



Direct Dial: 267.533.1830  
khadijah.scott@exeloncorp.com

May 22, 2025

**VIA E-FILING**

Matthew Homsher, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, Second Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

**RE: Tanaya Kinard v. PECO Energy Company**  
**Docket No. C-2025-3054997**

Dear Mr. Homsher:

Enclosed for filing with the Commission is the *Preliminary Objections of Respondent, PECO Energy Company*.

I have enclosed a Certificate of Service showing that a copy of the above document was served on the interested parties. Thank you for your time and attention on this matter.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Khadijah Scott".

Khadijah Scott, Esquire  
Assistant General Counsel, PECO Energy Company

Encl.

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

<b>TANAYA KINARD</b>	:	
<b>Complainant</b>	:	
	:	
v.	:	<b>DOCKET NO. C-2025-3054997</b>
	:	
<b>PECO ENERGY COMPANY</b>	:	
<b>Respondent</b>	:	

---

**NOTICE TO PLEAD**

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.101 and 5.62(c), you are hereby notified that, if you do not file a written response denying or correcting the enclosed Preliminary Objections of PECO Energy Company, within 10 days from service of this notice, a decision may be rendered against you. 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 PECO Energy Company, Khadijah Scott, and where applicable, the Administrative Law Judge presiding over the issue.

File with:  
Matthew Homsher, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street, Second Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

With a copy to:  
Khadijah Scott, Esq.  
PECO Energy Company  
2301 Market Street, S-23  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Dated: May 22, 2025



---

Khadijah Scott  
Counsel for PECO Energy Company  
2301 Market Street S-23  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(267) 533-1830  
Khadijah.scott@exeloncorp.com

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

<b>TANAYA KINARD</b>	:	
<b>Complainant</b>	:	
	:	
v.	:	<b>DOCKET NO. C-2025-3054997</b>
	:	
<b>PECO ENERGY COMPANY</b>	:	
<b>Respondent</b>	:	

---

**PRELIMINARY OBJECTION OF RESPONDENT,  
PECO ENERGY COMPANY**

Respondent, PECO Energy Company (“PECO”), pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.101(a)(1), respectfully petitions this Honorable Commission to dismiss the instant Complaint as outside of the Commission’s jurisdiction.

1. On May 7, 2025, PECO was served with a formal complaint filed by TANAYA KINARD (hereafter “Complainant”). *See*, Complainant’s Complaint.
2. On May 22, 2025, the Respondent filed an Answer to the Complainant’s Complaint. *See*, Respondent’s Answer to Complaint.
3. In the Complaint, the Complainant states that states that there are incorrect charges on her bill with regard to charges accrued between 2018 and 2021.
4. To the extent the Complainant seeks the court to review billing issues which began in 2018, the Complainant is beyond the three (3) year statute of limitations in which to bring a claim. 66 Pa.C.S. §3314(a).
5. The Complainant is beyond the four (4) year statute of limitations in which to request a refund. 66 Pa.C.S. §1312(a).
6. PECO therefore files the instant Preliminary Objection.

7. Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code §5.101, preliminary objections may be filed against a complaint and dismissed for lack of Commission jurisdiction. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(1).

8. Commission procedure regarding the disposition of preliminary objections is similar to that utilized in Pennsylvania civil procedure. Equitable Small Transportation Intervenor. v. Equitable Gas Co., 1994 Pa.PUC LEXIS 69, Docket No. C-00935435 (July 18, 1994).

9. In deciding preliminary objections, the Public Utility Commission must determine, based on the factual pleadings of the petitioner, if relief or recovery is possible. Roc v. Flaherty, 527 A.2d 211 (Pa. Cmwlth 1985).

10. A complaint must be able to recover under the law to survive a preliminary objection. Milliner v. Enck, 709 A.2d 417, 418 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1998) (“preliminary objection should be sustained only where it appears with certainty that, upon the facts averred, the law will not allow the plaintiff to recover”).

11. All of the non-moving party’s averments must be taken as true for the sake of deciding the preliminary objection. County of Allegheny v. Commw. of Pa., 490 A.2d 402 (Pa. 1985).

12. The court does not, however, need to accept, “unwarranted inferences from facts, argumentative allegations, or expressions of opinions.” Feingold v. McNulty, 2009 Phila. Ct. Com. Pl LEXIS 167, \*3.

13. Section 703 of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa. C.S.A. § 703(b) provides that the Commission may dismiss any complaint without a hearing if, in its opinion, a hearing is not necessary to the public interest.

14. A hearing is required only when there is a disputed question of fact, and is not required to resolve questions of law. Dee-Dee Cab, Inc. v. Pa.Pub. Util. Comm'n, 817 A.2<sup>nd</sup> 593 (Pa.Comm. Ct. 2003), petition for allowance of appeal denied, 836 A.2d 123 (Pa. 2003).

**I. THE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION LACKS THE JURISDICTION TO ISSUE THE COMPLAINANT A REFUND.**

1. The Complainant alleges that there are incorrect charges on their bill.

Specifically, she disputes charges that accrued during the 2018 to 2021 time frame at a former address.

2. The Complainant initiated service in June 2017 and disconnected service in December 2021.

3. The guideline for the statute of limitations is set forth at 66 Pa.C.S. §3314(a).

Pursuant to section 3314(a):

**General Rule.** —No action for the recovery of any penalties or forfeitures incurred under the provisions of this part, and no prosecutions on account of any matter or thing mentioned in this part, shall be maintained unless brought within three years from the date at which the liability therefor arose, except as otherwise provided in this part.

