

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Charlotte Valeriano	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3056769
	:	
FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company	:	

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
F. Joseph Brady  
Administrative Law Judge

**INTRODUCTION**

This Initial Decision dismisses, with prejudice, the Formal Complaint of Charlotte Valeriano against FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company because she failed to appear for her hearing and prosecute her Complaint. This Decision also bars Complainant from filing any further informal or formal complaints related to her outstanding balance, until such time as her outstanding balance has been paid in full, due to her abuse of the administrative process.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On August 11, 2025, Charlotte Valeriano (Complainant or Ms. Valeriano) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company (FE PA or Respondent or Company) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission). In the Complaint, Complainant placed checkmarks in the boxes indicating:

“The utility is threatening to shut off my service or has already shut off my service,” “I would like a payment agreement,” and “Other.” Complaint ¶ 4. Under “Other,” Complainant stated, “Medical issues. No more options in using medical certificate.” *Id.* Complainant requested a new payment arrangement as relief. Complaint ¶ 5.

In her Complaint, Complainant selected the option to receive all communications from the Commission via eService through an eFiling account she registered with the Commission at the email address provided by Complainant on the Complaint. Complaint ¶ 9.

On September 2, 2025, FE PA filed an Answer with New Matter (Answer) along with a Notice to Plead. In its Answer, FE PA admitted in part and denied in part various material allegations of the Complaint. FE PA admitted that it provides residential electric service in Complainant’s name to 3349 Montrose Avenue, Laureldale, Pennsylvania. Answer ¶ 3. FE PA also admitted that a termination notice was issued to Complainant on July 28, 2025. Answer ¶ 4. FE PA averred that Complainant has defaulted on four Company-issued payment arrangements and one Commission-issued payment arrangement. *Id.* FE PA further averred Complainant’s outstanding balance is \$10,963.66 as of August 7, 2025. *Id.*

In its New Matter, FE PA averred that Complainant is not entitled to a second Commission-issued payment arrangement or an extension of the prior Commission-issued payment arrangement because there has been no change in income or significant change of circumstances. New Matter ¶ 14. FE PA also averred that since August 2023, Complainant has filed six informal complaints and the present Formal Complaint in an effort to avoid paying her bills. New Matter ¶ 17. FE PA requests the Commission to find Complainant has abused the administrative process and bar her from filing any further complaints until her balance is paid in full. New Matter ¶ 25.

Complainant's Answer to FE PA's New Matter was due within twenty days of the date of service of the Answer with New Matter. 52 Pa. Code § 5.63(a). Complainant did not file an Answer to FE PA's New Matter.

On October 8, 2025, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was served on the parties scheduling an initial telephonic hearing on December 5, 2025, at 10:00 a.m., and the matter was assigned to me. The Hearing Notice provided the parties with the Toll-Free Bridge Number and the PIN to call and participate in the telephonic hearing. The Hearing Notice further stated as follows:

**FAILURE TO APPEAR:** You may lose the case if you do not take part in this hearing and present evidence on the issue(s) raised. Your case may be dismissed "with prejudice" which means that you will be barred from filing another complaint raising the same claim(s) and issue(s) presented in the dismissed complaint.

**CONTINUANCES.** You may request a continuance of the hearing if you have a good reason. All continuances will be granted only for good cause. To request a continuance, you must submit a written request (a "motion") at least five (5) days before the hearing. Your motion should include: 1) The case name, number, and hearing date; 2) The reason for the request; and 3) Whether the other party agrees (or if you do not know).

On October 8, 2025, a Prehearing Order was served on the parties reminding them of the date and time of the hearing. The Prehearing Order also stated the potential consequences if a party failed to appear at the hearing. Additionally, the Prehearing Order informed the parties about the applicable procedural rules and again included the procedure to follow for hearing continuances.

The Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were eServed to Complainant in the ordinary course of the Commission's business to the email address that was registered with the Commission by Complainant. Neither the Hearing Notice nor the Prehearing Order were returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

On December 5, 2025, the hearing convened as scheduled. Complainant was not present at the start of the hearing. After a short recess to allow time for Complainant to appear, the hearing proceeded in Complainant's absence. Margaret Morris, Esquire, appeared on behalf of FE PA and presented the testimony of Alison Walker, an Advanced Customer Services Compliance Specialist at FE PA. Respondent offered fourteen exhibits, which were entered into the record.

The record closed on December 23, 2025, upon the filing of the transcript with the Commission.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Complainant is Charlotte Valeriano.
2. Respondent is FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company.
3. On August 11, 2025, Complainant filed a Formal Complaint against Respondent.
4. On September 2, 2025, Respondent filed an Answer with New Matter to the Complaint.
5. Complainant did not file an Answer to FE PA's New Matter.

6. Complainant established an account with FE PA on November 22, 2019, at 3349 Montrose Ave., Laureldale, PA, 19605 (Service Address). Complaint ¶ 1; Tr. 12; FE PA Exh. 1.

7. Complainant received four separate Company-issued payment arrangements on November 25, 2019, September 9, 2020, April 14, 2022, and May 18, 2023. Tr. 17-18; FE PA Exh. 4.

8. Complainant defaulted on all four Company-issued payment arrangements for non-payment. Tr. 17-18; FE PA Exh. 4.

9. On May 18, 2023, Complainant filed an informal complaint with the Bureau of Consumer Services (BCS) at Case No. 3911219, pursuant to service termination. Tr. 24; FE PA Exh. 10.

10. The May 18, 2023 informal complaint was closed without a decision pursuant to restoration of service for Complainant's payment of reduced restoration terms. Tr. 24; FE PA Exh. 10.

11. On August 11, 2023, Complainant filed an informal complaint with the BCS at Case No. 3933353, pursuant to a termination notice. Tr. 18-19; FE PA Exh. 5.

12. On August 14, 2023, the BCS at Case No. 3933353 issued a payment arrangement to Complainant. Tr. 18-19; FE PA Exh. 5.

13. Complainant defaulted on the Commission-issued payment arrangement for non-payment. Tr. 19.

14. On April 11, 2024, Complainant filed an informal complaint with the BCS at Case No. 3975168, pursuant to service termination. Tr. 20; FE PA Exh. 6.

15. On April 11, 2024, BCS dismissed the informal complaint at Case No. 3975168 pursuant to Section 1405 of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(d). Tr. 20-21; FE PA Exh. 6.

16. On April 11, 2024, FE PA accepted a medical certification to restore service. Tr. 15; FE PA Exh. 3.

17. On August 9, 2024, Complainant filed an informal complaint with the BCS at Case No. 4008988, seeking a payment arrangement. Tr. 21; FE PA Exh. 7.

18. On August 13, 2024, FE PA accepted a medical certification to prevent termination of service. Tr. 15; FE PA Exh. 3.

19. On September 17, 2024, BCS dismissed the informal complaint at Case No. 4008988, pursuant to Section 1405 of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 1405(d). Tr. 22; FE PA Exh. 7.

20. On October 11, 2024, FE PA accepted a medical certification to restore service. Tr. 15; FE PA Exh. 3.

21. On April 11, 2025, Complainant filed an informal complaint with the BCS at Case No. 4053885, seeking a payment arrangement. Tr. 22; FE PA Exh. 8.

22. On April 29, 2025, BCS dismissed the informal complaint at Case No. 4053885, for failure to satisfy a prior Commission-issued payment arrangement. Tr. 23; FE PA Exh. 8.

23. On June 23, 2025, Complainant filed an informal complaint with the BCS at Case No. 4072525, seeking a payment arrangement. Tr. 23; FE PA Exh. 9.

24. On July 10, 2025, BCS dismissed the informal complaint at Case No. 4072525, for failure to satisfy a prior Commission-issued payment arrangement. Tr. 23-24; FE PA Exh. 9.

25. FE PA has issued eighteen 10-Day Termination Notices to Complainant from November 22, 2019 to November 19, 2025. Tr. 26; FE PA Exh. 13.

