

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

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

**INITIAL DECISION**

Before  
Emily A. Farren  
Administrative Law Judge

**INTRODUCTION**

This Initial Decision (1) grants in part and denies in part, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation’s Preliminary Objections after holding a prehearing conference; and (2) dismisses, with prejudice, the Formal Complaint for legal insufficiency.

**HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

On September 29, 2025, Sheron<sup>1</sup> Lisowski (Complainant) filed a Formal Complaint (Complaint) against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation (PPL or Respondent) with the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission). The Complainant checked the box marked “other” as the reason for the Complaint and explained: “I was in

---

<sup>1</sup> The Complainant interchangeably identifies herself as “Sheron” and “Sharon” throughout the Complaint and attachments thereto.

the hospital an [sic] my daughter was in charge of paying my bills but stole my whole years [sic] pay.” Complaint ¶ 4.

The Complainant requested 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, wherein PPL either admitted or denied the various allegations.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, PPL denied that Complainant is entitled to the relief requested and further averred that, as of the date of the Answer, Complainant’s overdue balance exceeded \$10,500. Answer ¶ 4.

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 failed to allege PPL committed any violations of the Public Utility Code (Code), a Commission regulation or order, or its tariff. PPL further asserted the request for damages should be stricken from the Complaint because the Commission has no power to award damages.

No responsive pleading was filed to the Preliminary Objections.

On January 8, 2026, I issued an Interim Order holding the Preliminary Objections in abeyance and directing a Prehearing Conference be held to provide Ms. Lisowski an opportunity to orally explain her Complaint. *See Carlock v. The United Tel. Co. of Pa.*, Docket No. F-00163617 (Opinion and Order entered July 14, 1993) (in many

---

<sup>2</sup> PPL originally filed an unredacted version of its Answer on October 22, 2025; however, pursuant to instruction from the Secretary’s Bureau, PPL refiled a redacted version of the Answer. In the Complaint, Complainant averred that a court granted a protection from abuse order or any other order for her personal safety or welfare. Complaint ¶ 6.

cases unrepresented complainants can explain their dispute orally much better than they can communicate their grievance in written form).

On January 8, 2026, the Commission issued an Initial Telephonic Prehearing Conference Notice alerting the parties that a Prehearing Conference would be held on February 4, 2026. On the morning of February 4, 2026, Counsel for PPL called the Office of Administrative Law Judge and indicated (1) Ms. Lisowski communicated she needed a continuance of the Prehearing Conference, and (2) PPL had no objection to such a request.

On February 6, 2026, the Commission issued a Rescheduled Initial Telephonic Prehearing Conference Notice alerting the parties that the Prehearing Conference would be held on February 25, 2026.

On February 25, 2026, the Prehearing Conference convened as scheduled. Ms. Lisowski appeared, *pro se*. Alice Wade, Esquire, appeared on behalf of PPL.

On March 17, 2026, the 17-page transcript of the Prehearing Conference was filed with the Commission and the record closed on this same date.

For the reasons set forth below, the instant Complaint will be dismissed, with prejudice, for legal insufficiency.

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Complainant, Sheron Lisowski, receives electric service from Respondent, PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, at all relevant times in her Complaint.

2. On September 29, 2025, Complainant filed a Formal Complaint against Respondent and averred that money she intended to pay her PPL bills was stolen.

3. For relief, Complainant requested PPL forgive the money she owed for electric service.

4. On October 22, 2025, Respondent filed an Answer and Preliminary Objections to the Formal Complaint.

5. No responsive pleading was filed to the Preliminary Objections.

6. On February 25, 2026, a Prehearing Conference convened to allow Complainant an opportunity to orally describe her Formal Complaint. Tr. at 4-6, 11, 15.

7. Ms. Lisowski clearly articulated she did not want to be considered for a Commission-issued payment arrangement, and a hearing would “just be more time spent doing – not accomplishing anything for [her].” Tr. at 15.

### DISCUSSION

The Commission’s Rules of Administrative Practice and Procedure permit the filing of preliminary objections. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101. Commission procedure regarding the disposition of preliminary objections is similar to that utilized in Pennsylvania civil practice. *Equitable Small Transp. Interveners v. Equitable Gas Co.*, 1994 Pa. PUC LEXIS 69, Docket No. C-00935435 (July 18, 1994).

A preliminary objection seeking dismissal of a pleading will be granted only where relief is clearly warranted and free from doubt. *Interstate Traveller Servs., Inc. v. Pa. Dept. of Env’t Res.*, 406 A.2d 1020 (Pa. 1979). The moving party may not

rely on its own factual assertions but must accept for the purpose of disposition of the motion, all well-pleaded material facts of the other party, as well as every inference fairly deducible from those facts. *Cnty. of Allegheny v. Cmwlth. of Pa.*, 490 A.2d 402 (Pa. 1985). Therefore, in ruling on a preliminary objection, the Commission must assume, for decisional purposes only, that the factual allegations of the Complaint are true. *Id.* The motion will be granted only if the moving party prevails as a matter of law. *Rok v. Flaherty*, 527 A.2d 211 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1987). Any doubt must be resolved in favor of the non-moving party. *Dept. of Auditor General v. State Emps.' Ret. Sys.*, 836 A.2d 1053 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2003).

The grounds for preliminary objections, as set forth in Section 5.101(a), are 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.

52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a).

