

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

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

**INTERIM ORDER
ON PROCEDURAL DEADLINES**

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 explained 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 appeared to try to raise other procedural matters but this was 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.

On December 19, 2025, I issued an interim order converting the scheduled hearing to a prehearing conference, 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.

Also on December 19, 2025, attorney Margaret Morris filed notice of her appearance for PECO. On the same date, attorney Khadijah Scott withdrew her appearance for the Company.

By Hearing Notice dated December 23, 2025, the telephonic prehearing conference was rescheduled for January 22, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

On January 22, 2026, the prehearing conference was convened as scheduled. Mr. Sampeur appeared and Attorney Morris participated on behalf of PECO. A representative of PECO was also present. The parties stated their willingness to take some time to discuss settlement and agreed to my participation as settlement judge. 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.

While no settlement was reached, several matters were resolved by these discussions, including that PECO would provide bills, customer contacts and a statement of account for the years 2024 and 2025 to the Complainant. It was further agreed that, after reviewing the material provided, Mr. Sampeur would send any of his questions, in writing, to counsel for PECO. Ms. Morris also indicated that PECO would send written questions to the Complainant. I encouraged the parties to explore alternatives to the subpoena process, through discovery, consent by PECO to call the witnesses, or stipulations or admissions of fact.

The parties also agreed to the manner of service for this case. Counsel for PECO will be served by email. Mr. Sampeur may also send PECO a copy by certified mail, if he chooses. Mr. Sampeur will be served by mail and his compliance with deadlines will be determined by the postmark; however, PECO will also send a copy to Mr. Sampeur by email.

We also discussed the Complainant's request for an in-person hearing. As set forth on the record, Mr. Sampeur raised concerns that there could be a technological failure that would prevent or disrupt a telephonic hearing, which would be avoided by holding the hearing in person. He also noted that his accent may be easier to understand in person. Counsel for PECO objected for reasons including that, for many years, the Commission routinely and successfully held telephonic hearings and her hearing schedule before the Commission does not allow travel time to and from Harrisburg, where the presiding officer is located.

After consideration of the parties' positions, as well as the nature and scope of the Complaint and requested relief, I will hold the hearing by telephone. As noted on the record, there were no technology issues during the prehearing conference, which lasted more than two hours. The parties will connect to the hearing using the same phone number and pin number used for the prehearing conference. The hearing will be scheduled on an available date in late April, to accommodate the parties' availability and provide time for discovery and exchange of witness information.

The parties are encouraged to review the Commission's regulations relating to discovery and subpoenas, which are set forth in Chapter 5 of the Pennsylvania Code, 52 Pa. Code § 5.321 to 5.372 and 5.421.¹

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.

The deadlines to identify potential witnesses, request to subpoena a witness, and submit proposed hearing exhibits are set forth in the ordering paragraphs below.

¹ The Commission's procedures for discovery and subpoenas are available online at the links below:
<https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/052/chapter5/subchapDtoc.html>
<https://www.pacodeandbulletin.gov/Display/pacode?file=/secure/pacode/data/052/chapter5/s5.421.html>

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

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

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

3. 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) and 5.234(a).

4. That, **no later than March 13, 2026**, if the Complainant has any proposed witnesses (other than himself), he 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.

5. That, **no later than March 13, 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.

6. That, **no later than March 24, 2026**, any application for subpoena must be filed with the Secretary of the Public Utility Commission and emailed to the presiding officer and parties.

7. 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.

8. That, **no later than April 14, 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. Note that attachments to your Complaint or Answer are not admitted into the record unless submitted separately as exhibits.

Date: January 23, 2026

_____/s/
Erin L. Gannon
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

pierrerichard230@comcast.net

Served via USPS First-class mail and email January 23, 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 23, 2026
(Counsel for PECO Energy Company)