

July 1, 2025

Secretary

PA Public Utility Commission

Commonwealth Keystone Building

2nd Floor, Room – N201

Harrisburg, PA 17120

Subject: C-2024-3050485

Michael and Sharon Hartman v. PPL

Objection and Answer to PPL's Answer to Complainants' Motion to Lift Stay

Dear Secretary,

I hereby certify that on July 1, 2025, I served a true copy of the Complainants' Objection and Answer upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of § 1.54 (relating to service by a party) via email.

Honorable Emily L. Devoe (via email [edevoe@pa.gov](mailto:edevoe@pa.gov))

Devin Ryan, Esquire (via email [dryan@postschell.com](mailto:dryan@postschell.com))

Alice Wade, Esquire (via email [alice.wade@postschell.com](mailto:alice.wade@postschell.com))

Post and Schell

Michael J. Shafer, Esquire (via email [mjshafer@pplweb.com](mailto:mjshafer@pplweb.com))

PPL Electric Utilities

*Michael Hartman*

Michael Hartman Dated this 1st day of July 2025

Michael C. Hartman  
Sharon R. Hartman  
1650 Primrose Lane  
Dauphin, PA 17108  
(717) 315-9473  
[angelgah@comcast.net](mailto:angelgah@comcast.net)

July 1, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Honorable Emily DeVoe  
Administrative Law Judge  
PA Public Utility Commission  
Suite 220, Piatt Place  
301 Fifth Avenue  
Pittsburgh, PA 15222

BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

Michael and Sharon Hartman,

Complainants,

v.

PPL Electric Utilities Corporation,

Respondent.

Docket No. C-2024-3050485

---

OBJECTION AND ANSWER OF COMPLAINANTS MICHAEL AND SHARON HARTMAN  
TO PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION ANSWER TO COMPLAINANTS  
MOTION TO LIFT THE STAY

---

TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE EMILY DEVOE:

Your Complainants respectfully file this Objection and Answer to PPL's Answer to Complainants' Motion to Lift the Stay.

Specifically, it is the intent of your Complainants to correct the misrepresentation and mischaracterization contained in the Respondent's recent Answer below:

**RESPONDENT PPL SAID**

In addition, the Complainants erroneously assert that Administrative Law Judge Steven K. Haas ("ALJ Haas") denied them the opportunity to submit surrebuttal testimony and exhibits.

7. As the Commission noted in its February 28, 2025 Order in the First Complaint proceeding, "By e-mail dated July 13, 2022, the Hartmans indicated that they did not intend to serve surrebuttal testimony." *Hartman v. PPL Elec. Utils. Corp.*, Docket No. C-2019-3008272 (Order entered Feb. 28, 2025).

8. It is indisputable that the Complainants had the opportunity to present surrebuttal testimony and exhibits in that proceeding but elected not to do so.

9. Thus, the Complainants cannot and should not fault ALJ Haas for their failure to present surrebuttal testimony and exhibits.

## COMPLAINANTS OBJECTION AND ANSWER

### **We were denied an opportunity to present Rebuttal or Surrebuttal testimony at the conclusion of PPL's defense**

1. As detailed in our answer to PPL's Motion to Strike, when your Complainants (hereinafter I – Michael Hartman or we Michael and Sharon Hartman) agreed to the litigation schedule proposed by PPL, I made it clear to PPL, repeatedly, that we did not agree to limit our testimony to the May 17, 2022, submission. Mr. Ryan agreed. In fact, I was under the impression that I would have an opportunity to present our case, in its entirety, in-person, at the scheduled August 16, 2022, hearing.
2. At the scheduled August 16, 2022, telephonic Hearing, I intended to summarize Hartman Exhibit A and Hartman Testimony Exhibits 1 through 7 (May 17, 2022, Hartman Testimony), review Exhibit B, (May 17, 2022, Hartman Testimony photographs with dates), and testify in detail to Hartman Exhibits 7A through 57. As day one of the Hearing progressed, I learned that I was mistaken. Following cross-examination by Mr. Ryan, I was afforded an opportunity to introduce Hartman Exhibits 7A through 57. I understood that Hartman Exhibits 7A through 57 were duly admitted at that time, and that in addition to using same for cross examination of PPL witnesses, I intended to testify, in detail, to each exhibit during Complainant Rebuttal or Surrebuttal. On the eve of the final Hearing date, September 21, 2022, Judge Haas informed me that I would not have an opportunity to present Rebuttal/Surrebuttal testimony at the conclusion of PPL's defense.
3. The prejudice of being denied an opportunity to present Rebuttal/Surrebuttal testimony was aggravated by the fact that significant portions of our testimony and exhibits were struck by Judge Haas during February 2023, more than four (4) months after the Hearing was closed, and eight (8) months after my May 17, 2022, testimony was submitted. PPL should have been required to raise objections and file a Motion to Strike the testimony and Exhibits real-time, and not months later. The delinquent objections and ruling denied your Complainants an opportunity to gather testimony and exhibits to replace evidence that was stricken, and rebut PPL's testimony, particularly the inaccurate, misleading and false testimony of PPL employee witnesses William Salisbury and Matthew Stutzman.

4. In denying Complainants' request to provide surrebuttal testimony and exhibits, your Complainants were denied an opportunity to present evidence, documents and witness testimony, to prove that the testimony of William Salisbury and Matthew Stutzman was inaccurate, misleading and false, perhaps knowingly false.
5. Particularly egregious was the denial of an opportunity to rebut inaccurate, misleading and false testimony presented by William Salisbury and Matthew Stutzman during cross examination and redirect for the first time.
6. Please consider, also, that PPL withheld the identity of William Salisbury, arguably in bad faith, until April 2022, three years after we filed the Formal Complaint. We were unaware of the content of Salisbury's and Stutzman's testimony until July 2022, two months after we submitted our testimony and one month prior to the August 2022 Hearing.
7. Furthermore, PPL refused to answer Complainants' Interrogatories addressed to William Salisbury that we submitted during July 2022 after receipt of Salisbury's Rebuttal Statement. Confronted with PPL's last minute Rebuttal Statements, I asked Judge Haas for permission not to submit "**written**" emphasis added, surrebuttal testimony. At no time did I waive our right to present surrebuttal testimony.
8. Your Complainant acknowledges that we argued that the testimony of Salisbury and Stutzman was inaccurate, misleading and false. But argument is not evidence. We respectfully submit that Judge Haas' Initial Decision and the PUC's February 28, 2025, Opinion and Order make it clear that the Respondent's (Salisbury and Stutzman) Rebuttal Testimony was considered truthful and accurate on its face, and absent "**evidence**", emphasis added, your Complainants' argument regarding the inaccurate, misleading and false testimony of William Salisbury and Matthew Stutzman was afforded no weight.
9. It is not the intent of your Complainants to re-litigate the First Complaint or fault The Honorable Judge Haas' decision. Your Complainants simply request an opportunity to gather evidence to determine if the Respondents' submission of inaccurate, misleading, and false testimony was knowing, willful and unreasonable.
10. Accordingly, Your Complainants respectfully request that the Stay in this matter be lifted so that Your Complainant be afforded immediate Discovery, for the first time, to determine whether the testimony of William Salisbury and Matthew Stutzman was inaccurate, misleading and false, and knowingly and willfully such.

11. Your Complainants anxiously await the resumption of the second Formal Complaint and a Status Hearing to discuss the Commissions' jurisdiction in this matter considering the evidence presented to date in the second Formal Complaint.

Sincerely,

*Michael C. Hartman*

Michael C. Hartman

*Sharon R. Hartman*

Sharon R. Hartman,

Complainants