

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

D. Gregory Shamp	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2025-3054132
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Michael J. Mroczka
Special Agent

INTRODUCTION

This decision dismisses the Formal Complaint with prejudice for the failure of Complainant to appear for the hearing and prosecute the Complaint.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On February 28, 2025, D. Gregory Shamp (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (Respondent or PPL).¹ The Complaint alleges that there are incorrect charges on his bill and in support, stated the following:

¹ The Complaint is a timely appeal from the determination of the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS), at BCS No. 4031468. A timely BCS appeal is subject to *de novo* review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

I am writing to formally dispute several electric bills with PPL, regarding my properties at 1337 West Chew Street and 25 North Madison St., Allentown, PA[.] [A] former tenant [residing] at the Chew Street property, created the initial problem by the tenant who failed to transfer the electric service into his name despite being responsible for the account. Unfortunately, I had to evict the tenant for unrelated reasons and I recently discovered PPL has transferred all my bills from Chew Street into my other rental at 25 North Madison St. in Allentown. PPL has now charged me nearly \$2700 for the electric service at Chew Street and Madison Street even though I do not own Chew Street anymore. To make matters worse, they have continued adding interest to this balance. This is an unfair and improper reassignment of charges that were the response of the tenant, not me.

1. I respectfully request that the public utilities commission review this situation and assist in having PPL properly address this matter. Specifically, I am asking for... [a] correction to remove the charges from my Chew Street and Madison Street residence as it did not incur them.

2. A proper reassessment of the account to reflect the true responsible parties.

Compl. Attach. at 1.

In his Complaint, Complainant selected the option to receive all communications from the Commission via First-Class Mail at the address provided by the Complainant on the Complaint. Compl. ¶ 9.

On April 14, 2025,² the Respondent filed an answer in which it denied the material allegations of fact and conclusions of law in the Complaint. Respondent requested that the Complaint be dismissed.

² The Complaint was served on Respondent on March 24, 2025.

On April 28, 2025, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was served on the parties scheduling an initial telephonic hearing on June 18, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. and the case was assigned to me. The Hearing Notice provided the parties with the Toll-Free Bridge Number and the PIN to call and participate in the telephonic hearing. The Hearing Notice further stated as follows:

FAILURE TO APPEAR: You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present evidence on the issue(s) raised. Your case may be dismissed “with prejudice” which means that you will be barred from filing another complaint raising the same claim(s) and issue(s) presented in the dismissed complaint.

CONTINUANCES. You may request a continuance of the hearing if you have a good reason. All continuances will be granted only for good cause. To request a continuance, you must submit a written request (a “motion”) at least five (5) days before the hearing. Your motion should include: 1) The case name, number, and hearing date; 2) The reason for the request; and 3) Whether the other party agrees (or if you do not know).

On April 28, 2025, a Prehearing Order was served on the parties which reminded the parties of the date and time of the hearing. The Prehearing Order again stated the failure to appear warning. Additionally, the Prehearing Order informed the parties about the applicable procedural rules, and again included the procedure to follow for hearing continuances.

In the ordinary course of the Commission’s business, the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were served via U.S. First-Class Mail to Complainant at the street address provided by him to the Commission. The Commission did not receive any return mail that the Hearing Notice or the Prehearing Order sent to Complainant’s address were undeliverable.

On June 18, 2025, the hearing convened as scheduled. Alice Wade, Esquire, appeared on behalf of Respondent along with one witness and was ready to proceed. The court reporter was also present. Complainant was not present to start the hearing. After a short recess to allow time for Complainant to appear, the hearing proceeded in Complainant's absence. No testimony was taken, and no exhibits were introduced into the record. At the hearing, Respondent moved to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice for Complainant's failure to appear and prosecute his Complaint. I took this motion under advisement. Tr. 4, 6.

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

The record closed on June 30, 2025, when the 7-page transcript was filed with the Commission. This decision grants the Respondent's motion to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is D. Gregory Champ.
2. The Respondent is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.
3. On February 28, 2025, Complainant filed a Formal Complaint against Respondent.
4. On April 14, 2025, Respondent filed an answer to the Complaint.
5. On April 28, 2025, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was served on Complainant scheduling an initial telephonic hearing on June 18, 2025 at 10:00 a.m.

6. On April 28, 2025, a Prehearing Order for Telephone Hearing was served on Complainant providing additional information to the parties regarding the hearing.

7. Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were served on Complainant by U.S. First-Class Mail to the postal address Complainant provided to the Commission.

8. Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order provided the Complainant with the toll-free bridge telephone number and PIN to call and participate in the hearing, and, *inter alia*, the procedure for requesting a continuance and the possible consequences of failing to appear at the hearing.

