

## PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

505 VAN NESS AVENUE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-3298

**FILED**

01/30/24

10:37 AM

C2401008

Stephen Simoni,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company  
(U338E),

Defendants.

**Case (C.) 24-01-008**  
(Filed January 8, 2024)**INSTRUCTIONS TO ANSWER NOTICE to Defendant:**

Southern California Edison Company (U338E)  
Attn: Anna Valdborg, Director & Managing Attorney  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead, CA 91770  
T-626-302-6008  
E-mail 1: [Anna.Valdborg@sce.com](mailto:Anna.Valdborg@sce.com)  
E-mail 2: [case.admin@sce.com](mailto:case.admin@sce.com)

Pursuant to Rule 4.3 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, this is the electronically filed Instructions to Answer Notice from the Docket Office of the California Public Utilities Commission. You are hereby notified that the above-entitled Complaint has been filed against you as the defendant on January 8, 2024. **You are directed to answer the Complaint in writing within thirty (30) days of this notice in compliance with Rule 4.4.** Your **verified answer** shall be filed electronically at <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/efile/> or if in paper form, sent to the California Public Utilities Commission, Attn.: Docket Office, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102. **A copy must also be sent to Complainant.**

This matter has been assigned to **Commissioner John Reynolds** and **Administrative Law Judge Marcelo Poirier**. It has been determined that the complaint will be categorized as **Adjudicatory**. A Prehearing Conference will be scheduled by the assigned Administrative Law Judge unless the matter is otherwise resolved by the parties.

**NOTICE TO DEFENDANT(S) ONLY:**

Please acknowledge your receipt of this Notice within 24 hours of receipt by completing the enclosed **Notice and Acknowledgement of Receipt** form and returning it as an Attachment to an Email addressed to Martin Nakahara ([martin.nakahara@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:martin.nakahara@cpuc.ca.gov)) and Charisse Wayne ([charisse.wayne@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:charisse.wayne@cpuc.ca.gov)) in the Docket Office or by mail to the Docket Office in the self-addressed envelope provided. A self-addressed envelope is provided only if you were served by First Class U.S. mail or by Certified Mail Return Receipt Requested.

It may be possible to resolve this matter through the Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution Program. Please see the enclosed information on the ADR Program or go to the ADR link on the Commission's website (<http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/adr/>).

If you have any questions regarding any matter addressed here, please call the Docket Office at (415) 703-1929/1927.

Dated at San Francisco, California on January 30, 2024.

/s/ MICHELLE COOKE  
Michelle Cooke  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC/cw4

Enclosures: As specified on the Certificate of Service attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein.

cc: Commissioner: John Reynolds  
Administrative Law Judge: Marcelo Poirier  
*Via Email Only*

**(REMAINDER OF PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY)**

## **Alternative Dispute Resolution Program (ADR)**

ADR commonly describes processes, such as facilitation, negotiation, mediation, and early neutral evaluation, to help disputants resolve a conflict without a formal decision by a court or agency. When successful, ADR may achieve results that a court or agency could not order, give the parties more ownership in the result, and reduce litigation and agency costs.

Our Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Division administers the ADR program and trained, experienced ALJs serve as neutrals in the program.

Because ADR focuses on the parties' basic interests, a dispute may be settled on terms more favorable to each of the parties. Since the process is voluntary, free, and normally confidential, parties have little "down-side" risk in trying ADR. If it results in a full settlement, ADR may save time and litigation expenses. Even if a complete settlement is not possible, agreement may be reached on some important points and this, also, may save time.

ADR can occur at any time during a formal proceeding. We encourage the early use of ADR to save the parties' time and money and to avoid unnecessary escalation of a dispute. On occasion, ADR may be available to help resolve disputes that are still informal and have yet to be filed as formal complaints. Most ADR sessions are completed in ½ to 2 days. Some ADR sessions continue over several weeks, with the parties meeting for a day or two at a time.

For additional information visit <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/adr/>.

### **4.4. (Rule 4.4) Answers**

The answer must admit or deny each material allegation in the complaint and shall set forth any new matter constituting a defense. Its purpose is to fully advise the complainant and the Commission of the nature of the defense. At least one of the defendants filing an answer must verify it, but if more than one answer is filed in response to a complaint against multiple defendants, each answer must be separately verified. (See Rule 1.11.)

The answer should also set forth any defects in the complaint which require amendment or clarification. Failure to indicate jurisdictional defects does not waive these defects and shall not prevent a motion to dismiss made thereafter.

The answer must state any comments or objections regarding the complainant's statement on the need for hearing, issues to be considered and proposed schedule. The proposed schedule shall be consistent with the categorization of the proceeding, including a deadline for resolving the proceeding within 12 months or less (adjudicatory proceeding) or 18 months or less (ratesetting or quasi-legislative proceeding). (See Article 7.)

Answers must include the full name, address, and telephone number of defendant and the defendant's attorney, if any, and indicate service on all complainants.

**(END OF RULE 4.4)**