66 Pa.C.S. § 3314. (*emphasis added*)

4. The Complainant is requesting that the court review a matter which stemmed from 2018.

5. A seven (7) year old billing claim is clearly beyond the three (3) year Statute of Limitations to which PECO Energy and the Court are bound. 66 Pa.C.S. §3314(a).

6. Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 1312(a), the Complainant is barred from obtaining a refund for the disputed charges beyond four years. Section 1312(a) specifies:

(a) **General Rule.**-- If, in any proceeding involving rates, the Commission shall determine that any rate received by a public utility was unjust or unreasonable, or was in violation of any regulation or order of the Commission, or was in excess of the applicable rate contained in an existing and effective tariff of such public utility, the Commission shall have the power and the authority to make an order requiring the public utility to refund the amount of any excess paid by any patron, in consequence of such unlawful collection, **within four years prior to the date of the filing of the complaint**, together with interest at the legal rate from the date of each such excessive payment ...

66 Pa.C.S. §1312(a) (*emphasis added*).

7. Title 66 Pa.C.S. §1312(a) represents a special limitation fixing the scope of the Commission's power to order refunds.

8. A seven (7) year old billing claim is clearly beyond the four (4) year Statute of Limitations to which PECO Energy and the Court are bound. 66 Pa.C.S. §1312(a).

9. In this matter, the Complainant disputes billing fees, stemming from 2018.

10. Administrative Law Judge Cynthia Williams Fordham ("ALJ Fordham") reached a similar conclusion in the matter Darryl Hicks v. Philadelphia Gas Works, Docket No. C-2010-2207800 (Initial Decision entered, July 12, 2012). In that case, the Complainant disputed charges on his bill from May 2005 and a meter exchange that took place in 2005. Philadelphia Gas Works argued that the Complainant was barred from contesting his bill due to the three year statute of limitations. Id. ALJ Fordham dismissed the Complainant's case and the Complainant filed Exceptions. Id. The Commission agreed with ALJ Fordham,

dismissed the Complainant's Exceptions and adopted ALJ Fordham's Initial Decision as follows:

We find that the ALJ properly concluded that the Complainant is barred from contesting the May 2005 bill. Sections 3314(a) and 1312(a) preclude the Complainant from filing a Complaint in 2010 regarding the May 2005 meter exchange or the May 2005 bill. Accordingly, the ALJ correctly concluded that the Complainant has not met his burden of proof, pursuant to Section 332(a), *supra*, on the matter of the Company's alleged incorrect billing.

Darryl Hicks v. Philadelphia Gas Works, Docket No. C-2010-2207800 (Opinion and Order entered, February 14, 2013).

11. Accordingly, to the extent the Complainant's formal complaint seeks to have the court address billing that stemmed from 2018, the Complainant should be dismissed as the Public Utility Commission does not have the jurisdiction to adjudicate matters outside of the three year statute of limitations or to award customer refunds outside of the proscribed statute of limitations. 52 Pa. Code §5.101(a)(1).

12. The Complainants' Complaint without regard to any billing issues prior to 2022 are outside of the PUC's jurisdiction.

13. The Complainant is also not entitled to a PUC ordered payment agreement because the Complainant enrolled in PECO's Customer Assistance Program ("CAP") in December 2018. The Complainant is currently enrolled in the program. The Complainant's outstanding account balance is comprised of CAP arrears.

14. Title 66 Pa.C.S. §1405(c) provides that, "(c)ustomer assistance program rates shall be timely paid and shall not be the subject of payment agreements negotiated or approved by the commission."

15. Consequently, pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. §1405(c), the PUC has no jurisdiction to give the Complainant a payment agreement on her CAP arrearage.

16. The Complainant has a current balance due of \$13,986.07 for which she accepted responsibility for at time of hearing under docket number C-2024-3048003.

17. This Complaint is without merit and should be dismissed.

**REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, for the reasons set forth above, PECO Energy Company respectfully requests that your Honorable Commission summarily dismiss the Complainant's formal Complaint.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Khadijah Scott  
Counsel for PECO Energy Company  
2301 Market Street, S23-1  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(267) 533-1830  
Fax: 215.568.3389  
Khadijah.scott@exeloncorp.com

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

<b>TANAYA KINARD</b>	:	
<b>Complainant</b>	:	
	:	
v.	:	<b>DOCKET NO. C-2025-3054997</b>
	:	
<b>PECO ENERGY COMPANY</b>	:	
<b>Respondent</b>	:	

---

**VERIFICATION**

I, Khadijah Scott, hereby declare that I am counsel for PECO Energy Company; that as such I am authorized to make this verification on its behalf; that the facts set forth in the foregoing Pleading are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, and that I make this verification subject to the penalties of 18 Pa. C.S. §4904 pertaining to false statements to authorities.



Date: May 22, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_  
Khadijah Scott

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

<b>TANAYA KINARD</b>	:	
<b>Complainant</b>	:	
	:	
v.	:	<b>DOCKET NO. C-2025-3054997</b>
	:	
<b>PECO ENERGY COMPANY</b>	:	
<b>Respondent</b>	:	

---

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Khadijah Scott, hereby certify that I have this day served a copy of PECO Energy Company's Preliminary Objection in the above matter upon all interested parties by *E-mailing* a copy to:

TANAYA KINARD  
3217 ARLINGTON ST  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19121  
*Via Email: kinardtanaya@gmail.com*

Dated: May 22, 2025



---

Khadijah Scott  
Counsel for PECO Energy Company  
2301 Market Street, S23-1  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(267) 533-1830  
Fax: 215.568.3389  
Khadijah.scott@exeloncorp.com