



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

FILED

07/01/25

03:45 PM

C2506006

C. 25-06-006

David Noel Rosen,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company (U338-E),

Defendant.

JOINT MOTION FOR A RULING STAYING THE PROCEEDING

ANNA VALDBERG
WILLIAM YU

Attorneys for

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON
COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-1634
E-mail: William.W.Yu@sce.com

Dated: July 1, 2025

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

David Noel Rosen,	C. 25-06-006
	Complainant,
vs.	
Southern California Edison Company (U338-E),	
	Defendant.

JOINT MOTION FOR A RULING STAYING THE PROCEEDING

Pursuant to Rule 11.1 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”), Southern California Edison Company (“SCE”) and David Noel Rosen (“Complainant”) (collectively, the “Parties”) submit this Joint Motion for a Ruling Staying the Proceeding (“Joint Motion”).¹ Since March 2025, several Complaints have been filed with substantially similar issues relating to SCE’s January 2025 Public Safety Power Shutoffs (“PSPS”) in the Triunfo Lobo Canyon (“TLC”) area. For purposes of efficiency, the Parties request that the Commission issue a ruling to stay these related proceedings, including C. 25-03-011 (Forbes vs. SCE), C. 25-03-012 (Hookers vs. SCE), C. 25-03-013 (Robertsons vs. SCE), C. 25-06-005 (S. Rosen vs. SCE), and C. 25-06-006 (D. Rosen vs. SCE) (collectively, “TLC Complaints”), while SCE and the Complainants to these proceedings (collectively, “TLC Complainants”) participate in discussions that, if successful, could resolve the issues presented in these related Complaints. While the proceeding is stayed, the Parties propose that they provide

¹ Pursuant to Rule 1.8(d) of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, SCE confirms that the TLC Complainants have authorized SCE to submit this Joint Motion on behalf of them.

joint updates every 60 days concerning the status of the ongoing discussions for purposes of case management.

The Commission has discretion to stay proceedings in the interest of efficiency.² Such a stay is warranted here. SCE has been in communication with the TLC Complainants and the Parties have indicated that they are amenable to participating in ongoing discussions regarding the TLC Complainants' concerns. The Parties and the TLC Complainants have scheduled a community meeting on August 25. If successful, the meeting and discussions could render the TLC Complaints moot, as it would no longer be necessary for the Commission to resolve the issues presented by TLC Complainants. For this reason, to conserve Commission and party resources, it is prudent to stay this proceeding pending the outcome of the ongoing discussions.

As noted above, this Complaint is substantially similar to the other TLC Complaints filed by residents of the TLC community.³ As such, in the interest of efficiency, the parties to those proceedings plan to file similar motions to stay.

² See, e.g., *Coleman, et al v. Odd Fellows Sierra Rec. Ass'n*, C.12-03-017, Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Granting Stay, March 12, 2012 (staying proceeding to allow party negotiations); *OhmConnect, Inc. v. Southern California Edison Co.*, C.19-03-005, Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Granting Motion to Extend Stay of Proceeding, Nov. 7, 2023 (staying proceeding to await outcome of separate application). Cf. *Freiberg v. City of Mission Viejo*, 33 Cal. App. 4th 1484, 1489, (1995) ("Trial courts generally have the inherent power to stay proceedings in the interests of justice and to promote judicial efficiency").

³ See C. 25-03-011 (Forbes vs. SCE); C. 25-03-012 (Hookers vs. SCE); C. 25-03-013 (Robertsons vs. SCE); C. 25-06-005 (S. Rosen vs. SCE); C. 25-06-006 (D. Rosen vs. SCE).

Accordingly, SCE and Complainant jointly request that the Commission issue a ruling staying this proceeding pending the outcome of the ongoing discussions. During the stay, the procedural schedule should be suspended, other than the joint updates that will be filed in the proceeding.

Dated: July 1, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM YU

/s/ William Yu

By: William Yu

Attorney for
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY

2244 Walnut Grove Avenue
Post Office Box 800
Rosemead, California 91770
Telephone: (626) 302-1634
E-mail: William.W.Yu@sce.com