

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Amy Wedul	:	
	:	
v.	:	F-2025-3058098
	:	
PECO Energy Company	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Decision dismisses with prejudice the Formal Complaint of Amy Wedul because the Complainant failed to appear at the scheduled hearing and prosecute her Formal Complaint.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On October 16, 2025, Amy Wedul (Complainant or Ms. Wedul) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against PECO Energy Company (PECO, Respondent or Company) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) alleging that the utility is threatening to shut off her service or has already shut off her service. As relief, Ms. Wedul requested that the Commission issue an affordable payment arrangement for her.

In her Complaint, Ms. Wedul selected the option to receive all communications from the Commission via email at the email address provided by Complainant on the Complaint. Complaint ¶ 9

This Complaint is a timely appeal of the informal decision issued by the Commission's Bureau of Consumer Services at BCS Case No. 4091543. A timely BCS appeal is subject to *de novo* review. 52 Pa. Code § 56.173(a).

On November 12, 2025, the Respondent filed an Answer denying all material allegations of fact and conclusions of law in the Complaint. Respondent requested that the Complaint be dismissed.

On November 17, 2025, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was served on the parties scheduling an initial telephonic hearing on January 14, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. and the case was assigned to me. The Hearing Notice provided the parties with the Toll-Free Bridge Number and the PIN to call and participate in the telephonic hearing. The Hearing Notice further stated as follows:

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.

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 continuance, 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).

On November 19, 2025, a Prehearing Order was served on the parties which reminded them of the date and time of the hearing. The Prehearing Order also stated the potential consequences if a party failed to appear at the hearing. Additionally, the Prehearing Order informed the parties about the applicable procedural rules, and again included the procedure to follow for hearing continuances.

Due to a conflict in my schedule, the January 14, 2026 hearing was cancelled. A Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice dated January 20, 2026, notified the parties that the initial telephone hearing was rescheduled for February 27, 2026, at 1:00 p.m. The Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice provided the parties with the Toll-Free Bridge Number and the PIN to call and participate in the telephonic hearing. Like the November 17, 2025 Hearing Notice, the Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice instructed the parties on the procedures for requesting a continuance and the potential consequences for failing to appear at the hearing.

The November 17, 2025 Hearing Notice, the November 19, 2025 Prehearing Order, and the January 20, 2026 Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice were electronically served to the Complainant in the ordinary course of the Commission's business to the email address that was registered with the Commission by Complainant. None of these documents were returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

On February 27, 2026, I convened the hearing as scheduled. Margaret A. Morris, Esq. appeared on behalf of Respondent along with one witness and was ready to proceed. The court reporter was also present. Complainant was not present at the start of the hearing. After a short recess to allow time for Complainant to appear, the hearing proceeded in Complainant's absence. No testimony was taken, and no exhibits were introduced into the record. At the hearing, Respondent moved to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice for Complainant's failure to appear and prosecute her Complaint. I took this motion under advisement.

The record closed on March 13, 2026, upon receipt of the hearing transcript.

On May 15, 2026, I received a detailed email from Ms. Wedul concerning the issues raised in her Complaint.¹ In her email, Ms. Wedul did not explain why her failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable nor did she request a new hearing date.

This Decision grants the Respondent's Motion to Dismiss the Complaint.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is Amy Wedul.
2. The Respondent is PECO Energy Company.
3. On October 16, 2025, Ms. Wedul filed a Formal Complaint against PECO alleging that the utility is threatening to shut off her service or has already shut off her service.
4. As relief, Ms. Wedul requested that the Commission issue an affordable payment arrangement for her.
5. On November 12, 2025, the Respondent filed an Answer denying all material allegations of fact and conclusions of law in the Complaint.

¹ A copy of Ms. Wedul's email was sent to PECO's counsel to cure any *ex parte* communication.

6. On November 17, 2025, a Call-In Telephone Hearing Notice was served on the Complainant scheduling an initial telephonic hearing on January 14, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

7. On November 19, 2025, a Prehearing Order for Telephone Hearing was served on Complainant providing additional information to the parties regarding the hearing.

8. Both the November 17, 2025 Hearing Notice and the November 19, 2025 Prehearing Order provided the parties with the Toll-Free Bridge Number and the PIN to call and participate in the telephonic hearing and, *inter alia*, the procedure for requesting a continuance and the possible consequences of failing to appear at the hearing.

9. Both the November 17, 2025 Hearing Notice and the November 19, 2025 Prehearing Order were served on Complainant by electronic mail to the email address Complainant provided to and registered with the Commission.

10. Neither the November 17, 2025 Hearing Notice nor the November 19, 2025 Prehearing Order were returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

11. A Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice dated January 20, 2026, notified the parties that the initial telephone hearing was rescheduled for February 27, 2026, at 1:00 p.m.

12. The January 20, 2026 Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice provided the parties with the Toll-Free Bridge Number and the PIN to call and participate in the telephonic hearing and, *inter alia*, the procedure for requesting a continuance and the possible consequences of failing to appear at the hearing.

13. The January 20, 2026 Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice was served on the Complainant by electronic mail to the email address that was registered with the Commission.

14. The January 20, 2026 Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice was not returned to the Commission as undeliverable.

15. Complainant failed to appear and participate in the scheduled telephonic hearing on February 27, 2026.

16. The court reporter, Counsel for Respondent and its witness were present and prepared to proceed at the February 27, 2026 hearing.