9. Neither the Hearing Notice nor the Prehearing Order were returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

10. Complainant failed to appear and participate in the scheduled telephonic hearing on June 18, 2025.

11. The court reporter, Counsel for Respondent and its witness(es) were present and prepared to proceed at the June 18, 2025, hearing.

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

DISCUSSION

Due Process and Notice

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 due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. *Id.*

The record shows that Complainant was provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. First, on April 28, 2025, Complainant was served a Hearing Notice which advised the parties of the date and time of the hearing, and how to participate. Second, on April 28, 2025, Complainant was served a Prehearing Order which reminded the parties of the date and time of the hearing, and how to participate. Further, both documents advised the parties, *inter alia*, how to request a continuance prior to the hearing if needed. Finally, both documents advised Complainant that failure to appear may result in dismissal with prejudice, which means that Complainant would be barred from filing another complaint raising the same claim(s) and issues(s) presented in the dismissed complaint.

Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were served by U.S. First-Class Mail to the address provided on the Complaint. Neither document was returned as being undeliverable. Accordingly, it must be presumed that this mail was received by Complainant. *Berkowitz v. Mayflower Sec., Inc.*, 317 A.2d 584 (Pa. 1974); *Meierdierck v. Miller*, 147 A.2d 406 (Pa. 1959); *Samaras v. Hartwick*, 698 A.2d 71 (Pa. Super. 1997); *Judge v. Celina Mut. Ins. Co.*, 449 A.2d 658 (Pa. Super. 1982).

Complainant had notice of the hearing and an opportunity to be heard in this proceeding. Therefore, the Complainant's due process rights have been fully

protected. *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 25, 1993).

Failure to Appear, Waiver and the “Unavoidable” Standard

Once a hearing is scheduled and the parties are duly notified by the Commission, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing. *Mumma v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Opinion and Order entered Jan. 28, 2002). 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). However, these provisions in the Code and in the Commission’s regulations do not apply if the presiding officer determines that the party’s failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable and that the interests of the other parties and of the public would not be prejudiced by permitting the reopening or further examination. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(b).

The party who failed to appear at the hearing has the burden of explaining why his/her 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 with prejudice. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 22, 2022) (*Brown*); *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) (*Williams*); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995) (*Jefferson*); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

Complainant failed to appear for the hearing despite receiving notice and despite the undersigned allowing additional time for Complainant to appear. To date, there has been no communication to the Office of Administrative Law Judge or me by, or on behalf of, Complainant explaining why Complainant's failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

Consequently, I find that Complainant waived the opportunity to participate in a hearing on the matters raised in the Complaint, Complainant's absence was not unavoidable, and the Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice.

Burden of Proof and Dismissal of Complaint

Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code provides that the party seeking relief from the Commission has the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a). To establish a sufficient case and satisfy the burden of proof, the complainant must show that the respondent public utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the complaint. *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (1990); *Feinstein v. Phila. Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (1976). Such a showing must be by a preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 578 A.2d 600 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990). A preponderance of the evidence is established by presenting evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

As the proponent of any request for relief, Complainant bears the burden of proof. By failing to participate and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, Complainant has failed to meet this burden. Thus, it is appropriate to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice. *Brown; Williams* (citing *Jefferson*). Accordingly, the merits of the Complaint will not be addressed.

Respondent's motion to dismiss with prejudice will be granted.

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 Commission is required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them; this due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

3. Notice mailed via U.S. First-Class Mail to a party and not returned to the Commission as undeliverable is presumed received. *Berkowitz v. Mayflower Sec., Inc.*, 317 A.2d 584 (Pa. 1974); *Meierdierck v. Miller*, 147 A.2d 406 (Pa. 1959); *Samaras v. Hartwick*, 698 A.2d 71 (Pa. Super. 1997); *Judge v. Celina Mut. Ins. Co.*, 449 A.2d 658 (Pa. Super. 1982).

4. 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).

5. 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 with prejudice. *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).

6. Complainant's due process rights have been fully protected and Complainant's failure to appear was not unavoidable. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

7. As the party seeking relief, Complainant bears the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

8. By failing to participate in the hearing and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, Complainant has failed to meet the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That PPL Electric Utilities Corporation's motion to dismiss, with prejudice, the Formal Complaint of D. Gregory Shamp at Docket Number F-2025-3054132 is granted.

2. That the Formal Complaint filed by D. Gregory Shamp in *D. Gregory Shamp v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, Docket Number F-2025-3054132, is hereby dismissed with prejudice.

3. That the Secretary's Bureau shall mark Docket Number F-2025-3054132 as closed.

Date: August 20, 2025

_____/s/
Michael J. Mroczka
Special Agent