

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

DJ Christopher Norman	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3057175
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

**INTERIM ORDER
ON CONTINUANCE AND PROCEDURAL DEADLINES**

On August 27, 2025, DJ Christopher Norman (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PECO Energy Company (PECO or Respondent). The Complainant alleged PECO refused to activate gas service at 19 Linden Avenue, Lansdowne, PA 19050. In addition, Mr. Norman alleged that PECO refused to provide him with written documentation showing the customer’s responsibility for gas services and activation of gas service, made false allegations regarding ownership of its equipment and refused to identify personnel when requested. For relief, the Complainant requested:

- 1) that the gas service at the subject property be activated forthwith, 2) that the specific codes, rules, regulations and procedures regarding a customer's responsibility regarding gas service be identified and/or provided to the customer in writing, 3) that ownership of gas metering equipment be clarified and established with certainty, and 4) Identify the full name, title and direct supervisor/manager for PECO representative only know as Eric who contacted customer from (215) 861-0259 (this line has a voice mail belonging to Zac Marcella who customer has not returned customers calls)

Complaint ¶ 5.

On September 25, 2025, PECO timely filed an answer, in which it generally denied the Complainant’s allegations. PECO admitted that the Complainant contacted the utility

for an appointment for a gas pressure test but averred that the Complainant asked for a same-day appointment, which could not be accommodated. PECO stated that it will be available for the testing if the Complainant chooses to schedule a gas pressure test appointment. The Respondent asked the Commission to dismiss the Complaint.

On October 2, 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.

On November 17, 2025, the Office of Administrative Law Judge (OALJ) issued a Call-In Telephonic Hearing Notice scheduling an initial telephonic hearing for Friday, January 9, 2025 at 1:00 p.m., and assigning me as the presiding officer. On November 18, 2025, a Prehearing Order was issued which addressed the procedures applicable to this proceeding, including how to request a continuance.

On November 19, 2025, the Complainant filed a Petition for Interim Emergency Order (Emergency Petition) seeking expedited review of his request for activation of gas service at his residence. Mr. Norman alleged that PECO refused to activate gas service at the property and, as a result, that he was without heat or hot water since August 2025. The Complainant further alleged that PECO refused to provide the legal requirements or responsibilities of the parties regarding the activation of gas service for a residential customer and failed to exhibit good faith during these proceedings.

On November 20, 2025, the Commission issued a Judge Change Assignment Notice, advising that Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Steven K. Haas would be responsible for resolving any issues that arose during the preliminary phase of the proceeding. On the same date, notice was issued that a telephonic emergency hearing would be held on Monday, December 1, 2025. On November 21, 2025, a second notice was issued changing the date for the emergency hearing to Tuesday, November 25, 2025.

The hearing on the Emergency Petition was convened, as scheduled, on November 25, 2025. Mr. Norman appeared and represented himself. Attorney Khadijah Scott appeared on behalf of PECO and had two witnesses who were prepared to testify. Prior to the taking of testimony, however, the parties discussed and agreed upon settlement terms as a resolution of the Emergency Petition. Tr. 8.

On December 4, 2025, ALJ Haas issued an interim order granting the Complainant's withdrawal of the Emergency Petition. At this time, the matter was returned to me to preside and render an initial decision on the underlying complaint.

On December 19, 2025, filings were made to change counsel for PECO. Attorney Scott withdrew her appearance and Attorney Margaret A. Morris entered her appearance.

On December 31, 2025, the Complainant filed a document titled "Petitioner DJ Norman Pre-Trial Memorandum." The document was not served to the presiding officer. On January 7, 2026, I forwarded a copy of the memorandum to counsel for PECO because the document did not indicate that it was served to PECO.

On January 9, 2025, the evidentiary hearing was convened as scheduled. Mr. Norman appeared and Attorney Morris participated on behalf of PECO. Two PECO witnesses were present and prepared to testify. Following discussion with the parties, I granted a request by PECO to continue the hearing, to provide time for the Company to conduct additional investigation of the matters raised by the Complainant. Mr. Norman did not object to a continuance and indicated that he may use the additional time before hearing to file applications for subpoenas. All parties indicated their availability for a hearing on Wednesday, April 1, 2026.

On January 13, 2026, the OALJ issued a call-in Telephonic Evidentiary Hearing Notice scheduling a telephonic hearing for Wednesday, April 1, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.

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).¹ 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). If settlement is not feasible, the parties are encouraged to stipulate to any matters they reasonably can in order to expedite this proceeding, lessen the burden of time and expenses in litigation on all parties and conserve administrative hearing resources. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.232, 5.234.

Specifically, the parties are encouraged to explore whether stipulations of fact or agreement by a party to produce a witness could be used in place of the formal subpoena process. Any party intending to subpoena witnesses for the hearing should review the procedures established in 52 Pa. Code § 5.421 regarding form, service, and fees.²

The deadlines for filing applications for subpoenas and responsive pleadings are set forth in the ordering paragraphs below.

¹ These regulations are available online at the link below:
<https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/052/chapter5/subchapDtoc.html>

² The procedures for subpoenas are provided at this link:
<https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/052/chapter5/s5.421.html>

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the parties are encouraged to exchange information on an informal basis, consistent with the Commission's regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 5.322.
2. That the parties shall engage in discussions with each other and pursue a possible settlement of the outstanding issues, and potential stipulations, consistent with provisions in the Commission's regulations in 52 Pa. Code § 5.231(a).
3. That, **no later than March 2, 2026**, any application for subpoena must be filed with the Secretary of the Public Utility Commission and emailed to the presiding officer and parties.
4. That, **within ten (10) days of service of the application for subpoena**, any response or objection must be filed with the Secretary of the Public Utility Commission and emailed to the presiding officer and parties.
5. That, **no later than March 25, 2026**, any party wishing to present any documents or exhibits at the hearing must send a copy by email to the presiding officer and parties. This requirement does not apply to documents and exhibits that were provided prior to the initial hearing on January 9, 2026.

Date: January 15, 2026

Erin L. Gannon
Administrative Law Judge

C-2025-3057175 - DJ CHRISTOPHER NORMAN v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY
Revised 12/22/2025

DJ CHRISTOPHER NORMAN
19 LINDEN AVENUE
LANSDOWNE PA 19050
267.304.2162
dnorman1@student.ccp.edu
dnorman1@ccp.edu
Served via eService January 15, 2026

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 January 15, 2026
(Counsel for PECO Energy Company)