Chiavetta
Secretary

Enclosure

RC: acg

cc: All Parties of Record
Document Folder

I am unsatisfied with the outcome of this complaint. My complaint is against the PUC and UGI. The judge, F. Joseph Brady, was biased in this case. He was one of the judge's who APPROVED the WNA charge on out bills! UGI is ONE AGAIN, increasing our rates ADD to that the WNA charge! I am filing yet another complaint against the PUC and UGI for allowing this ILLEGAL charge.

In this case, UGI filed a preliminary objection based on the position that the Complaint is legally insufficient because a utility cannot be held liable for complying with its Commission-approved tariff. However, whether UGI complied with its tariff is not the issue here. Rather, the Complaint is against the tariff itself. Specifically, the Complaint disputes the Commission approval of the WNA provision. The Commission must view the Complaint in the light most favorable to the Complainant and should dismiss the Complaint, or portions of it, only if it appears that the Complainant would not be entitled to relief under any circumstance as a matter of law. Here, Ms. Aed alleges that WNA provision of UGI's tariff is unreasonable. When viewing these averments as true for purposes of the Preliminary Objection, it is clear that recovery or relief would be possible for the Complainant. Accordingly, I conclude that UGI has failed to show that the Complaint is legally insufficient, and the Preliminary Objection is denied.