
Alice A. Wade

alice.wade@postschell.com
412-506-6364 Direct
412-227-9065 Direct Fax
File #: 213081

May 4, 2026

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING


Matthew Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: DeAurdrea Franczak (Long) v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation
Docket No. C-2025-3055351**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Attached for filing is the Answer of PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to the Petition to Reopen the Record of DeAurdrea Franczak (Long) in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,



Alice A. Wade

AAW/bfc
Attachment

cc: Certificate of Service
Legal Secretary Pamela McNeal (*via email w/ attachment*)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of this filing has been served upon the following persons, in the manner indicated, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a participant).

VIA EMAIL

DeAurdrea Linika Franczak
11405 Warwick Pointe Drive, Apt. 202
Brandon, FL 33511
deaurea0107@yahoo.com

Date: May 4, 2026



Alice A. Wade

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

DeAurdrea Linika Franczak,	:	
	:	
Complainant,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2025-3055351
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

**ANSWER OF PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION
TO THE COMPLAINANT’S PETITION TO REOPEN THE RECORD**

TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE F. JOSEPH BRADY:

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.61 and 5.571, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (“PPL Electric” or the “Company”) hereby files this Answer to DeAurdrea Linika Franczak’s (“Complainant”) “Complainant’s Petition to Reopen the Record for the Limited Purpose of Admitting PPL Exhibits 10 And 11 and Secondary Exhibit 8” (“Petition”). In his Motion, the Complainant asks that Administrative Law Judge F. Joseph Brady (the “ALJ”) reopen “the record for the limited purpose of admitting PPL Exhibit 10, PPL Exhibit 11, and Secondary Exhibit 8, with no additional live testimony unless the Presiding Officer deems further testimony necessary” or in the alternative, “requests leave to submit those three exhibits by written filing and have them marked and received without reconvening the hearing.” (Petition, p. 2.)

As explained herein, the Complainant’s Motion should be denied. The Complainant has completely failed to: (1) prove that there have been “material changes of fact or of law” that have occurred since the record was closed or that the “public interest requires” reopening the record (52

Pa. Code § 5.571(b), (d)); and (2) demonstrate that “good cause” exists to reopen the record for the acceptance of additional evidence (52 Pa. Code § 5.431(b)).

For these reasons, and as explained in more detail herein, no material changes in fact or law have occurred since the record closed on April 23, 2026, the public interest does not require reopening the record, and good cause does not exist for reopening the record to accept further evidence in this matter.

In support of its Answer, PPL Electric states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND AND RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. PPL Electric is a “public utility,” an “electric distribution company” and a “default service provider” as defined in Sections 102 and 2803 of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C.S. §§ 102, 2803.

2. On May 22, 2025, PPL Electric was served with the above-captioned Complaint.

3. On June 11, 2025, PPL Electric timely filed an Answer to the Complaint.

4. On June 26, 2025, an Initial Telephonic Hearing Notice was issued, setting the hearing for Thursday, August 28, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. before Judge Francis Brady (the “ALJ”). This was confirmed by a Prehearing Order issued on June 30, 2025.

5. On August 28, 2025, PPL Electric requested a continuance of this hearing due to the witness becoming ill and therefore unavailable. This request was unopposed.

6. On August 28, 2025, an Initial Telephonic Hearing Notice was issued confirming the cancelation of the August 28, 2025 hearing and setting the initial hearing for Friday, November 7, 2025.

7. On September 4, 2025, an Order granting the continuance request was issued.

8. On November 7, 2025, the telephonic hearing was convened as scheduled.

9. On January 29, 2026, the ALJ issued an Order Reopening Record and Reconvening Evidentiary Hearing directing both parties to, “be prepared to discuss and present evidence regarding electric usage during this time period and comparable prior time periods.” (Order Reopening Record, p. 1.)

10. A Further Telephonic Hearing Notice was issued on February 18, 2026, setting the further hearing for Tuesday, April 7, 2026.

11. The April 7, 2026 hearing was canceled by a notice issued March 12, 2026, which set the hearing for Thursday, April 23, 2026 at 10:00 a.m.

12. On April 23, 2026, the further hearing was convened as scheduled. PPL Electric was prepared to offer two additional exhibits in to evidence, a meter reading history¹ as Exhibit 10 and usage summary as Exhibit 11. The ALJ indicated during the hearing that he did not want testimony presented regarding these exhibits.

13. The same day, the Complainant filed the subject Petition to Reopen the Record for the Limited Purpose of Admitting PPL Exhibits 10 And 11 and Secondary Exhibit 8.

III. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS

14. The Commission’s regulations specify that “at any time after the record is closed but before a final decision is issued, a party may file a petition to reopen the proceeding for the purpose of taking additional evidence.” 52 Pa. Code § 5.571(a).

15. Such a petition “must set forth clearly the facts claimed to constitute grounds requiring reopening of the proceeding, including material changes of fact or of law alleged to have occurred since the conclusion of the hearing.” *Id.* § 5.571(b).

