

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Charmaine Prater	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2023-3039169
	:	C-2025-3058086
PECO Energy Company	:	C-2025-3059038
Charmaine Custis	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3058088
	:	C-2025-3058831
PECO Energy Company	:	

**SECOND ORDER CONSOLIDATING PROCEEDINGS**

On March 9, 2023, Charmaine Prater filed a Formal Complaint against PECO, at Docket No. C-2023-3039169 (First Complaint) in which she alleged, among other things, improper billing and service termination procedures by PECO and that PECO has illegally blocked her from her accounts. On April 11, 2023, PECO filed an answer in which it denied the material allegations in the complaint.

On September 11, 2025, Ms. Prater filed a Formal Complaint against PECO, at Docket No. C-2025-8086 (Second Complaint), in which she again alleged, among other things, improper billing, meter tampering by PECO personnel and improper service termination procedures. On November 11, 2025, PECO filed an answer in which it denied the material allegations in the complaint.

On September 10, 2025, the Complainant, using the name Charmaine Custis, filed a Formal Complaint against PECO, at Docket No. C-2025-3058088 (Third Complaint) again alleging, among other things, improper billing and service termination procedures, as well as

meter tampering by PECO personnel. On November 11, 2025, PECO filed an answer in which it denied the material allegations in the complaint.

On November 25, 2025, the Complainant, using the name Charmaine Custis, filed a Formal Complaint against PECO, at Docket No. C-2025-3058831 (Fourth Complaint) appealing “informal decisions identified as #4095112, #40940862, #4087874, #4069204, and #4037393”. Complainant argued that the identified informal decisions were withheld in violation of her civil rights, due process and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). On December 12, 2025, PECO filed an answer in which it denied the material allegations in the complaint and also filed a Preliminary Objection to which no response was filed.

By Order dated January 22, 2026, the Preliminary Objection was sustained from the Fourth Complaint and struck allegations of violations of the ADA and consolidated C-2025-3058831 with C-2023-3059169, C-2025-3058086 and C-2025-3058088 for hearing and adjudication.

On December 3, 2025, the Formal Complaint against PECO filed by Complainant, using the name Charmaine Prater, at Docket No. C-2025-3059083 (Fifth Complaint) was served on PECO again alleging, among other things, improper billing, and that the Secretary’s Bureau created a hostile environment during her on-site visit. On December 12, 2025, PECO filed an answer in which it denied the material allegations in the complaint.

On February 25, 2026, PECO filed a Motion to Consolidate, properly endorsed with a Notice to Plead, Complainant’s Formal Complaints. Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.103, a party has twenty (20) days from the date of service within which to answer or object to a motion, unless the period of time is otherwise fixed by the Commission or the presiding officer. Here, due to telephone hearing at Docket No. C-2025-3059038 being scheduled for March 10, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., Ms. Prater had five (5) days from the date of service to file an answer to the Motion to Consolidate. As of the date of this Order, Ms. Prater has not filed an answer to the Motion to Consolidate.

The Commission's regulation pertaining to Consolidation appears at 52 Pa. Code § 5.81, and states in relevant part:

**§ 5.81. Consolidation**

(a) The Commission or presiding officer, with or without motion, may order proceedings involving a common question of law or fact to be consolidated. The Commission or presiding officer may make orders concerning the conduct of the proceeding as may avoid unnecessary costs or delay.

52 Pa. Code § 5.81(a).

The question of consolidation is clearly left to the sound discretion of the Commission or presiding officer.

In these cases, the above-captioned proceedings are interrelated and raise common issues of law and fact. All five complaints involve the same parties and involve allegations of, among other things, improper billing and service termination procedures and meter tampering by PECO personnel. Because the disposition of each of these matters is interrelated, the consolidation of these proceedings will promote the efficient use of the time and resources of the parties and the Commission. Consolidation for hearing and adjudication is warranted and in the public interest, the interest of the parties and the interest of the Commission.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That this Complaint proceeding at Docket C-2025-3059038 is consolidated with the previously consolidated complaint proceedings Docket Numbers C-2023-3039169, C-2025-3058086, C-2025-3058088 and C-2025-3058831 for hearing and adjudication.
2. That the telephone hearing scheduled for March 10, 2026 shall be changed



**C-2025-3059038 - CHARMAINE PRATER v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY**



Served via email- March 3, 2026

MARGARET A MORRIS ESQUIRE  
REGER RIZZO & DARNALL LLP  
CIRA CENTRE 13TH FL  
2929 ARCH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19104  
215.495.6524  
215.870.5785  
[mmorris@regerlaw.com](mailto:mmorris@regerlaw.com)

Served via eService- March 3, 2026  
(*Counsel for PECO Energy Company*)