

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

|                       |   |                |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|
| DJ Christopher Norman | : |                |
|                       | : |                |
| v.                    | : | C-2025-3057175 |
|                       | : |                |
| PECO Energy Company   | : |                |

**INTERIM ORDER  
GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART  
COMPLAINANT’S APPLICATION FOR THE ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENAS**

On March 4, 2025, Mr. Deree Norman (Complainant) filed documents titled as Notices of Intent to Serve a Subpoena to Attend and Testify Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.421, for twelve people (Subpoena Notice). Also on March 4, 2026, Mr. Norman emailed a copy of the Subpoena Notice to me and counsel for PECO Energy Company (PECO, the Company, or Respondent), Attorney Margaret A. Morris.

On March 12, 2026, the Respondent filed and served Objections of PECO Energy Company to the Complainant’s Subpoena Request (Objections). One of PECO’s objections is that Mr. Norman did not file an application for issuance of subpoena pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.421(b).

On March 16, 2026, Mr. Norman eFiled a Motion to Compel and Response to Objections of PECO Energy Company to Subpoena Request of DJ Christopher Norman. The filing included a Certificate of Service, which indicated that it was emailed to me and Ms. Morris. The undersigned did not receive the filing by email.

During a review of the docket on March 20, 2026, I became aware of the Complainant’s March 16, 2026 filing. Also on March 20, 2026, I emailed both parties a copy of the filing.

On March 23, 2026, I issued an interim order (March 23 Order) addressing procedures related to the Complainant's March 16, 2026 filing. In the March 23 Order, I deemed the Complainant's March 16, 2026 filing to be an application for subpoenas (Application), supplementing the Subpoena Notice filed by the Complainant on March 4, 2026. I directed PECO to file any objection to the application by March 30, 2026. I advised that the hearing scheduled for Wednesday, April 1, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. would go forward and that, if the application is granted, the necessity for further hearing would be addressed.

On March 30, 2026, PECO filed objections to the Complainant's application for the issuance of subpoenas (Supplemental Objections). In its Supplemental Objections, the Company avers that the Complainant has not specified the relevancy, materiality and scope of the testimony for the persons he seeks to subpoena nor explained what facts would be proved by the requested documents. Supp. Objections ¶ 11. PECO requests that the Complainants' Application for the issuance of subpoenas be denied. Supp. Objections at 6.

The hearing convened on April 1, 2026, as scheduled. The Complainant was present. Attorney Morris appeared for PECO, with two Company representatives, Ms. Lisa Crespo and Mr. John Leu. The hearing was adjourned at approximately 1:00 p.m. because PECO counsel and one of its witnesses were scheduled to appear for other proceedings before the Commission. Further, it was estimated that at least one more day of hearings will be required for both parties to complete their testimony and cross-examination. The instant proceeding was continued to June 4, 2026, the first available date on which all parties and known witnesses are available to participate in a full day of hearings.

On April 7, 2026, notice was issued to schedule a further hearing on Thursday, June 4, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.

Section 5.421(a)(2) of the Commission's regulations states that a "subpoena will issue only upon application in writing to the presiding officer, except that during a hearing in a proceeding, the application may be made orally on the record before the presiding officer, who will determine the necessity of issuing the subpoena." 52 Pa. Code § 5.421(a)(2).

Such an application: (1) must specify as nearly as possible the general relevance, materiality and scope of the testimony or documentary evidence sought, including, as to documentary evidence, specification as nearly as possible of the documents desired; (2) must list the facts to be proved by the documents in sufficient detail to indicate the necessity of the documents; (3) must contain a notice that a response or objection to the application shall be filed with the Commission and presiding officer within 10 days of service of the application; (4) must include a certificate of service; and (5) may attach the proposed subpoena to the application. 52 Pa. Code § 5.421(b)(1)-(5).

