

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

PETROLEUM VALLEY REGIONAL  
WATER AUTHORITY,

Complainant,

vs.

EAST BRADY BOROUGH,

Respondent.

COMPLAINT DOCKET NO.  
C-2024-3051609

ANSWER TO MOTION IN LIMINE TO  
PRECLUDE EVIDENCE REGARDING  
KAYLOR MINE NO 4

Filed on behalf of Respondent:

**EAST BRADY BOROUGH**

Counsel of Record for this Party:

Amy R. Schrempf, Esquire  
Pa. I.D. No. 87619

ANDREWS & PRICE, LLC  
1500 Ardmore Blvd., Suite 506  
Pittsburgh, PA 15221  
(412) 243-9700

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

|   |   |                      |
|---|---|----------------------|
| PETROLEUM VALLEY REGIONAL<br>WATER AUTHORITY, | : | COMPLAINT DOCKET NO. |
|   | : | C-2024-3051609       |
|   | : |                      |
| Complainant,                                  | : |                      |
|   | : |                      |
| vs.   | : |                      |
|   | : |                      |
| EAST BRADY BOROUGH,                           | : |                      |
|   | : |                      |
| Respondent.                                   | : |                      |

**ANSWER TO MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE REGARDING  
KAYLOR MINE NO 4**

NOW COMES Respondent, East Brady Borough, (hereinafter “Borough”), by its undersigned counsel, and files the following ANSWER TO MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE REGARDING KAYLOR MINE NO 4, in support thereof averring as follows:

1. On November 7, 2025, by email, Complainant Authority (hereinafter “Authority”) served this Motion in Limine on Respondent. No brief in support was attached.
2. The Motion in Limine states no legal reason as to why to exclude evidence, and with no supporting brief, Respondent is essentially unable to respond in any meaningful way to the Motion.
3. Paragraph 7 of the Motion baldly states, “Kaylor has no relevance as to the reasonableness of the EBB rate increase of March 19, 2024.”

4. Motions in limine are made prior to the presentation of evidence to aid the clear presentation of evidence, and to narrow the evidentiary issues for trial. *United States v. Ramsey*, No. 19-628, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 192115, 2021 WL 4554642, at \*2 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 5, 2021).

5. Evidence should only be excluded on a motion in limine if it is clearly inadmissible on all potential grounds. *Hunt v. Drake*, No. 16-CV-1729, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108003, 2020 WL 3402343 (M.D. Pa. June 19, 2020).

6. Authority, as the moving party, bears the burden of demonstrating that the evidence is inadmissible on all potential grounds. *Id.*

7. Authority makes no legal argument as to the admissibility of the evidence it seeks to exclude, and provided no supporting brief to assist in such analysis.

8. Authority merely states that in its opinion, the evidence is irrelevant.

9. However, our Supreme Court has articulated the threshold inquiry in determining whether evidence is properly admitted into evidence: Any analysis of the admissibility of a particular type of evidence must start with a threshold inquiry as to its relevance and probative value. The Court has cited with approval the test for relevance propounded by two leading evidentiary authorities, Wigmore and McCormick. Wigmore defines relevance in terms of two axioms, 'None but facts having rational probative value are admissible,' and 'All facts having rational probative value are admissible, unless some specific rule forbids.' 1 Wigmore, Evidence, § 9-10 at 289-95 (3rd Ed. 1940). McCormick suggests the following for determining relevance, '... [d]oes the evidence offered render the desired inference more probable than it would be without the evidence? . . . Relevant evidence then, is evidence that in some degree advances the inquiry, and thus has probative value, and is prima facie admissible.' McCormick, Evidence § 185 at 437-38 (2nd Ed. 1972)." *Commonwealth v. Walzack*, 360 A.2d, 914, 918 (Pa. 1976).

10. Authority does not address any aspect of this inquiry.

11. Further, Authority simply concludes that the evidence is prejudicial.

12. A trial court may exclude relevant evidence if its probative value is outweighed by a danger of, among other things, unfair prejudice. Pa.R.E. 403.

13. "Unfair prejudice" is "a tendency to suggest decision on an improper basis or to divert the jury's attention away from its duty of weighing the evidence impartially." Pa.R.E. 403.

14. "Unfair prejudice" does not mean that the evidence is inconvenient to the moving party's theory of the case. It must suggest a decision based upon an improper basis or divert the attention away from its duty of weighing the evidence.

15. Authority alleges none of these things here when asserting prejudice.

16. Evidence of a new source of water, as the impetus for the Authority to not enter into a long-term agreement with the Borough is incredibly relevant and not prejudicial in any way. It is just inconvenient to the Authority's theory of its case.

17. As such, the Motion in Limine must be denied.

WHEREFORE, Borough respectfully requests that the Motion in Limine be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

**ANDREWS & PRICE LLC**

By: *Amy R. Schrempf*

Amy R. Schrempf

Attorney for Respondent, East Brady Borough

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

|   |   |                      |
|---|---|----------------------|
| PETROLEUM VALLEY REGIONAL<br>WATER AUTHORITY, | : | COMPLAINT DOCKET NO. |
|   | : | C-2024-3051609       |
|   | : |                      |
| Complainant,                                  | : |                      |
|   | : |                      |
| vs.   | : |                      |
|   | : |                      |
| EAST BRADY BOROUGH,                           | : |                      |
|   | : |                      |
| Respondent.                                   | : |                      |

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, upon consideration of the MOTION IN LIMINE filed by Petroleum Valley Regional Water Authority, it is hereby **ORDERED** that PVRWA’s MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE EVIDENCE REGARDING KAYLOR MINE NO 4, is hereby DENIED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey A. Watson  
Administrative Law Judge J.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION

|                           |   |                      |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| PETROLEUM VALLEY REGIONAL | : | COMPLAINT DOCKET NO. |
| WATER AUTHORITY,          | : | C-2024-3051609       |
|                           | : |                      |
| Complainant,              | : |                      |
|                           | : |                      |
| vs.                       | : |                      |
|                           | : |                      |
| EAST BRADY BOROUGH,       | : |                      |
|                           | : |                      |
| Respondent.               | : |                      |

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned counsel hereby verifies that on November 17, 2025, a true and correct copy of the Response to Motion was served upon the following by U.S. Postal Service, First Class Mail and via email:

Michael D. Gallagher  
Sean Gallagher  
Gallagher Law Group  
110 East Diamond Street, Suite 101  
Butler, PA 16001

**ANDREWS & PRICE LLC**

By: *Amy R. Schrempf*  
Amy R. Schrempf  
Attorney for Respondent, East Brady Borough

1500 Ardmore Blvd., Suite 506  
Pittsburgh, PA 15221  
(412) 243-9700 (Phone)  
(412) 243-9660 (Fax)

