

December 28, 2021

Via Electronic Filing

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

**Re: Docket No. C-2021-3029823
Alexander David Burkholder v. Met-Ed
Preliminary Objections of Met-Ed**

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:


Attached for filing is the Preliminary Objections of Metropolitan Edison Company to the Complaint filed by Alexander David Burkholder in the above captioned proceeding.

A copy of the Preliminary Objections 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/co
Enclosures

cc: Tori Giesler, Esquire, FirstEnergy Service Company [w/encls.]
Timothy T. Engler, Esquire, Steiner & Sandoe, LLC

**Re: Docket No. C-2021-3029823
Alexander David Burkholder v. Met-Ed
Preliminary Objections of Met-Ed**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

Via Electronic Mail

Timothy T. Engler, Esquire
Steiner & Sandoe, LLC
36 West Main Avenue
Myerstown, PA 17067-1199
tim@steinersandoe.com

Dated: December 28, 2021


Margaret A. Morris, Esquire

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

ALEXANDER DAVID BURKHOLDER :
v. : Docket No. C-2021-3029823
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY :

NOTICE TO PLEAD

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.63, 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 Preliminary Objections, must be filed with the Secretary of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, with a copy served 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
rchiavetta@pa.gov

With a copy to:

Margaret A. Morris, Esquire
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
mmorris@regerlaw.com

Date: December 28, 2021




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.)
mmorris@regerlaw.com

Counsel for Metropolitan Edison Company

WHEREFORE, Metropolitan Edison Company, requests that the requested relief for monetary damages on behalf of Burkholder Capital LLC be stricken from the Formal Complaint filed by Alexander David Burkholder for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 28, 2021



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

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

ALEXANDER DAVID BURKHOLDER :
v. : Docket No. C-2021-3029823
METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY :

**PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS OF METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY
TO THE COMPLAINT OF ALEXANDER DAVID BURKHOLDER**

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 Objections to the Formal Complaint of Alexander David Burkholder (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 an impertinent matter in its requested relief. Therefore, Met-Ed requests that these Preliminary Objections be granted and that the Commission: (1) grant its Preliminary Objections and strike the Complainant's request for monetary damages; (2) expressly prohibit the Complainant from introducing any testimony or exhibits at any evidentiary hearing regarding alleged damages; and (3) 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 non-residential electric service in the name of Burkholder Capital LLC (Customer) to 3094 North Reading Road, Adamstown, Pennsylvania (Service Location) under Account No. 100141929594 (Account).

2. The Complainant filed a Formal Complaint, alleging a reliability, safety or quality problem with the electric service provided to the Service Location and sought, *inter alia*, damages on behalf of the Customer. Complaint at ¶ 5.

3. In its Answer and New Matter being served contemporaneously with this Preliminary Objection, Met-Ed denied that its actions were negligent or that the Company is responsible for the requested relief.

4. Pursuant to 52. Pa. Code § 5.101, Met-Ed objects to the requested relief on the grounds that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to award monetary damages.

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 requests reimbursement for damages on behalf of the Customer.

8. Clearly, that requested 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 an “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 on behalf of the Customer is an irrelevant to the instant cause of action and therefore an “impertinent matter.”

III. Conclusion

15. Consistent with Pennsylvania law, the Commission does not have subject matter jurisdiction to award monetary damages and the Complainant’s requested relief 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, Metropolitan Edison Company, requests that the requested relief for monetary damages on behalf of Burkholder Capital LLC be stricken from the Formal Complaint filed by Alexander David Burkholder for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 28, 2021



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