
Garrett P. Lent
Associate

glent@postschell.com
717-612-6032 Direct
717-731-1979 Direct Fax
File #: 200842

August 14, 2025

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Matthew Homsher, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor North
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: Monroe Energy, LLC, et al. v. Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.
Docket Nos. C-2025-3053018**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed for filing in the above-referenced proceeding is the Motion to Compel Responses to Sheetz, Inc., Set IV Discovery on behalf of Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.

Copies will be provided as indicated on the Certificate of Service.

Respectfully submitted,


Garrett P. Lent

GPL/dmc
Attachment

cc: The Honorable Eranda Vero (*via email; w/attachment*)
Certificate of Service

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

VIA E-MAIL ONLY

Todd S. Stewart
HMS Legal LLP
501 Corporate Circle, Suite 302
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Email: tsstewart@hmslegal.com
Counsel for Monroe Energy, LLC

Robert A. Weishaar, Jr.
Adeolu A. Bakare
Rebecca Kimmel
McNees Wallace & Nurick, LLC
100 Pine Street
Harrisburg, PA 17101
Email: bweishaar@mcneeslaw.com
abakare@mcneeslaw.com
rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com
*Counsel for Lucknow Highspire Terminals,
LLC and Sheetz, Inc.*

Randall S. Rich
Pierce Atwood LLP
1875 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Email: rrich@pierceatwood.com
*Attorneys for PBF Holding Company LLC
Pro hac vice*

Date: August 14, 2025



Garrett P. Lent

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Monroe Energy LLC, Lucknow-Highspire :
Terminals LLC, Sheetz INC, and PBF :
Holding Company LLC : Docket No. C-2025-3053018
Complainants, :
v. :
Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. :
Respondent. :

NOTICE TO PLEAD

YOU ARE HEREBY ADVISED THAT, PURSUANT TO 52 PA. CODE § 5.342(g)(1), YOU MAY FILE A REPLY TO THE ENCLOSED MOTION TO COMPEL WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS AFTER THE DATE OF SERVICE. YOUR REPLY SHOULD BE FILED WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION, P.O. BOX 3265, HARRISBURG, PA 17105-3265. A COPY OF YOUR REPLY SHOULD ALSO BE SERVED ON THE UNDERSIGNED COUNSEL.

Christopher J. Barr, Esquire (DC ID #375372)
Post & Schell, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-2000
Phone: (202) 347-1000
Fax: (202) 661-6970
E-mail: cbarr@postschell.com

Admitted Pro Hac Vice

Date: August 14, 2025


David B. MacGregor, Esquire (PA ID #28804)
Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire (PA ID #85522)
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire (PA ID #321566)
Alice W. Wade, Esquire (ID # 335228)
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
Phone: (717) 731-1970
Fax: (717) 731-1985
E-mail: dmacgregor@postschell.com
E-mail: akanagy@postschell.com
E-mail: glent@postschell.com
E-mail: alice.wade@postschell.com

Counsel for Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Monroe Energy LLC, Lucknow-Highspire | : | |
| Terminals LLC, Sheetz INC, and PBF | : | |
| Holding Company LLC | : | Docket No. C-2025-3053018 |
| Complainants, | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. | : | |
| | : | |
| Respondent. | : | |

**MOTION TO COMPEL ANSWERS TO INTERROGATORIES
AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS
PROPOUNDED BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.
ON SHEETZ INC – SET IV**

TO ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ERANDA VERO:

As explained herein, Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. (“Laurel” or the “Company”) hereby files, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.342, this Motion to Compel Answers to its Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents (“Set IV Discovery”) directed to Sheetz INC (“Sheetz”). The Motion to Compel requests that Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero (the “ALJ”) direct Sheetz to provide full and complete responses to Questions 2, 3, and 4, of the Set IV Discovery as is required by 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(a)(4). In support of this Motion, Laurel states as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This proceeding was initiated by the filing of the above-captioned Complaint by Monroe Energy, LLC (“Monroe”), Lucknow-Highspire Terminal, LLC (“LHT”), Sheetz, Inc. (“Sheetz”) and PBF Holding Company LLC (“PBF”) (collectively the “Complainants”), dated January 21, 2025.

2. On February 11, 2025, Laurel filed its Answer and New Matter (“ANM”), and Preliminary Objections (“PO”) to the Complaint in Docket No. C-2025-3053018, rebutting in detail the various claims and arguments of the Complainants.

