

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

MARLENE FLOWERS	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2024-3051571
	:	
FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY	:	
	:	

**INTERIM ORDER  
GRANTING MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

On October 9, 2024, Marlene Flowers filed a Formal Complaint against West Penn Power<sup>1</sup> regarding billing for Pat’s Auto and Truck Repair. FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company (FirstEnergy or Respondent) filed an Answer denying the material allegations of the complaint and requesting mediation. The Chief Administrative Law Judge issued an order directing the Parties to attempt to resolve their dispute with the facilitation of the Commission’s Mediation Unit.

The Parties did not resolve their dispute and by hearing notice dated December 20, 2024, the complaint was assigned to me, and a telephone hearing was scheduled for February 4, 2025.

Attorney Karen Hassinger entered an appearance on behalf of the Complainant and by email dated January 31, 2025, requested a continuance of the hearing. I granted the

---

<sup>1</sup> On January 1, 2024, FirstEnergy's Pennsylvania operating companies (i.e., Metropolitan Edison Company, Pennsylvania Electric Company, Pennsylvania Power Company, and West Penn Power Company) merged into FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company. Due to the merger transaction, the affected operating companies' tariffs were consolidated into a single tariff, with each former operating company's rates becoming its own rate district. As such, the customers of the former Pennsylvania Electric Company have their own separate and distinct rate district under FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company’s tariff.

continuance and cancelled the hearing. The hearing was rescheduled for March 26, 2025. On March 24, 2025, FirstEnergy notified me that the Parties had resolved their dispute and filed a Certificate of Satisfaction. The Complainant did not object to the Certificate and the docket was closed on April 13, 2025.

On May 20, 2025, Commission Secretary Matthew L. Homsher, issued a letter directed to Ms. Flowers in response to a voice mail message from Ryan Hickey, who identified himself as Ms. Flowers' son. According to the letter, Mr. Hickey indicated that he had concerns about Ms. Flowers' name and address begin visible in public documents on the Commission's website. Among other things, Secretary Homsher advised Ms. Flowers that the Secretary's Bureau is not authorized to modify filings in a proceeding.

On June 13, 2025, Ms. Flowers filed a Petition to Reopen the Record for the purpose of filing a protective order to redact "sensitive and unrelated personal contact information that has been made public in connection with this case." Ms. Flowers requested protection of her home address, home telephone number, email address and son's private cell phone number, and alleged that disclosure of this information was a violation of Pennsylvania Privacy Laws.<sup>2</sup>

On July 9, 2025, Secretary Homsher issued a letter noting that Ms. Flowers had failed to serve a copy of the Petition on counsel for FirstEnergy. As a courtesy the Secretary's Bureau served a copy of the Petition and extended the time for FirstEnergy to file a response until July 21, 2025. FirstEnergy did not file a response.

At the request of the Secretary's Bureau, this matter was referred to the Office of Administrative Law Judge. By notice dated August 20, 2025, the Petition was assigned to me.

On August 20, 2025, I issued an interim order which granted Ms. Flowers' petition to reopen the record and directed her to file a motion for protective order consistent with

---

<sup>2</sup> This document does not appear to have been filed by Ms. Flowers' attorney.

Commission regulations on or before September 10, 2025. The Respondent was directed to file a response on or before September 24, 2025.

Ms. Flowers filed a motion for a protective order on September 10, 2025. Respondent filed an answer on September 23, 2025, noting that it did not object to Ms. Flowers' motion.

Except for a formal complaint initiating a proceeding, it is Commission practice to post filings on the Commission's docket on its public website. Service lists attached to orders are also published to the Commission's website and routinely include a party's name, address, telephone numbers and email address. Ms. Flowers notes in her motion that:

Since this information became publicly available, Complainant, who has a substantial social-media following (approx.3 million followers), has been subjected to death threats, repeated drive-by, prolonged horn-honking outside her home, and other threatening and harassing conduct. These incidents are ongoing and credibly tied to the public availability of her home address and direct contact details.

Service among counsel and the Tribunal does not require public dissemination of a self-represented party's home address, telephone number, or personal email. The Commission's eFiling/service mechanisms and counsel's records are sufficient to effect service without public exposure of this data.

Motion for Protective Order at page 2. Accordingly, Ms. Flowers requests that the documents containing her name, address, telephone numbers and email address be removed from the Commission's website and replaced with redacted versions.

As noted above, the Respondent does not oppose the motion, nor does the Respondent dispute the factual statements made by Ms. Flowers in her motion.

Generally speaking, the exclusion of records from the public domain is antithetical to the public's interest in free and open access to the administrative process. It is

certainly unusual to entertain a request to protect information for the first time after the case has been concluded. However, given that the Parties in this matter settled their dispute many months ago, the public has little interest in the continued availability of the documents filed at this docket. Further, the documents related to the case are procedural in nature. Therefore, I will grant the Motion for a Protective Order.

However, rather than imposing the substantial administrative resources that would be required to review all of the documents and redact Ms. Flowers' address, telephone numbers, and email address, I will direct that the entire docket be marked as confidential and removed from the Commission's public website.<sup>3</sup>

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Motion for Protective Order by Marlene Flowers is GRANTED.
2. That the Commission's Secretary's Bureau is directed to place the documents at Docket No. C-2024-3051571, in a confidential folder.
3. That the Secretary mark the docket closed.

Date: September 30, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Mary D. Long  
Administrative Law Judge

---

<sup>3</sup> In the event Ms. Flowers files another matter with the Commission, she should include a request for the protection of information with the initial filing. This order only applies to this docket.

**C-2024-3051571 - MARLENE FLOWERS v. FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA  
ELECTRIC COMPANY**

MARLENE FLOWERS



Served via eService – Served 9/30/2025

KAREN HASSINGER ESQUIRE  
LAW OFFICE OF KAREN HASSINGER  
55 SOUTH MAIN STREET, 2<sup>ND</sup> FLOOR  
WASHINGTON PA 15301

**724.229.0277**

**412.915.9763**

[karenhassinger@aol.com](mailto:karenhassinger@aol.com)

Served via eService – Served 9/30/2025

*(Counsel for Complainant)*

TIMOTHY K. MCHUGH ESQUIRE  
FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY  
76 SOUTH MAIN STREET  
AKRON OH 44308

**610.301.9072**

[tmchugh@firstenergycorp.com](mailto:tmchugh@firstenergycorp.com)

Served via eService – Served 9/30/2025

*(Counsel for FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company)*