- BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF UTAH -

Formal Complaint of Melissa Cantrell against Rocky Mountain Power	DOCKET NO. 25-035-26 ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT

ISSUED: August 28, 2025

On April 14, 2025, Melissa Cantrell ("Complainant") filed a formal complaint ("Complaint") with the Public Service Commission (PSC) against Rocky Mountain Power (RMP). The PSC issued a Notice of Filing and Comment Period on April 18, 2025, inviting RMP to respond by May 14, 2025, and Complainant to submit a reply by May 29, 2025.

On May 14, 2025, RMP filed its Answer and Motion to Dismiss ("Motion"), asking the PSC to dismiss the complaint with prejudice. On May 28, 2025, Complainant filed her reply ("Reply").[1]

1. The Complaint

Generally, Complainant alleges RMP has overbilled her for electricity she did not consume. The Complaint speculates the overbilling may be associated with one or more of the following: (1) a neighbor "steal[ing] power"; (2) a "retaliatory" measure by RMP; (3) RMP's faulty equipment; or (4) a neighbor or RMP otherwise tampering with her meter, a transformer, or other equipment. The Complaint requests the following relief: (1) a refund of Complainant's "entire bill from December 2024 [through] May 2025 … free of charge and a substantial inconvenience credit added to [her] account";

[1] While Complainant filed a Request for Extension of Time on May 21, 2025, the reply she filed was timely. Therefore, the PSC considers that request to be moot.

(2) RMP "refund the State of Utah $2 million in taxes that [it] illegally claimed" with interest; (3) RMP be "banned from the State of Utah" and "broken down" such that only "Utah based businesses" provide utility service in Utah; and (4) any entity that Berkshire-Hathaway owns be "banned from Utah for [its] blatant monopoly and theft."

2. RMP's Answer and Motion to Dismiss

The Motion explains RMP's numerous efforts to address Complainant's concerns, assuage her suspicions about electricity theft, and confirm the accuracy of her meter and billing. After several conversations with Complainant by telephone, RMP sent a field employee to Complainant's residence on February 19, 2025, to test the accuracy of her meter. Consistent with "typical practice," the employee knocked on the door to inform Complainant of the reason for the visit.[2] Unfortunately, this woke the Complainant, she was apparently not pleased, and she "declined a meter test at that time and declined to provide a more convenient time" for RMP to return and test the meter.[3] RMP avers the employee left without performing a test and elevated the issue to RMP's "help desk."

The following day, RMP states its "customer advocacy team" called Complainant, seeking to resolve the issue and schedule a time to test the meter. However, Complainant "disconnected the call without providing a convenient time" to

[2] Motion at 3.
[3] *Id.* The Complaint similarly describes a visit to Complainant's home in "late February" that woke her, explaining she works at night and did not appreciate the "unannounced" daytime visit.

do so.[4] RMP subsequently sent an email to Complainant, again soliciting an appointment to test the meter.

On February 27, 2025, RMP "was able to visit Complainant's property and test the meter." RMP represents the meter tested 99.99 [percent] accurate[,]" noting this is within the acceptable range under its Electric Service Regulation No. 7(4)(a).

After, Complainant continued to call RMP to protest the amount of her bill and the accuracy of her meter. Complainant also complained of suspicious wires on her property, expressed concern a neighbor was somehow stealing power from her, and requested RMP perform another site inspection.

RMP states it sent an employee to Complainant's residence again, on February 28, 2025. After finding no evidence of tampering, the employee left a "door hanger note … explaining that even though the wires from [her] residence and her neighbor's residence are connected to a common pole, this [is] standard electric equipment" and "not evidence of electricity theft."[5]

RMP also represents, in response to Complainant's concerns, it "reviewed the neighbors [sic] account, conducted a site visit, and performed a meter test and found no evidence of tampering."[6]

[4] Motion at 3.
[5] *Id.* at 4.
[6] *Id.*

Complainant continued to contact RMP to complain about the accuracy of her bill and potential theft.

On March 13, 2025, RMP sent a local field manager to the property. The field manager re-tested Complainant's meter, the neighbor's meter, and confirmed no signs of tampering existed. RMP states its field manager spent approximately 90 minutes with the Complainant, trying to address her concerns.

On Complainant's request, RMP sent field employees again to the site, on March 17, 2025, to inspect the transformer and meter base. "The employees explained to the Complainant that the equipment was in proper working condition."[7] However, owing to Complainant's persistent concerns, RMP replaced Complainant's Automated Meter Reading (AMR) meter with an Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) meter. The AMI meter should allow Complainant to monitor interval usage details through RMP's online portal.

Finally, RMP states Complainant contacted RMP again on March 19, 2025, again complaining about theft of service. RMP explains it declined to take further action given that it had already "performed multiple site visits, tested multiple meters multiple times, inspected the wires and transformer, and replaced Complainant's meter with … upgraded technology to help Complainant monitor her usage."[8]

[7] *Id.* at 5.
[8] *Id.* at 6.

