



FILED

10/03/25
11:50 AM
I2508007

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Order Instituting Investigation into the Operations, Maintenance, and Practices of Havasu Water Company (WTD-352) for Failure to Comply With the Laws, Rules, and Regulations of this State Governing the Manner in which California Consumers are Provided with Safe and Reliable Water Service and Order to Show Cause Why the Commission Should Not Petition the Superior Court for the Appointment of a Receiver.

Investigation 25-08-007
(Filed August 14, 2025)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING ADMONISHING PARTIES FOR VIOLATION OF EX PARTE AND FILE AND SERVICE RULES

On September 30, 2025, at the Pre-hearing Conference (PHC), in the above entitled matter, Havasu Water Company's counsel, Ravi Bendapudi, orally moved for a stay of the proceeding. Counsel for the Commission's Consumer Protection Enforcement Division's, Martha Perez, objected and argued against the motion. The assigned Administrative Law Judge took the oral motion and objection to that motion under advisement and notified the Parties that a ruling would be issued on October 1, 2025.

On October 1, 2025, Ms. Perez sent the assigned Administrative Law Judge an email objecting to Havasu's motion for a stay. (See Attachment A). On the same day, Mr. Bendapudi responded via email to Ms. Perez's email. (See Attachment B.) Ms. Perez and Mr. Bendapudi's emails to the assigned Administrative Law Judge violated the California Public Utilities Commission's (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules) section 1.10, Electronic Mail Service, Rule 11.1 Motions, and Rule 8.2 Ex Parte Requirements. Both

counsels were advised during the PHC that ex parte communications are strictly prohibited in this proceeding.

Ms. Perez and Mr. Bendapudi are again reminded that oral motions are permitted at a hearing or conference. All motions made outside of a hearing or conference must be written, filed with the Docket Office, and properly served (Rule 11.1(c)).

Ms. Perez and Mr. Bendapudi must read Rules 8.1 and 8.2(b) regarding ex parte communication. Both Counsels are again reminded that ex parte communications are strictly prohibited in this proceeding. Each Counsel sent substantive written communication directly to a decisionmaker, the Administrative Law Judge, in violation of Rule 8.2(b).

This is the second and final warning that the parties to this proceeding and their counsel must comply with the prohibition of ex parte communication. Counsels are on notice that, going forward, failure to follow the Rules will result in an Order to Show Cause as to why a penalty should not be imposed (Rules 8.2(l)(i) provides for a penalty from \$500.00 up to \$50,000 for each offense).

Finally, Ms. Perez and Mr. Bendapudi are also reminded of Rule 1.1, misleading the Commission, and the penalties and sanctions that may be imposed for violation of the Rules.

While both counsels are expected to fight vigorously for their respective clients they must do so while following the Rules.

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated October 3, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MINH LEQUANG

Minh LeQuang
Administrative Law Judge