



ALJ/LGG/vj4 12/30/2025

**FILED**

12/30/25

04:59 PM

C2506014

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

Patterson Point LP,

Complainant,

vs.

Case 25-06-014

Southern California Edison Company,

Defendant.

**EMAIL RULING DENYING MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF TIME**

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

/s/ LEAH S. GOLDBERG

Leah S. Goldberg  
Administrative Law Judge

**From:** Goldberg, Leah <[Leah.Goldberg@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Leah.Goldberg@cpuc.ca.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 30, 2025 6:23 PM  
**To:** MacBride, Thomas <[tmacbride@DowneyBrand.com](mailto:tmacbride@DowneyBrand.com)>; Maiwand, Henna <[Henna.Maiwand@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Henna.Maiwand@cpuc.ca.gov)>; [Anna.Valdberg@sce.com](mailto:Anna.Valdberg@sce.com); [Anna.Wojtyna-Machon@sce.com](mailto:Anna.Wojtyna-Machon@sce.com); Marelich, Christopher <[cmarelich@DowneyBrand.com](mailto:cmarelich@DowneyBrand.com)>; [Case.Admin@sce.com](mailto:Case.Admin@sce.com); [CaseAdminTeamSupportGroupList@sce.com](mailto:CaseAdminTeamSupportGroupList@sce.com); [Joe@JFWiedman.com](mailto:Joe@JFWiedman.com); [Milton.J@AriverCapital.com](mailto:Milton.J@AriverCapital.com); [NicoleCelio@hasbarco.org](mailto:NicoleCelio@hasbarco.org); [Tariffs.Manager@sce.com](mailto:Tariffs.Manager@sce.com); [angela.1.whatley@sce.com](mailto:angela.1.whatley@sce.com); Wang, Melissa <[Melissa.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Melissa.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov)>; [pauline.nguyen@sce.com](mailto:pauline.nguyen@sce.com)  
**Cc:** ALJ Process <[alj\\_process@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:alj_process@cpuc.ca.gov)>; ALJ Support ID <[alj\\_supportid@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:alj_supportid@cpuc.ca.gov)>; ALJ Proceedings Event Support Request <[ALJProceedingsEventSupportRequest@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ALJProceedingsEventSupportRequest@cpuc.ca.gov)>; ALJ Docket Office <[ALJ\\_Docket\\_Office@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:ALJ_Docket_Office@cpuc.ca.gov)>; Colbert, W. Anthony <[W.Anthony.Colbert@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:W.Anthony.Colbert@cpuc.ca.gov)>  
**Subject:** Case 25-06-014 Patterson Point LP, v Southern California Edison Company Email Ruling Denying Motion for an Extension of Time

To the Parties in C.25-06-014,

I am in receipt of the parties' Motion for an Extension of Time to reply to the parties' Motions to Admit Evidence in the Evidentiary Record, which request Patterson Point LP (Patterson Point or Complainant) made today on behalf of itself and Southern California Edison Company (SCE).

Earlier today, consistent with Rule 11.1(g), I issued a ruling granting the motions and admitting evidence in the evidentiary record rendering the parties' request for an extension moot. Therefore, the parties' motion for an extension to respond to the motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record is denied. Any motion for modification of the assigned ALJ's ruling granting the motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record must be made by January 9, 2026.

### **Factual and Procedural Background**

On June 11, 2025, Patterson Point filed a complaint against SCE alleging violations of SCE's Electrical Service Requirements (ESR), specifically ESR Section 5 and ESR Rules 16 and 18. Complainant plans to build and operate a housing project that will consist of 23 resident units and one unit for an on-site manager. Only formerly unhoused people and those with special needs meeting certain income requirements will qualify for tenancy. In addition to housing,

residents will be provided an array of services that are not provided in market-rate or low-income housing. The Complaint alleges that housing authority projects, such as the one proposed, serving extremely low income residents with special needs, have been allowed to install one master meter serving all units in the projects under ESR Rules 16 and 18, provided that the rental agreements include electrical usage. Complainant asserts that its project is similar to other projects granted a single meter for multiple residential units.

