## BEFORE THE

PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

## SCOTT LUELLEN, Complainant

## v.

MAROADI TRANSFER \& STORAGE, INC., Respondent

## RESPONDENT'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Pursuant to this Court's Order of October 5, 2016, Respondent, MAROADI TRANSFER \& STORAGE, INC. (hereinafter "Maroadi"), by its attorneys, Marshall, Dennehey, Warner, Coleman \& Goggin, hereby file this instant Brief in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment.

## I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

This case arises out of an accident that occurred on or about December 13, 2014 wherein Complainant, Scott Luellen (hereinafter "Luellen") alleges he was injured when he fell from a ladder while attempting to assist movers in loading household items onto a truck. Respondent, Maroadi Transfer \& Storage Inc. (hereinafter "Maroadi") performed services as a booking agent for its parent company, Mayflower Transit, LLC, and arranged for the shipment of household goods belonging to Luellen to be shipped from Swissvale, Pennsylvania to Belmont, Massachusetts. This agreement for shipping services was memorialized in a Bill of Lading, Order Number M0222-10242-4 between Luellen's self-proclaimed partner, Katherine Drago, and Mayflower Transit, LLC, for the interstate shipment of household goods from 7105 Schoyer

Street, Swissvale, PA 15218 to 14 Marlboro Street, Belmont, MA 02478. (See Bill of Lading attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A).

Luellen initiated the instant claim in an attempt to recover for alleged personal injuries arising out of an agreement for the interstate shipment of household goods by filing an Amended Formal Complaint on May 3, 2016. Maroadi has filed its Answer, New Matter, and Preliminary Objections to Luellen's Complaint. By Order of Court dated, June 30, 2016, this Court granted Maroadi's Preliminary Objections in part, denying Luellen's claims requesting monetary damages, and also stating that:

The Complainant is cautioned that if, in fact, it is shown at the evidentiary hearing that the move originated in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and terminated in another state (including the state of Massachusetts), such determination will be fatal to Complainant's complaint, due to lack of Commission jurisdiction over the transaction, since such a transaction constitutes commerce among the states, and the complaint will be dismissed in its entirety.
(Pg. 6, June 30, 2016 Order, emphasis added).
A prehearing conference was held on October 5, 2016 for the purposes of further addressing the jurisdictional issue. During the prehearing conference, Luellen acknowledged in response to the inquiries of the Honorable Steven K. Haas, that the underlying trip giving rise to Luellen's claims and this proceeding was, in fact, an interstate trip, having originated in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania area and terminated in Belmont, Massachusetts. (See pg. 3, October 5, 2016 Order; See also Transcript of October 5, 2016 prehearing conference attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit B, pgs. 5-6). Following this admission by Luellen, the Court directed both parties to file motions for summary judgment as to whether the Commission has jurisdiction over interstate transportation.

## II. QUESTION PRESENTED

## SHOULD RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT BE GRANTED AND CLAIMAINT'S AMENDED COMPLAINT BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITES COMMISSION LACKS JURISDICTION OVER INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION AND THUS OVER THE INSTANT CLAIM?

## SUGGESTED ANSWER: YES.

## III. ARGUMENT

Luellen's Amended Complaint should be dismissed in its entirety because the underlying transaction constituted an agreement for the interstate transport of household goods and the Commission does not have jurisdiction over commerce among the states.

The Public Utility Code provides for the process through which a formal complaint may be filed, and conveys to the Commission jurisdiction with which to adjudicate such complaints under the purview of that jurisdiction. Chapter 7 of the Public Utility Code sets forth the procedure on formal complaints within the jurisdiction of the Commission, and includes in pertinent part:
... any person ... having an interest in the subject matter, or any public utility concerned, may complain in writing, setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation, or claimed violation, of any law which the commission has jurisdiction to administer...

66 Pa. C.S. § 701 (emphasis added). Section 701 allows for the filing of a complaint wherein a complainant must set forth anything done or omitted in violation of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer. The facts of this case demonstrates the lack of jurisdiction on behalf of the Commission due to the interstate characteristics of the agreement from which Luellen's claims arise.

Luellen's claims arise out of an agreement for shipping services to be performed, and that were performed, transporting household goods from Swissvale, Pennsylvania, to Belmont,

Massachusetts. See Exhibit A; (See also Invoice and payment transaction record for interstate shipment attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibits C \& D.) Luellen confirmed during the prehearing conference held on October 5, 2016 that the trip at issue was an interstate trip that originated in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania area and terminated in Belmont,

Massachusetts. See Exhibit B, pgs. 5-6. Luellen also included as an exhibit to his Amended Formal Complaint correspondence from Luellen addressed to Maroadi stating: "Your company moved us from 7105 Schoyer Avenue in Pittsburgh to Boston on December 14, 2014". The subject line of that correspondence reads: "Hello from Boston !". (See correspondence attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit E).

Chapter 1 of the Public Utility Code sets forth general provisions pertaining to the Commission, and includes in pertinent part:

The provisions of this part, except when specifically so provided, shall not apply, or be construed to apply, to commerce with foreign nations, or among the several states...