When the person for whom the subpoena is sought is a non-party, the application must provide the names and addresses of the persons, including the Secretary of the Commission and the presiding officer, to whom the answer or objection to the application shall be sent. 52 Pa. Code § 5.421(c)(5).

As a preliminary matter, in their respective filings related to Mr. Norman's requested subpoenas, the Complainant and PECO address whether a formal application for subpoena was required. This is moot to the extent that I deemed Mr. Norman's March 16, 2026 filing to be an application for subpoenas, supplementing the Subpoena Notice that he filed on March 4, 2026. While I have exercised this discretion in recognition that Mr. Norman is not represented by counsel, I require sufficient information to determine the necessity for issuing the subpoena and, specifically, to understand the general relevance, materiality and scope of the testimony and documentary evidence sought.

Mr. Norman requests that a subpoena be issued for the following twelve persons:

1. Khadijah Scott
2. Nichole Pinata
3. Lisa Crespo
4. John Leu
5. Eric "Doe"
6. "John Does" (seven (7) PECO employees)

As discussed below, I will grant the request to subpoena Lisa Crespo and John Leu, with modifications to the documents to be produced. I will deny the remaining requests.

Khadijah Scott

The Complaint requests, *inter alia*, that the Commission issue a subpoena compelling PECO's former attorney in this matter to testify and to produce, within 10 days after service of the subpoena, "all documents or things directly or indirectly associated with C-2025-3057175 regarding the date of loss August 21, 2025, (e.g., notes, forms, contracts, letters, e-mails, directives, decisions, witness statements etc.). Proposed Subpoena (Scott).<sup>1</sup>

In its Objections, the Company asserts that Attorney Scott is no longer employed by PECO, that the materials listed in the subpoena are overly broad, and include "all documents" including notes and emails that are protected by the attorney work product. Objections ¶¶ 11, 13. PECO also states that the Complainant "does not specify the relevancy, materiality and scope of the testimony for Attorney Scott or explain what facts would be proved by the documents requested from Attorney Scott." Supp. Objections ¶ 13.

Regarding attorney work product, Mr. Norman argues that because Attorney Scott signed the verification page of PECO's answer to the Complaint, any document used to complete the answer is no longer protected as a work product. He also asserts that Attorney Scott is still accountable for her actions in this matter while she was employed by PECO. Application ¶ 13.

The Complainant's application to subpoena Khadijah Scott will be denied. The Complainant has not specified how testimony by PECO's former attorney is relevant, material, and necessary to develop a record on the issues raised in his Complaint.

---

<sup>1</sup> The pages of the Subpoena Notice filing are not numbered. Therefore, the documents will be referred to as Proposed Subpoena (witness name).

Although Attorney Scott verified the Company's answer to the Complaint,<sup>2</sup> the facts averred in that pleading are not evidence, until and unless they are established with evidence admitted into the record. The Complainant will have the opportunity to cross-examine PECO witnesses on any testimony and documentary evidence they present at the hearing, including any testimony or documents about facts that were averred in the Company's answer.

As further reason to deny the application for Attorney Scott, Pennsylvania's Rules of Professional Conduct prohibit lawyers from acting as a witness on behalf of their clients, except in limited circumstances.<sup>3</sup> See Pa. Rule of Professional Conduct Rule 3.7 (providing exceptions for testimony related to an uncontested issue or the nature and value of legal services rendered in the case, or if disqualification would cause substantial hardship to the client). None of the exceptions contained in Rule 3.7 have been identified by Complainant in the Application.