26. Complainant's outstanding balance as of November 10, 2025, was \$10,789.30. Tr. 14; FE PA Exh. 2.

27. On October 8, 2025, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was served on Complainant scheduling an initial telephonic hearing on December 5, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

28. On October 8, 2025, a Prehearing Order for Telephone Hearing was served on Complainant providing additional information to the parties regarding the hearing.

29. On December 5, 2025, the hearing convened as scheduled.

30. Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were served on Complainant by eService to the email address Complainant provided to and registered with the Commission.

31. Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order provided the Complainant with the toll-free bridge telephone number and PIN to call and participate in

the hearing, and, *inter alia*, the procedure for requesting a continuance and the possible consequences of failing to appear at the hearing.

32. Neither the Hearing Notice nor the Prehearing Order were returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

33. Complainant failed to appear and participate in the scheduled telephonic hearing on December 5, 2025. Tr. 6.

34. Complainant has not contacted the Commission to explain why her failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

## DISCUSSION

### **Due Process and Notice**

Administrative agencies, such as the Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984). This due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. *Id.*

The record shows that Complainant was provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. First, on October 8, 2025, the Commission served Complainant a Hearing Notice which advised the parties of the date and time of the hearing, and how to participate. Second, also on October 8, 2025, the Commission served Complainant a Prehearing Order which reminded the parties of the date and time of the hearing, and how to participate. Further, both documents advised the parties, *inter alia*, how to request a continuance prior to the hearing if needed. Finally, both documents advised Complainant that failure to appear may result in the dismissal of the Complaint with prejudice, which

means that Complainant would be barred from filing another complaint raising the same claim(s) and issues(s) presented in the dismissed complaint.

Both the Hearing Notice and Prehearing Order were eServed to Complainant at the email address she registered with the Commission. Neither was returned to the Commission as undeliverable. Notice eServed to a party's registered email address with no notification that service failed is presumed to have been received. *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Order entered Dec. 19, 2019); *Zirkel v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered Apr. 7, 2017); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered Jan. 31, 2017).

Complainant had notice of the hearing and an opportunity to be heard in this proceeding. Therefore, Complainant's due process rights have been fully protected. *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 25, 1993).

### **Failure to Appear, Waiver and the "Unavoidable" Standard**

Once a hearing is scheduled and the parties are duly notified by the Commission, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing. *Mumma v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Opinion and Order entered Jan. 28, 2002). Both the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations provide that, after being notified, a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing shall be deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted to later reopen the matter or be permitted to recall excused witnesses. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a). However, these provisions in the Code and in the Commission's regulations do not apply if the presiding officer determines that the party's failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable and that the interests of the other

parties and of the public would not be prejudiced by permitting the reopening or further examination. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(b).

The party who failed to appear at the hearing has the burden of explaining why her/his failure to appear was unavoidable. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); *Herr v. W. Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3028202 (Opinion and Order entered Sept. 15, 2022). When there are no facts in the record that the party's failure to appear was unavoidable, the complaint should be dismissed with prejudice. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 22, 2022); *Little v. Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Auth.*, Docket No. F-2021-3027107 (Opinion and Order entered Feb. 7, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3000734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

Complainant failed to appear for the hearing despite receiving notice and despite the undersigned allowing additional time for Complainant to appear. To date, there has been no communication to the Office of Administrative Law Judge or me by, or on behalf of, Complainant explaining why Complainant's failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

Consequently, I find that Complainant waived the opportunity to participate in a hearing on the matters raised in the Complaint. Complainant's absence was not unavoidable, and the Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice.

### **Burden of Proof and Dismissal of Complaint**

Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code provides that the party seeking relief from the Commission has the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a). To establish a sufficient case and satisfy the burden of proof, a complainant must show that the

respondent public utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the complaint. *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (1990); *Feinstein v. Phila. Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (1976). Such a showing must be by a preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 578 A.2d 600 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990). A preponderance of the evidence is established by presenting evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

As the proponent of any request for relief, Complainant bears the burden of proof. By failing to participate and proffer any evidence to support the complaint, Complainant has failed to meet this burden. Thus, it is appropriate to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 22, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-300734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019) (citing *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995)).

