

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Tracy Baltimore	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3057022
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

**INTERIM ORDER
ON CONTINUANCE AND PROCEDURAL DEADLINES**

On August 25, 2025, Tracy Baltimore (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Respondent). The Complainant alleged PPL was threatening to shut off her electric service and that she was having a reliability, safety or quality problem with her utility service. Ms. Baltimore stated that PPL has been (1) illegally shutting off her service at various times of the day when her bill was not due or delinquent; (2) discriminating against and harassing her for many months and; (2) working with Tri County Community Action to pad her bill, commit fraudulent entries on her statements and tamper with her assistance programs. For relief, the Complainant stated:

I seek a \$250,000 dollar settlement amount in damages, intentional infliction of emotional harm and distress, compensation for ongoing harassment (sic) and stalking, damage to my home and electrical system, reputation and family life.

Complaint ¶ 5.

On August 29, 2025, the Complainant filed a document titled Additional Information to Complaint, to which she attached documents concerning her claims.¹

On September 15, 2025, PPL timely filed an answer, in which it generally denied the Complainant's allegations. PPL admitted that it sent a termination notice to the Complainant on July 1, 2025 but averred that service had not been terminated since the notice was sent, and denied that the Company has been illegally shutting off her electric service. At the time of filing the answer, PPL stated that the Complainant's account balance was \$1,490.27, of which \$1,237.19 was in arrears. The Respondent asked the Commission to dismiss the complaint in its entirety and with prejudice.

On September 19, 2025, the Office of Administrative Law Judge issued a Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice scheduling an Initial Telephonic Hearing for Tuesday, November 4, 2025 at 10:00 a.m., and assigning me as the presiding officer. On the same date, a Prehearing Order was issued which addressed the procedures applicable to this proceeding, including how to request a continuance.

On Tuesday, November 4, 2025, the hearing was convened as scheduled. Ms. Baltimore appeared and represented herself. PPL was represented and appeared at the hearing, along with a witness. The parties stated their willingness to take some time to discuss settlement and requested my participation as settlement judge. Tr. 3. The parties provided their consent and acknowledgement that I would preside over an evidentiary hearing and render a decision if the case is not settled. *Id.* at 3-4.

The discussion helped to clarify the scope of the Complaint but did not resolve Ms. Baltimore's claims. On the record, the Complainant explained that she would like the Commission to make a finding whether PPL violated the Commission's statutes, rules and

¹ The Commission's records indicate the filing was submitted by eFiling on September 5, 2025 and posted to the docket on September 8, 2025.

requirements regarding terminations, billing and handling of its customer assistance program, and discrimination. Tr. 9-12.

Ms. Baltimore requested a continuance of the hearing on the basis that she wanted to contact an attorney for guidance and/or representation, conduct discovery and prepare additional exhibits. Tr. 5-9.

PPL objected to the request for continuance. Tr. 6. Attorney Wilburn asserted that the Complainant did not comply with the requirements for requesting a continuance prior to the hearing, had seventy days before the hearing to engage in discovery or identify any witness(es), and demonstrated no exigent circumstances. *Id.* at 6-7. Additionally, PPL's witness was present and the Respondent was prepared to proceed with the hearing. *Id.* at 7.

After consideration of the parties' positions, I granted the Complainant's oral request for continuance. In finding good cause for continuance, I gave weight to the fact that the Complainant is self-represented. Tr. 12. I also considered that the Complainant's oral explanation of her claims helped to clarify which matters she intends to pursue before the Commission, and that discovery may serve to further focus the proceedings to the benefit of both parties. *Id.* at 9-12.

I noted on the record that the duration of the continuance and scheduling of the continued hearing would be addressed by written interim order that I would prepare after I received the initial hearing transcript. Tr. 13. I also stated that the written interim order would provide requirements and deadlines regarding the identification of witnesses and submission of proposed hearing exhibits in advance of the rescheduled hearing. *Id.*

Regarding the duration of the continuance, the Complainant requested 90 days. The Commission's regulations provide twenty days for a recipient to answer discovery in a non-rate proceeding. 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(d). Given that the Complainant indicated she will conduct discovery, objections or follow-up to discovery may increase the time needed and, additionally,

the Complainant may seek to engage counsel, I find ninety days to be a reasonable time for continuance.

The Commission's rules for discovery are set forth in 52 Pa. Code § 5.231 to 5.372 (Title 52 of the Pennsylvania Code, Chapter 5, Subchapter D. Discovery).² The parties should review the regulations relating to discovery, specifically, 52 Pa. Code § 5.331(b), which provides that "a party shall initiate discovery as early in the proceedings as reasonably possible," and 52 Pa. Code § 5.322, which encourages participants to exchange information on an informal basis.

The parties are expected to pursue resolution of discovery issues among themselves; motions to compel should be filed only after such efforts have failed. There are limitations on discovery and sanctions for abuse of the discovery process. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.361, 5.371, 5.372.

It is the Commission's policy to encourage settlements. 52 Pa. Code § 5.231(a). Even if the parties are unable to settle this case, they may still resolve some of the questions or issues during their discussions and through their ongoing exchange of information.

As stated during the hearing, the Complainant is not required to be represented by an attorney in this matter. If Ms. Baltimore chooses to be represented by an attorney, the attorney should file a notice of appearance before the scheduled hearing date. 52 Pa. Code § 1.24(b)(2).

The deadlines to identify potential witnesses and provide proposed hearing exhibits are set forth in the ordering paragraphs below.

² These regulations are available online at the link below:
<https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/052/chapter5/subchapDtoc.html>

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That Complainant's request to continue the hearing for ninety (90) days is granted.

2. That the scheduling staff of the Office of Administrative Law Judge shall reschedule this matter for a telephonic hearing and notify the parties in writing.

3. That the parties are encouraged to exchange information on an informal basis, consistent the Commission's regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 5.322.

4. That the parties shall engage in discussions with each other and pursue a possible settlement of the outstanding issues, consistent with provisions in the Commission's regulations in 52 Pa. Code §5.231(a).

5. That, if the Complainant is represented by an attorney in this matter, the attorney should file a notice of appearance before the scheduled hearing date. 52 Pa. Code § 1.24(b)(2).

6. That, **no later than January 9, 2026**, if the Complainant has any proposed witnesses (other than herself), she must provide their name, address, and a written summary of their expected testimony. The information should be emailed to the presiding officer at egannon@pa.gov and copied to the other party.

7. That, **no later than January 9, 2026**, the Respondent must provide the name and business address of any proposed witnesses, and a written summary of their expected testimony. The information should be emailed to the presiding officer at egannon@pa.gov and copied to the other party.

8. That, **no later than five (5) business days prior to the hearing**, any party wishing to present any documents or exhibits at the hearing must send a copy by email to the presiding officer and the other party.

Date: November 25, 2025

Erin L. Gannon
Administrative Law Judge

C-2025-3057022 - TRACY BALTIMORE v. PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

TRACY L BALTIMORE
637 EMERALD STREET
HARRISBURG PA 17110
717.350.9918
tracybaltimore@gmail.com
Served via eService November 25, 2025

HAYLEY E WILBURN ESQUIRE
DEVIN T RYAN ESQUIRE
ALICE WADE ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL PC
ONE OXFORD CENTRE
301 GRANT STREET SUITE 3010
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412.506.6362
717.612.6052
412.506.6364
hwilburn@postschell.com
dryan@postschell.com
alice.wade@postschell.com
Served via eService November 25, 2025
(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)