66 Pa. C.S. § 104 (emphasis added). In light of the provisions of section § 104, the Commission lacks jurisdiction over transactions involving interstate commerce, and therefore, over the present proceeding. Accordingly, Maroadi's Motion for Summary Judgment should be granted, and Luellen's Amended Complaint should be dismissed in its entirety.

## IV. CONCLUSION

As directly acknowledged by the Court in its June 30, 2016 Order and based on the facts, law and testimony presented herein, there is no genuine issue of material fact as to the determination that the Commission lacks jurisdiction over interstate transportation, and therefore lacks jurisdiction over this proceeding. Luellen's claims arise out of a contract for the interstate shipment of goods, and accordingly, Luellen's Amended Complaint should be dismissed in its
entirety. Maroadi Transfer \& Storage Inc. respectfully requests this Honorable Court grant its Motion for Summary Judgment, and enter an order discontinuing all claims as against Maroadi Transfer \& Storage, Inc. in this matter.

Respectfully submitted,
MARSHALL, DENNEHEY, WARNER, COLEMAN \& GOGGIN


Dated: October 25, 2016
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## Exhibit B

```
                        COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
                        PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
Scott Luellen
    v.
                                Docket No.: C-2016-2539599
Maroadi Transfer &
Storage, Inc.
Transportation Complaint।
----------------------------
Pages 1 - 16
PUC
Keystone Building
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120
Wednesday, October 5, 2016
Commencing at 10:21 a.m.
BEFORE:
STEVEN K. HAAS, Administrative Law Judge
APPEARANCES:
SCOTT LUELIEN, Pro Se
            For the Complainant
```



```
ALEX K. YODER, Esquire Marshall, Dennehey, Warner, Coleman \& Goggin, LLP 100 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 201 Camp Hill, PA 17011
For the Respondent
```

REPORTER: DANA M. ROSS

Any reproduction of this transcript is prohibited without authorization by the certifying agency.
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So what $I$ think $I^{\prime} m$ going to do is give the parties an opportunity to file. Each file a motion for summary judgment explaining why they think the Commission either has jurisdiction over this trip or doesn't have jurisdiction over this trip. And then, each party will have an opportunity to file a response to the other party's motion for summary judgment.

And then, I'll review everything and issue a decision on this jurisdictional issue. And if I decide that the Commission does not have jurisdiction then this proceeding will be --- will be ended here at the Eublic Utility Commission.

Now, Mr. Luellen, that does not mean ---
if that's the ultimate conclusion --- that you are completely out of court. As an interstate trip, you have a remedy, potentially, or you can bring a proceeding before the United states Department of Transportation. And $I$ think the Bureau within that department is the Federal Motor Carrier safety Administration. As an interstate'trip, that may be the proper place to bring this, this complaint.

But as $I$ said, $I^{\prime} m$ going to give each of you an opportunity to make an argument about whether or not the Commission has jurisdiction over an
interstate trip by filing motions for summary judgment.

Mr. Luellen, any comment on what $I^{\prime} v e$ laid out?

MR. LUELIEN:
Well, Your Honor, I'm happy to argue via
pleading for the cross motions for summary judgment that the Court requests. I appreciate your information. I suspect that Respondent will be held accountable in Court for the foreseeable future, regardless of the Utility Commission's decision.

Having said that, just for the record, I would take the position that the debate is not so much one --- but not entirely about legal jurisdiction. I believe it's a factual debate, based on a number of things which I'm happy to plead, argue via pleading, but essentially, that only a couple of issues, but the primary one is that the Respondent was actually hired to do four discrete jobs. Paid for the street amount; these four discrete vendors or providers

And the question --- the argument that Respondent makes would be a completely valid argument if there had been a vehicle in transit from one state to another state and there had been an injury during that transition, and that wasn't the case.

This occurred, you know, 24 hours before anything ever moved during packing and loading paper, which occurred exclusively within a town in Pennsylvania.

So I think, we, $I$, would argue that
that's a factual matter and that the Respondent is not so much attacking jurisdiction on the state of the amended complaint. They're essentially trying to argue the facts in a preliminary stage.

JUDGE HAAS:
Well, the fact remains, if the underlying trip that's at issue here is an interstate trip then the Commission doesn't have jurisdiction over any of that stuff that you just --- that you just mentioned. And that's what we need to --- that's what we need to resolve first, the issue of --- of, you know, whether or not being an interstate trip, the Commission has jurisdiction at all.

Mr. Yoder, do you have any comments on
the procedure that $I^{\prime}$ ve laid out?

## ATTORNEY YODER:

We will be filing the requested motion by the court, and any --- will there be any brief required?
JUDGE HAAS:


Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc.
(814) 536-8908


Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc.
(814) 536-8908
contact information for the people at the reporting company?

## JUDGE HAAS:

Yeah. We'll do that before we're done here. Do either of you want to speed up the turnaround of the transcripts, or is the --- if we go with the standard time, it's roughly three weeks, and then we'd have to set a deadiine for the motions 30 days out from that point. So do either of you want to speed up the process? Mr. Luellen?

MR. IUELLEN:
Well, I don't feel we're going to need
it. We haven't heard any facts today, this legal argument, so we don't need the transcript.