Lisa Crespo and John Leu

PECO states that the request for a subpoena for the appearance for Lisa Crespo and John Leu is moot because they will be presented as PECO witnesses, however the Company objects to the request for those witnesses to bring to the hearing "all documents or things directly or indirectly associated with C-2025-3057175." Supp. Objections at 6. PECO asserts that the Complainant failed to explain what facts would be proved by the documents requested from Ms. Crespo and Mr. Leu. *Id.*

The Complainant avers that PECO has refused to identify the specific names of any other documents created for this account over the last seven months. Application ¶ 11. Mr. Norman contends that he has made the request for documents as precise as possible by limiting it to specific dates and individuals. He also avers that he has not received monthly statements of charges for his account, despite an email request to PECO on February 10, 2026. *Id.*

---

<sup>2</sup> No legal support was offered for the Complainant's broad assertion that there is no work product protection for any document that was used to prepare PECO's answer to the Complaint. Signing a verification effects no waiver of a protection that would otherwise apply. Pa. R.C.P. 1024.

<sup>3</sup> The Pennsylvania Rules of Professional Conduct impose a continuing duty on attorneys to preserve confidentiality of information obtained in the course of representing a former client. See Rule 1.9(c).

For Ms. Crespo, the Complainant gave examples of the types of documents he seeks: “e.g., notes, forms, letters, e-mails, directives, decisions, witness statements etc.” Proposed Subpoena (Crespo). For Mr. Leu, the Complainant provided the following examples: “e.g., names and titles of all PECO employees/representatives that arrived at the subject property on November 26, 2025 and December 5, 2025, the August 21, 2025 work records (service calls, GPS locations etc.) for the aforesaid employees/representatives, forms, letters, e-mails, directives, decisions, witness statements etc.” Proposed Subpoena (Leu). While those documents are provided as examples, the subpoena itself is not limited to the examples. For both witnesses, the proposed subpoena requests “all documents or things directly or indirectly associated with C-2025-3057175” regarding August 21, 2025.

As PECO will produce Ms. Crespo and Mr. Leu for the hearing and has indicated those witnesses will present testimony relevant to the Complaint, I will issue a subpoena for their appearance. I also find that the Complainant has reasonably and as nearly as possible specified the general relevance, materiality and scope of the documents sought and the facts to be proved by the documents in sufficient detail to indicate the necessity of the documents. However, based on the Complainant’s assertions regarding his monthly billing, I will modify the documents to be provided by Ms. Crespo to include copies of monthly bills and billing and payment records for the Complainant’s account for August 2025 to date.

Also, the subpoenas drafted by Mr. Norman specify August 21, 2025 as the “date of loss.” Based on the issues raised by the Complainant regarding activation of gas service, responsibility for gas pressure testing, and billing and crediting for the account, I find it prudent to modify the request for Ms. Crespo to include the initiation and activation of gas service, customer contacts, and account activity, from August 2025 to date.

Similarly, I find it appropriate to broaden the documents to be produced by Mr. Leu, to include the initiation and activation of gas service in 2025. However, I do not find that the Complainant has shown that all of the specific documents requested by the Complainant are material to the initiation and attempted activation of gas service that occurred in August 2025, *i.e.* service calls and GPS locations for the PECO employees and representatives that were at the

service location on dates when gas pressure testing was performed at the Complainant's home in November and December 2025.

The original subpoenas reflecting the foregoing modifications are attached to this interim order.

No determination is being made that all of the subjects identified in the subpoenas are relevant or admissible. Appropriate objections to proposed testimony and exhibits can be made by timely objection(s) at the hearing.

#### Eric "Doe" and Nicole Pinata

As stated in Mr. Norman's Complaint and Application, Eric "Doe" (last name unknown) and Nicole Pinata are PECO representatives who spoke to Mr. Norman by phone regarding the activation of his gas service and pressure testing. Complaint ¶¶ 2, 5, 7(c). The proposed subpoenas for these individuals ask them to produce "all documents or things directly or indirectly associated with C-2025-3057175 regarding the date of loss August 21, 2025, (e.g., notes, forms, letters, e-mails, directives, decisions, witness statements etc.)." Proposed Subpoena (Eric "Doe"); Proposed Subpoena (Pinata).