17. Complainant did not contact the Commission to explain why her failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

DISCUSSION

Due Process and Notice

Administrative agencies, such as the Commission, are required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984). This due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. *Id.*

The record shows that Complainant was provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. On January 20, 2026, the Commission served the Complainant the Hearing Cancellation/Reschedule Notice advising the parties of the date and time of the hearing, how to participate in it, and how to request a continuance prior to the hearing

if needed. The same advice and instructions were included in the Hearing Notice dated November 17, 2025, and the Prehearing Order dated November 19, 2025. Importantly, all three documents advised Complainant that failure to appear may result in the dismissal of the Complaint with prejudice, which means that Complainant would be barred from filing another complaint, raising the same claim(s) and issues(s) presented in the dismissed Complaint.

The two Hearing Notices and the Prehearing Order were electronically served to the email address provided by the Complainant to the Commission. None of these documents were returned to the Commission as undeliverable. Accordingly, it must be presumed that these documents sent to Complainant were received by Complainant. *Skow v. Metro. Edison Co.*, Docket No. F-2023-3042228 (Final Order entered May 7, 2024); *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Order entered Dec. 19, 2019); *Zirkel v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered Apr. 7, 2017); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered Jan. 31, 2017).

Complainant had notice of the hearing and an opportunity to be heard in this proceeding. Therefore, Complainant's due process rights have been fully protected. *Sentner v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00161106 (Opinion and Order entered Oct. 25, 1993).

Failure to Appear, Waiver and the "Unavoidable" Standard

Once a hearing is scheduled and the parties are duly notified by the Commission, it is the responsibility of the parties to appear and participate in the hearing. *Mumma v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-00014869 (Opinion and Order entered Jan. 28, 2002). Both the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations provide that, after being notified, a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing shall be

deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted to later reopen the matter or be permitted to recall excused witnesses. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a). However, these provisions in the Code and in the Commission's regulations do not apply if the presiding officer determines that the party's failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable and that the interests of the other parties and of the public would not be prejudiced by permitting the reopening or further examination. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(b).

The party who failed to appear at the hearing has the burden of explaining why her failure to appear was unavoidable. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); *Herr v. West Penn Power Co.*, Docket No. C-2021-3028202 (Opinion and Order entered Sept. 15, 2022). When there are no facts in the record that the party's failure to appear was unavoidable, the complaint should be dismissed. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 2, 2022); *Little v. Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Auth.*, Docket No. F-2021-3027107 (Opinion and Order entered Feb. 7, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3000734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

Complainant failed to appear for the hearing despite receiving notice and despite the undersigned allowing additional time for Complainant to appear. To date, there has been no communication to the Office of Administrative Law Judge or me by, or on behalf of, Complainant explaining why her failure to appear at the hearing was unavoidable.

Consequently, I find that Complainant waived the opportunity to participate in a hearing on the matters raised in the Complaint, Complainant's absence was not unavoidable, and the Complaint should be dismissed.

Burden of Proof and Dismissal of Complaint

Section 332(a) of the Public Utility Code provides that the party seeking relief from the Commission has the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a). To establish a sufficient case and satisfy the burden of proof, a complainant must show that the respondent public utility is responsible or accountable for the problem described in the complaint. *Patterson v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 72 Pa.P.U.C. 196 (1990); *Feinstein v. Phila. Suburban Water Co.*, 50 Pa.P.U.C. 300 (1976). Such a showing must be by a preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 578 A.2d 600 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990). A preponderance of the evidence is established by presenting evidence more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than that presented by the other party. *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

As the proponent of any request for relief, Complainant bears the burden of proof. By failing to participate and proffer any evidence to support the complaint, Complainant has failed to meet this burden. Thus, it is appropriate to dismiss the Complaint. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 2, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-300734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019) (citing *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995)). Accordingly, the merits of the Complaint will not be addressed.

Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Ms. Wedul's Complaint will be granted.

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. The Commission is required to provide due process to the parties appearing before them; this due process requirement is satisfied when the parties are provided notice and the opportunity to be heard. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984).

3. Notice electronically served to a party with no notification that service failed is presumed received. *Skow v. Metro. Edison Co.*, Docket No. F-2023-3042228 (Final Order entered May 7, 2024); *Hu v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3012075 (Order entered Dec. 19, 2019); *Zirkel v. Phila. Gas Works*, Docket No. C-2016-2561176 (Final Order entered Apr. 7, 2017); *Morella v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2016-2553416 (Final Order entered Jan. 31, 2017).

4. After being notified, a party who fails to appear at a scheduled hearing shall be deemed to have waived the opportunity to participate in the hearing and shall not be permitted to later reopen the matter or be permitted to recall excused witnesses. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

5. If there are no facts in the record that a party's failure to appear at a hearing was unavoidable, the complaint should be dismissed. *Brown v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2019-3009486 (Opinion and Order entered Apr. 2, 2022); *Little v. Pittsburgh Water & Sewer Auth.*, Docket No. F-2021-3027107 (Opinion and Order entered Feb. 7, 2022); *Williams v. PECO Energy Co.*, Docket No. C-2018-3000734 (Opinion and Order entered Mar. 14, 2019); *Jefferson v. UGI Utils., Inc.*, Docket No. Z-00269892 (Opinion and Order entered Dec. 26, 1995).

6. Complainant's due process rights have been fully protected and Complainant's failure to appear was not unavoidable. *Schneider v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 479 A.2d 10 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984); 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(f); 52 Pa. Code § 5.245(a).

7. As the party seeking relief, Complainant bears the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a); *Se-Ling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950).

8. By failing to participate in the hearing and proffer any evidence to support the Complaint, Complainant has failed to meet the burden of proof. 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED

1. That PECO Energy Company's Motion to Dismiss the Formal Complaint of Amy Wedul at Docket No. F-2025-3058098 is granted.
2. That the Formal Complaint of Amy Wedul in *Amy Wedul v. PECO Energy Company* at Docket No. F-2025-3058098 is dismissed with prejudice.
3. That Docket No. F-2025-3058098 be marked closed.

Date: June 1, 2026

/s/
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge