

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Marie LeVan Lick	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3059284
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
John M. Coogan  
Administrative Law Judge

**INTRODUCTION**

This Initial Decision grants Complainant’s unopposed Petition for Leave to Withdraw the Formal Complaint against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation because it is unopposed and in the public interest.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On December 16, 2025, Marie LeVan Lick (Ms. Lick or Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Company). In her Complaint, Ms. Lick alleged that she was having a reliability, safety or quality problem with her utility service. Specifically, Ms. Lick alleged that numerous times over the past eight years she has lived at the service address, power will go out and be out for hours at

a time. As relief, Ms. Lick requests to know what the issues are and a confirmed timeline of when the issues will be resolved.

On January 5, 2026, PPL filed an Answer and New Matter to Ms. Lick's Complaint. PPL admitted that Complainant's service address has experienced electric service outages. PPL denied that the Company has failed to provide safe, reliable, and adequate electric service to the service address. PPL's New Matter averred that certain allegations in the Complaint are barred or limited by the statute of limitations set forth at 66 Pa.C.S. § 3314(a). PPL's New Matter included a Notice to Plead. No response was filed to PPL's New Matter.

On February 9, 2026, the Commission issued an Initial Telephonic Hearing Notice, assigning me to this proceeding and setting a call-in telephonic hearing for this matter for March 31, 2026 at 10:00 a.m. In anticipation of that hearing, I issued a Prehearing Order on February 9, 2026, setting forth various rules that would govern the March 31, 2026 hearing.

On March 24, 2026, Ms. Lick sent an e-mail to the undersigned and counsel for PPL, stating in relevant part:

Would I be able to drop my complaint at this time? Or must I go through with the Administrative hearing on 3/31/26, 9am ?

I have seen and read that PPL is definitely proceeding with upgrades and repairs which is a very positive move that I have learned.

On March 24, 2026, I responded to Ms. Lick by e-mail, copying counsel for PPL, stating that she may withdraw her Complaint if PPL did not object. Ms. Lick responded by e-mail on March 24, 2026, confirming that she would like to withdraw her

Complaint. On March 24, 2026, counsel for PPL responded by e-mail, stating that PPL has no objection to withdrawal of the Complaint.

The record closed on March 24, 2026, the date I received the Complainant's e-mail withdrawal request. I will treat Ms. Lick's request as a Petition for Leave to Withdraw her Formal Complaint (Petition), and I will grant the Petition as it is unopposed and in the public interest.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant in this case is Marie LeVan Lick.
2. The Respondent in this case is PPL Electric Utilities Corporation.
3. On December 16, 2025, Ms. Lick filed a Formal Complaint against PPL.
4. On January 5, 2026, PPL filed an Answer and New Matter.
5. On March 24, 2026, Ms. Lick requested by e-mail that her Formal Complaint be withdrawn.
6. On March 24, 2026, counsel for PPL stated by e-mail that the Company did not object to Ms. Lick's request to withdraw the Formal Complaint.

## DISCUSSION

Commission regulations address the withdrawal of pleadings in a contested proceeding in relevant part as follows:

### **§ 5.94. Withdrawal of pleadings in a contested proceeding.**

(a) [A] party desiring to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding may file a petition for leave to withdraw the appropriate document with the Commission and serve it upon the other parties. The petition must set forth the reasons for the withdrawal. A party may object to the petition within 10 days of service. After considering the petition, an objection thereto and the public interest, the presiding officer or the Commission will determine whether the withdrawal will be permitted.

52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

A “pleading” is defined as “[a]n application, complaint, petition, answer, motion, preliminary objection, protest, reply, order to show cause, new matter and reply to new matter or other similar document filed in a formal proceeding.” 52 Pa. Code § 1.8. This matter became a contested proceeding once PPL filed an answer to the Formal Complaint. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n v. West Penn Utils.*, Docket No. C-2022-3031862 (Opinion and Order entered May, 18, 2023); *New Fizon Catering, Inc. v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2008-2065498 (Opinion and Order entered Jun. 24, 2009).

The Commission’s regulations provide that the Commission or presiding officer at any stage of an action or proceeding may disregard an error or defect of procedure which does not affect the substantive rights of the parties. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(a).

Complainant's e-mail requesting that her Formal Complaint be withdrawn does not comply with the Commission's regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a). In particular, the request was not filed with the Commission. I will exercise my discretion pursuant to Sections 1.2(a) and 1.2(d) of the Commission's regulations, 52 Pa. Code §§ 1.2(a), 1.2(d), and treat Complainant's e-mail as a Petition for Leave to Withdraw the Complaint. *See Ulishney v. W. Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3024487 (Opinion and Order entered May 19, 2022) (finding that an e-mail requesting withdrawal of a complaint constituted a petition to withdraw). PPL's substantive rights are not affected since PPL received Ms. Lick's request, and PPL responded stating that it did object to Ms. Lick's request.

Pursuant to the Commission's regulations above, I must consider any objection to the Petition, and the public interest, when determining whether the Petition will be granted. PPL did not object to Ms. Lick's request to withdraw her Formal Complaint. It would not be in the public interest to have the parties in this matter further litigate this proceeding when Complainant no longer wishes to pursue the Formal Complaint. Granting the Petition will save the parties and the Commission additional costs in time and money they would otherwise incur in further litigating this case. Finally, the Complaint does not contain any novel issues or issues of public interest. Therefore, the Petition will be granted in the ordering paragraphs below.

#### 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. A party desiring to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding may file a petition for leave to withdraw the appropriate document with the Commission and serve it upon other parties. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

3. A petition to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding must set forth the reasons for the withdrawal and that a party may object to the petition within ten days. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

4. After considering a petition to withdraw a pleading in a contested proceeding, any objection thereto and the public interest, the presiding officer or the Commission will determine whether the withdrawal will be permitted. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a).

5. The Commission or presiding officer at any stage of an action or proceeding may disregard an error or defect of procedure which does not affect the substantive rights of the parties. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(a).

6. The liberal construction provisions apply with particularity in proceedings involving *pro se* litigants. 52 Pa. Code § 1.2(d).

7. A party's e-mail request to withdraw his/her complaint constitutes a petition to withdraw a pleading under 52 Pa. Code § 5.94(a). *Ulishney v. W. Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3024487 (Opinion and Order entered May 19, 2022).

8. It is in the public interest to allow Complainant to withdraw her Formal Complaint. 52 Pa. Code § 5.94.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Petition for Leave to Withdraw the Formal Complaint made by Marie LeVan Lick at Docket No. C-2025-3059284 is granted.
2. That the Formal Complaint filed in the matter of Marie LeVan Lick v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation at Docket No. C-2025-3059284 is withdrawn.
3. That the Secretary's Bureau shall mark Docket No. C-2025-3059284 as closed.

Dated: April 24, 2026

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
John M. Coogan  
Administrative Law Judge