### **Abuse of Process/Complainant Bar**

Additionally, FE PA argues that Complainant is abusing the Commission's process and complaint procedures to avoid termination. Thus, FE PA requests that Complainant be barred from filing further formal or informal complaints until her outstanding arrearages are paid in full.

The Commission has found an abuse of administrative due process in numerous other cases. In *Grossman v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania*, 67 Pa.P.U.C. 714 (1988) (*Grossman*), the Commission stated that abuse of administrative process is an exploitation of due process. The *Grossman* case involved a *pro se* litigant who abused the regulatory practice by frequently requesting continuances of hearings without showing good cause, and then not appearing for her scheduled hearings and not honoring

a settlement with the utility. *Id.* Abuse of administrative process cases often involve Complainants filing consecutive pleadings, complaints and motions for continuance of hearings in order to avoid payment and termination of services. As the Commission stated in *Argento's Pizza v. FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Co.*, Docket No. C-2009-2138055 (Final Order entered Oct. 1, 2010), the factors to be considered include the following: 1) the number and nature of complaints; 2) the number of defaulted payments; 3) the use of tactics to avoid payments and service terminations that became due; and 4) the history of payments. Similarly, in *Mazza v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2012-2318472 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 23, 2014), the Commission ultimately found an abuse of process and precluded the filing of future complaints until the arrearage on the account was satisfied.

In this matter, Complainant began failing to pay her electric bills from the start of her service with FE PA. Complainant established an account with FE PA on November 22, 2019, and received her first Company-issued payment arrangement on November 25, 2019. Complainant received three more Company-issued payment arrangements on September 9, 2020, April 14, 2022, and May 18, 2023. Complainant defaulted on all four Company-issued payment arrangements for non-payment. When FE PA would no longer issue payment arrangements, Complainant turned to filing complaints. Since May 18, 2023, Complainant has filed six informal complaints and the instant Formal Complaint. All of the complaints were filed just before Complainant's electric service was scheduled to be terminated or had been terminated. Complainant's consistent failure to timely pay her electric bills has forced FE PA to issue eighteen 10-Day Termination Notices to Complainant from November 22, 2019 to November 19, 2025. Complainant's tactics have resulted in her current outstanding balance rising to \$10,789.30.

The Respondent has the right to bill and receive payment for the utility service actually supplied. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1303, *Neal v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. Z-

00871874 (Final Order entered Jan. 4, 2002); *Angie's Bar v. Duquesne Light Co.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 213 (1990). In fact, the Commission has consistently held that:

A public utility is entitled to full payment for service provided to customers and all customers are obligated to pay for the utility service provided to them. Otherwise, a customer's unpaid bills are included in the utility's uncollectible expenses and ultimately paid for by other utility customers.

*Griggs v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. F-2020-3021754 (Opinion and Order entered July 15, 2021), citing *Scaccia v. West Penn Power Co.*, 55 Pa.P.U.C. 637 (1982); *Mill v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 447 A.2d 1100 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982); *Bolt v. Duquesne Light Co.*, Docket No. Z-8712758 (Order entered Apr. 8, 1988). The record in this case highlights a disturbing trend in Complainant's use of the Commission's informal and formal complaint procedures to avoid paying her electric bills while evading the Company's termination procedures.

Based on the foregoing, I find Complainant is abusing the administrative process in order to avoid paying her bills and having her service shut off. Accordingly, I will grant FE PA's request to bar Complainant from filing any further informal or formal complaints related to her current outstanding balance with FE PA until it is paid in full. Further, FE PA is authorized to terminate Complainant's electric service upon issuance of a final order by the Commission.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter of and the parties to this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701.

2. The Commission is required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them; this due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

3. Notice eServed to a party's registered email address with no notification that service failed to be delivered to that email address is presumed to have been received. *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Order entered Dec. 19, 2019); *Zirkel v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered Apr. 7, 2017); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered Jan. 31, 2017).

