

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Shawn Mathis,	:	
Complainant,	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2024-3052143
	:	
Philadelphia Gas Works,	:	
Respondent.	:	

**PHILADELPHIA GAS WORKS’
REPLY TO COMPLAINANT’S EXCEPTIONS**

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.535 the Philadelphia Gas Works (“PGW” or “Respondent”) hereby submits the following Reply to the Exceptions filed by Shawn Mathis (“Complainant”) to the Initial Decision in this matter issued on September 23, 2025 (“Initial Decision”).

I. INTRODUCTION

On November 18, 2024, Complainant filed a Formal Complaint with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) against PGW wherein he requested a Commission - issued payment agreement (“Complaint”).

On December 9, 2024, PGW filed an Answer wherein it stated that Complainant had multiple, prior, unsatisfied payment agreements from both the company and the Commission, and asked that the Complaint be dismissed.

An Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was scheduled for March 13, 2025 before Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Christopher Pell, but was continued until May 6, 2025 at the Complainant’s request. The hearing was continued once more, until June 23, 2025, at PGW’s request to afford Complainant more time to effectuate settlement.

On June 23, 2025, the hearing convened as scheduled. Both parties were in attendance and presented evidence. The record closed on July 1, 2025.

On September 23, 2025, Judge Pell issued the Initial Decision wherein he dismissed the Complaint.

The Complainant’s Exception was docketed October 8, 2025. PGW’s reply follows.

II. COMPLAINANT’S EXCEPTIONS AND PGW’S REPLY

Exception

Complainant’s exception fails to identify any error in fact or law contained in the Initial

Decision. Rather, Complainant's exception reiterate the claims and requests made in the Complaint and present alleged new matter, that is, a change in income that he argues would now qualify him for a subsequent payment agreement from the Commission.

Reply

Complainant's exceptions fail to demonstrate that the Initial Decision is unsupported by substantial evidence. In fact, Complainant impliedly concedes the propriety of the Initial Decision by not attacking or addressing any of its findings of facts or law, but rather requesting the Commission consider new facts outside the record. This is improper and should be unavailing.

Complainant concedes that he has had a PUC issued payment agreement that he has not satisfied. As noted in DCALJ Pell's Initial Decision, at the time of the hearing Complainant did not allege either an acceptable change in income, nor a significant change in life circumstances that would allow the Commission to grant a subsequent payment arrangement or reinstate or extend his last defaulted payment arrangement.¹ In fact, his reported income had increased substantially. Yet, after making one \$900 payment in order to gain another continuance of the hearing as well as continuing to allege throughout the hearing that he would, "make [his] best efforts to pay [the catch-up amount] in the next 30 days, hopefully" he made no further payments or attempts to reinstate the existing PAR from May 1, 2025 until the time of the hearing.² The current government shut-down did not begin until months later.

The Commission is left with a record that clearly shows that Complainant has failed to make a good faith effort to pay his gas bill, regardless of his employment status or ability to pay. This shutdown, while unfortunate for everyone, has no bearing on Complainant's eligibility for a subsequent payment arrangement. The Commission can and should take into consideration his history of multiple, unsatisfied payment arrangements, and see these exceptions for what they are: another attempt at buying time to avoid shutoff. If the Commission is inclined to consider the request for a subsequent payment arrangement and accept the New Matter submitted in exceptions, PGW would request it be allowed to also supplement the record with Complainant's (non)payment history from the date of the hearing until the date of this filing.

¹ See 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(d) and § 1405(e).

² TR. p. 37, ln. 2-3.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, PGW respectfully requests that this Commission deny Complainant's exceptions and adopt the Initial Decision.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Tracy Tripp

Tracy Tripp, Esquire
Attorney I.D. 310712
Philadelphia Gas Works
800 W. Montgomery Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Telephone: (215) 684-6249
tracy.tripp@pgworks.com

Date: October 20, 2025

Counsel for PGW