3. On February 21, 2025, Monroe, LHT, Sheetz, and PBF filed a response to the Preliminary Objections of Laurel.

4. On July 25, 2025, Laurel served Set IV Discovery on Sheetz.

5. Sheetz objected to Set IV Discovery on August 4, 2025. Sheetz lodged objections to Instructions No. 15 and 16 and Questions 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Set IV Discovery. Sheetz indicated it will provide a response to Question 1 “to the extent feasible.” A copy of Complainants’ Objections is provided as Appendix A hereto.

6. On July 29, 2025, LHT and Sheetz filed a Petition for Interim Emergency Relief in the above-captioned matter. The parties to that matter reached a settlement in principle on August 5, 2025.

7. Counsel for Laurel emailed Sheetz’ counsel proposals regarding possible resolution of the objections on August 14, 2025. Discussion of possible resolution of the objections remains ongoing, and Laurel remains willing to discuss reasonable resolutions of the objections. While Laurel is filing the instant Motion to preserve its right to compel responses to valid discovery requests, if the parties are able to resolve the objections Laurel will withdraw its Motion with respect to any such discovery requests.

8. Laurel hereby files its Motion to Compel Complainants to Questions 2, 3, and 4 of the Set IV Discovery.

II. ARGUMENT

A. SHEETZ SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO PROVIDE A FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE WITH RESPECT TO REQUEST NO. 2 OF THE SET IV DISCOVERY.

9. Request No. 2 provides as follows:

2. Please reference Exhibit JDJ-1, 3:8-11. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which Sheetz has failed to move barrels it nominated on Laurel or Buckeye. Please include with this response all documents, including but not limited to emails, instant message logs or letters.

10. Sheetz objects to Request No. 2 arguing that it is ambiguous and unreasonably vague due to the phrase, “failed to move barrels,” that the request would, therefore, impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz, and that Laurel should have the information.

11. In his testimony, Mr. Jadlocki describes issues with moving product due to the existing bidirectional service. The phrase, “failed to move barrels,” seeks to determine whether the witness is aware of instances where Sheetz could not move barrels that it had nominated on Laurel or Buckeye. This does not impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz.

12. Further, even if Laurel could access this information, the witness and Sheetz’s awareness of such information goes to the credibility of the witness’s testimony.

13. For the reasons more fully explained above, Sheetz should be compelled to provide a full and complete response to Requests No. 2 of Set IV discovery.

B. SHEETZ SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO PROVIDE A FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE WITH RESPECT TO REQUEST NO. 3 OF THE SET IV DISCOVERY.

14. Request No. 3 provides as follows:

3. Please reference Exhibit JDJ-1, 3:8-11. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which Sheetz has sought to change a nomination (e.g. asked Laurel or Buckeye to deliver barrels to a new location). Please include with this response all documents, including but not limited to emails, instant message logs or letters.

15. Sheetz objects to Question 3 in Set IV Discovery arguing that the request would impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz because Laurel should have the information.

16. In his testimony, Mr. Jadlocki describes issues with moving product due to the existing bidirectional service. Even if Laurel could access this information regarding changed nominations, the witness and Sheetz's awareness of such information goes to the credibility of the witness's testimony. This does not impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz.

17. For the reasons more fully explained above, Sheetz should be compelled to provide a full and complete response to Requests No. 3 of Set IV discovery.

C. SHEETZ SHOULD BE COMPELLED TO PROVIDE A FULL AND COMPLETE RESPONSE WITH RESPECT TO REQUEST NO. 4 OF THE SET IV DISCOVERY.

18. Request No. 4 provides as follows:

4. Please reference Exhibit JDJ-1, 3:8-11. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which Laurel or Buckeye has sought to change a nomination (e.g. asked Sheetz to deliver barrels to a new location). Please include with this response all documents, including but not limited to emails, instant message logs or letters.

19. Sheetz objects to Question 4 in Set IV Discovery arguing that the request would impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz because Laurel should have the information.

20. In his testimony, Mr. Jadlocki describes issues with moving product due to the existing bidirectional service. Even if Laurel could access this information regarding changed nominations, the witness and Sheetz's awareness of such information goes to the credibility of the witness's testimony. This does not impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz.

