

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Elizabeth Wozniak,	:	
	:	
Complainant,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2024-3046538
	:	
Duquesne Light Company,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

NOTICE TO PLEAD

YOU ARE HEREBY ADVISED THAT, PURSUANT TO 52 PA. CODE § 5.101, YOU MAY FILE AN ANSWER TO THE ENCLOSED PRELIMINARY OBJECTION WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS OF THE DATE OF SERVICE HEREOF. YOUR ANSWER TO THE PRELIMINARY OBJECTION MUST BE FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION, P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265. A COPY SHOULD ALSO BE SERVED ON THE UNDERSIGNED COUNSEL.



Megan E. Rulli (ID # 331981)

Post & Schell, P.C.

17 North Second Street, 12th Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601

Phone: 717-731-1970

Fax: 717-731-1985

mrulli@postschell.com

Date: March 11, 2024

Attorney for Duquesne Light Company

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Elizabeth Wozniak,	:	
	:	
Complainant,	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2024-3046538
	:	
Duquesne Light Company,	:	
	:	
Respondent.	:	

**PRELIMINARY OBJECTION OF
DUQUESNE LIGHT COMPANY TO
THE COMPLAINT OF ELIZABETH WOZNIAK**

TO THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

AND NOW, comes Duquesne Light Company (“Duquesne Light” or the “Company”) and hereby files this Preliminary Objection, pursuant to the regulations of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (“Commission”) at 52 Pa. Code § 5.101, and respectfully requests that the portion of the Formal Complaint of Elizabeth Wozniak (“Complainant”) requesting damages be dismissed because the Commission has no power to award damages.

In support thereof, Duquesne Light states as follows:

I. BACKGROUND

1. Duquesne Light is a “public utility,” an “electric distribution company,” and a “default service provider” as defined in Sections 102 and 2803 of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C.S. §§ 102, 2803.

2. On February 20, 2024, Duquesne Light was served with the above-captioned Complaint. The issues raised in the Complaint pertain to an asphalt parking pad the Complainant

alleges were damaged due to the actions of Duquesne Light's contractor Wright Tree Service, Inc. ("Wright"). (Complaint ¶ 4.) As relief, the Complainant requests, among other things, that she would like Duquesne Light to "[r]epair asphalt [sic] in damaged areas." (Complaint ¶ 5.)

3. Duquesne Light herein files this Preliminary Objection to the Complaint. For the reasons explained below, Duquesne Light respectfully requests that the portion of the Complaint pertaining to a request for monetary reimbursement to compensate for losses be dismissed pursuant to Section 5.101(a)(2) of the Commission's regulations because a request for damages constitutes impertinent matter. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2).

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

4. Pursuant to the Commission's regulations, preliminary objections in response to a pleading may be filed on several grounds, including:

- (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 a 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.

52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2) (emphasis added).

5. In ruling on preliminary objections, the Presiding Officer must accept as true all well-pled allegations of material facts as well as all inferences reasonable deducible therefrom.

Stilp v. Commonwealth, 910 A.2d 775, 781 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2006) (“*Stilp*”) (citing *Dep’t of Gen. Servs. V. Bd. Of Claims*, 881 A.2d 14 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2005)), *affirmed* 974 A.2d 491 (Pa. 2009). However, the Presiding Officer need not accept as true conclusions of law, unwarranted inferences from facts, argumentative allegations, or expressions of opinion. *Stanton-Negley Drug Co. v. Dep’t of Pub. Welfare*, 927 A.2d 671, 673 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2008), *affirmed*, 963 A.2d 670 (Pa. 2009). Notwithstanding, any doubt must be resolved in favor of the non-moving party. *Stilp* at 781.

6. In addition, the Presiding Officer must determine whether, based on the factual pleadings, if recovery is possible. *See Rok v. Flaherty*, 527 A.2d 211, 214 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1987) (citation omitted). Indeed, for preliminary objections to be sustained, it must appear with certainty that the law will permit no recovery. *See Stilp* at 781; *Milliner v. Enck*, 709 A.2d 417, 418 (Pa. Super. 1998) (quoting *Santiago v. Pa. Nat. Mut. Cas. Ins. Co.*, 613 A.2d 1235, 1238 (Pa. Super. 1992)).

III. PRELIMINARY OBJECTION

I. THE COMPLAINANT’S REQUEST FOR DAMAGES SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE COMMISSION HAS NO POWER TO AWARD DAMAGES

7. Duquesne Light incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 6 as if fully set forth herein.

8. The portion of the Complaint requesting damages should be dismissed because the Commission cannot award damages.

9. In the Complaint, the Complainant requests that Duquesne Light “[r]epair asphalt [sic] in damaged areas” at her service address. (Complaint ¶ 5.)

10. It is well-established that the Commission does not have authority to order a public utility to pay damages, as requested by the Complainant. *See DeFrancesco v. W. Pa. Water Co.*,

453 A.2d 595, 596-97 (Pa. 1982); *Elkin v. Bell of Pa.*, 420 A.2d 371, 375 (Pa. 1980); *Feingold v. Bell of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 791, 794-95 (Pa. 1977).

11. Here, the Complainant's request for damages is impertinent matter "in the sense that it is irrelevant to [the] cause of action" because the Commission lacks authority to award damages. See *Stoner v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-2013-2385588, p. 3 (Nov. 14, 2013 (order sustaining preliminary objections)). Indeed, requests for damages are regularly stricken from complaints as being impertinent matter. See, e.g., *id.* at pp. 3, 5; *Powell v. Verizon Pa., Inc.*, Docket No C-2011-226876, 2011 Pa. PUC LEXIS 652, at *8-9, 16-17 (Dec. 21, 2011), *adopted by Comm'n*, 2012 PA. PUC LEXIS 374 (Order Entered Mar. 1, 2012); *J.E. Culbertson Co. v. Pa. Elec. Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2204947, 2011 Pa. PUC LEXIS 781, at *8-9, 12 (Feb. 4, 2011), *adopted by Comm'n*, Docket No. C-2010-2204947 (Order Entered Apr. 8, 2011).

12. Therefore, consistent with longstanding Commission precedent, the Complainant's request for damages is impertinent matter and should be stricken from his Complaint pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2).

IV. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Duquesne Light Company respectfully requests that the Complainant's request for damages be summarily dismissed pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2).

Respectfully submitted,



Megan E. Rulli (ID # 331981)

Post & Schell, P.C.

17 North Second Street, 12th Floor

Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601

Phone: 717-731-1970

Fax: 717-731-1985

mrulli@postschell.com

Date: March 11, 2024

Attorney for Duquesne Light Company