

October 21, 2025

Via Electronic Filing

Matthew Homsher, Esquire
Secretary
PA Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

**Re: Docket No. C-2025-3057454
George J. Venesky v. FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company
Preliminary Objections of FE PA (Penelec Rate District)**

Dear Secretary Homsher:


Attached for filing is the Preliminary Objections of FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company (Penelec Rate District) to the Amended Complaint filed by George J. Venesky (Complainant) in the above-referenced proceeding.

A copy of the Preliminary Objections has been provided to the Complainant in the manner indicated on the attached Certificate of Service.

If there are any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP



Margaret A. Morris

MAM/co
Enclosures

cc: Tori Giesler, Esquire, FirstEnergy Service Company [w/encls.]
George J. Venesky [w/encls.]

**Re: Docket No. C-2025-3057454
George J. Venesky v. FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company
Preliminary Objections of FE PA (Penelec Rate District)**


CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

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

Via Electronic Mail

George J. Venesky
neinvsvc@aol.com

Dated: October 21, 2025



Margaret A. Morris, Esquire

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

GEORGE J. VENESKY

v.

FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC
COMPANY

:
:
:
:
:
:

Docket No. C-2025-3057454

NOTICE TO PLEAD

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.63, you are hereby notified that if you do not file a written response answering the enclosed Preliminary Objections of FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company within ten (10) days from service of this notice, the facts set forth by FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company in the Preliminary Objections may be deemed to be true, whereby requiring no other proof. 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 FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company, Margaret A. Morris, Esq., and where applicable, the Administrative Law Judge presiding over the issue.


File by Mail or e-filing with:

Matthew Homsher, Esquire
Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
P.O. Box 3265
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

With a copy to:

Margaret A. Morris, Esquire
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
mmorris@regerlaw.com

Date: October 21, 2025



Margaret A. Morris, Esquire
Attorney ID No. 75048
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 495-6524 (tel.)
mmorris@regerlaw.com

*Counsel for FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric
Company (Penelec Rate District)*

BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

GEORGE J. VENESKY	:	
	:	
v.	:	Docket No. C-2025-3057454
	:	
FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA	:	
ELECTRIC COMPANY	:	

PRELIMINARY OBJECTIONS OF FIRSTENERGY PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY TO THE AMENDED COMPLAINT OF GEORGE J. VENESKY

FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company, Penelec Rate District, (Respondent or Company), by and through its attorneys, Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP, pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.101, hereby files its Preliminary Objections to the Amended Formal Complaint of George J. Venesky (Complainant) filed in the above-captioned proceeding.

The Respondent avers that the subject of the Amended Formal Complaint is beyond the jurisdiction of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) who is without authorization to grant the Complainant’s request for damages. The Amended Formal Complaint includes an impertinent matter in its requested relief. Therefore, the Company requests that this Preliminary Objection be granted and that the Commission: (1) grant its Preliminary Objections and strike the Complainant’s requests for monetary damages; (2) expressly prohibit the Complainant from introducing any testimony or exhibits at any evidentiary hearing regarding alleged damages; and (3) grant the Company such other relief as may be just and reasonable under the circumstances.

In support of its preliminary objections, the Respondent states as follows:

I. Procedural Background

1. The Company is an electric distribution company certificated as a public utility permitted to operate within the Commonwealth in Pennsylvania and provides residential electric service in the Complainant's name to 133 Lantz Road, Northpoint, Pennsylvania (Service Location) under Account No. 100004173306 (Account).

2. On September 16, 2025, the Complainant filed a Formal Complaint alleging damage to personal property as a result of an incident experienced on June 18, 2025, at the Service Location. On October 1, 2025, the Complainant filed an Amended Formal Complaint to include the mast on the porch roof to his list of damages. Original and Amended Complaint at ¶¶ 4 and 5.

3. In its Answer and New Matter being served contemporaneously with this Preliminary Objection, the Respondent avers that at all times relevant to this proceeding the Company's actions have been reasonable and performed in accordance with all applicable laws, as well as the Company's Commission-approved Tariff, the Pennsylvania Public Utility Code (Code), Commission regulations and orders.

4. Pursuant to 52. Pa. Code § 5.101, the Company objects to the Amended Formal Complaint on the grounds that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to award monetary damages. The Complainant seeks reimbursement, in the amount of \$65.00, to replace a blown circuit breaker in addition to an unspecified amount to repair the bent mast.

II. Argument

5. The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure permit parties to file preliminary objections. The grounds for preliminary objections are limited to those set forth in 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a) as follows:

- (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 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.

6. Commission's procedure regarding the disposition of preliminary objections is similar to that utilized in Pennsylvania civil practice. *Equitable Small Transportation Intervenors v. Equitable Gas Company*, Docket No. C-00935435 (Opinion and Order entered July 18, 1994).

7. In both the original Formal and Amended Complaint, the Complainant requests compensation for alleged damage to personal property. Original and Amended Complaint at ¶ 5.

8. Clearly, that requested relief sought through the original Formal and Amended Complaint is an award of monetary damages from the Company.

A. Impertinent Matter

9. The Commission's procedural regulations allow a party to object to pleadings that fail to comply with the rules of administrative practice or that include scandalous or impertinent matters. *See* 52 Pa. Code § 5.102(a)(2).

10. It is well-established under Pennsylvania law that the enforcement powers of the Commission do not include the power to award money damages. *Elkin v. Bell Tel. Co. of PA.*, 420 A.2d 371 (Pa. 1980); *Feingold v. Bell of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 791 (Pa. 1978); *see Nagy v. Bell Tel. Co. of PA.*, 436 A.2d 701 (Pa. Super. 1981).

11. In *Feingold*, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court explained:

. . . the statutory array of PUC remedial and enforcement powers does not include the power to award damages to a private litigant for breach of contract by a public utility. Nor can we find an express grant of power from which the power to award such damages can be fairly implied. Thus, it can be concluded that the Legislature did not intend for the PUC to have such a power.

Feingold, 383 A.2d at 794.

12. The Court of Common Pleas retains original jurisdiction over suits for monetary damages. *Behrend, supra*.


13. A prayer for damages, which are not legally recoverable in the cause of action, is “impertinent matter” in the sense that it is irrelevant to that cause of action and is correctly challenged through a motion to strike the requested relief as impertinent matter. *Third Avenue Realty Limited Partners v. Pennsylvania-American Water Co.*, Docket No. C-2010-2167286 (Final Order entered September 30, 2010) (citing *Hudock v. Donegal Mut. Ins. Co.*, 264 A.2d 668 (Pa. 1970)).

14. The Complainant’s requested relief for monetary damages is irrelevant to the instant cause of action and therefore an “impertinent matter.”

15. Therefore, in accordance with Pennsylvania law, this Commission does not have the power to award monetary damages and the Complainant’s request for money damages is an impertinent matter that must be stricken within the use and meaning of Commission regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2).

WHEREFORE, Respondent, FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric Company, respectfully requests that the relief for monetary damages be stricken from the Amended Formal Complaint filed by George J. Venesky for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: October 21, 2025

Margaret A. Morris, Esq.
Attorney ID No. 75048
Reger Rizzo & Darnall LLP
Cira Centre, 13th Floor
2929 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
(215) 495-6524 tel.
mmorris@regerlaw.com

*Counsel for FirstEnergy Pennsylvania Electric
Company (Penelec Rate District)*