



COM/DH7/jnf 12/30/2025

FILED

12/30/25

03:10 PM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Richard Siaw,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
(U39E),

Defendant.

Case 25-06-004

ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S SCOPING MEMO AND RULING

This scoping memo and ruling sets forth the issues, need for hearing, schedule, category, and other matters necessary to scope this proceeding pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.1 and Article 7 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules).

1. Factual and Procedural Background

On June 6, 2025, Richard Siaw (Mr. Siaw or Complainant) filed Case (C.) 25-06-004 (Complaint) against Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or Defendant) claiming that PG&E must lower or adjust the amount it charged Claimant for his alleged unauthorized electric use (or energy consumed but not billed) from March 2017 through April 2019.

PG&E filed its answer to the Complaint on July 17, 2025 (Answer). In the Answer, PG&E denied most material allegations made in the Complaint except as follows:

- 1) PG&E admits the electric service was cut at the Siaw property on March 7, 2020, at the electric distribution pole for safety due to arcing and smoke;
- 2) PG&E admits discovering an unauthorized electric meter bypass on March 7, 2020, which caused arcing of the electric service at the Siaw Property;
- 3) PG&E admits a PG&E Investigator spoke with Mr. Siaw about what he needed to do for restoration of electric service, that Mr. Siaw completed those steps, and that PG&E restored electric service shortly thereafter; and
- 4) PG&E admits sending Mr. Siaw a bill for \$44,206.53 for estimated energy consumed and unregistered at the Siaw Property for 2017 - 2019.

In addition, PG&E set forth the following affirmative defenses:

- 1) The Complaint fails to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted; and
- 2) PG&E affirmatively alleges that it has complied with all applicable tariffs.

A telephonic prehearing conference (PHC) was held on September 29, 2025, to determine issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary. After considering the Application and discussion at the PHC, I have determined the issues and initial schedule of the proceeding to be set forth in this scoping memo. I have also determined that no environmental and social justice issues have been raised at this time.

2. Issues

The issues to be determined or otherwise considered are:

1. Did PG&E deny Complainant due process given Complainant's allegation that a PG&E Investigator never came to Complainant's residence to investigate a PG&E Troubleshooter's initial determination that unauthorized electric use occurred at the residence?
 - a. Can PG&E bill Complainant for his alleged unauthorized electric use in the amount of \$43,106.07, for energy consumed but not billed, from March 2017 through April 2019?
 - b. Should PG&E lower the amount it billed Complainant for his alleged unauthorized electric use from March 2017 through April 2019 for energy consumed but not billed and if so by what amount?

3. Need for Evidentiary Hearing

The issues identified above are potentially contested material issues of fact. Accordingly, we will allow parties to present evidence on these issues and evidentiary hearings are needed.

4. Schedule

The following schedule is adopted here and may be modified by the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) as required to promote the efficient and fair resolution of the complaint.

Event	Date
Meet and confer, held	January 30, 2026
Final Status Conference, held	Date TBD
Evidentiary Hearing, held	February 27, 2026 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.
Post-hearing opening briefs [if needed], filed and served	TBD

Event	Date
Post-hearing reply briefs [if needed], filed and served	TBD
Presiding Officer's Decision, issued	No later than 90 days after submission

By January 30, 2026, and prior to the start of the final status conference, the parties shall meet and confer to accomplish the following tasks:

- identify any material facts to which the parties can stipulate without the need to call live witnesses or introduce documentary evidence;
- prepare and discuss their witness lists, along with time estimates for direct and cross examination; and
- prepare and exchange their exhibit lists. The parties shall use the Commission's exhibit list template and populate it with their respective exhibits, which shall be identified with a two or three-letter prefix (e.g., RS for Richard Siaw and PGE for PG&E), followed by a dash and a number, and a description of the exhibit.

By a separate ruling, the final status conference will be noticed and conducted via Webex. The purpose of the final status conference is to ascertain whether, pursuant to Rule 13.8(c), the parties stipulate to the receipt of prepared testimony into evidence without direct or cross examination or other need to convene an evidentiary hearing or, in the alternative, the parties' resources, readiness and needs for the effective remote conduct of the evidentiary hearing, including estimates of time requested for cross-examination and identification of anticipated witnesses and exhibits.