PECO objects to the issuance of Eric Doe's subpoena, arguing that the Complainant does not specify the relevancy, materiality and scope of the testimony by Eric Doe or explain what facts would be proved by the documents requested. PECO also objects to Ms. Pinata being subpoenaed, alleging that Ms. Pinata is not employed by PECO, and that her contact information and relationship to the Formal Complaint is unknown. Supp. Objections ¶ 14.

During the evidentiary hearing on April 1, 2026, Mr. Norman stated that the correct spelling of the name may be "Panetta" based on a reference in PECO's proposed hearing exhibits. For purposes of this ruling, I will accept that Ms. Panetta is a PECO representative who spoke to Mr. Norman.

Turning to the merits of the Application, the request to subpoena Mr. Doe and Ms. Panetta is denied. The documents which the Complainant seeks from these witnesses are already included in the subpoena for Ms. Crespo. Further, the Complainant has testified and provided exhibits regarding his calls with Mr. Doe and Ms. Panetta, and he may cross-examine PECO's witnesses on anything that PECO presents to rebut his testimony. Mr. Norman has not shown that testimony by Mr. Doe or Ms. Pinata, in addition to that of Ms. Crespo and Mr. Leu, is necessary to prosecute his Complaint.

"John Does" (seven unidentified PECO employees)

The Complainant contends that two PECO representatives and five PECO representatives, respectively, were at his service address on November 26, 2025 and December 5, 2025 to witness the results of gas pressure tests. He submitted pictures of the seven individuals he identifies as John Does in his Subpoena Notice, and their vehicles. Norman Exh. 10 (admitted into the record at the April 1, 2026 hearing); Proposed Subpoena (John Does). Mr. Norman states that that he has reasonably identified the representatives for purposes of the requested subpoenas. Application ¶ 12. He requests that they produce the following documents:

Within ten (10) days after the service of this subpoena, you are ordered by the Commission to produce all documents or things directly or indirectly associated with C-2025-3057175 regarding the date of loss August 21, 2025, (e.g., names and titles of all PECO employees/representatives that arrived at the subject property on November 26, 2025 and December 5, 2025, The August 21, 2025 work records (service calls, locations etc.) for the aforesaid employees/representatives, forms, letters, e-mails, directives, decisions, witness statements etc.), to Deree J. Norman at 19 Linden Ave, Lansdowne, Pa 19050 or electronically to dnorman1@CCP.edu.

Proposed Subpoena (John Does).

PECO objects to the subpoenas, arguing that the Complainant has not specified the relevancy, materiality and scope of the testimony or explain what facts would be proved by the documents requested. Supp. Objections ¶ 12. As for the other subpoenas, PECO argues that

the Complainant has failed to provide sufficient information for a determination of the necessity for the subpoenas. *Id.* ¶ 15.

The request to compel the appearance and testimony of the seven identified PECO employees is denied. The Complainant has not shown that the testimony of employees who were at the service address in November and December 2025 is necessary to establish relevant or material facts about the events in August 2025 or PECO's gas pressure testing requirements. As noted above, Mr. Norman may cross-examine PECO's witnesses on anything that the Respondent presents to rebut his testimony and exhibits about the PECO employees and vehicles. Further, many of the documents which the Complainant seeks from these witnesses are already included in the subpoena for Mr. Leu.

Under the circumstances, the following Order will be entered.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the request by Complainant, D.J. Norman, for the issuance of a hearing subpoena to fact witness, Lisa Crespo, is granted. Lisa Crespo shall attend and participate in the evidentiary hearing scheduled for Thursday, June 4, 2026, by calling into the telephone hearing platform promptly at 10:00 a.m. and remaining until excused. Instructions to call in to the hearing are provided on the subpoena and the hearing notice, copies of which are attached to this order.

2. That the request by Complainant, D.J. Norman, for the issuance of a hearing subpoena to fact witness, John Leu, is granted. John Leu shall attend and participate in the evidentiary hearing scheduled for Thursday, June 4, 2026, by calling into the telephone hearing platform promptly at 10:00 a.m. and remaining until excused. Instructions to call in to

the hearing are provided on the subpoena and the hearing notice, copies of which are attached to this order.

