

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Lisa Gambaro	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3058131
	:	
Verizon Pennsylvania, LLC	:	

**INTERIM ORDER SUSTAINING PRELIMINARY OBJECTION**

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On October 27, 2025, Lisa Gambaro (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) against Verizon Pennsylvania, LLC (Verizon, Respondent or Company). In the Complaint, Complainant alleged, *inter alia*, that a “Verizon line may have also torn down the PECO line.” As relief, the Complainant requested reimbursement.

On November 17, 2025, Verizon filed an Answer denying all material allegations in the Complaint.

Also on November 17, 2025, Verizon filed a Preliminary Objection to the Complaint along with a Notice to Plead. In its Preliminary Objection, Verizon seeks dismissal of the portions of the Complaint seeking reimbursement for damages based on the argument that the Commission lacks authority to award damages.

Complainant’s Answer to Verizon’s Preliminary Objection was due within ten days of the date of service of the Preliminary Objection. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101. Complainant did not file an Answer to Verizon’s Preliminary Objection.

By Motion Judge Assignment Notice dated November 19, 2025, the parties were informed that I was assigned as the Presiding Officer in this matter and responsible for resolving any issues which may arise during the preliminary phase of this proceeding.

Verizon's Preliminary Objection is now ready to be ruled upon. For the reasons set forth below, Verizon's Preliminary Objection will be granted and any portion of the Complaint seeking reimbursement for damages will be stricken from the Complaint as impertinent matter. A hearing will be scheduled solely to address whether Verizon provided reasonable service.

### DISCUSSION

Commission regulations permit the filing of preliminary objections. 52 Pa.Code §§ 5.101(a)(1)-(7). Preliminary objection practice before the Commission is similar to Pennsylvania civil practice respecting preliminary objections. *Equitable Small Transportation Intervenors v. Equitable Gas Company*, 1994 Pa. PUC LEXIS 69, Docket No. C-00935435 (July 18, 1994).

Commission regulations provide:

#### **§ 5.101. Preliminary objections.**

(a) *Grounds.* Preliminary objections are available to parties and may be filed in response to a pleading except motions and prior preliminary objections. Preliminary objections must be accompanied by a notice to plead, must state specifically the legal and factual grounds relied upon and be limited to the following:

- (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.

52 Pa.Code § 5.101.

In deciding preliminary objections, the Commission must determine whether, based on well-pleaded factual averments of the complainant, recovery or relief is possible. *Dep't of Auditor General, et al v. SERS, et al.*, 836 A.2d 1053, 1064 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2003); *P.J.S. v. Pa. State Ethics Comm'n*, 669 A.2d 1105 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1996). Any doubt must be resolved in favor of the non-moving party by refusing to sustain the preliminary objections. *Boyd v. Ward*, 802 A.2d 705 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002). All of the non-moving party's averments in the complaint must be viewed as true for purposes of deciding the preliminary objections, and only those facts specifically admitted may be considered against the non-moving party. *Ridge v. State Employees' Retirement Bd.*, 690 A.2d 1312 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1997).

In the present case, Complainant alleges that a "Shoprite truck tore down 2 power lines, Verizon and PECO lines. [Complainant] was without electricity 4 days, lost refrigerated food (two refrigerators), 2 laptops surged and had to pay electrician to come and install the electrical box that was torn away on my chimney." Complaint ¶ 4. For requested relief Complainant seeks "reimbursement please." Complaint ¶ 5. Complainant also states that "PECO has told me that Verizon line may have also torn down the PeCO line. I have not heard back from Verizon personnel after leaving messages twice." Complaint ¶ 7. In its Preliminary Objection, Respondent argues that the Commission lacks authority to award monetary damages and requests that any portion of the Complaint seeking reimbursement be dismissed.

As a creature of legislation, the Commission possesses only the authority the State Legislature has specifically granted to it in the Public Utility Code (the "Code"), 66 Pa. C.S. §§ 101, *et seq.* Its jurisdiction must arise from the express language of the pertinent enabling

legislation or by strong and necessary implication therefrom. *Feingold v. Bell of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 1191 (Pa. 1977); *Allegheny County Port Authority v. Pa. P.U.C.*, 237 A.2d 602 (Pa. 1967). *Behrend v. Bell of PA*, 390 A.2d 233 (Pa. Super. 1978); *Pa. Department of Highways v. Pa. P.U.C.*, 182 A.2d 267 (Pa. Super. 1962); *City of Erie v. Pa. Electric Co.*, 383 A.2d 575 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1978).

