

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Carlos Ortiz	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2025-3056999
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

**INTERIM ORDER
SETTING NEW DEADLINE FOR A REPLY TO RESPONDENT’S OBJECTIONS**

This order memorializes the procedural matters discussed at the evidentiary hearing held on November 14, 2025 and establishes a new deadline for any reply to the Respondent’s objections to admitting Ortiz Exhibit 1 into the evidentiary record.

On or about August 18, 2025, Carlos Ortiz (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Company).¹ Mr. Ortiz’s Complaint was served on PPL on August 22, 2025. In the Complaint, Mr. Ortiz indicated that the utility is threatening or has already shut off his service. In addition, he states that “[over] \$6,000 of charges have been added to the account that service started back in 3/4/2025. I need a detail explanation on where these fees are coming from.” As relief, Mr. Ortiz asked for “a detailed bill and if needed a payment arrangement.”

On September 11, 2025, PPL filed an answer to the Complaint. PPL denied the material allegations of the Complaint and averred that, on March 3, 2025, two overdue balances associated with the Complainant’s previous accounts were transferred to Mr. Ortiz’s current

¹ The Complaint is a timely appeal from the determination of the Commission’s Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS), at BCS No. 4066078, which dismissed Complainant’s informal billing complaint. A timely BCS appeal is subject to *de novo* review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

account. The Company admits that it issued a termination notice on August 7, 2025. PPL asks the Commission to deny the Complaint in its entirety and with prejudice.

On September 26, 2025, the Commission issued an initial hearing notice setting a call-in telephonic hearing for this matter on November 14, 2025, and assigning me as the presiding officer.

Also on September 26, 2025, I issued a Prehearing Order which addressed the procedures applicable to this proceeding.

By email sent to me at 6:36 p.m. on November 13, 2025, the Complainant stated that he was not aware that a hearing notice or prehearing order had been sent, until counsel for PPL, Attorney Alice Wade, forwarded him the information on November 12, 2025. Mr. Ortiz attached a proposed hearing exhibit to his email. I forwarded Mr. Ortiz's email to Ms. Wade, with my reply to Mr. Ortiz. I attached the hearing notice and prehearing order, and asked Mr. Ortiz to reply if he could not participate.

The parties convened, as scheduled, on November 14, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Ortiz participated, as did Attorney Wade and PPL's witness, Dana Delong. As a preliminary matter, the Complainant was asked whether the Commission should update the email address used for service in this proceeding. Mr. Ortiz stated that the email address on his Complaint should continue to be used.

We discussed whether Mr. Ortiz would like to continue the hearing to have additional time to prepare. He stated that he was ready to go forward with the hearing the same day and did not want to provide any additional exhibits. Given the timing of its receipt of the Complainant's exhibit, the Company was also asked whether it wanted more time to prepare. Attorney Wade indicated that she was prepared to go forward with the hearing but would like to keep the evidentiary record open to submit any additional objections after the Company had more opportunity to review the Complainant's exhibit.

The evidentiary hearing commenced, during which Mr. Ortiz represented himself and testified on his own behalf. He offered one exhibit, which was identified as Ortiz Exhibit 1. PPL objected to admission of the exhibit on several grounds. I held ruling on the exhibit, in part, because Ortiz Exhibit 1 discussed certain proposed PPL exhibits, which had not yet been the presented or addressed on the record. Counsel for PPL conducted cross-examination of Mr. Ortiz and Mr. Ortiz was provided opportunity to present responsive testimony.

Next, PPL presented the testimony of its witness. Ms. Delong sponsored nine exhibits, which were identified as PPL Exhibits 1 through 9. Mr. Ortiz had no objection, and all of the Company's exhibits were admitted into the record. The Complainant cross-examined PPL's witness and PPL conducted redirect.

Both parties were afforded an opportunity to provide closing statements; Mr. Ortiz declined and Attorney Wade made a brief statement.

To provide reasonable opportunity for PPL to review and respond to Ortiz Exhibit 1, I directed that if PPL wished to object to admission of the exhibit, the Company should file written objections by Friday, November 21, 2025. I recognized that part of PPL's objection to the exhibit was its contention that the scope of claims raised by Mr. Ortiz was broader than what was stated in the Complaint. Accordingly, I asked the Company to identify any additional evidence it would offer in response to the claims in the exhibit, as part of its objections. Tr. 91.

I directed that Mr. Ortiz could file a reply to PPL's objections by Wednesday, December 3, 2025. Tr. 92-93.

I advised the parties that a written order memorializing those deadlines would be issued. Tr. 95-96, 100. However, a review of the record in this matter showed that the parties were never served with the prepared order. Consistent with the deadline established at the hearing, on November 21, 2025, PPL filed a letter stating its objections to the admission of Ortiz Exhibit 1 into the record.

The Company served its objections to the Complainant by email to the address provided on his Complaint, and PPL's certificate of service states that the letter was also sent to Mr. Ortiz by first-class mail.

As noted above, the original deadline for Mr. Ortiz to file a reply to PPL's objection was December 3, 2025. A reply is optional and not required. Tr. 93.

No reply was filed to PPL's objections by the December 3, 2025 deadline. Given that the written order was not served, however, I will establish a new deadline for Mr. Ortiz to reply to PPL's objections.

Accordingly, if Mr. Ortiz wishes to reply to PPL's objections, that reply is due by Tuesday, December 23, 2025. The filing must be postmarked or eFiled by that date. The mailing address for the Secretary is:

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

If filed, objections and replies to objections should be filed with the Secretary, sent to me and mailed to the other parties.

After the time has expired for the filing addressed above, I will issue a further order ruling on whether Ortiz Exhibit 1 will be admitted into the record.

The parties are reminded that Commission policy encourages settlement and that they are encouraged to continue to communicate with each other in an attempt to resolve their dispute.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That Complainant Carlos Ortiz must postmark or eFile any reply to PPL Electric Utilities Corporation's objections no later than December 23, 2025.
2. That the record in this matter will remain open and be closed by future order.

Date: December 11, 2025

_____/s/_____
Erin L. Gannon
Administrative Law Judge

F-2025-3056999 - CARLOS ORTIZ v. PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

CARLOS ORTIZ
2065 QUAIL COURT
BETHLEHEM PA 18015
610.813.2065
carlos@eliteseobusiness.com
Served via email December 11, 2025

ALICE WADE ESQUIRE
DEVIN T RYAN ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL
ONE OXFORD CENTRE
301 GRANT STREET SUITE 3010
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
717.612.6052
717.731.1985
alice.wade@postschell.com
dryan@postschell.com
Served via eService December 11, 2025
(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)

MEGAN E RULLI ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL
17 NORTH SECOND STREET 12TH FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717.612.6012
717.472.0466
mrulli@postschell.com
Served via eService December 11, 2025
(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)