

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Laura Goodz	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3054426
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	
Polaris Power Services LLC	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
John M. Coogan
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision grants the unopposed Petition for Leave to Withdraw the Formal Complaint filed by Laura Goodz against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation and Polaris Power Services LLC, because it is unopposed and in the public interest.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On April 3, 2025, Laura Goodz (Ms. Goodz or Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL). The Formal Complaint was served on PPL on April 4, 2025. In her Complaint, Ms. Goodz states that she signed up with an electric generation supplier (EGS), Polaris Power Services LLC (Polaris), on February 18, 2025, but then called Polaris on February 19, 2025 to rescind her EGS contract. Ms. Goodz complains of her experience in contacting PPL regarding her change in electric generation suppliers. Ms. Goodz also asserts: (1) she does not want to

pay Polaris charges because she did not have a valid contract; and, (2) she does not want to pay PPL charges because Complainant alleges PPL had no one to service her account when she spoke with PPL's customer service. As relief, Ms. Goodz requests that \$2.79 in Polaris charges and \$45.45 in PPL charges be removed from her bill.

On April 24, 2025, PPL filed an answer and new matter to the Formal Complaint. PPL's new matter included a notice to plead.

No response to PPL's new matter has been filed.

Also on April 24, 2025, PPL filed preliminary objections to the Formal Complaint. The preliminary objections included a notice to plead. PPL's preliminary objections assert that most issues raised in the Complaint pertain to a claim that the Complainant did not agree to transfer electric generation supply service to an EGS. Specifically, PPL asserts that most issues relate to Complainant's claim that she did not consent to switch her EGS from All American Power and Gas PA, LLC d/b/a/ AAP&G to Polaris. PPL requests that the Complaint be dismissed pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(5) due to nonjoinder of a necessary party, i.e., the EGS at issue, Polaris.

On May 12, 2025, Ms. Goodz filed a response to PPL's preliminary objections. Ms. Goodz states that on February 19, 2025, she received an e-mail from Polaris confirming that they received her request to rescind her service and transmitted that information to PPL. Ms. Goodz states that her complaint is with PPL, and that her short interactions with Polaris were all handled in a timely manner by phone and e-mail.

On May 14, 2025, a motion judge assignment notice was issued, assigning me as the presiding officer.

On June 10, 2025, I issued an order joining Polaris as a necessary party and dismissing PPL's preliminary objections.

On July 11, 2025, Ms. Goodz filed a letter with the Commission, titled "REQUEST TO CANCEL CASE", and stating:

I, Laura Goodz, have been contacted by Polaris Power Services LLC, and they have sent me check #1835 in the amount of \$50.00 to cover PPL's charges. I am going to except this check as a resolution to this matter. I do however, feel this was a mis-handling on PPL's part, and a company of this size should have a customer service email for their customers.

On July 15, 2025, I e-mailed Ms. Goodz and counsel for PPL and Polaris, stating that I intended to treat Ms. Goodz's filing as an informal petition to withdraw her Formal Complaint. Parties were instructed to let me know by July 18, 2025 if there were any objections to my treating the filing as an informal petition to withdraw or parties intended to file a formal response to the filing.

On July 18, 2025, counsel for PPL stated by e-mail that PPL did not object to the filing being treated as an informal petition to withdraw and does not oppose the Petition. No other responses were received.

The record closed on June 11, 2025, the date I received Ms. Goodz's withdrawal request. I will treat Ms. Goodz's request as a Petition for Leave to Withdraw her Formal Complaint, and I will grant the Petition as it is unopposed and in the public interest.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant in this case is Laura Goodz.
2. The Respondents in this case are PPL Electric Utilities Corporation and Polaris Power Services LLC.
3. On April 3, 2025, Ms. Goodz filed a Formal Complaint against PPL.
4. On April 24, 2025, PPL filed an answer and new matter.
5. On April 24, 2025, PPL filed preliminary objections
6. On June 10, 2025, I issued an order joining Polaris as a necessary party and dismissing PPL's preliminary objections.
7. On July 11, 2025, Ms. Goodz filed a letter requesting that her case be cancelled, and stating that she accepted a settlement from Polaris Power Services LLC as a resolution.
8. Parties do not object to treating Ms. Goodz's letter as an informal petition to withdraw her Formal Complaint.