Nothing in the Code confers jurisdiction upon the Commission to award monetary damages. See, *DeFrancesco v. Western Pennsylvania Water Company*, 453 A.2d 595 (Pa. 1982); *Elkin v. Bell of Pa.*, 420 A.2d 371 (Pa. 1980); *Feingold v. Bell of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 791 (Pa. 1977); *Poorbaugh v. Pa. PUC*, 666 A.2d 744 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995).

However, while the Commission does not have jurisdiction to award damages, it does not follow that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to hear a complaint that seeks damages. If such a complaint alleges a violation of the Public Utility Code, and if the allegations are established by the evidence presented at a hearing, an Administrative Law Judge and the Commission might conclude that the utility violated 66 Pa. C.S. § 1501 by failing to provide safe and adequate service. Although the Commission would not be able to award damages, it may decide to impose a fine or other penalty upon the utility. See *Seidel v. Ralph G. Smith, Inc.*, 49 Pa. PUC 557, 1975 Pa. PUC LEXIS 7 (1975); *Robert Attianese and Michele Attianese v. Santoro Enterprises, Inc., t/d/b/a Thomas Gerrity Movers and Storage and Paul Arpin Van Lines, Inc.*, Docket Number A-00113019C0203 (October 14, 2003), Opinion and Order adopted March 4, 2004, entered March 11, 2004, 2004 Pa. PUC LEXIS 19.

Additionally, in a complaint against a public utility that seeks monetary damages arising from a failure to provide safe, adequate, reasonable, or efficient service, the Supreme Court has approved of a bifurcated procedure. In *De Francesco v. Western Pennsylvania Water Co.*, 453 A.2d 595 (Pa. 1982), the Supreme Court stated:

The question of the PUC's jurisdiction was before us recently in *Feingold v. Bell of Pennsylvania*, 477 Pa. 1, 383, A.2d 791 (1977) and *Elkin v. Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania*, 491 Pa. 123, 420 A.2d 371 (1980). In *Feingold*, we held that the courts of common

pleas have original jurisdiction to hear suits against public utilities for damages arising from failure to provide adequate service. 477 Pa. at 10, 383 A.2d at 795. *See also, Elkin*, 491 Pa. at 130, 420 A.2d at 375. In *Elkin* we further defined the parameters of our holding in *Feingold*. *Elkin* involved an action challenging the adequacy of a complainant's telephone service, and this Court there approved of a bifurcated procedure for certain situations, whereby the issue of liability is decided initially by the PUC, after which the court of common pleas considers the issue of damages where appropriate. *Elkin*, 491 Pa. at 134, 420 A.2d at 377.

*De Francesco v. Western Pennsylvania Water Co.*, 453 A.2d 595 (Pa. 1982).

Thus, service issues are first decided by the Commission, and then a court of common pleas may consider the issue of damages. *DeFrancesco v. Western Pa. Water Co.*, 453 A.2d 595 (Pa. 1982). Consequently, the Commission retains jurisdiction to determine whether Respondent rendered reasonable and adequate service to Complainant.

Based on the foregoing, Respondent's Preliminary Objection will be granted and any portion of the Complaint seeking reimbursement for damages will be stricken from the Complaint as impertinent matter under 52 Pa.Code § 5.101(a)(2). Accordingly, a hearing shall be scheduled solely to address whether Verizon provided reasonable service pursuant to 66 Pa. C.S. § 1501.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the Preliminary Objection filed by Verizon Pennsylvania, LLC, in the matter of Lisa Gambaro v. Verizon Pennsylvania, LLC, at Docket No. C-2025-3058131, is sustained.

2. That any portion of the Complaint seeking reimbursement for damages is stricken from the Complaint as impertinent matter.



**C-2025-3058131 - LISA GAMBARO v. VERIZON PENNSYLVANIA LLC**

LISA GAMBARO  
370 PAOLI AVENUE  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19128  
**267.971.7409**  
[lisamarie56@yahoo.com](mailto:lisamarie56@yahoo.com)  
Served via eService December 17, 2025

SUZAN D. PAIVA ESQUIRE  
VERIZON  
900 RACE STREET, 6<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
PHILADELPHIA PA 19107  
**267.768.6184**  
[suzan.d.paiva@verizon.com](mailto:suzan.d.paiva@verizon.com)  
Served via eService December 17, 2025  
(*Counsel for Verizon Pennsylvania LLC*)