

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Sheron Lisowski	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2025-3057780
	:	
PPL Electric Utilities Corporation	:	

INTERIM ORDER ON PRELIMINARY OBJECTION

This interim order holds the Respondent’s preliminary objection in abeyance pending a prehearing conference to be held in this matter, where the Complainant will be afforded the opportunity to explain the complaint on the record.

Procedural Background

On September 29, 2025, Sheron Lisowski (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Respondent). The Complainant alleges that Complaint was hospitalized and the money she intended to pay PPL was stolen. The Complainant requests PPL “pay the amount that was not payed [sic] in the year of 2023.” Complaint ¶ 5.

On November 4, 2025, PPL filed an answer to the Complaint. Also on November 4, 2025, PPL filed preliminary objections, properly accompanied by a Notice to Plead. PPL asserted the Complaint is legally insufficient and should be dismissed with prejudice because the Complaint fails to allege any violations by PPL. The Company further asserted the Complaint’s request for damages should be dismissed because the Commission has no power to award damages.

PPL’s certificate of service indicates that the answer and preliminary objections were served by First-Class Mail to the address provided on the Complaint. The Complainant did not file a response to the preliminary objections.

More than ten days have passed since the filing of the preliminary objection, and no responsive pleading has been filed. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(f)(1).

Legal Principles

Complaints

Section 701 of the Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 701, provides that any person may complain, in writing, about any act or thing done or omitted to be done by a public utility in violation, or claimed violation, of any law which the Commission has the jurisdiction to administer, or of any regulation or order of the Commission.

Commission Jurisdiction

As in every case coming before this forum, the Commission must decide initially whether it has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this dispute. The Commission, as a creation of the General Assembly, has only the powers and authority granted to it by the General Assembly contained in the Public Utility Code. *Shedlosky v. Pennsylvania Electric Co.*, Docket No. C-20066937 (Opinion and Order entered May 28, 2008); *Feingold v. Bell Tel. Co. of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 791 (Pa. 1977). The Commission must act within, and cannot exceed, its jurisdiction. *City of Pittsburgh v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 43 A.2d 348 (Pa. Super. 1945). Jurisdiction may not be conferred by the parties where none exists. *Roberts v. Martorano*, 235 A.2d 602 (Pa. 1967). Subject matter jurisdiction is a prerequisite to the exercise of power to decide a controversy. *Hughes v. Pennsylvania State Police*, 619 A.2d 390 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1992) *alloc. denied* 637 A.2d 293 (Pa. 1993).

Analysis

As noted above, the Complainant did not file a response to PPL's preliminary objections, as provided for under 52 Pa. Code § 5.101. The Respondent argues that all of the Complainant's claims and requests for relief are not against PPL or within the Commission's power to remedy.

It is not clear from the Complaint whether the Complainant is seeking a remedy the Commission can order, such as a payment arrangement for arrearages. I am mindful that the Complainant is self-represented. On the other hand, PPL must have an opportunity to understand and respond in a meaningful way to a formal complaint.

The Commission's rules of procedure permit the Commission to direct a more specific pleading.⁴ Also, the Commission has expressed the concern that, in general, complainants may find it difficult to navigate through pre-hearing motions and should be given the chance to orally describe their basic issues. *Carlock v. The United Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00163617 (Opinion and Order entered July 14, 1993) (“in many cases unrepresented complainants can explain their dispute orally much better than they can communicate their grievance in written form”).

Therefore, I will hold the preliminary objection in abeyance, pending a prehearing conference. At the prehearing conference, the Complainant will have the opportunity to explain his claims orally. To be clear, no testimony will be taken. The purpose of the prehearing conference is to clarify and define the issues.

The Parties are encouraged to talk with each other to resolve these matters or some portion thereof. It is the Commission's policy to encourage settlements. 52 Pa. Code § 5.231.

³ Citing *Coppedge* and *Alkhatib*.

⁴ 52 Pa. Code § 5.93.

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That the preliminary objection filed by PPL Electric Utilities Corporation in the case captioned *Sheron Lisowski v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation* at Docket No. C-2025-3057780 is held in abeyance.

2. That the matter *Sheron Lisowski v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation* at Docket No. C-2025-3057780 shall be set for a telephonic prehearing conference.

Dated: January 8, 2026

_____/s/
Emily A. Farren
Administrative Law Judge

C-2025-3057780 - SHERON LISOWSKI v. PPL ELECTRIC UTILITIES CORPORATION

SHARON LISOWSKI



Served via USPS First-Class mail January 8, 2026

ALICE WADE ESQUIRE
DEVIN T RYAN ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL
ONE OXFORD CENTRE
301 GRANT STREET SUITE 3010
PITTSBURGH PA 15219
412-506-6364

alice.wade@postschell.com

dryan@postschell.com

Served via eService January 8, 2026

(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corp.)

MEGAN E RULLI ESQUIRE
POST & SCHELL
17 NORTH SECOND STREET
12TH FLOOR
HARRISBURG PA 17101
717-612-6012

mrulli@postschell.com

Served via eService January 8, 2026

(Counsel for PPL Electric Utilities Corp.)