

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Monroe Energy, LLC,	:	
Lucknow-Highspire Terminals, LLC,	:	C-2025-3053018
Sheetz, Inc. and PBF Holding Company LLC	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.	:	

**ORDER REGARDING RESPONDENT’S MOTIONS TO COMPEL - SHEETZ**

On July 18, 2025, Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P. (Laurel) served Set II Discovery on Sheetz, Inc. (Sheetz).

On July 28, 2025, Sheetz timely objected to Set II Instructions No. 15 and No. 16 and Discovery Request Nos. 1-9, 10(a-d), 11(a), 12(a), 12(c), and 14.

Counsel for Laurel and Sheetz met and conferred regarding possible resolution of the objections on August 6, 2025.

On August 6, 2025, Sheetz provided responses subject to and notwithstanding its objections to Set II Instructions No. 15 and No. 16 and Discovery Request Nos. 1-9, 10(a-d), 11(a), 12(a), 12(c), and 14.

Sheetz maintained its objections to Set II Instructions No. 15 and No. 16 and Discovery Request Nos. 1-9, 10(a-d), 11(a), 12(a), 12(c) and 14.

On August 7, 2025, Laurel filed Motion to Compel Sheetz to respond to Set II Instructions No. 15 and No. 16 and Discovery Request Nos. 1-9, 10(a-d), 11(a), 12(a), 12(c), and 14.

On August 12, 2025, Sheetz filed an Answer (Answer) to Laurel's Motions to Compel.

The Motion to Compel is ready for ruling.

**Laurel-Set II, Instructions No. 15 and No. 16**

Laurel agrees not to compel the instruction and will not require a privilege log subject to confirmation by counsel that all non-privileged information has been provided. Motion ¶ 12.

Counsel for Sheetz has provided counsel for Laurel with the required confirmation that all non-privileged information has been provided. Answer ¶ 12.

Based upon the foregoing, Laurel's Motion to compel responses to Set II, Instructions No. 15 and No. 16 is moot.

**Laurel – Set II, Request Nos. 1-9**

Laurel – Set II, Request Nos. 1-9 provides as follows:

1. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-1. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*
2. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-2. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*
3. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-3. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

4. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-4. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

5. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-5. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

6. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-6. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

7. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-7. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

8. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-8. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

9. *Please provide copies of all Documents, studies, analyses, and workpapers upon which you relied in the preparation of Exhibit JDJ-9. Please provide electronic copies of such materials in their native format (e.g., Microsoft Excel).*

Sheetz objects to Request Nos. 1-9 to the extent that they seek information not in the witness's possession as he might have been influenced by information no longer in his possession. According to Sheetz, the request appears to demand the production of "all" documents upon which Mr. Jadlocki might have relied, regardless of time and regardless of degree, that was in any way the basis of his testimony.

A party may serve on another party a request for either of the following:

(1) To produce and permit the party making the request, or someone acting on the party's behalf, to inspect and copy designated documents—including writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, computer records and other compilations of data from which information can be obtained, translated, if necessary, by the respondent through detection devices into reasonable usable form— or to inspect a copy, test or sample tangible things which constitute or contain matters within the scope of § 5.321(b), 5.323 and 5.324 (relating to scope; hearing preparation material; and discovery of expert testimony) and which are in the possession, custody or control of the party upon whom the request is served.

In its Motion, Laurel explains that its request presumes that the materials relied upon by the witness are likely to still be in the possession of the witness. Sheetz has inferred from the request that it seeks the entire universe of information that a witness may have, prior to his participation in the case. Laurel explains that that is not the case. In accordance with regulation, Laurel is seeking only those materials that were relied on during the witness's preparation of his testimony. Motion ¶ 16.

Upon careful consideration of both parties' positions, I agree that Sheetz should produce the materials that were relied on during the witness' preparation of his testimony. The said information should be produced by no later than September 1, 2025. Laurel's Motion to compel response to Laurel – Set II, Request Nos. 1-9 is granted. Sheetz' objections to same are overruled.