DISCUSSION

Commission regulations address the withdrawal of pleadings in a contested proceeding in relevant part as follows:

§ 5.94. Withdrawal of pleadings in a contested proceeding.

[A] party desiring to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding may file a petition for leave to withdraw the appropriate document with the Commission and serve it upon the other parties. The petition must set forth the reasons for the withdrawal. A party may object to the petition within 10 days of service. After considering the petition, an objection thereto and the public interest, the presiding officer or the Commission will determine whether the withdrawal will be permitted.

52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

A “pleading” is defined as “[a]n application, complaint, petition, answer, motion, preliminary objection, protest, reply, order to show cause, new matter and reply to new matter or other similar document filed in a formal proceeding.” 52 Pa. Code § 1.8. This matter became a contested proceeding once PPL filed an answer to the Formal Complaint. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n v. West Penn Utils.*, Docket No. C-2022-3031862 (Opinion and Order entered May 18, 2023); *New Fizon Catering, Inc. v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2008-2065498 (Opinion and Order entered Jun. 24, 2009).

The Commission’s regulations provide that the Commission or presiding officer at any stage of an action or proceeding may disregard an error or defect of procedure which does not affect the substantive rights of the parties. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(a). The liberal construction provisions apply with particularity in proceedings involving *pro se* litigants. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(d).

A certificate of service was not attached to Ms. Goodz’s letter and therefore it is unclear whether PPL and Polaris received a copy at the time the letter was filed.¹ However, I will exercise my discretion pursuant to Sections 1.2(a) and 1.2(d) of the

¹ The undersigned did not receive a copy of the letter from Ms. Goodz.

Commission's regulations and treat Complainant's letter as a properly filed Petition for Leave to Withdraw the Complaint. *See Ulishney v. West Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3024487 (Opinion and Order entered May 19, 2022) (finding that an e-mail requesting withdrawal of a complaint constituted a petition to withdraw). PPL's and Polaris's substantive rights are not affected because I provided both PPL and Polaris an opportunity to either formally respond to the letter or to object to my treating the letter as an informal petition to withdraw.

Pursuant to the Commission's regulation regarding withdrawal of pleadings in a contested proceeding, I must consider any objection to the Petition, and the public interest, when determining whether the Petition will be granted. PPL and Polaris did not object to the Petition. It would not be in the public interest to have the parties in this matter further litigate this proceeding when Complainant no longer wishes to pursue the Formal Complaint. Granting the Petition will save the parties and the Commission additional costs in time and money they would otherwise incur in further litigating this case. Furthermore, the Complaint does not contain any novel issues or issues of public interest. Therefore, the Petition will be granted in the ordering paragraphs below.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter and the parties to this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.
2. A party desiring to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding may file a petition for leave to withdraw the appropriate document with the Commission and serve it upon other parties. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

3. A petition to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding must set forth the reasons for the withdrawal and that a party may object to the petition within ten days. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

4. After considering a petition to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding, any objection thereto and the public interest, the presiding officer or the Commission will determine whether the withdrawal will be permitted. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

5. The Commission or presiding officer at any stage of an action or proceeding may disregard an error or defect of procedure which does not affect the substantive rights of the parties. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(a).

6. The liberal construction provisions apply with particularity in proceedings involving *pro se* litigants. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(d).

7. A party's informal request to withdraw his/her complaint constitutes a petition to withdraw a pleading under 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a). *Ulishney v. West Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3024487 (Opinion and Order entered May 19, 2022).

8. It is in the public interest to allow Complainant to withdraw her Formal Complaint. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Petition for Leave to Withdraw the Formal Complaint made by Laura Goodz on July 11, 2025 at Docket Number C-2025-3054426 is granted;
2. That the Formal Complaint filed in the matter of Laura Goodz v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation and Polaris Power Services LLC at Docket Number C-2025-3054426 is withdrawn;
3. That the Secretary's Bureau shall mark Docket Number C-2025-3054426 as closed.

Date: August 7, 2025

/s/
John M. Coogan
Administrative Law Judge