On July 1, 2025, the California Public Utilities Commission (Commission) issued Instructions to Answer Notice to Defendant. On July 24, 2025, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a ruling setting a prehearing conference (PHC) for August 14, 2025, directing the parties to meet and confer, and directing SCE to file a Joint PHC Statement by August 8, 2025.

On July 31, 2025, SCE filed an answer to the Complaint. SCE contends that both SCE Tariffs and the Public Utilities Code (PUC) do not allow for the type of metering proposed by the Complainant. Based on its understanding that the proposed project is new construction, that each unit will have its own kitchen, and that the project will include seven electric vehicle charging ports, SCE asserts the project is a residential multiunit structure that as a matter of law must have a separate electricity usage meter.

A PHC was held on August 25, 2025, to address the issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary. Commissioner Douglas issued a Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) on September 19, 2025, which among other things, established a schedule for the proceeding.

On November 3, 2025, SCE filed and served a Motion to Dismiss. On the same date, SCE served its testimony.

On November 4, 2025, Patterson Point sent an email to the assigned ALJ stating that its testimony was not ready and asking the assigned ALJ to suspend the proceeding schedule pending decision on SCE's Motion to Dismiss. On November 7, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued an email ruling directing the Complainant to explain its failure to serve testimony and directing the Complainant to file a formal motion to amend the proceeding schedule, which Complainant did on November 14, 2025. SCE filed a response to Patterson Point's motion on September 19, 2025.

The assigned ALJ held a virtual status conference on November 21, 2025, during which the assigned ALJ discussed the Commission's Environmental and Social Justice Action Plan (ESJ) Action Plan and its impact on this proceeding. The assigned ALJ encouraged the parties to review their positions and consider settlement based on the ESJ Action Plan considerations. SCE was directed to file a case status update by December 2, 2025, updating the Commission on the parties' desire to settle the Complaint.

As directed, SCE filed a case status update on December 2, 2025, stating that it will adjust its definition of properties eligible for a single meter to include Patterson Point and future projects that are similarly situated. SCE requested that the Commission issue a Presiding Officer's Decision to confirm that SCE's approach is consistent with statutory and tariff rules. Patterson Point also filed a Status Report on December 2, 2025, stating that the construction deadlines for the Patterson Point project will not allow for a master meter at this point. Instead, Patterson Point is committed to installing individual meters for each unit.

On December 12, 2025, the assigned ALJ issued a ruling amending the proceeding schedule, requesting additional information and denying SCE's motion to dismiss.

On December 19, 2025, Patterson Point filed its prepared testimony. On the same date, the parties also filed motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record and provided additional information regarding per meter charges that the assigned ALJ requested in the December 12, 2025 ruling. SCE filed an accompanying Motion for Leave to File Under Seal the Confidential Version of Motion to Admit Evidence into the Evidentiary Record and Responses to Request for Additional Information.

The assigned ALJ issued a ruling on December 30, 2025, granting the motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record and granting SCE's Motion to File Under Seal. On December 30, 2025, Patterson Point, on behalf of Patterson Point and SCE filed a motion to extend the time for filing a response to the motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record.

## **Discussion**

The parties' Motion for an Extension of Time to Respond mentioned that the parties are working to resolve issues between themselves but did not elaborate on what those issues are and if they relate to the Complaint as a whole or simply to the Motions to Admit Evidence into the Evidentiary Record. Because a ruling granting the motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record has already been issued under the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure 11.1(g), the request for an extension of time to reply is moot and therefore must be denied.

If there are compelling issues or concerns regarding the evidence that has been admitted into the evidentiary record, the parties may file a motion to request modification of the Ruling Granting the Motions to Admit Evidence into the Evidentiary Record, but any such motion must be filed by January 9, 2026.

