

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Logan R. Baker	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2025-3059308
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

**ORDER**  
**DENYING PRELIMINARY OBJECTION**

This Order denies Respondent’s Preliminary Objection (PO) and directs that a hearing be scheduled.

**Background**

On or about December 5, 2025, the Complainant, Logan R. Baker, filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL) alleging that PPL improperly denied his enrollment in the OnTrack assistance program by including in his income VA disability benefits in violation of Pennsylvania Act 27 of 2024 (Act 27). Mr. Logan argues that his disability benefits should not be included in the calculation of his income for OnTrack eligibility purposes. He requests, among other things, that PPL recalculate his household income by excluding all of his disability benefits and order his immediate enrollment in OnTrack retroactive to July 1, 2025.

On January 5, 2026, PPL filed an Answer and a PO in response to Mr. Baker’s Complaint. In its Answer, PPL denied that it incorrectly calculated Mr. Baker’s income for OnTrack eligibility purposes. In its POs, PPL argues, *inter alia*, that claims

about Veteran's Administration disability benefits and Act 27 should be dismissed as beyond the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Baker did not file a response to PPL's PO.

By Motion Judge Assignment Notice dated February 2, 2026, PPL's POs were assigned to me for disposition.

## **Discussion**

In his Complaint, Mr. Baker avers that he was denied enrollment in PPL's OnTrack assistance program because PPL improperly included his VA disability benefits in its income calculation for purposes of determining his eligibility for the program. He argues that, pursuant to Act 27, no part of a veteran's disability benefits may be included as income for any Commonwealth program. Mr. Baker requests that his income be recalculated by excluding his disability benefit payments, and that PPL enroll him in the OnTrack program retroactive to July 1, 2025, which was the date of his denial.

In its PO, PPL argues that claims involving the interpretation of Act 27 are beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission to consider and, therefore, should be dismissed preliminarily. In its Answer, PPL avers that, pursuant to its Commission-approved Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan, it is authorized to include all earned and non-earned income, including Veteran's and disability benefits, in its income calculation for OnTrack eligibility purposes.

Section 9902(a) of the Military and Veteran's Code provides, "Income Exclusion – One hundred percent of a veterans' benefit payment may not be included as income for any **Commonwealth program.**" 51 Pa. C.S. § 9902(a) (emphasis added). Mr. Baker cites to this provision in support of his argument that his disability benefits should not have been included in PPL's calculation of his income.

In the broadest sense, Mr. Baker is alleging that he was improperly denied enrollment in PPL's OnTrack assistance program because the company incorrectly calculated his income. This is clearly an issue over which the Commission has jurisdiction. The ultimate resolution of this issue, however, appears to come down to a legal determination as to whether PPL's OnTrack program is a "Commonwealth program" and, in turn, whether the income exclusion provision in Act 27 is therefore applicable here.

As noted above, PPL cites to its Commission-approved Universal Service and Energy Conservation Plan, which authorizes the company to include all earned and non-earned income, including Veteran's and disability benefits, in its income calculation for OnTrack eligibility purposes.

Given the uncertainties noted above, I am not prepared at this point to grant PPL's PO and dismiss Mr. Baker's Complaint preliminarily. Therefore, I will schedule a hearing to allow the parties to present their respective positions, and I will direct the parties to submit briefs following the hearing in which they can address the legal issues identified above.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Preliminary Objection filed by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation is denied and a telephonic hearing be scheduled.

Dated: March 10, 2026

---

Steven K. Haas  
Administrative Law Judge

**F-2025-3059308 - LOGAN BAKER v. PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION**

LOGAN BAKER  
224 SULFUR RUN ROAD  
JERSEY SHORE PA 17740  
[loganb178@gmail.com](mailto:loganb178@gmail.com)  
Served via email March 10, 2026

HAYLEY E WILBURN ESQUIRE  
DEVIN T RYAN ESQUIRE  
POST & SCHELL PC  
ONE OXFORD CENTRE  
301 GRANT STREET SUITE 3010  
PITTSBURGH PA 15219  
**412.506.6362**  
**717.612.6052**  
[hwilburn@postschell.com](mailto:hwilburn@postschell.com)  
[dryan@postschell.com](mailto:dryan@postschell.com)  
Served via eService March 10, 2026  
*(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation)*