

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17120**

Julie Koffel
v.
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation

**Public Meeting of May 21, 2026
3057649-ALJ
Docket No. F-2025-3057649**

STATEMENT OF VICE CHAIR KIMBERLY BARROW

Before the Commission is the March 23, 2026 Initial Decision issued by Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) F. Joseph Brady. The Initial Decision dismisses the Formal Complaint, with prejudice, because Ms. Koffel failed to attend the evidentiary hearing.

I want to highlight a few facts averred in the Formal Complaint. Ms. Koffel ultimately sought a Commission-issued payment arrangement and the prevention of termination of electric service. Of importance, in the Formal Complaint filed on September 23, 2025, Ms. Koffel averred that she was almost seven months pregnant with a high-risk pregnancy and that her doctor has instructed her to not work. The evidentiary hearing was scheduled for December 12, 2025, which appears to be close to Ms. Koffel's due date.

While I acknowledge that Ms. Koffel failed to attend the hearing and present her case, the limited facts averred in the pleadings do not support a dismissal with prejudice, and allowing this matter to be dismissed, with prejudice, in light of Ms. Koffel's situation is unacceptable. Accordingly, I believe the matter should have been dismissed, without prejudice.

Moreover, in cases where there is no reason to suspect that the Commission's administrative process is being abused, dismissing, without prejudice, protects the complainant's right to due process while respecting the Commission's administrative process. I have previously expressed concern regarding the Commission's practice of dismissing pro se complaints, with prejudice, as being inconsistent with Section 1.2 of our Regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 1.2, and the Commission's own case precedent regarding due process.¹ The case should be dismissed, without prejudice.

May 21, 2026



Kimberly Barrow, Vice Chair

¹ This Commission has long recognized the mitigating effect pro se status confers upon litigants unlearned in the law when confronted with technical violations of its procedural rules. *Carlock v. The United Telephone Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00163617 (July 14, 1993). Most important, from my perspective, the Commission has stated that it is in the public interest that all litigants, particularly pro se litigants, be afforded a meaningful opportunity to be heard. *Amir V. Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2190024 (January 13, 2011).