

November 19, 2018

Via Electronic Filing

Rosemary Chiavetta, Esquire
Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: Docket No. C-2018-3005655
James T. Chrin v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Preliminary Objection of Metropolitan Edison Company**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Attached for filing is the Preliminary Objection of Metropolitan Edison Company Company (Met-Ed) to the Complaint filed by James T. Chrin (Complainant) in the above captioned proceedings.

A copy of the Preliminary Objection has been provided to the Complainant in the manner indicated on the attached Certificate of Service.

If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP



Margaret A. Morris

MAM/lm
Attachment

cc: John L. Munsch, Esquire, FirstEnergy Service Company [w/enc.]
Angelo M. Perrucci, Jr., Esquire, Perrucci Law [w/enc.]
James T. Chrin [w/enc.]

**Re: Docket No. C-2018-3005655
James T. Chrin v. Metropolitan Edison Company
Preliminary Objection of Metropolitan Edison Company**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


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

Via Electronic and First Class Mail

Angelo M. Perrucci, Jr., Esquire
825 Walnut Street
Easton, PA 18042
perruccilawcorporation@rcn.com

James T. Chrin
268 Deemer Rd.
Easton, Pa. 18042
jcms@ren.com

Dated: November 19, 2018


Margaret A. Morris, Esquire

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

JAMES T. CHRIN

v.

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2018-3005655

NOTICE TO PLEAD

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101 you are hereby notified that if you do not file a written response answering the enclosed Preliminary Objections of Metropolitan Edison Company within **ten (10) days** from service of this Notice, the facts set forth by Metropolitan Edison Company in the Preliminary Objections may be deemed to be true, whereby requiring no other proof. All pleadings, such as a Reply to the Preliminary Objections, must be filed with the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, with a copy to counsel for Metropolitan Edison Company, Margaret A. Morris, Esq., and where applicable, the Administrative Law Judge presiding over the issue.

File with:

Rosemary Chiavetta, Esquire
Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building, 2 North
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105

With a copy to:

Margaret A. Morris, Esquire
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Date: November 19, 2018



Margaret A. Morris, Esquire
Attorney ID No. 75048
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 495-6524 tel.
(215) 495-6600 fax
mmorris@regerlaw.com

Counsel for Metropolitan Edison Company

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

JAMES T. CHRIN	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2018-3005655
	:	
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY	:	

**PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS OF METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY
TO THE FORMAL COMPLAINT OF JAMES T. CHRIN**

Metropolitan Edison Company (Met-Ed or Company), by and through its attorneys, Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101, hereby files its Preliminary Objection to the Formal Complaint of James T. Chrin (Complainant) filed in the above-captioned proceeding.

Met-Ed avers the subject of the Formal Complaint is beyond the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) who is without authorization to grant the Complainant’s request for damages. The Formal Complaint includes impertinent matter in its requested relief. Therefore, Met-Ed requests that this Preliminary Objection be granted and that the Commission: (1) grant its Preliminary Objections and strike the Complainant’s requests for monetary damages; (2) expressly prohibit the Complainant from introducing any testimony or exhibits at any evidentiary hearing regarding alleged damages; (3) dismiss the Formal Complaint in its entirety with prejudice; and (4) grant the Company such other relief as may be just and reasonable under the circumstances.

In support of its preliminary objections, Met-Ed states as follows:

I. Procedural Background

1. Met-Ed is an electric distribution company certificated as a public utility permitted to operate within the Commonwealth in Pennsylvania and provides residential electric service to the Complainant under Account No. 100016300970.

2. The Complainant resides at 268 Deemer Road, Easton, Pennsylvania (Service Location). He filed a Formal Complaint alleging Met-Ed failed to maintain equipment in a safe condition causing a “power over voltage” and he seeks compensatory damages in the amount of \$6,706.59 for his personal property at the Service Location.

3. In its Answer and New Matter being served contemporaneously with this Preliminary Objection, Met-Ed denied that its actions caused any damage to the Complainant’s personal property.

4. Pursuant to 52. Pa. Code § 5.101, Met-Ed objects to the Formal Complaint on the grounds that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to award monetary damages. The Complainant seeks to have Met-Ed pay for the alleged damages to his property.

II. Argument

5. The Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure permit parties to file preliminary objections. The grounds for preliminary objections are limited to those set forth in 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a) as follows:

- (1) Lack of Commission jurisdiction or improper service of the pleading initiating the proceeding.
- (2) Failure of a pleading to conform to this chapter or the inclusion of scandalous or impertinent matter.
- (3) Insufficient specificity of a pleading.
- (4) Legal insufficiency of a pleading.

- (5) Lack of capacity to sue, nonjoinder of a necessary party or misjoinder of a cause of action.
- (6) Pendency of a prior proceeding or agreement for alternative dispute resolution.
- (7) Standing of a party to participate in the proceeding.

6. Commission's procedure regarding the disposition of preliminary objections is similar to that utilized in Pennsylvania civil practice. *Equitable Small Transportation Intervenors v. Equitable Gas Company*, Docket No. C-00935435 (Opinion and Order entered July 18, 1994).

7. In the instant Formal Complaint, the Complainant's sole requested relief is to be reimbursed in the amount of \$6,706.59 for the damaged personal property.

8. Clearly, the only relief sought through the Formal Complaint is an award of monetary damages from the Company.

A. Impertinent Matter

9. The Commission's procedural regulations allow a party to object to pleadings that fail to comply with the rules of administrative practice or that include scandalous or impertinent matters. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 5.102(a)(2).

10. It is well-established under Pennsylvania law that the enforcement powers of the Commission do not include the power to award money damages. *Elkin v. Bell Tel. Co. of PA.*, 420 A.2d 371 (Pa. 1980); *Feingold v. Bell of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 791 (Pa. 1978); *see Nagy v. Bell Tel. Co. of PA.*, 436 A.2d 701 (Pa. Super. 1981).

11. In *Feingold*, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court explained:

. . . the statutory array of PUC remedial and enforcement powers does not include the power to award damages to a private litigant for breach of contract by a public utility. Nor can we find an express grant of power from which the power to award such damages can be fairly implied. Thus, it can be concluded that the Legislature did not intend for the PUC to have such a power.

Feingold, 383 A.2d at 794.

12. The Court of Common Pleas retains original jurisdiction over suits for monetary damages. *Behrend, supra*.

13. A prayer for damages, which are not legally recoverable in the cause of action, is “impertinent matter” in the sense that it is irrelevant to that cause of action, and is correctly challenged through a motion to strike the requested relief as impertinent matter. *Third Avenue Realty Limited Partners v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2167286 (Final Order entered September 30, 2010) (citing *Hudock v. Donegal Mut. Ins. Co.*, 264 A.2d 668 (Pa. 1970)).


14. The Complainant’s requested relief of damages is irrelevant to the instant cause of action and therefore an “impertinent matter.”

15. Therefore, in accordance with Pennsylvania law, this Commission does not have the power to award monetary damages and the Complainant’s request for money damages is an impertinent matter that must be stricken within the use and meaning of Commission regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2).

WHEREFORE, Respondent, Metropolitan Edison Company, requests that the relief for damages requested in the Formal Complaint filed by James T. Chrin be stricken or denied in its entirety for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. The Respondent also requests, to the extent relevant, that no testimony or exhibits at any evidentiary hearing regarding alleged damages be permitted.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2018



Margaret A. Morris, Esq.
Attorney ID No. 75048
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 495-6524 tel.
mmorris@regerlaw.com

Counsel for Metropolitan Edison Company