**Laurel – Set II, Request No. 10 (a-d)**

Laurel – Set II, Request No. 10 (a-d) provides as follows:

*10. 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 identify each terminal facility in which*

*Sheetz stores refined product in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia or Ohio.*

*b) For each facility identified in response to subpart (a) please provide the quantity of refined product stored at the facility by day from 2017 to the present.*

*c) For each facility identified in response to subpart (a) please identify the supplier and quantity supplied at each terminal from 2017 to the present.*

*d) For each of the stores located in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia or Ohio please provide the address of each store in machine readable form and identify the terminal from which refined product is obtained; to the extent a store is supplied by more than one terminal please identify all terminals that supply the store and provide the percentage of product supplied by each store.*

Sheetz objects to Request No. 10(a-d) and argue that “A party may obtain discovery only on matters relevant to the subject matter and issues in the proceeding, and thus reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. 52 Pa. Code § 5.321(c). Specifically, the request is irrelevant and immaterial because the issues here concern only Pennsylvania terminals. In addition, they argue that the interrogatories are burdensome and would cause unreasonable investigation.

Laurel argues that the data at terminals both inside and outside of Pennsylvania is highly relevant to the issues that Mr. Jadlocki raises in his testimony. Specifically, the witness says that they have changed their operational parameters because of the uncertainty caused by Laurel bi-directional status; this testimony is not limited to the claim that they have changed operations in Pennsylvania alone. Compelling this response would ensure that Laurel has the ability to test this claim. Motion ¶ 20.

Laurel further adds that the discovery request in question merely asks for information about Sheetz’s own operations and shipment quantities, is not burdensome as

claimed. In addition, given that Sheetz has specifically claimed that it changed its operations in response to bi-directional service on the Laurel pipeline, Laurel argues that both information before and after bi-directional service has been implemented is necessary to test this claim. Requiring a party to provide the information underlying claims they advance in their testimony does not call for an unreasonable investigation. Motion ¶ 21.

In response, Sheetz reasons that the request for information on the specific terminals supplying each of Sheetz's retail locations across five states is unlikely to lead to admissible evidence relevant to Sheetz's testimony. Sheetz references its operations in states outside of Pennsylvania only in the background section of its testimony. In addition, compiling data related to the specific supply source for each terminal, the daily volumes for each terminal used by Sheetz, as well as the specific terminal(s) that have supplied each individual retail outlet is a considerable production that imposes an unreasonable burden on top of being untethered to the issues addressed in Mr. Jadlocki's testimony. Answer ¶¶ 20-21.

I agree with Laurel that the information sought is relevant to the issues raised in this case; however, I find that compiling data related to the specific supply source for each terminal, the daily volumes for each terminal used by Sheetz, as well as the specific terminal(s) that have supplied each individual retail outlet in the last eight years imposes an unreasonable burden of Sheetz. Consequently, Laurel's Motion to Compel is denied as to Request No. 10(a)-(d). Laurel can propound a revised interrogatory to Sheetz.

**Laurel – Set II, Request No. 11 (a)**

Laurel – Set II, Request No. 11 (a) provides as follows:

*11. With regard to Mr. Jadlocki's statement that a pipeline outage "allows Midwest refiners to immediately increase product costs" as well as his discussion of Gulf Coast and other alternatives in Exhibit JDJ-1 at 4:21-5-9:*

- a) *Please provide in machine readable form, all prices at which Sheetz has purchased re-fined product in the Midwest, Gulf Coast and East Coast from 2019 to the present.*

Sheetz objects to Request No. 11(a) to the extent that the request is irrelevant, immaterial, and not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this proceeding with respect to Sheetz, arguing Laurel already has the information, so it would lead to an unreasonable investigation.