The proceeding will stand submitted upon the filing of reply briefs, unless the assigned ALJ directs the parties that no post-hearing briefs are required, in which case the proceeding will stand submitted upon the adjournment of the

evidentiary hearing. Based on this schedule, the proceeding will be resolved within 12 months as required by Pub. Util. Code §1701.2(i).

5. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Program and Settlements

The Commission's Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) program offers mediation, early neutral evaluation, and facilitation services, and uses ALJs who have been trained as neutrals. At the parties' request, the assigned ALJ can refer this proceeding to the Commission's ADR Coordinator. Additional ADR information is available on the Commission's website.¹

Any settlement between parties, whether regarding all or some of the issues, shall comply with Article 12 of the Rules and shall be served in writing. Such settlements shall include a complete explanation of the settlement and a complete explanation of why it is reasonable in light of the whole record, consistent with the law and in the public interest. The proposing parties bear the burden of proof as to whether the settlement should be adopted by the Commission.

6. Category of Proceeding and Ex Parte Restrictions

The Commission determined that this is an adjudicatory proceeding. Accordingly, *ex parte* communications are prohibited pursuant to Article 8 of the Rules.

7. Response to Public Comments

Parties may, but are not required to, respond to written comments received from the public. Parties may do so by posting such response using the

¹ <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/adr/>.

“Add Public Comment” button on the “Public Comment” tab of the online docket card for the proceeding.

8. Public Advisor

Any person interested in participating in this proceeding who is unfamiliar with the Commission’s procedures or has questions about the electronic filing procedures is encouraged to obtain more information at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/about-cpuc/divisions/news-and-public-information-office/public-advisors-office> or contact the Commission’s Public Advisor at 1-866-849-8390 or 1-866-836-7825 (TTY), or send an e-mail to public.advisor@cpuc.ca.gov.

9. Filing, Service, and Service List

The official service list has been created and is on the Commission’s website. Parties should confirm that their information on the service list is correct and serve notice of any errors on the Commission’s Process Office, the service list, and the ALJ. Persons may become a party pursuant to Rule 1.4².

When serving any document, each party must ensure that it is using the current official service list on the Commission’s website.

This proceeding will follow the electronic service protocol set forth in Rule 1.10. All parties to this proceeding shall serve documents and pleadings using electronic mail, whenever possible, transmitted no later than 5:00 p.m., on the date scheduled for service to occur. Rule 1.10 requires service on the ALJ of both an electronic and a paper copy of filed or served documents.

² The form to request additions and changes to the Service list may be found at <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/administrative-law-judge-division/documents/additiontoservicelisttranscriptordercompliant.pdf>.

When serving documents on Commissioners or their personal advisors, whether or not they are on the official service list, parties must only provide electronic service. Parties must not send hard copies of documents to Commissioners or their personal advisors unless specifically instructed to do so.

Persons who are not parties but wish to receive electronic service of documents filed in the proceeding may contact the Process Office at process_office@cpuc.ca.gov to request addition to the “Information Only” category of the official service list pursuant to Rule 1.9(f).

The Commission encourages those who seek information -only status on the service list to consider the Commission’s subscription service as an alternative. The subscription service sends individual notifications to each subscriber of formal e--filings tendered and accepted by the Commission. Notices sent through subscription service are less likely to be flagged by spam or other filters. Notifications can be for a specific proceeding, a range of documents and daily or weekly digests.

10. Receiving Electronic Service from the Commission

Parties and other persons on the service list are advised that it is the responsibility of each person or entity on the service list for Commission proceedings to ensure their ability to receive emails from the Commission. Please add “@cpuc.ca.gov” to your email safe sender list and update your email screening practices, settings and filters to ensure receipt of emails from the Commission.

11. Assignment of Proceeding

Darcie L. Houck is the assigned Commissioner and Suman Mathews is the assigned Administrative Law Judge for this proceeding.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is described above and is adopted.
2. The schedule of this proceeding is set forth above and is adopted.
3. Evidentiary hearing is needed.
4. This order is effective today.

Dated December 30, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ DARCIE L. HOUCK

Darcie L. Houck
Assigned Commissioner