

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

| | | |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Kristine Cardaci | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | C-2025-3056935 |
| | : | |
| PPL Electric Utilities Corporation | : | |

**INTERIM ORDER
ON MOTIONS AND SCHEDULING AN EVIDENTIARY HEARING**

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

This Order denies the Respondent’s motion in limine. It also memorializes the February 18, 2026 deadline for filing motions prior to an evidentiary hearing on the Complaint and directs that an evidentiary hearing will be scheduled for a date following the 20-day period for filing responses to motions.

By way of background, on or about July 23, 2025, Kristine Cardaci (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL, Company or Respondent). Ms. Cardaci checked the box on the Complaint form averring that the utility is threatening to shut off her service or has already shut off her service. She also checked the box averring that there are incorrect charges on her bill. Specifically, Ms. Cardaci alleges that, between December 2024 and January 14, 2025, she was not using electric heat but her usage spiked. She also alleges that she was stuck with a debt forgiveness balance from OnTrack during the same period. As relief, she asks the Commission to order “total reimbursement (\$1,300) for abusive charges.” Complaint ¶ 5.

On September 8, 2025, PPL filed an answer to the Complaint, in which the Respondent admits in part and denies in part the various material allegations of the Complaint.¹ PPL admits that it issued a termination notice to the Complainant. The Company also admits that the Complainant's OnTrack enrollment ended in January 2025, the remaining arrears that had been eligible for forgiveness through OnTrack became due. PPL denies that the Complainant's bills contain incorrect charges. The Company requested that the Commission dismiss the Complaint, with prejudice.

By Hearing Notice dated September 19, 2025, an Initial Call-In Telephonic Hearing was scheduled for November 12, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., and the matter was assigned to me. On September 23, 2025, a Prehearing Order was issued which addressed the procedures applicable to this proceeding.

On November 12, 2025, a telephonic evidentiary hearing was convened. The Complainant was present. PPL was represented by Megan E. Rulli, Esquire, and a witness for the Company was present. Ms. Cardaci averred that, on Monday, November 10, 2025, she had mailed proposed hearing exhibits to the Respondent and presiding officer. The undersigned and PPL did not receive the exhibits before the hearing. As such, the hearing was continued to allow time for PPL to receive and review the Complainant's proposed exhibits. No testimony was taken and no exhibits were presented.

On November 12, 2025, the Commission issued a Further Telephonic Hearing Notice to reschedule the hearing for November 25, 2025. On November 13, 2025, a Second Prehearing Order was issued.

On November 19, 2025, Ms. Cardaci called the Office of Administrative Law Judge to ask for a continuance of the November 25, 2025 hearing. Given the limited time before the hearing, I contacted counsel for PPL, who responded that the Respondent did not oppose the hearing being continued.

¹ The Commission's records show that the Complaint was served to PPL on August 19, 2025.

I found good cause to grant the continuance because it was unopposed and the first continuance was relatively short given that (1) PPL anticipated that it might serve an additional proposed exhibit prior to the November 25, 2025 hearing and (2) service to the Complainant is by First-Class Mail.

Accordingly, on November 20, 2025, notice was issued to cancel the further hearing on November 25, 2025. On November 21, 2025, notice was issued to reschedule the further telephonic hearing for January 12, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.

On December 9, 2025, PPL filed a motion in limine to prohibit the Complainant from presenting any testimony and exhibits related to her high billing claims. PPL averred the Complainant has refused to provide the Company with access to its meter for testing. PPL contended that, without access to the meter for testing, the Company cannot fully prepare for the hearing and respond to the Complainant's high billing claims. Further, the Company claimed that it would be unfairly prejudiced if the Complainant was permitted to present testimony and evidence related to her high billing claims while preventing the Company from presenting its own relevant evidence in response. PPL stated that two weeks is the minimum time needed to remove the meter, test it, and submit the results to both the Complainant and the ALJ prior to the hearing scheduled for January 12, 2026, and that it would withdraw the motion if the Complainant allowed the Company access to its meter for removal and testing by December 29, 2025.

PPL's motion was endorsed with a notice to plead. The notice stated that a reply could be filed within twenty (20) days after the date of service, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.103(c). PPL requested an expedited response period of ten (10) calendar days to facilitate a ruling on the motion in sufficient time before the hearing.

On December 22, 2026, I issued an interim order converting the January 12, 2026 evidentiary hearing to a prehearing conference to discuss the motion in limine and meter testing, to ensure this matter was ready for a hearing. I held ruling on the motion in limine in abeyance, to be addressed after the prehearing conference, if necessary. I also directed that the

Complainant's written answer to PPL's motion in limine, if any, must be filed by December 29, 2025. Ms. Cardaci did not file an answer.