**IT IS SO ORDERED. THE DOCKET OFFICE SHALL FORMALLY FILE THIS RULING.**

Leah S. Goldberg  
Administrative Law Judge  
California Public Utilities Commission  
[leah.goldberg@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:leah.goldberg@cpuc.ca.gov)

Notice: This communication may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information for the use of the intended recipient(s). Unauthorized use or disclosure is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the communication.

**From:** MacBride, Thomas <[tmacbride@DowneyBrand.com](mailto:tmacbride@DowneyBrand.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 30, 2025 7:37 AM  
**To:** Maiwand, Henna <[Henna.Maiwand@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Henna.Maiwand@cpuc.ca.gov)>;  
[Anna.Valdberg@sce.com](mailto:Anna.Valdberg@sce.com); [Anna.Wojtyna-Machon@sce.com](mailto:Anna.Wojtyna-Machon@sce.com); Marelich, Christopher <[cmarelich@DowneyBrand.com](mailto:cmarelich@DowneyBrand.com)>; [Case.Admin@sce.com](mailto:Case.Admin@sce.com);  
[CaseAdminTeamSupportGroupList@sce.com](mailto:CaseAdminTeamSupportGroupList@sce.com); [Joe@JFWiedman.com](mailto:Joe@JFWiedman.com);  
[Milton.J@AriverCapital.com](mailto:Milton.J@AriverCapital.com); [NocoleCelio@hasbarco.org](mailto:NocoleCelio@hasbarco.org);  
[Tariffs.Manager@sce.com](mailto:Tariffs.Manager@sce.com); [angela.1.whatley@sce.com](mailto:angela.1.whatley@sce.com); Goldberg, Leah <[Leah.Goldberg@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Leah.Goldberg@cpuc.ca.gov)>; Wang, Melissa <[Melissa.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Melissa.Wang@cpuc.ca.gov)>;  
[pauline.nguyen@sce.com](mailto:pauline.nguyen@sce.com)  
**Cc:** ALJ Process <[alj\\_process@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:alj_process@cpuc.ca.gov)>; Gutto, Shane <[Shane.Gutto@cpuc.ca.gov](mailto:Shane.Gutto@cpuc.ca.gov)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Case 25-06-014 Patterson Point LP, v Southern California Edison Company

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Your Honor,

Pursuant to Rules 11.1 (e) and 11.6 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Patterson Point LP and Southern California Edison Company, ("Parties") submit this email motion for extension of time and ask that the date for replying to "motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record" be extended to January 9, 2025.

Ordering Paragraph No. 2 of Your Honor's December 12, 2025 Ruling Amending the Proceeding Schedule directed the Parties To " file and serve motions to admit evidence into the evidentiary record by December 19, 2025...." Both Parties timely filed those motions. Accordingly, pursuant to Rule 11.1 (e), responses to those motions would be due on January 5, 2026 "unless the Administrative Law Judge sets a different date."

The Parties have been meeting in an effort to resolve several of the issues before the Commission in this proceeding. Moreover, the schedules of both Parties were affected by the holidays. It would greatly assist the Parties if the date for responding to the motions be extended to January 9, 2026 and the Parties so move.

Respectfully,

Tom MacBride

Thomas J. MacBride

**DOWNEY BRAND**

Downey Brand LLP

455 Market Street, Suite 1500

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.848.4800 Main

415.848.4842 Direct

415.848.4801 Fax

[tmacbride@DowneyBrand.com](mailto:tmacbride@DowneyBrand.com)

[www.downeybrand.com](http://www.downeybrand.com)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication from Downey Brand and any accompanying document(s) are confidential and privileged. They are intended for the sole use of the addressee. If you receive this transmission in error, you are advised that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or the taking of any action in reliance upon the communication is strictly prohibited. Moreover, any such inadvertent disclosure shall not compromise or waive the attorney-client privilege as to this communication or otherwise. If you have received this communication in error, please contact our IT Department at its Internet address ([IT@downeybrand.com](mailto:IT@downeybrand.com)), or by telephone at (916)444-1000x5325. Thank you.