

Decision _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Sid Chan,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company
(U338E),

Defendant.

(ECP)
Case 15-05-011
(Filed May 14, 2015)

Sid Chan, Complainant
Prabha Cadambi for Southern California
Edison Company, Defendant

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT

The complaint of Sid Chan (Complainant) should be dismissed for lack of prosecution. At two separate duly noticed hearings, held on July 16, 2015 and August 26, 2015, Complainant failed to appear.

The Complainant filed Case (C.) 15-05-011 on March 14, 2015 under the California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) Expedited Complaint Procedure. The Commission’s Docket Office filed the Instructions to Answer on May 22, 2015, and served that document on both parties by email. On May 26, 2015, Southern California Edison Company (SCE) filed a Notice and Acknowledgement of Receipt for filing. On June 9, 2015, SCE filed an Answer to the complaint. By Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Ruling issued on June 16, 2015, and served on both parties, a hearing was set for July 16, 2015

at 10:00 a.m. in the Junipero Serra State Office Building in Los Angeles, California. At the hearing, Prabha Cadambi appeared for SCE, but Complainant did not appear.

By ruling on Monday, July 27, 2015, the assigned ALJ notified both parties that the duly noticed hearing had occurred and invited the Complainant to notify the ALJ and the defendant of the extenuating circumstances, if any, that prevented the Complainant from appearing at the July 16, 2015 hearing. On July 27, 2015, complainant responded by e-mail from the e-mail address provided for service that he had not received notice of the previously scheduled hearing.

On August 12, 2015, by ALJ ruling, a second hearing date was noticed for 10:00 a.m. on August 26, 2015, at the County Administrative Center in Riverside, California. The hearing notice was served on both parties. At the August 12, 2015, hearing, Prabhi Cadambi, for SCE appeared, but Complainant did not appear. The complaint should therefore be dismissed for lack of prosecution.

The Complaint is dismissed.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The complaint of Sid Chan is dismissed for lack of prosecution.
2. Case 15-05-011 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.