



ALJ/DJG/asf 11/20/2025

FILED

11/20/25

11:43 AM

A2509002

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of IPC Systems, Inc. For a
Certificate of Public Convenience and
Necessity to Operate as a Non-
Dominant Interexchange Carrier.

Application 25-09-002

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING AMENDING PROCEDURAL
SCHEDULE TO ALLOW PRELIMINARY RESPONSE REGARDING
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES OFFERED**

This ruling amends the procedural schedule and sets a deadline of December 5, 2025 for IPC System, Inc. (IPC) to provide a response to this ruling indicating that it does not intend to provide services other than non-interconnected Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) and requesting abeyance of the procedural schedule.

1. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 13, 2025, IPC System, Inc. (IPC) attended a Prehearing Conference (PHC) in the instant proceeding. Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Gruen understood IPC to indicate the instant application was for IPC to mainly provide non-interconnected VOIP service. However, IPC's application shows that IPC intends to be an interexchange service provider.¹

IPC's application also states that it "contracted with two customers earlier this year for integrated service offerings that would permit the customers to access the company's private line services at California locations as of July 1,

¹ Application (A.) 25-09-002, Section 6.d, at pdf p. 4.

2025.”² At the PHC, the ALJ directed IPC to file, by December 19, 2025, (1) a motion requesting adoption of a range of penalties in the event that IPC determined that it offered wireline telecommunications services since July 1, 2025, if applicable, and (2) a response discussing how, in IPC’s view, whether the Commission had jurisdiction over services offered since July 1, 2025 as well as proposed services; this response would also include a discussion of any additional services, other than non-interconnected VoIP, that IPC intended to offer that were within the Commission’s jurisdiction, such as interexchange services. The assigned ALJ also directed IPC to respond to the ALJ’s request for additional information, as discussed during the PHC, by December 19, 2025.

2. DISCUSSION

The Commission licenses wireline telecommunications services pursuant to Pub. Util. Code Section 1001. This includes local exchange, interexchange, and interconnected VoIP services. The Commission does not license non-interconnected VoIP services as wireline telecommunications service at this time.

While IPC’s Application (A.) 25 09-002 requests permission from the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) to provide interexchange service; IPC represented at the PHC that it has been operating as a provider of non-interconnected VoIP services since July 1, 2025. At the PHC, IPC also indicated that it was unclear whether it planned to provide interexchange service, as proposed in its application.

If the Commission finds that IPC has not, and does not intend to provide local exchange, interexchange, or interconnected VoIP services, the Commission may find it does not have jurisdiction over IPC services. In order to streamline

² A.25-09-002, at pdf p. 24.

IPC's obligations in this proceeding, this ruling amends the assigned ALJ's previous instruction to file documents by December 19, 2025, as detailed above.

Therefore, this ruling sets a deadline of December 5, 2025, for IPC System, Inc. (IPC) to provide a response to this ruling indicating that it does not intend to provide services other than non-interconnected Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP) and requesting abeyance of the procedural schedule.

In the event that IPC does not file a response by December 5, 2025, as discussed, IPC will be required to file the following by December 19, 2025: (1) a motion related to the range of penalties if IPC in fact determines that it has violated Section 1001 as a provider of telecommunications services regulated by the Commission, (2) a Response to ALJ Oral Ruling Directing Additional Information Regarding Telecommunications Services Offered indicating IPC's intent to offer wireline telecommunications services licenses, with a description of the services to be provided, and (3) a Response to ALJ Oral Ruling Directing Additional Information Regarding Application.

The Response to ALJ Oral Ruling Directing Additional Information Regarding Application shall respond to the following questions posed by the assigned ALJ at the PHC:

1. Application (A.) 25-09-002 states that Applicant "will provide resold point-to-point private line voice and data services to business customers only. The company's services will provide access solely to Applicant's private network, and thus will not permit calls to or from the Public Switched Telephone Network."³
 - a. Why hasn't IPC checked one of the two top boxes in Section 8 of the application?

³ A.25-09-002, Section 8.

- b. Is IPC not proposing to provide voice services directly to customers, as shown in box 1 of Section 8 of the application?
- 2. Commission Decision 24-11-003 Appendix F sets forth the financial requirements for applications for certificates of public convenience and necessity such as that of IPC. D.24-11-003 requires IPC to provide financial documents as part of its application, and offers options about which documents that IPC can provide.
 - a. Did IPC provide financial documents as part of its application in compliance with D.24-11-003 Appendix F?
 - b. To the extent it did not provide such financial documents in compliance with D.24-11-003 Appendix F, please supplement the application accordingly.
- 3. A.25-09-002 states, “As a result of an effort to integrate the company’s private line services with its non-telecom services offerings (i.e., hardware and software) provided by Applicant, Applicant contracted with two customers earlier this year for integrated service offerings that would permit the customers to access the company’s private line services at California locations as of July 1, 2025.”⁴
 - a. Does this passage mean that IPC Systems, Inc. began providing service to two customers in California on July 1, 2025?
 - b. Other than the two customers with whom IPC contracted on July 1, 2025, has IPC Systems, Inc. provided service to additional customers in California? If so, provide the number of customers, and the date on which service began for each one.
- 4. Has IPC reviewed the California Public Utilities Commission’s latest Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan?

⁴ A.25-09-002 at 24 of 78.

5. Based upon IPC's review of the California Public Utilities Commission's latest Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan, are there any environmental and social justice (ESJ) issues that arise from in the Application?
6. Application 25-09-002 Appendix G states, "IPC Intermediate Holdings LLC is 100% wholly-owned by IPC Parent Holdings LLC, a Delaware limited liability company..."⁵ Is IPC intermediate holdings owned by IPC Parent Holdings LLC, or by IPC Management Holdings LLC?
7. Please provide the date of birth and middle name for Mr. Kurt Adams. If Mr. Adams has a state-issued identification, please provide a copy of that. Mr. Adams' information may be filed under seal.
8. Is applicant currently affiliated with Global Crossing Telecommunications, Inc. (U5005C)?
9. Is applicant currently affiliated with Global Crossing Local Services, Inc. (U5685C)?
10. Will IPC Services, Inc. please confirm that IPC.com is the official website of the applicant?
11. The leadership team on that website shows the following officers and I will spell their names for the record: Kurt Adams, Chief Executive Officer; Tito Singh, Chief Revenue Officer; Tim Carmody, Chief Technology Officer; Alex Baren, Chief Operating & Transformation Officer; Adam Bozek, EVP and Chief Administrative Officer; Meeghan Salcedo, Chief People Officer; and Vimal Vel, Chief Product Officer.
 - a. Will IPC Services Inc. please confirm that these people are all officers for IPC?
 - b. Are there other offices for IPC?
 - c. If so, please name them, spell their names, and include their titles.

⁵ Application, pdf page 38 of 78.

IT IS RULED that:

1. By December 5, 2025, IPC Systems, Inc. may file a Response to ALJ Ruling indicating that it does not intend to provide services other than non-interconnected Voice Over Internet Protocol VOIP and requesting abeyance of the procedural schedule, as discussed herein.

Dated November 20, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DARRYL GRUEN

Darryl Gruen
Administrative Law Judge