3. That Counsel for PECO Energy Company is directed to promptly communicate the contents of this interim order and provide a copy of this interim order to the proposed fact witnesses, Lisa Crespo and John Leu, and to produce the attendance of Lisa Crespo and John Leu at the evidentiary hearing beginning on Thursday, June 4, 2026, promptly at 10:00 a.m.

4. That any objections to the testimony or any portions thereof shall be timely made at the evidentiary hearing in this proceeding.

Date: April 10, 2026

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Erin L. Gannon  
Administrative Law Judge



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA**  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
400 NORTH STREET  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

April 10, 2026

DJ Christopher Norman  
19 Linden Avenue  
Lansdowne, PA 19050  
dnorman1@student.ccp.edu  
dnorman1@ccp.edu

Re: DJ Christopher Norman v. PECO Energy Company

Docket No. C-2025-3057175

Dear Mr. Norman:

Attached are the original subpoenas issued in this case. The subpoenas must be served consistent with Commission regulations and the Affidavits of the service, must be filed with the Commission.

Copies of this letter and the attachments are being provided to all Parties consistent with the Service List attached.

Sincerely,

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Erin L. Gannon  
Administrative Law Judge



Commonwealth of Pennsylvania )  
 ) SS:  
Count of )

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_  
who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he/she served a true and correct  
copy of the within SUBPOENA upon \_\_\_\_\_  
by handing the same to him/her at 1 \_\_\_\_\_ on the  
\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20 \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ a.m./p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Sworn to and subscribed before me  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20 \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Notary Public*



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

In the Matter of:  
DJ Norman v. PECO Energy Company

Docket No. C-2025-3057175

**SUBPOENA**

To: John Leu, PECO Energy Company, 2301 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(Name and Address)

Pursuant to the authority of this Commission under §§3309, 331(d)(2) and 333(j) of the Public Utility Code:

1. YOU ARE ORDERED by the Commission to come to testify by telephone by calling 866-759-6860, Passcode # 71568747, on June 4, 2026, at 10:00 AM in the above case to testify on behalf of Complainant DJ Christopher Norman and to remain until excused.

A copy of the Hearing Notice providing instructions to call into the evidentiary hearing on June 4, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., is attached.

2. Within twenty-five (25) days after the service of this subpoena, you are ordered by the Commission to produce all documents or things directly or indirectly associated with C-2025-3057175 regarding the initiation and activation of gas service in 2025, (e.g., work records, forms, letters, e-mails, directives, decisions, witness statements etc.), to Deree J. Norman at 19 Linden Ave, Lansdowne, Pa 19050 or electronically to [dnorman1@CCP.edu](mailto:dnorman1@CCP.edu).

This subpoena is issued subject to the provisions of 52 Pa. Code §5.421 (with regard to issuance, notice, service and witness fees).

**BY THE COMMISSION**

Date: April 10, 2026

\_\_\_\_\_/s/  
Erin L. Gannon  
Administrative Law Judge

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania )  
 ) SS:  
Count of )

**AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE**

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_  
who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he/she served a true and correct  
copy of the within SUBPOENA upon \_\_\_\_\_  
by handing the same to him/her at \_\_\_\_\_ on the  
\_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ a.m./p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Sworn to and subscribed before me  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Notary Public*



**COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA**  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING  
Office of Administrative Law Judge  
400 NORTH STREET  
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120

**April 7, 2026**

**In Re: C-2025-3057175**

(SEE ATTACHED LIST)

**DJ Norman v. PECO Energy Company**

Service/Reliability Issues

**Further Telephonic Evidentiary Hearing Notice**

This is to inform you that a Further Evidentiary call-in hearing on the above-captioned case will be held as follows:

Type: **Further Telephonic Evidentiary Hearing**

Date: **Thursday, June 4, 2026**

Time: **10:00 AM**

Presiding: **Administrative Law Judge Erin L. Gannon**  
Phone: 717.787.1399 Fax: 717.213.6812

**At the above date and time, you must call into the hearing. You will not be called by the Presiding Officer.**

**To participate in the hearing**

- You must dial the toll-free Conference number below
- You must enter the PIN number below when instructed
- You must speak your name when prompted, and press #
- Then, the telephone system will connect you to the hearing

Toll-free Bridge Number: **866.759.6860**  
Passcode: **71568747**

**WITNESSES:** If you have any witnesses you want to have present during the hearing who are participating from a separate phone, you must provide them with the Conference and PIN numbers above.

**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. If you are unable to attend the hearing for any reason, you must request a continuance using the procedure described below.

**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 continuation, 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).

**REPRESENTATION.** If you are an individual, you may represent yourself or you may have an attorney represent you. All others, including a partnership, corporation, limited liability company, trust, association, or governmental agency or subdivision, must be represented by an attorney licensed to practice law in Pennsylvania, or admitted *pro hac vice*. Only an attorney may represent someone else.

**PRESENTING EXHIBITS.** If you intend to present any documents or exhibits at the hearing, you must email one (1) copy to the Presiding Officer at [egannon@pa.gov](mailto:egannon@pa.gov) and one (1) copy each must be sent to every other party. All copies must be received at least five (5) business days before the hearing. Proposed exhibits should be properly pre-marked for identification purposes.

**ACCOMMODATION.** Any party who needs accommodation for a disability in order to participate in this hearing process may request one. Please call the OALJ scheduling office at least five (5) business days prior to your hearing to submit your request.

If you require an interpreter to participate in the hearing, please call the scheduling office at least ten (10) business days prior to your hearing to submit your request.

- Scheduling Office: 717.787.1399
- TTY-based Telecommunications Relay Service number for persons who are deaf or hearing-impaired is: 711

**DOCUMENTS:** ALL Parties to proceedings pending are encouraged to EITHER open and use an eFiling account through the Commission’s website at [www.puc.pa.gov](http://www.puc.pa.gov) OR to ensure timely arrival, submit the filing by overnight delivery as explained below.

**E-FILING.** The PUC offers a free e-Filing Subscription Service. This service allows a user to file documents electronically and receive an automatic email notification whenever a document is added, removed, or changed on the PUC website in a specific case. For information and to subscribe to this service, visit the PUC’s website at: <https://www.puc.pa.gov/filing-resources/efiling/>

**PAPER FILING.** If you do not have the capability to open and use an e-Filing account, you may file paper documents with the Secretary of the Commission. Filing of paper documents must be sent by overnight delivery to:

Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

It is important that you retain tracking information as proof of submission. Emailed or faxed submissions to the Commission are not acceptable.

**CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL.** ALL documents containing confidential information must include the word "CONFIDENTIAL" written clearly and noticeably on the face of the first page of the document. If a filing contains confidential or proprietary material, the filing should be submitted by overnight delivery to ensure arrival. These filings should be followed by a hard copy with a flash drive or CD for the Commission's file. Large filings containing confidential or proprietary material may also be submitted through the Commission's Share Point File system. Filers should contact the Secretary's Bureau in advance to set up a Share Point File.

cc:

ALJ Gannon  
L Jackson  
Calendar File

**C-2025-3057175 - DJ CHRISTOPHER NORMAN v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY**  
**Revised 12/22/2025**

DJ CHRISTOPHER NORMAN  
19 LINDEN AVENUE  
LANSDOWNE PA 19050  
**267.304.2162**  
[dnorman1@student.ccp.edu](mailto:dnorman1@student.ccp.edu)  
[dnorman1@ccp.edu](mailto:dnorman1@ccp.edu)  
Served via eService April 10, 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](mailto:mmorris@regerlaw.com)  
Served via eService April 10, 2026  
*(Counsel for PECO Energy Company)*