21. For the reasons more fully explained above, Sheetz should be compelled to provide a full and complete response to Requests No. 4 of Set IV discovery.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. respectfully requests that Administrative Law Judge Eranda Vero grant this Motion to Compel and order Sheetz INC to fully fully answer Questions 2, 3, and 4 of the Set IV Discovery as is required by 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(a)(4).

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher J. Barr, Esquire (DC ID #375372)
Post & Schell, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-2000
Phone: (202) 347-1000
Fax: (202) 661-6970
E-mail: cbarr@postschell.com

Admitted Pro Hac Vice

Date: August 14, 2025

David B. MacGregor, Esquire (PA ID #28804)
Anthony D. Kanagy, Esquire (PA ID #85522)
Garrett P. Lent, Esquire (PA ID #321566)
Alice W. Wade, Esquire (ID # 335228)
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601
Phone: (717) 731-1970
Fax: (717) 731-1985
E-mail: dmacgregor@postschell.com
E-mail: akanagy@postschell.com
E-mail: glent@postschell.com
E-mail: alice.wade@postschell.com

Counsel for Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.

APPENDIX A



McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC
100 Pine Street
P.O. Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166

Adeolu A. Bakare
Direct Dial: 717.237.5290
Direct Fax: 717.260.1744
abakare@mcneeslaw.com

August 4, 2025

VIA E-MAIL

David B. MacGregor, Esq.
Anthony D. Kanagy, Esq.
Garrett P. Lent, Esq.
Alice W. Wade, Esq.
Post & Schell, P.C.
17 North Second Street, 12th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101-1601

Christopher J. Barr, Esq.
Post & Schell, P.C.
607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-2000

RE: Monroe Energy, LLC, Lucknow-Highspire Terminals, LLC, Sheetz, Inc. and PBF Holding Company LLC v. Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.; Docket No. C-2025-3053018

Dear Counsel:

Attached please find Objections of Sheetz, Inc. to Set IV Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P., in the above-referenced proceeding.

As evidenced by the attached Certificate of Service, all parties to this proceeding are being duly served with a copy of this document. Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Adeolu A. Bakare', written over a white background.

Adeolu A. Bakare
MCNEES WALLACE & NURICK LLC

c: Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary (via electronic filing, letter and certificate only)
Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Monroe Energy, LLC, Lucknow-Highspire | : | |
| Terminals, LLC, Sheetz, Inc. and PBF | : | |
| Holding Company, LLC, | : | Docket No. C-2025-3053018 |
| | : | |
| Complainants, | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. | : | |
| | : | |
| Respondent. | : | |

**OBJECTIONS OF SHEETZ, INC. TO
SET IV INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED
BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

Pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 333 and 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.341 *et seq.*, Sheetz Inc. ("Sheetz") objects to the following Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents propounded by the Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. ("Laurel", or the "Company") on Sheetz, Set IV. The basis of the objections, of which there are three, are: 1) that the requests would require unreasonable investigation; 2) that the requests are ambiguous, overly broad, and unreasonably vague; and/or 3) that the requests are unreasonably burdensome. Sheetz objects to the following requests for the reasons stated therein: 1, 2, 3, and 4.

For the reasons stated herein, Sheetz objects to the listed requests pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.342(e).

Respectfully submitted,

McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

By: 

Adeolu A. Bakare
Rebecca Kimmel
100 Pine Street
PO Box 1166
Harrisburg, PA 17108-1166
(717) 232-8000
abakare@mcneeslaw.com
rkimmel@mcneeslaw.com

Robert A. Weishaar, Jr.
1200 G Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 898-5700
bweishaar@mcneeslaw.com

Counsel for Sheetz, Inc.

**OBJECTIONS OF SHEETZ, INC. TO
SET IV INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED
BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

Docket No. C-2025-3053018

The instructions to Set IV include the following instructions:

15. If, in connection with a discovery request, the Responding Party contends that any information, otherwise subject to discovery, is covered by either the attorney-client privilege, the so-called “attorneys’ work product doctrine,” or any other privilege or doctrine, then specify the general subject matter of the information and the basis to support each such objection.

16. If any information is withheld on grounds of privilege or other protection from disclosure, provide the following information: (a) every person to whom such information has been communicated and from whom such information was learned; (b) the nature and subject matter of the information; and (c) the basis on which the privilege or other protection from disclosure is claimed.

