

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Larry Hackney

Public Meeting held April 30, 2026

3056536-OSA

v.

Docket No. F-2025-3056536

PECO Energy Company

MOTION OF COMMISSIONER JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.

Before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) for consideration and disposition are the Exceptions of Larry Hackney (Complainant) and the Replies to Exceptions of PECO Energy Company (PECO) to the Initial Decision (ID) in the above-referenced case.

In the ID, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) dismissed the Complainant's Formal Complaint (Complaint) because the Complainant obstructed the orderly conduct of the proceeding in a way that was inimical to the public interest and failed to comply with Commission procedures.¹ The Complainant's Exceptions are difficult to read and understand, but they appear to be a continuation of the allegations made in his Complaint. In its Replies to Exceptions, PECO submits that the Complainant's Exceptions are without merit.

Based on my review of the record in this proceeding, the Exceptions, and the Replies thereto, the Complainant's Exceptions should be denied.

The Commission is required to provide due process to the parties appearing before it. This requirement is satisfied when the parties are afforded notice and the opportunity to be heard.² Once notice of a hearing and the opportunity to be heard have been provided, it is the responsibility of the parties to participate in the hearing.³ Commission precedent provides that "[t]his participation must be in a respectful and orderly fashion."⁴

Here, the Complainant was afforded an opportunity to explain the reasons for his Complaint at both a prehearing conference and hearing. During the hearing, the Complainant frequently interrupted and spoke over the ALJ and counsel for PECO. The Complainant offered testimony that was unrelated to his Complaint and refused to stop speaking when instructed to do so by the ALJ. The ALJ correctly dismissed the Complaint pursuant to the Commission's Regulation at Section 5.245(c).

¹ 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(c).

² *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth.1984).

³ *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered October 25, 1993).

⁴ *David Nippes v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2013-2363324 (Initial Decision dated Aug. 15, 2013, at 4; Final Order entered Sept. 30, 2013). *See also*, *Finberg v. Aqua Pa., Inc.*, Docket No. F-2017-2588064 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 25, 2018); *Roberts v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. F-2018-3001072 (Order entered January 16, 2020).

THEREFORE, I MOVE THAT:

1. The Exceptions of Larry Hackney, filed on February 6, 2026, to the Initial Decision of Administrative Law Judge F. Joseph Brady, are denied, consistent with this Motion.
2. The Initial Decision of Administrative Law Judge F. Joseph Brady, issued on January 14, 2026, is adopted, consistent with this Motion.
3. The Formal Complaint filed by Larry Hackney on July 28, 2025, against PECO Energy Company at Docket No. F-2025-3056536 is dismissed, consistent with this Motion.
4. The Office of Special Assistants prepare an Opinion and Order consistent with this Motion.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John F. Coleman, Jr.", written over a horizontal purple line.

Date: April 30, 2026

**JOHN F. COLEMAN, JR.
COMMISSIONER**