RMP asks the PSC dismiss the Complaint because no allegation exists suggesting it violated any statute, rule, tariff, or prior order of the PSC. RMP emphasizes that a meter is compliant with its Electric Service Regulations provided it tests no lower than 98 percent and no higher than 102 percent.[9] Complainant's meter tested "99.99 [percent] accurate, well within the established … parameters."[10]

3. Complainant's Reply

The Reply suggests RMP somehow failed to timely respond within 30 days pursuant to Utah Code § 63G-4-204(1). It alleges unspecified violations of "Consumer Sales Practices Act … and Deceptive Trade Practices." The reply implies that RMP sought to increase "Utah State power bills by 30" percent, failed in its attempt to "legislate" that increase, and now "will use faulty meters, overloaded transformers, rusted tanks, broken wiring, deceptive billing practices, and coercion to enrich themselves."

The Reply reiterates the request for relief in the Complaint, and additionally asks the PSC (1) order RMP to "reimburse all tax related Federal funds [it] acquired from the $96 billion received at the end of the Biden presidency" and (2) "if [RMP] refuses to pay … an injunction filed on all their properties in Utah, confiscat[ing] their properties and auction[ing] off each property to 15 year + long-term Utah residents."

[9] *Id.* at 7-8 (citing Electric Service Regulation No. 7(4)(a)).
[10] *Id.* at 8.

4. Findings and Conclusions

Complainant cites a $219 bill for February 2025 and $274 bill for March 2025 as prompting her concern about excessive charges. RMP notes its records show her bill increased when she moved from an apartment to a stand-alone home built in the 1960s. RMP also notes Complainant apparently does not have access to the bottom floor of the home (which is "locked by the owner") but attached to the same meter. Finally, RMP notes Complainant activated the service at the home on December 10, 2024, but she did not remove the apartment from her account until December 24, 2024, resulting in some overlap during which service for both addresses was assigned to her account.

Having reviewed the Complaint, Motion, and Reply, the PSC concludes no factual allegation suggests that RMP violated any statute, rule, tariff provision, or prior order of the PSC. Complainant's vague declarations about tampering and theft find no support in any specific allegation of fact.

The PSC appreciates Complainant is concerned about increased electricity costs, but both the Complaint and Motion make clear RMP has reasonably endeavored to address her concerns, visiting the property multiple times, testing her (and her neighbor's) meter several times, and finally installing an AMI meter that allows Complainant to closely monitor her electricity use.

Accordingly, the Motion is granted, and the Complaint is dismissed. As to RMP's request to dismiss the Complaint with prejudice, the PSC will not entertain any future complaint from the Complainant concerning a disparity between the amount of electricity she consumed and the amount for which she was billed unless Complainant specifically alleges the amount of the disparity and how it was determined or measured.

5. Order

The Motion is granted, and the Complaint is dismissed.

DATED at Salt Lake City, Utah, August 28, 2025.

/s/ Michael J. Hammer
Presiding Officer

Approved and Confirmed August 28, 2025, as the Order of the Public Service Commission of Utah.

/s/ Jerry D. Fenn, Chair

/s/ David R. Clark, Commissioner

/s/ John S. Harvey, Ph.D., Commissioner

Attest:

/s/ Gary L. Widerburg
PSC Secretary
DW#341246

Notice of Opportunity for Agency Review or Rehearing

Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-301 and 54-7-15, a party may seek agency review or rehearing of this written order by filing a request for review or rehearing with the PSC within 30 days after the issuance of the order. Responses to a request for agency review or rehearing must be filed within 15 days of the filing of the request for review or rehearing. If the PSC fails to grant a request for review or rehearing within 30 days after the filing of a request for review or rehearing, it is deemed denied. Judicial review of the PSC's final agency action may be obtained by filing a Petition for Review with the Utah Supreme Court within 30 days after final agency action. Any Petition for Review must comply with the requirements of Utah Code Ann. §§ 63G-4-401, 63G-4-403, and the Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I CERTIFY that on August 28, 2025, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was delivered upon the following as indicated below:

By USPS:

Melissa Cantrell
367 S. 450 W.
Cedar City, UT 84720

By Email:

Melissa Cantrell (melissa_cantrell@hotmail.com)

Data Request Response Center (datareq@pacificorp.com)
(customeradvocacyteam@pacificorp.com)
PacifiCorp

Max Backlund (max.backlund@pacificorp.com)
James Ingram (james.ingram@pacificorp.com)
Rocky Mountain Power

Patricia Schmid (pschmid@agutah.gov)
Patrick Grecu (pgrecu@agutah.gov)
Robert Moore (rmoore@agutah.gov)
Assistant Utah Attorneys General

Madison Galt (mgalt@utah.gov)
Division of Public Utilities

Alyson Anderson (akanderson@utah.gov)
Cameron Irmas (cirmas@utah.gov)
Jennifer Ntiamoah (jntiamoah@utah.gov)
Bela Vastag (bvastag@utah.gov)
Alex Ware (aware@utah.gov)
(ocs@utah.gov)
Office of Consumer Services

/s/ Melissa R. Paschal
Administrative Assistant