

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pierre-Richard Sampeur	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3056913
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

**INTERIM ORDER
CONVERTING HEARING INTO A PREHEARING CONFERENCE**

The parties are directed to read this Interim Order in its entirety, as it contains important information regarding the above-captioned matter.

This Order is issued pursuant to the authority granted to presiding officers at 52 Pa. Code § 5.483 (relating to authority of presiding officer), and converts the telephonic evidentiary hearing scheduled for January 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., into a telephonic Prehearing Conference on this same date and time. At this prehearing conference, the parties should be prepared to discuss the procedural matters raised by the Complainant’s December 15, 2025 email to me, which I forwarded to counsel for PECO Energy Company.

By way of background, on August 13, 2025, Pierre-Richard Sampeur (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PECO Energy Company (PECO, Company or Respondent). Mr. Sampeur checked the box on the Complaint form averring that the utility is threatening to shut off his service or has already shut off his service. He also checked the box averring that there are incorrect charges on his bill. Specifically, Mr. Sampeur alleges that PECO refused to send him a bill for a six-month (6-month) period and that the Company’s representatives did not honor promises to stop late fees and collection activities related to the delayed billing and make scheduled calls to the Complainant. As relief, the Complainant asks the Commission to direct PECO to do the following:

- a) PECO to send me a monthly bill with meters reading dates and time
- b) PECO to refund all lates fees hidden within the bills (From May to Present since PECO is responsible for the situation []).
- c) I want a judge to review my situation and take the proper decision to protect the customers from PECO's abuse (I want a hearing in front of a judge)
- d) I need the record of my contacts with [P]eco during my phone calls to be turned over to the presiding judge.
- e) The judge to call Jamar and AL as witnesses. (PECO sent lawyers the last time (want the people I talk to to be present for questioning/clarification).

Complaint ¶ 5.

On September 8, 2025, PECO filed an answer to the Complaint, in which the Respondent admits in part and denies in part the various material allegations of the Complaint. PECO admits that the Complainant received delayed billings from June 2024 through October 2024 and from January 2025 to March 2025. The Company also admits that it assessed late payment charges and that a notice to terminate service was issued July 29, 2025 for an outstanding balance. PECO denies that the bills contain incorrect charges. The Company requested that the matter be referred to mediation and that the Commission dismiss the Complaint.

On September 23, 2025, Chief Administrative Law Judge Charles E. Rainey, Jr. issued an Interim Order Setting Resolution Conference referring this matter to mediation. Mediation was not successful.

By Hearing Notice dated November 5, 2025, an Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was scheduled for January 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., and the matter was assigned to me.

On December 15, 2025, the Complainant sent me an email that, on its face, does not show that PECO received a copy. In this email, Mr. Sampeur explains that he prefers an in-

person hearing to be held in the Commission's regional office in Philadelphia rather than a telephonic hearing on January 5, 2026. Mr. Sampeur also appears to try to raise other procedural matters but this is not clear. On December 15, 2025, in the interests of due process and fairness, I forwarded a copy of Complainant's email to counsel for the Respondent to cure this *ex parte* communication. By reply email, counsel opposed the Complainant's request for an in-person hearing.

Thus, under the circumstances, I find that a prehearing conference may be helpful to address procedural matters prior to the hearing. Therefore, by way of this Order, the January 5, 2026 evidentiary hearing will be converted to a prehearing conference. The purpose of the prehearing conference will be to discuss Mr. Sampeur's request for in-person hearing and provide an opportunity for Mr. Sampeur to clarify other procedural matters, if any, that he may be trying to raise in his December 15, 2025 email. To be clear, the prehearing conference is not being held in place of a hearing; it is being held to prepare the case for an orderly and efficient hearing and disposition.

Additionally, the parties should be prepared to discuss the possibilities for settlement. The prehearing conference is also an opportunity, with both parties' consent, to use the Settlement Judge procedure. If a hearing remains necessary, it will be scheduled after the conclusion of the prehearing conference.

The Complainant is cautioned that his failure to attend and fully participate in the prehearing conference could result in the Complaint being dismissed with prejudice and without hearing.

Mr. Sampeur's email also contained a request that all communication regarding this matter be sent by U.S. mail, not by email. That is consistent with the Complainant's requested form of service on his Complaint form.¹ The Certificate of Service provided with

¹ Also, the Commission's records do not indicate that Mr. Sampeur has an eFiling account such that he waived the requirement for service by mail.

PECO's answer indicates that the only manner of service was email. As such, the Company is directed to serve a copy of its answer to Mr. Sampeur by First-Class Mail.

Finally, the parties are reminded that any correspondence sent to me must also be copied to the opposing party. The requirements for filing and serving documents, and other information about the procedural rules for this case are provided in the prehearing order issued on November 5, 2025.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the telephonic evidentiary hearing scheduled for Monday, January 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., is hereby converted to a telephonic Prehearing Conference scheduled on the same date and time: January 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m.

2. That the parties shall attend and participate in a telephone prehearing conference on January 5, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., and shall be fully prepared for the conference, consistent with the terms set forth above.

3. That to participate in the Prehearing Conference, you must dial the toll-free number listed below. You will be prompted to enter a PIN number, which is also listed below. You will be asked to speak your name and then the telephone system will connect you to the hearing.

Toll-free Bridge Number: **866.759.6860**
PIN Number: **71568747**

You must call into the Prehearing Conference on the scheduled day and time. If you fail to do so, your case may be dismissed. You will not be called by the Office of the Administrative Law Judge.

C-2025-3056913 - PIERRE-RICHARD SAMPEUR v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY
Revised 12/19/2025

PIERRE-RICHARD SAMPEUR
240 BEECHWOOD ROAD
BROOKHAVEN PA 19015
267.403.6624

pierrericard230@comcast.net

Served via USPS First-class mail December 19, 2025

KHADIJAH SCOTT ESQUIRE
PECO ENERGY COMPANY
2301 MARKET STREET - S23-1
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103
267.533.1830

khadijah.scott@exeloncorp.com

Served via eService December 19, 2025

MARGARET MORRIS ESQUIRE
REGER RIZZO & DARNALL
CIRA CENTRE 13TH FL
2929 ARCH STREET
PHILADELPHIA PA 19104
215.495.6524
215.870.5785

mmorris@regerlaw.com

Served via eService December 19, 2025
(Counsel for PECO Energy Company)