



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING
400 NORTH STREET
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

IN REPLY PLEASE
REFER TO OUR FILE

September 22, 2025

ALL PARTIES OF RECORD

Re: LeRon Alston v Community Utilities of Pennsylvania Inc.
Docket Number: F-2025-3052978

To All Parties of Record:

On September 22, 2025, my office received Exceptions to the Initial Decision of Administrative Law Judge Arnold 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.

Due to the failure of LeRon Alston to provide service on all the parties of record to the case, and in order to avoid prejudice to any party pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.535, the Respondent shall have until October 3, 2025 to file Reply Exceptions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Matthew L. Homsher'.

Matthew L. Homsher
Secretary

Enclosure
MH: acg

cc: All Parties of Record
Document Folder

LeRon Alston does not accept the decision made by judge Alphonso Arnold 3rd, the Exceptions are the undeniable Facts of the case which the judge chose to Overlook the Facts are, 1) the only notice of Rate change was a Rate proposal the Utility Company mailed to Me Proposing to increase the rate from 74.73 to 112.51 that was in January 2024 2) without any other notice in August 2024 My wastewater Bill went from 74.73 in July to \$338.57 in August for the same amount of water usage without any other notice of Rate increase or change from the previous proposal sent in January, 3) The rate increase does not reflect the amount said in the proposal which stated an increase of only \$112.51 and when I questioned the amount and how it got to that I was told at first it was actual meter reading which investigator Austin from the Commission first brought to My Attention because again I was given no notice of Rate change or what the increase would be and then told months later that it is not metered it is Volumetric readings on how they Bill the water Either way I wasn't given notice on any of the changes The PUC Rules are Clear, The Utility Company that Notify Customers at least 60 days in Advance before an increase the notice must include the amount and how much more I can expect to Pay. I was not given Any of those Rights in fact the Judge Referenced that The Commission made a decision to allow Volumetric water Rates by the Company which is fine but that doesn't mean that The Utility Company Can Bypass All other Rules and Regulations which means notifying Us Customers of such Changes and Charges The Judge also in his Decision 1308a) Referenced that The Commission can Allow a Utility Company to Bypass Notifications, and Make Rate increases and changes in special circumstances I Definitely want to know why I'm the Special Circumstances and Do not Agree with the Commission Having the Power to Rule on a Utility being able to Break the Rules The PUC Commission is there to Regulate the Utility Company and Protect Consumers Rights that's it They Can't strip Us Consumers of Our Rights and Can't Allow the Utility Company to Skip Any Due Process put in to place to Protect us Consumers Especially when it comes to a Rate increases That's why I don't Agree with the Judge's Decision Sincerely LeRon Alston