

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Myron Griffin,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company (U338E),

Defendant.

(ECP)
Complaint 13-07-006
(Filed July 12, 2013)

DECISION RESOLVING COMPLAINT

Summary

Today’s decision resolves a complaint filed by Myron Griffin (Complainant) against the Southern California Edison Company (SCE), which effectively alleges that SCE has refused to provide accurate billing information. Specifically, Complainant alleges that SCE refuses to provide him a letter stating that it estimated his bills and has not overbilled his account. This decision finds the complaint to be without merit and dismisses it.

Background

Complainant has repeatedly contacted Southern California Edison Company (SCE) to request a letter stating that SCE has estimated his account and that SCE is not overbilling him. In a letter dated February 11, 2013, Complainant explains that he read an article in the Los Angeles times (about SCE estimating customer bills) and reviewed court documents related to a pending action, and

believes SCE overbilled him. In response to Complainant's request, by letter dated April 3, 2013, SCE informed Complainant that it did not estimate any billing on his account and had no reason to believe it overbilled him. On July 12, 2013, Complainant filed this action.

Discussion

A hearing was noticed in this matter on November 6, 2013, and held on December 12, 2013. When Complainant failed to appear at the designated time and place for the hearing, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Darwin E. Farrar called him at his residence. Complainant acknowledged that he had received a document from the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) but could not recall what it was about. After being informed that all other parties were present at the hearing, Complainant agreed to participate telephonically. At the hearing Complainant explained that his reading of a Los Angeles Times article led him to believe SCE could develop an estimate of his energy usage and thereby ensure that he was not being overbilled. In response, SCE representatives explained that, consistent with its Commission adopted tariffs, usage estimates such as those referred to in the Los Angeles Times article were only used when actual usage data could not be obtained.¹ SCE went on to state that, since it used actual usage data to calculate Complainant's monthly bill, an estimate of Complainant's usage was neither appropriate nor available.

¹ In accordance with Tariff Rule 9, Section A, SCE's bills for metered service are based on meter registrations. However Tariff Rule 17, Section A provides that "when regular, accurate meter readings are not available or the electric usage has not been accurately measured, SCE may estimate the customer's energy usage for billing purposes...".

We agree with SCE that it is neither appropriate nor beneficial for them to provide a usage estimate when it has provided actual usage data. Accordingly, the requested relief is denied, the complaint is dismissed, and the proceeding closed.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Complaint 13-07-006 is dismissed.
2. This proceeding is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.