

Decision \_\_\_\_\_

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

Linda M. Fox,

Complainant,

vs.

San Diego Gas & Electric Company  
(U902E),

Defendant.

(ECP)

Case 08-01-013

(Filed January 22, 2008)

Linda M. Fox, for herself, complainant.Aurora Carrillo, for San Diego Gas & Electric  
Company, defendant.**OPINION DENYING RELIEF**

Complainant seeks a refund of \$1,500 from San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) for what she claims is “fraud, waste, and abuse” in providing her electric service. Complainant also seeks \$1,000 for lost employment and \$5,000 for undue stress. SDG&E denies the charges. Public hearing was held March 27, 2008, and the matter submitted.

Complainant testified that from July 2007 through February 2008, her electric bills were much too high by at least \$1,500 over the eight months. She says she does not have enough appliances to consume that much electricity. She said she has had high bills since July 2006, when she saw someone, at about

3:30 a.m., tampering with the SDG&E transformer outside of her home. She informed SDG&E, who investigated but failed to find the tampering that resulted in outrageous monthly electric bills. She said an SDG&E technician came to her home and shut down all electrical power to her home but the meter continued to run. The SDG&E technician told her son that there was a problem with the underground wiring, and that he would request an expert from SDG&E to identify and fix the problem. SDG&E never resolved the problem with the underground wiring. She hired a private electrician to review all the appliances and electrical wiring in her home. His report indicates that there is nothing wrong with the internal electrical wiring or appliances. Based on his expertise, he said there was an underground wire problem.

An SDG&E witness testified that on April 10, 2006, complainant contacted SDG&E because she was experiencing power surges. Complainant stated she had light dimmers in her home and the lights were changing from low to high. A SDG&E technician investigated, but could not locate any problems. He issued a work order to have a recording device placed on the meter to record any power fluctuations. A recording device was installed at the premises; SDG&E found no abnormalities. On July 18, 2006, complainant contacted SDG&E and requested to be placed on SDG&E's Level Pay Plan (LPP) because she was using her air conditioner and was aware that her electric bill would increase. In July 2006, she told SDG&E of a possible transformer problem. SDG&E checked the transformer, but found no evidence of tampering.

On November 6, 2006, complainant contacted SDG&E inquiring about her outstanding balance and unpaid monthly bills. Complainant claimed her son moved into her home in June of 2006 and, as a result, her bills increased substantially. Complainant further stated that four people lived in the home and

that her son used the air conditioner a couple of times a week. On November 8, 2006, a SDG&E meter tester tested complainant's electric meter and found the meter to be working properly.

On February 14, 2007, complainant contacted SDG&E explaining she believed her neighbors were stealing power from her home and felt that was the reason for her high bills. SDG&E had a technician verify what the meter serves. The technician advised complainant's son to shut off all appliances, but the meter continued to spin. However, the technician did not enter the home to check that all appliances were shut off. The technician advised complainant's son that he would make arrangements with a SDG&E meter tester to follow up on her concern.

On February 22, 2007, a SDG&E meter tester went to the home. The meter test showed it was operating correctly. On March 2, 2007, complainant contacted SDG&E again stating a neighbor was stealing energy. SDG&E advised complainant that no tampering was noted, her meter had been tested and found to be working properly.

### **Discussion**

The evidence shows that SDG&E inspected the transformer outside of complainant's home and tested her meter. No defects were found. Complainant's house has the normal appliances plus air conditioning. Her son lived in the house and used the air conditioner. The electric load in the house was sufficient to consume the electricity the meter showed was consumed. The relief requested should be denied.

### **Assignment of Proceeding**

Timothy Alan Simon is the assigned Commissioner and Robert Barnett is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

**O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED** that:

1. The relief requested is denied.
2. Case 08-01-013 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_, at San Francisco, California.