The stated grounds for PPL’s Preliminary Objections are legal insufficiency and lack of Commission authority to award damages. I will address each of these grounds separately herein.

Legal insufficiency of the Complaint

PPL’s first preliminary objection, pursuant to Section 5.101(a)(4) of Commission regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(4), is based upon an asserted legal insufficiency of the Complaint. In asserting legal insufficiency, PPL is, in effect, contending that, even if all the facts set forth in the Complaint are assumed to be true, the Complaint fails to set forth a claim for which relief can be granted because it raises no issue concerning the public utility service provided by PPL. I agree with PPL that granting this preliminary objection is appropriate.

Pursuant to Section 501 of the Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 501, the Commission’s duty is “to enforce, execute and carry out, by its regulations, orders or otherwise” all the provisions of the Code. Section 701 of the Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 701, allows any person, having an interest in the subject matter, to file a formal complaint in writing with the Commission setting forth any act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation, or claimed violation, of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer. *See also*, 52 Pa. Code § 5.21(a).

The only allegations or statements in the Complaint involving PPL, a jurisdictional public utility, are: (1) a request that PPL “pay the amount that was not paid [sic] in the year of 2023”; and (2) the averment that “[t]he PPL utility didnt [sic] want to resolve the issue. Therefore I had no other option but to contact you guys.” Complaint ¶¶ 5, 7(c).

At the Prehearing Conference, Ms. Lisowski made no further allegations or statements that set forth any act or things done or omitted to be done by PPL in violation of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer. Tr., *generally*; *see also*, 52 Pa. Code § 5.21(a).

PPL submits Ms. Lisowski's request to forgive her electric utility bill debt because her daughter stole her money is not a matter of public utility service and involves no claimed violation of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer. I agree. Therefore, even if the facts stated in the Complaint are assumed true, as is required for ruling on a preliminary objection, I could not grant the requested relief, *e.g.* order PPL to forgive Ms. Lisowski's debt.

Accordingly, PPL's first preliminary objection will be granted for failure of the Complainant to set forth a claim for which relief can be granted by the Commission.

#### Lack of Commission authority to award damages

In its second preliminary objection, filed pursuant to Section 5.101 of Commission regulations, 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(2), PPL asserted that, to the extent Complainant's request for PPL "pay the amount that was not payed [sic] in the year of 2023" amounts to a request for an award of "damages," the Commission lacks authority to award damages. Preliminary Objections ¶¶ 18, 19, 22; *see also, Feingold v. Bell of Pa.*, 383 A.2d 791 (Pa. 1977). PPL asserted that Complainant's request for "damages" is impertinent matter that should be stricken from the Complaint. Preliminary Objections ¶¶ 22, 24.

I agree that the Commission is not authorized to award damages. However, the Complaint, on its face, does not actually request the type of damages that would be

sought in a civil case. Instead, it requests the relief of, “I would need them to pay the amount that was not payed [sic] in the year of 2023.” Complaint ¶ 5.

Since the Complaint is not, on its face, requesting relief in the form of damages as in *Feingold, supra*, PPL’s second preliminary objection is denied.

### Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, PPL’s preliminary objection of legal insufficiency of the Complaint will be granted and the Complaint of Sheron Lisowski against PPL Electric Utilities Corporation, at Docket No. C-2025-3057780, will be dismissed, with prejudice.

Where, as in the instant case, there are no disputed questions of material fact and the issue to be decided is purely one of law or policy, a case may be disposed of without resort to an evidentiary hearing. *Dee-Dee Cab, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 817 A.2d 593 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2003); *Diamond Energy, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 653 A.2d 1360 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995); *Lehigh Valley Power Comm. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n*, 563 A.2d 557 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1989); *see also*, 66 Pa.C.S. § 703(b); 52 Pa. Code § 5.21(d). It would serve no public purpose to require the parties to bear the time and expense of an evidentiary hearing as the Complaint involves no issues which can be determined by the Commission.

Moreover, in accordance with *Carlock*, Complainant was provided an opportunity to orally explain the Complaint at the February 25, 2026 Prehearing Conference, wherein Ms. Lisowski clearly articulated she did not want to be considered for a Commission-issued payment arrangement, and a hearing would “just be more time spent doing – not accomplishing anything for [her].” *Carlock*, Docket No. F-00163617; Tr. at 15.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Commission regulations provide for the filing of preliminary objections based upon legal insufficiency of a formal complaint. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(4).
2. Formal complaints before the Commission must allege an act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation, or claimed violation, of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701; 52 Pa. Code § 5.21(a).
3. Ms. Lisowski's request for PPL to forgive her electric utility bill debt because her daughter stole money is not an act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility in violation or claimed violation of any law which the Commission has jurisdiction to administer. 66 Pa.C.S. § 701; 52 Pa. Code § 5.21(a).
4. A preliminary objection based upon legal insufficiency is properly granted if the formal complaint, assuming all allegations therein are true, raises no issue concerning the public utility service provided by the public utility. 52 Pa. Code § 5.101(a)(4).
5. Where there are no disputed questions of fact and the issue to be decided is purely one of law or policy, a case against a party may be disposed of without resort to an evidentiary hearing. *Dee-Dee Cab, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 817 A.2d 593 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2003); *Diamond Energy, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 653 A.2d 1360 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1995); *Lehigh Valley Power Comm. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 563 A.2d 557 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1989); *see also*, 66 Pa.C.S. § 703(b); 52 Pa. Code § 5.21(d).