In its Motion, Laurel argues that Sheetz provides no explanation regarding why this would require unreasonable investigation by Sheetz. Instead, Sheetz states that Laurel should have some of this information but does not indicate why this makes the investigation unreasonable. Further, Laurel maintains that this information is relevant to the issues the witness raises in his testimony, as cited in the interrogatory, and Laurel needs the information the witness here analyzed to arrive at his conclusion. Specifically, Sheetz's claims regarding cost increases require validation by information within its possession that such cost increases have actually occurred. Motion ¶¶ 25-26.

According to Sheetz, Laurel claims that it "needs the information the witness here analyzed to arrive at his conclusion" but seeks information far beyond that. *See* Motion to Compel at 7. To the extent Laurel seeks the information analyzed by the witness, that information has been provided. Answer ¶¶ 25-26.

Upon consideration, I do not find that the discovery sought through Request 11 (a) is either irrelevant or overly burdensome as it pertains to Mr. Jadloski's statements in Exhibit JDJ-1 at 4:21-5-9. I also do not believe that it is necessary for produce information that already is on Laurel's possession. I, however, will accept Sheetz' statement that it has already provided to Laurel all the information that Ms. Jadloski analyzed in preparation for his testimony in Exhibit JDJ-1 at 4:21-5-9. If additional information has been analyzed by Mr. Jadloski and is either not disclosed to Laurel by September 1, 2025, or already in Laurel's possession, Sheetz will not be allowed to introduce that information or rely on it at the hearing.

**Laurel – Set II, Request No. 12(a) and 12 (c)**

Laurel – Set II, Request No. 12(a) and 12(c) provides as follows,

12. *With regard to Exhibit JDJ-6, discussed in Exhibit JDJ-1 at 8:12-9:3:*

- a) *Please provide in machine readable form the data maintained by "PSM Application – Sheetz Petroleum Back Office System of Record that is subject to outside industry audits" in the original form in which that data was maintained.*
- c) *Please provide the same type of data for the same time period provided in response to subpart (a) for all terminals or stores located in Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia or Ohio.*

Sheetz objects to Request No. 12(a) on the basis that the request is ambiguous and unreasonably vague. Notwithstanding the objection, Sheetz has responded to Request No. 12 (a) to confirm that it does not possess responsive documents. Answer ¶ 30.

Consequently, Sheetz’s objection to Request No. 12 (a) and Laurel’s Motion to compel answers to same are moot.

As for Request No. 12 (c), Sheetz objects on the basis that the request is irrelevant, immaterial and outside the scope of this proceeding.

I agree with Laurel that the information sought is relevant to the issues raised in this case; however, I find that compiling data related to the specific supply source for each terminal, the daily volumes for each terminal used by Sheetz, as well as the specific terminal(s) that have supplied each individual retail outlet in the last eight years imposes an unreasonable burden of Sheetz. Consequently, Laurel’s Motion to Compel is denied as to Request No. 10(a)-(d). Laurel can propound a revised interrogatory to Sheetz.

**Laurel – Set II, Request No. 14**

Laurel – Set II Request No. 14 provides as follows,

- 14. *Please provide all management level presentations from 2019 to the present that discuss issues related to transit time on Laurel.*

Sheetz objects to this discovery request on the basis that the request is ambiguous and vague as Sheetz does not know what “management level” means.

Notwithstanding the objection, Sheetz has agreed to answer Request No. 14 to confirm that it does not possess responsive documents. Answer ¶ 35.

Accordingly, Laurel’s Motion to Compel LHT to respond to Set II, Request No. 14 is sustained.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.’s Motion to Compel Sheetz, Inc. to respond to Set II Instructions No. 15 and No. 16 and Discovery Request Nos. 1-9, 10(a-d), 11(a), 12(a), 12(c), and 14 is sustained, in part and denied, in part in accordance with the discussion, *supra*.

2. That Sheetz, Inc.’s objections to Laurel’s Set II discovery requests are sustained, in part and denied, in part in accordance with the discussion, *supra*.