JUDGE HAAS:
How about you, Mr. Yoder?
ATTORNEY YODER:
I would like an expedited copy. Yes,
please.
JUDGE HAAS:
You would. Okay. So let's do a
three-day turnaround on the transcript. Okay.
OEE RECORD DISCUSSION
JUDGE HAAS:
I was just talking to the court

Sargent's Court Reporting Service, Inc. (814) 536-8908
reporter. And once we close the record in the prehearing conference, if you'll stay on the line and she'll --- you can arrange with the court reporter to get copies of the transcript.

So we are now looking at --- it is
Wednesday, the 5th. Looking at the transcript being available by Monday, the loth. One, two, three, four --- why don't we say, Eriday, November 11 th would be the due date for filings of the motions for summary judgment.

And then, Friday, December $2 n d$, the
deadiine for any response to the party's motions. That okay with everybody? Mr. Luellen?

MR. LUELLEN:
No problem at all, Your Honor.
JUDGE HAAS:
And Mr. Yoder, those dates all right
with you?
ATTORNEY YODER:
They are all right with us, Your Honor.
Thank you.
JUDGE HAAS:
Good. All right. Well then, we can adjourn this morning's pre-hearing conference. I will put out just a short order in the next day or in the



Exhibit C

# MAYTLOWER 

Mayflower Transit, LLC
22276 Network Place
Chicago, IL $60673-1222$

KATHERINE DRAGO 14 MARLBORO STREET<br>BELMONT, MA 02478



Fend Correspondence to Nayitower Transit LLC, One Mayiower Drive, Fenton, MO 63026-1350| 636-305-4000

Exhibit D

## Transaction Confirmation

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Transaction Status: } & \text { Approved } \\
\text { Authorization Code: } & 101880
\end{array}
$$

## Order Information

| Order Number: | M 222-10242-4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Shipper's Name: | Katherine Drago |
| Booking Agent: | MAROADI TRANSFER \& STORAGE, INC. |
| Requesting Agent: | Mayflower Transit, LLC |

## Authorization Information

Credit Card Type:
Credit Card Number:
xxxxxxxyxxx 1008
Expiration Month: 03
Expiration Year:
2015
Amount: . $5,000.00$
Transaction Date:
12/23/2014
Processed by
James Ruffalo

## Cardholder's Billing Information

Cardholder's Name: Katherine Drago
Billing Address:

14 Marlboro Street
Belmont, MA 02478

Exhibit E

## EXHIBIT G

From: Eric Luellen [sericluellen@gmail.com](mailto:sericluellen@gmail.com)
Date: Tue, Feb 2, 2016 at 5:17 PM
Subject: Fwd: Hello from Boston!
To: patrick@maroadi.com, Mary@maroadi.com
Cc: Katherine Drago [katherinedrago@gmail.com](mailto:katherinedrago@gmail.com)

## Mary \& Patrick:

We have not had the pleasure of formally meeting. I am Katie Drago's fiancée (all men marry up, I'm marrying way up). Your company moved us from 7105 Schoyer Avenue in Pittsburgh to Boston on December 14, 2014. We hired you because Katie was senior management at CMU, where you are a preferred vendor.

The reason Katie was asking for this documentation is because, as I understand you now know, an accident occurred during the move. Simply put, the crew that was hired failed to attach a safety tether to the rear door of the truck on the driver's side (the passenger's side was attached) and a wind-gust caught the door, swung it hard and fast to the closed position, striking me in the back because I was standing at the rear of the truck.

Today, 13-months later, I have been diagnosed by three physicians (one a Harvard fellow, one a spine specialist, and one a Harvard neurologist) with a combination of long-term and debilitating injuries, which have caused me significant pain and debility since the accident. It has also caused me thousands of dollars of medical expenses, and prescribed treatments to help with the long-term injuries caused costing around $\$ 750$ per month. Not a single penny has been paid by your insurers despite them being provided with witness statements, claims, and medical files.

I'm writing because essentially no progress was made with your insurers (Vanlines and York Management Services for Granite State). They have been, in our opinion, unresponsive for weeks and months at best, and unprofessional and dishonest at worst. It has reached the point were lawyers are being consulted to bring suit. We have also reached out to counsel with whom Katie worked at CMU to discuss Maroadi's preferred vendor status there and advice about the best way forward.

Having been a business owner for much of my career, I appreciate that once lawyers get involved costs spiral out of control and the sums that could have been spent to resolve the issues often are either doubled or tripled with legal expenses, or the money goes largely to the lawyers. I would like to prevent that and am reaching out to you directly prior to counsel bringing suit to try and settle the claim. Thank you for being in touch as soon as possible.
S. Eric Luellen
(M) 412-915-7468

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Barbara E. Steel, an employee of Marshall, Dennehey, Warner, Coleman \& Goggin, do hereby certify that on this $25^{\text {th }}$ day of October, 2016, I served a copy of the foregoing document, via electronic mail, as follows:

Scott Luellen
14 Marlboro Street
Belmont, MA 02478
SEricLuellen@gmail.com

## Barlara E. Steel

Barbara E. Steel