¹ The meter reading history showed that an estimate was generated for the account, but never billed. This is consistent with PPL Electric’s testimony at the initial hearing that the Complainant’s account was billed on actual readings. Estimates are sometimes generated, but not billed where actual meter reading data is not immediately available in the system, but becomes available shortly thereafter.

16. Further, “[t]he record may be reopened upon notification to the parties in a proceeding for the reception of further evidence if there is reason to believe that conditions of fact or of law have so changed as to require, or that the public interest requires, the reopening of the proceeding.” *Id.* § 5.571(d).

17. The Commission’s regulations also state that “[a]fter the record is closed, additional matter may not be relied upon or accepted into the record unless allowed for good cause shown by the presiding officer or the Commission upon motion.” *Id.* § 5.431(b).

18. “The Commission may deny a request where evidence of all of the additional facts alleged was available at the time of the hearing.” *Hess v. Pa. PUC*, 107 A.3d 246 at 266 n.12 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2014) (citing *City of Philadelphia v. Pa. PUC*, 138 A.2d 698 (Pa. Super. 1958)).

III. ANSWER TO MOTION TO REOPEN THE RECORD

19. The Complainant’s Motion should be denied because she has completely failed to demonstrate that there have been material changes of fact or law since the record closed, that the public interest requires the reopening of the record, and that good cause exists to admit additional evidence in this matter.

20. First, the Complainant does not allege that there have been material changes of fact or law since the record closed, nor does the Complainant aver that the public interest requires reopening the record. (Petition, pp. 1-3) The Complainant admits that the Exhibits she requests admission of were available at the time of the hearing. (*Id.*) These exhibits were in fact served prior to the hearing as proposed exhibits in accordance with the Hearing Notice issued on March 12. During the hearing, PPL Electric began to discuss proposed Exhibits 10 and 11 and, without the benefit of a transcript and to the best of recollection, offered to provide context regarding the Exhibits. The ALJ indicated that this was not necessary, that no further information was needed, and asked that PPL Electric move on.

21. Indeed, the Complainant's Petition meets none of the prongs to justify reopening the record, and instead appears to express disagreement with the ALJ's decision at the hearing, arguing that the Exhibits should be included because they are relevant. Mere relevance, however, should not in itself sustain a Petition to Reopen the Record where the evidence was available at the time of the hearing, as was the case here.

22. The Complainant argues that good cause exists to reopen the record "because the hearing testimony addressed the contents of PPL Exhibits 10 and 11, yet the source documents themselves are absent from the evidentiary record. Limited reopening is therefore necessary so that the record conforms to the evidence actually discussed and so the Commission may evaluate the disputed billing months on a complete and accurate record." (Petition, p. 2.)

23. This argument mischaracterizes the record. While PPL Electric was prepared to present Exhibits 10 and 11 and offer testimony regarding these exhibits, the ALJ indicated that this would not be necessary and asked PPL Electric to move on after a brief description of the exhibits were provided. The exhibits were not discussed at length. Because PPL Electric was not permitted to discuss these Exhibits, the Complainant's Exhibit 8, compiled from Exhibits 10 and 11, was also not entered into the record.

24. It is not a requirement that every exhibit mentioned during the course of a hearing be entered into the record. Further, there is not good cause to admit these exhibits as, contrary to the arguments of the Complainant, admitting these exhibits without affording PPL Electric an opportunity to explain the exhibits and provide context for the exhibits would inject confusion into the record, rather than clarity.

25. Thus, good cause does not exist to reopen the record for the purpose of admitting these additional exhibits.

26. Based on the foregoing, the Complainant's Motion should be denied.

II. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation respectfully requests that the Honorable Administrative Law Judge F. Joseph Brady deny the Complainant's "Petition to Reopen the Record for the Limited Purpose of Admitting PPL Exhibits 10 And 11 and Secondary Exhibit 8."

Respectfully submitted,



Kimberly A. Klock (ID # 89716)
Michael J. Shafer (ID # 205681)
PPL Services Corporation
645 Hamilton Street, Suite 700
Allentown, PA 18101
Phone: 610-774-2599
Fax: 610-774-4102
E-mail: kklock@pplweb.com
mjshafer@pplweb.com

Devin T. Ryan (ID # 316602)
Post & Schell, P.C.
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, Suite 3010
Pittsburgh, PA 15219
Phone: 717-612-6052
Fax: 717-731-1985
E-mail: dryan@postschell.com

Megan E. Rulli (ID # 331981)
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second St., 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
Phone: 717-612-6012
Fax: 717-731-1985
E-mail: mrulli@postschell.com

Date: May 4, 2026

Attorneys for PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

VERIFICATION

I, April Lewis being the Customer Contact Supervisor at PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, hereby state that the facts above set forth are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief and that I expect PPL Electric Utilities Corporation to be able to prove the same at a hearing held in this matter. I understand that the statements herein are made subject to the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 relating to unsworn falsification to authorities.

05/04/2026
Date: _____

April Lewis

April Lewis