

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Martin Gallas	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2024-3049469
	:	
FirstEnergy Pennsylvania f/k/a Met-Ed	:	

**INTERIM ORDER DENYING COMPLAINANT’S
THIRD REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE**

By Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice dated August 20, 2024, an Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was scheduled for October 8, 2024 at 1:00 p.m.

I issued a Prehearing Order on August 22 2024. The Prehearing Order directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and directed that a request to change the scheduled hearing should be sent to me at least five days prior to the hearing date, be in writing and state the agreement or opposition of the other party.

By email received on September 30, 2024, Margaret A. Morris, Esq., Counsel for Respondent, requested a continuance of the October 8, 2024 hearing on the Complainant’s behalf, indicating that the Complainant had a conflicting medical appointment. Ms. Morris advised that the Respondent did not oppose the requested continuance. Based on the stated reason for the request and that it was unopposed, I granted the request.

By Cancelled/Rescheduled Initial Telephonic Hearing Notice dated October 1, 2024, the Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was rescheduled for December 3, 2024 at 10:00 a.m.

By email received on November 6, 2024, the Complainant requested a continuance of the December 3, 2024 hearing due to a previously scheduled trip. The Complainant attached a copy of a receipt dated September 27, 2024 for a seven-day trip with a

December 1, 2024 departure date. The Complainant also advised that the Respondent did not oppose his request for continuance.

By Interim Order dated November 7, 2024, I granted the Complainant's second request for continuance.

By Cancelled/Rescheduled Initial Telephonic Hearing Notice dated November 12, 2024, the December 3, 2024 Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was rescheduled for January 13, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

I issued a second Prehearing Order on November 21, 2024. The Prehearing Order again directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and directed that a request to change the scheduled hearing should be sent to me at least five days prior to the hearing date, be in writing and state the agreement or opposition of the other party.

I issued a Corrected Prehearing Order on December 9, 2024. The Corrected Prehearing Order advised the parties that my legal assistant changed from Shalea Delvillar to Pamela McNeal. The Corrected Prehearing Order again directed the parties to comply with various procedural requirements and directed that a request to change the scheduled hearing should be sent to me at least five days prior to the hearing date, be in writing and state the agreement or opposition of the other party.

The January 13, 2025 hearing convened as scheduled. The Complainant appeared *Pro Se* and testified. The Respondent appeared and was represented by Ms. Morris. Ms. Morris had two witnesses available to testify.

During the hearing the Complainant raised concerns that he did not supply all of the bills that he wanted to supply for consideration during the hearing. To accommodate the Complainant, I agreed to reconvene the hearing at a later date to afford him an opportunity to present the bills that he received between June 2021 and June 2024 that he believes he should have supplied for the hearing. Tr. 41-42. The Complainant, who had already supplied Exhibits

C-1, C-2, and C-3, was instructed to provide these bills in chronological order, paginated, and pre-marked as “C-4.” Tr. 42-43. The Complainant was further directed to provide a redacted and an unredacted copy of his exhibits. Tr. 47.

By Further Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice dated January 14, 2025, a further call-in telephonic hearing was scheduled for February 25, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

By email received on February 18, 2025, the Complainant requested another continuance in this matter. The Complainant indicated that the reason for his request was his confusion regarding instructions for preparation/submission of exhibits from the January 13, 2025 hearing. In a subsequent email, the Complainant acknowledged that he had not contacted Ms. Morris regarding his continuance request.

By email received on February 19, 2025, Ms. Morris advised that the Company strenuously objects to the Complainant’s request for a third continuance as the stated reason does not constitute good cause. Ms. Morris stated that during the January hearing, the Complainant’s request that he be permitted to submit bills that he had not submitted prior to the hearing was granted, that I was explicit in explaining that the Complainant was being permitted to submit bills for the period June 2021 through June 2024, that he was instructed to mark the proposed exhibit as C-4, and that he was instructed to paginate the document. Ms. Morris argued that the Complainant’s comment that he is confused as to what he should have submitted is without merit as he previously submitted exhibits C-1 through C-3, and he has had a month to submit the bills.

Paragraph 3 of my August 22, 2024, November 21, 2024 and December 9, 2024 Prehearing Orders advised the parties that they may request a continuance of the hearing if they have a good reason. My Prehearing Orders further advised that “[t]o request a continuance, you must submit a written request (a “motion”) at least five (5) days before the hearing.” My Order further instructed that the motion should include: the case name, case number, and hearing date; the reason you are requesting a continuance; and the other party’s position on the request.

The Complainant was provided with a clear explanation of how to organize and mark his bills during the January 13, 2025 hearing as indicated above. The Complainant has had sufficient time to raise concerns since the January 13, 2025 hearing if he was unclear how to organize his exhibits. Additionally, the Complainant already supplied three exhibits which were admitted into the record, which demonstrates that he knows how to prepare and organize his exhibits for submission. Accordingly, I do not find that the Complainant's stated reason constitutes good cause warranting another postponement of this hearing.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Complainant's February 18, 2025 request for Continuance of the hearing in the matter captioned as Martin Gallas v. FirstEnergy Pennsylvania f/k/a Met-Ed at Docket No. C-2024-3049469 is denied.
2. That the hearing scheduled for February 25, 2025 proceed as scheduled.

Date: February 19, 2025

/s/
Christopher P. Pell
Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge

C-2024-3049469 - MARTIN GALLAS v. FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

MARTIN GALLAS
2630 HUCK LN
EAST STOUDSBURG PA 18302
201.694.7000
mgallas@cmgallas.com
Accepts eService February 19, 2025

MARGARET MORRIS ESQUIRE
REGER RIZZO & DARNALL
CIRA CENTRE 13TH FL
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA PA 19104
215.495.6524
215.870.5785
mmorris@regerlaw.com
Accepts eService February 19, 2025
(*Counsel for FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company*)

TORI L GIESLER
FIRSTENERGY SERVICE COMPANY
2800 POTTSVILLE PIKE
READING PA 19605
610.921.6658
paregulatorycomplaints@firstenergycorp.com
Accepts eService February 19, 2025