The prehearing conference was convened on January 12, 2026, as scheduled. Ms. Cardaci appeared *pro se*. Counsel Megan Rulli appeared for PPL. No testimony was taken. The parties stated their positions on the meter testing. Tr. 15-16, 23 (Rulli), 16-21 (Cardaci). Ms. Rulli stated that PPL attempted to remove the meter for testing on September 3, 2025 but was denied access. Tr. 15. Ms. Cardaci stated that the Company entered her property to attempt to remove the meter without providing notice or receiving her consent. Tr. 16-19.

Ms. Rulli stated that, on November 14, 2025, she called the Complainant to alert her that PPL intended to remove its meter for testing and the Complainant refused access and threatened to call law enforcement. Tr. 15. Ms. Cardaci confirmed that she spoke to Ms. Rulli and stated that she feels threatened by the Company's assertion that it will come on her property without her permission. Tr. 18-19.

If the meter must be tested, the Complainant wants to have the test performed by a third party. Tr. 27, 30. PPL's position is that the meter is the property of PPL and that the Company does not agree to having a third-party remove the meter. Tr. 32. Alternatives were discussed, including (1) having the Commission test the meter pursuant to the regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 57.22(b) and (2) whether the parties would agree to stipulate that the meter is accurate. Tr. 22, 34-35. The matter was not resolved during the prehearing conference.

The Complainant stated that she would like to file a motion and/or introduce an exhibit related to police reports about the meter testing dispute. Tr. 30. I directed that Ms. Cardaci should file any motions by February 18, 2026. Tr. 34.

After further consideration, I have determined that the benefit of having the results of a meter test for the evidentiary record is outweighed by the interest in preventing further escalation of the dispute between the Complainant and PPL. The Commission's regulations do not provide for a party other than PPL or the Commission to test the electric

meter. 52 Pa. Code § 57.22. If the Commission tests the meter, this does not avoid the need for PPL to enter the Complainant's property, because the Company is still required to be present. 52 Pa. Code § 57.22 (b) ("the public utility owning the meter shall be notified that a test is to be made and shall have a representative present to open the meter, assist in the test and adjust and seal the meter after the test"). Further, Ms. Cardaci does not agree to stipulate to the accuracy of the meter. Tr. 35.

In its motion in limine, PPL contends that not having the meter test "would unfairly prejudice the Company if the Complainant was permitted to present testimony and evidence related to her high billing claims while blocking the Company from presenting its own relevant evidence in response." Motion ¶ 21. PPL requests that the Complainant be prohibited from introducing into evidence "any exhibits and testimony related to claims that her electric service bill(s) contain incorrect charges." *Id.* ¶ 26.

In the instant case, I find that PPL's requested remedy is overly broad. The Commission has found that a customer can support a high bill complaint even where a meter test result showed the meter was accurate, by proving her case with relevant, circumstantial evidence that would support a finding that the disputed bill is unreasonably high. *Milkie v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 768 A.2d 1217 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001) (citing *Burleson v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 443 A.2d 1373 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982)); *Thomas v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2010- 2187197 (Opinion and Order entered Nov. 15, 2011). Here, as the matter currently stands, the record will show that no meter test has been conducted. No assumption will be made that the meter is inaccurate based on the absence of a meter test. My decision on the high bill complaint will be made based on the other direct and indirect evidence that is presented at the hearing. The burden of proof will remain on the Complainant to provide substantial evidence to support her high bill claim. 2 Pa.C.S. § 704. PPL will have the opportunity to cross examine Ms. Cardaci on her testimony. If the Company has a specific objection to testimony or evidence offered by the Complainant at the evidentiary hearing in this proceeding, a ruling will be made at the hearing upon timely objection and after affording Ms. Cardaci an opportunity to respond.

Accordingly, the motion in limine will be denied without prejudice.

Also, by this order, an evidentiary hearing will be scheduled for an available hearing date approximately 30 days after February 18, 2026. This will afford time before the hearing if PPL wishes to file a response to any motions filed by Ms. Cardaci. It also affords additional time for discovery.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Respondent's motion in limine is denied, without prejudice.
2. That, if the Complainant wishes to file a motion, that motion is due by February 18, 2026. 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

A copy of the motion should also be sent to me and to counsel for PPL.

3. That the Respondent may file an answer or objection to a motion within 20 days of service of the motion.

4. That the scheduling staff of the Office of Administrative Law Judge shall schedule this matter for hearing at least 30 days after February 18, 2026 and notify the parties in writing.

Date: February 5, 2026

/s/
Erin L. Gannon
Administrative Law Judge

C-2025-3056935 - KRISTINE CARDACI v. PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

KRISTINE CARDACI



Served via USPS First-Class Mail on February 5, 2026

MEGAN E RULLI ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL
17 NORTH SECOND ST 12TH FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717-612-6012

mrulli@postschell.com

Served via eService on February 5, 2026
(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)

DEVIN T RYAN ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL
ONE OXFORD CENTRE
31 GRANT STREET SUITE 3010
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412-506-6364

dryan@postschell.com

Served via eService on February 5, 2026
(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)