3. That Sheetz, Inc. shall provide full and timely responses to Laurel’s Set II discovery requests in accordance with the discussion, *supra*, by no later than September 1, 2025.

Date: August 21, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Eranda Vero  
Administrative Law Judge

**C-2025-3053018, P-2025-3056566 - MONROE ENERGY LLC; LUCKNOW-HIGHSPIRE TERMINALS LLC; SHEETZ INC; AND PBF HOLDING COMPANY LLC v. LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY, L.P.**

*Revised July 31, 2025*

TODD S. STEWART ESQUIRE  
HMS LEGAL LLP F/K/A HAWKE MCKEON AND SNISCAK LLP  
501 CORPORATE CIRCLE, SUITE 302  
HARRISBURG PA 17110  
717.236.1300  
717.236.4841  
[tsstewart@hmslegal.com](mailto:tsstewart@hmslegal.com)  
Served via eService August 21, 2025  
*(Counsel for Monroe Energy, LLC)*

ROBERT A. WEISHAAR, JR. ESQUIRE  
MCNEES WALLACE AND NURICK LLC  
1200 G STREET NW, SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON DC 20005  
202.898.5700  
[rweishaa@mwn.com](mailto:rweishaa@mwn.com)  
Served via eService August 21, 2025  
*(Counsel for Lucknow Highspire Terminals, LLC and Sheetz, Inc.)*

ADEOLU A. BAKARE ESQUIRE  
MCNEES WALLACE AND NURICK LLC  
100 PINE STREET  
PO BOX 1166  
HARRISBURG PA 17108  
717.232.8000  
717.260.1744  
[abakare@mcneeslaw.com](mailto:abakare@mcneeslaw.com)  
Served via eService August 21, 2025

RANDALL S. RICH ESQUIRE  
PIERCE ATWOOD LLP  
1875 K STREET NW, SUITE 700  
WASHINGTON DC 20006  
703.309.6448  
202.530.6424  
[rrich@pierceatwood.com](mailto:rrich@pierceatwood.com)  
Served via eService August 21, 2025  
*(Counsel for PBF Holding Company LLC)*

CARLISLE SEWELL  
LAUREL PIPE LINE COMPANY LP  
5 TEK PARK  
9999 HAMILTON BOULEVARD  
BREINIGSVILLE PA 18031  
610.904.4000  
Served via USPS First Class Mail August 21, 2025

CHRISTOPHER BARR ESQUIRE  
POST AND SCHELL PC  
607 14<sup>TH</sup> ST. NW, SUITE 600  
WASHINGTON DC 20005  
202.661.6950  
202.661.6951  
[cbarr@postschell.com](mailto:cbarr@postschell.com)  
Served via Email August 21, 2025

DAVID MACGREGOR ESQUIRE  
POST AND SCHELL PC  
17TH NORTH 2<sup>ND</sup> ST., 12<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
215.587.1197  
215.320.4879  
[dmacgregor@postschell.com](mailto:dmacgregor@postschell.com)  
Served via Email August 20, 2025  
(*Counsel for Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.*)

ANTHONY D. KANAGY ESQUIRE  
GARRETT P. LENT ESQUIRE  
POST AND SCHELL PC  
17 NORTH 2<sup>ND</sup> ST., 12<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
HARRISBURG PA 17101  
**717.612.6034**  
**717.612.6032**  
[akanagy@postschell.com](mailto:akanagy@postschell.com)  
[glent@postschell.com](mailto:glent@postschell.com)  
Served via eService August 21, 2025  
(*Counsel for Laurel Pipe Line Company, L.P.*)

ALICE A. WADE ESQUIRE  
POST AND SCHELL PC  
ONE OXFORD CENTRE  
301 GRANT STREET, SUITE 3010  
PITTSBURGH PA 15219  
**412.506.6364**  
[alice.wade@postschell.com](mailto:alice.wade@postschell.com)  
Served via eService August 21, 2025