4. After being notified, a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing shall be deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted to later reopen the matter or be permitted to recall excused witnesses. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

5. If there are no facts in the record that a party's failure to appear at a hearing was unavoidable, the complaint should be dismissed with prejudice. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 22, 2022); *Little v. Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Auth.*, Docket No. F-2021-3027107 (Opinion and Order entered Feb. 7, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3000734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995).

6. Complainant's due process rights have been fully protected and Complainant's failure to appear was not unavoidable. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

7. As the party seeking relief, Complainant bears the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

8. By failing to participate in the hearing and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, Complainant has failed to meet the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

9. By law, a public utility is entitled to receive payment for the service it provides, and the Complainant must pay the Respondent for the service she consumes. *Scaccia v. W. Penn Power Co.*, 55 Pa.P.U.C. 637 (1982); *Kea v. Peoples Nat. Gas Co.*, 60 Pa.P.U.C. 215 (1985); *Mill v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 447 A.2d 1100 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1982).

10. The Respondent has the right to bill and receive payment for the utility service actually supplied. 66 Pa.C.S. § 1303, *Neal v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. Z-00871874, (Final Order entered Jan. 4, 2002); *Angie's Bar v. Duquesne Light Co.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 213 (1990).

11. The Commission may preclude a party from filing further informal or formal complaints when the party has abused the Commission's complaint procedures in order to avoid the termination of his or her service. *Mazza v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2012-2318472 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 23, 2014); *Argento's Pizza v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2009-2138055 (Final Order entered Oct. 1, 2010); *Grossman v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 67 Pa.P.U.C. 714 (1988).

12. Complainant has abused the administrative process by filing multiple similar complaints, incurring a substantial outstanding balance, and evidencing a poor payment history, in an attempt to avoid termination and payment for services. *Mazza v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2012-2318472 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 23, 2014); *Argento's Pizza v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2009-2138055 (Final Order entered Oct. 1, 2010); *Grossman v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 67 Pa.P.U.C. 714 (1988).

### ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Formal Complaint filed by Charlotte Valeriano in *Charlotte Valeriano v. FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company* at Docket No. C-2025-3056769, is hereby dismissed with prejudice.

2. That Charlotte Valeriano is precluded from filing further informal or formal complaints with the Commission regarding the arrearages on the account for electric service rendered by FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company until such time as the outstanding arrearages in the amount of \$10,789.30, are paid in full, and that the filing of any complaint pertaining to those arrearages which are the subject of this proceeding shall be rejected without further proceedings.

3. That the filing of any other pleading related to this case, concerning the same subject matter be, and hereby is, deemed not to stay implementation of this Order.

4. That Commission staff (including but not limited to the Bureau of Consumer Services and the Secretary's Bureau) shall reject any formal or informal complaint that is filed with the Commission by Charlotte Valeriano, any member of her family, or any other person in the household, pertaining to the service address of 3349 Montrose Ave., Laureldale, PA, 19605 until the outstanding arrearages in the amount of \$10,789.30 are paid in full.

5. That any filing of a new informal or formal complaint by Charlotte Valeriano against FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company must include proof that the arrearages in the amount of \$10,789.30 have been paid in full (e.g. billing statement, account statement, receipt of payment, cancelled check, bank statement, proof of discharge of the arrearages in bankruptcy, or correspondence with the utility confirming payment in full).

6. That, if proof that the outstanding arrearages have been paid in full is not provided, the Secretary's Bureau and Bureau of Consumer Services are directed to reject the complaint, without a hearing before the Office of Administrative Law Judge.

7. That the failure of Charlotte Valeriano to pay the outstanding arrearages in the amount of \$10,789.30, in full, shall be grounds for FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company to take any necessary steps and actions under the Pennsylvania Public Utility Code and Commission Regulations, including but not limited to, termination of service, to address Charlotte Valeriano's outstanding balance.

8. That a copy of this decision/order shall be served to the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services and the Secretary's Bureau.

