

DH7/vm1 9/9/2016



**FILED**

9-09-16  
02:45 PM

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Application of SP LICENSES, INC. for  
Registration as an Interexchange Carrier  
Telephone Corporation pursuant to the  
Provisions of Public Utilities Code Section  
1013.

Application 16-06-005  
(Filed June 7, 2016)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING REQUIRING SECOND JOINT  
CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

A prehearing conference (PHC) was properly noticed and held on September 8, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in Commission Courtroom D, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California, to determine the parties, positions of the parties, scope and schedule of the proceeding, and other procedural matters. Consumer Protection and Enforcement Division (CPED) was present. The applicant failed to appear.<sup>1</sup>

The parties are directed to again meet and confer, and to file a second joint case management statement reporting on the results of their conferring by no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 19, 2016, on the following topics:

---

<sup>1</sup> An e-mail from Kali Reeves with Mr. Lance J.M. Steinhart's offices (representative for SP Licenses, Inc.) was received by the assigned Administrative Law Judge an hour before the hearing was set to begin asking whether there was a call-in number for the PHC. The Administrative Law Judge responded by e-mail with a copy to all parties that, "I am not aware of a prior request for a call in number. Such a request requires lead time to arrange and must be made in advance of the conference date. No call in number has been established for the hearing."

1. Whether there is a need for a second PHC and if so explain why;<sup>2</sup>
2. Progress with settlement since September 1, 2016;<sup>3</sup>
3. Identification of any motions requiring early resolution; and
4. Other topics as the interest of justice and efficient case management require.

The Applicant is further directed to file and serve the following supplemental information by no later than 5:00 p.m. on September 19, 2016:

1. Complete resumes for the officers listed in Exhibit D of the Application;
2. A statement correcting its response to Question 9 of the registration application and a complete response to the second portion of the question, "If your answer to this question is anything other than an unqualified 'True' please attach documentation and describe all such investigations, whether pending, settled voluntarily or resolved in another matter.";
3. A statement as to why Question 9 of the application was not correctly answered in the initial application; and
4. If Applicant intends to have any information provided deemed confidential it must file a Motion for Leave to File

---

<sup>2</sup> If a second PHC is necessary and any party wishes to appear by telephone, that party must contact the assigned Administrative Law Judge to request and arrange for a number and passcode information. That request must be copied to the service list and be made at least 48 hours prior to the day and time set for the second PHC.

<sup>3</sup> If the Parties reach a settlement prior to the September 15, 2016 filing date, they should include the settlement terms with their filing. Any proposed settlement should include a proposed dollar amount as to any fines or penalties that may be issued in this proceeding. If the parties cannot agree on a proposed dollar amount, then the filing should include an amount proposed by each party with justification as to the proposed dollar amount. This information will be considered by the assigned Administrative Law Judge when preparing the proposed decision.

Under Seal pursuant to CPUC Rules of Practice and  
Procedure Rule 11.4.

**IT IS SO RULED.**

Dated September 9, 2016 at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DARCIE L. HOUCK  
Darcie L. Houck  
Administrative Law Judge