



FILED

07-18-12

11:46 AM

GS1/lil July 18, 2012

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

California Tanning Salons, Inc.,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company (U338E),

Defendant.

Case 12-05-026
(Filed May 30, 2012)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING SETTING A PREHEARING
CONFERENCE AND REQUIRING THE PARTIES TO MEET AND CONFER
AND TO FILE A JOINT PREHEARING CONFERENCE STATEMENT**

1. Introduction

This ruling sets a Prehearing Conference (PHC), and requires the parties to meet and confer and to file a joint PHC statement.

California Tanning Salons, Inc. (Complainant), filed its complaint on May 30, 2012, alleging that Southern California Edison Company (SCE) had charged it for service provided to another business. SCE filed its answer on July 11, 2012.

2. The Prehearing Conference

This ruling sets a PHC for July 27, 2012, at 1:00 p.m., in the Commission Courtroom, State Office Building, at 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California.

A PHC is called to (1) determine the parties; (2) accept appearances and establish the permanent service list; (3) determine the positions of the parties; (4) identify issues for inclusion in the scoping memo for this proceeding; (5) discuss the schedule for this proceeding; (6) determine if there are any challenges to either the categorization of this proceeding or to the preliminary determination that there is a need for hearings; and (7) discuss any additional procedural matters relevant to this proceeding.

3. The PHC Statement and Order to Meet and Confer

In preparation for the PHC, the parties shall meet and confer to discuss the following subjects:

1. Identification of the specific factual issues and legal issues (if any) that the Commission needs to decide in this case;
 - a. Specifically, what amount of money has Defendant determined is subject to refund to Complainant?
 - b. Are the meters located at 1133 Artesia Boulevard in Manhattan Beach now properly identified? If not, what efforts can the parties jointly or separately undertake that will result in the proper identification of the meters?
 - c. Is International Coffee & Tea, LLC d/b/a The Coffee Bean & Tea Leaf an indispensable party to this case? If so, what efforts can the parties undertake to bring it into the proceeding?
2. What material facts are undisputed;
3. Settlement discussions;
4. Whether mediation conducted by a neutral Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), other than the assigned ALJ, would be helpful in resolving the disputed issues;
5. Whether any discovery is needed and the anticipated date that discovery will be completed;

6. Whether hearings are needed;
7. If the parties believe that a hearing is needed, the estimated number of days required, and the number of witnesses that each side plans to present at the hearing; and
8. A proposed schedule for this case, including dates for completing discovery, filing prepared written testimony, and for hearing.

During the meeting directed by this paragraph, the parties shall attempt to work out a Joint PHC Statement addressing the above issues. In the event the parties can agree on none of the matters listed above, each party may submit its own PHC Statement.

4. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR)

The Commission provides trained ALJs (other than the ALJ assigned to this proceeding), without cost the parties, to serve as facilitators, mediators, and early neutral evaluators to assist the parties in resolving their dispute. For more information about the Commission's ADR program, please go to the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/. Alternatively, the parties may select another ADR provider to assist them at their own expense, so long as the ADR process does not delay the schedule established for this proceeding.

5. Ex Parte Rules

Adjudicatory proceedings such as this complaint case are subject to the *ex parte* ban set out in Section 1701.2(b) of the Public Utilities Code as further explained in the Commission's Rules, Article 8 (beginning with Rule 8.1). The prohibition extends to communications between any party and a decisionmaker (including all Commissioners, Commissioners' advisors and the assigned ALJ)

concerning any substantive matter having to do with the case, unless the communication occurs in a public hearing or on the record. Accordingly, letters, e-mails, and conversations (whether by telephone or in person) that concern substantive matters, rather than purely procedural ones, are not permitted.

6. Filing, Service, and Service List

The parties shall file either their independent or their Joint PHC statements that address the above subjects with the Commission's Docket Office, and a copy to me, by no later than July 25, 2012. Parties may submit their copy to me by e-mail addressed to gs1@cpuc.ca.gov

Parties are encouraged to file and serve electronically, whenever possible. This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocols adopted by the Commission in Rule 1.10 for all documents, whether formally filed or just served. This rule allows electronic service of documents, in a searchable format, unless the party or state service list member did not provide an e-mail address. If no e-mail address was provided, service should be made by U.S. mail. Concurrent e-mail service to ALL persons on the service list for whom an e-mail address is available, including those listed under "Information Only," is required. Parties are expected to provide paper copies of served documents upon request. More information regarding electronic filing is available at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/puc/efiling>.

Parties are responsible for ensuring that the correct information is contained on the service list, and notifying the Commission's Process Office and other parties of corrections or ministerial changes. (*See Rules of Practice and Procedure Rule 1.9(f).*)

If either party has questions regarding Commission procedures, please contact the Commission Public Advisor's Office by phone at (866) 849-8390 or (415) 703-2074 or by e-mail at public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov. The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure are also available for review on our website at www.cpuc.ca.gov.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The Commission has set a Prehearing Conference (PHC) in the above-captioned matter for July 27, 2012, at 1:00 p.m., in the Commission Courtroom, State Office Building, at 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California.
2. The parties shall file and serve either their independent or their Joint PHC Statements, as described above, no later than July 25, 2012. Please also serve the undersigned with the PHC statement(s) by same day e-mail service at gs1@cpuc.ca.gov.
3. To the extent discovery is required, parties shall not wait for the PHC to commence it.

Dated July 18, 2012, at San Francisco, California.

 /s/ GLENN STOVER
Glenn Stover
Administrative Law Judge