OBJECTION:

The Commission’s regulations broadly exempt privileged materials and documents from discovery. 52 Pa. Code §§ 5.321(c) and 5.323(a); see also 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(3) (prohibiting discovery which relates to a matter which is privileged). However, the Commission’s regulations do not require a party to provide the provenance of every piece of information covered by privilege including what amounts to a log for that evidence noting every person who may have reviewed it. In addition, the Commission’s regulations prohibit discovery which would cause unreasonable burden to a party. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4). Laurel’s Set I, Instructions, Numbers 15 and 16 seek to unreasonably burden Sheetz’s efforts to respond to discovery requests, which specifically inquire into matters which are exempt from discovery under the Commission’s regulations, by imposing a requirement on Sheetz that is not contemplated by the Commissions regulations.

Based on the foregoing, Sheetz objects to Laurel’s Set IV, Instruction Numbers 15 & 16 as unreasonably burdensome. Subject to the foregoing objection, Sheetz intends to respond to appropriate discovery requests that do not seek privileged information, or ask Sheetz to provide legal conclusions, legal opinions and/or legal research. Notwithstanding these general objections, Sheetz is willing to provide responses subject to the specific Objections raised below.

**OBJECTIONS OF SHEETZ, INC. TO
SET IV INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED
BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

Docket No. C-2025-3053018

1. With regard to Mr. Jadlocki's discussion of Sheetz's operations and the states in which it operates in Exhibit JDJ-1 at 2:11-21:
 - a. Please provide all outage reports from 2019 to the present associated with each terminal where Sheetz obtains supply.
 - b. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which the terminal where Sheetz obtains supply was unable to supply product.
 - c. For each instance identified in subpart (b) please describe the cause of the outage, the nature of the outage, the duration of the outage and the grade(s) of the product in-volved.
 - d. Please identify all instances from 2019 to the present in which a lack of supply from Laurel caused the terminal to have insufficient supply to meet the needs of its customers.
 - e. Please identify all instances from 2019 to the present in which a lack of supply for some reason not identified in response to subpart (d) caused the terminal to have insufficient supply to meet the needs to its customers.

OBJECTION:

A party may not ask interrogatories that would cause unreasonable burden or expense. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(2). The request is unduly burdensome because it would take Sheetz an unreasonable amount of time to compile the requested data. Notwithstanding, Sheetz will provide a response to the extent feasible.

**OBJECTIONS OF SHEETZ, INC. TO
SET IV INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED
BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

Docket No. C-2025-3053018

2. Please reference Exhibit JDJ-1, 3:8-11. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which Sheetz has failed to move barrels it nominated on Laurel or Buckeye. Please include with this response all documents, including but not limited to emails, instant message logs or letters.

OBJECTION:

A party may not ask interrogatories that "[w]ould require the making of an unreasonable investigation by the deponent, a party or witness." 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4). The request is ambiguous and unreasonably vague because Sheetz does not understand what is meant by the phrase "failed to move barrels." The request would, therefore, impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4). To the extent the movement is of barrels through the Laurel Pipeline, then Laurel has or should have the requested information.

**OBJECTIONS OF SHEETZ, INC. TO
SET IV INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED
BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

Docket No. C-2025-3053018

3. Please reference Exhibit JDJ-1, 3:8-11. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which Sheetz has sought to change a nomination (e.g. asked Laurel or Buckeye to deliver barrels to a new location). Please include with this response all documents, including but not limited to emails, instant message logs or letters.

OBJECTION:

A party may not ask interrogatories that "[w]ould require the making of an unreasonable investigation by the deponent, a party or witness." 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4). Laurel's own data will show any instance when Sheetz sought a nomination change. Therefore, the request would impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4).

**OBJECTIONS OF SHEETZ, INC. TO
SET IV INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PROPOUNDED
BY LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

Docket No. C-2025-3053018

4. Please reference Exhibit JDJ-1, 3:8-11. Please identify each instance from 2019 to the present in which Laurel or Buckeye has sought to change a nomination (e.g. asked Sheetz to deliver barrels to a new location). Please include with this response all documents, including but not limited to emails, instant message logs or letters.

OBJECTION:

A party may not ask interrogatories that "[w]ould require the making of an unreasonable investigation by the deponent, a party or witness." 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4). Laurel's own data will show any instance when Laurel or Buckeye sought a nomination change. Therefore, the request would impose an unreasonable investigation on Sheetz. 52 Pa. Code § 5.361(a)(4).