FILED
01/09/26
11:57 AM
A2507016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Joint Application of Charter Communications, Inc., Charter Communications Holdings, LLC, and Cox Enterprises, Inc. for Approval Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 854 of the Indirect Transfer of Control of Cox California Telcom, LLC (U-5684-C).	Application 25-07-016

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING TO COMPEL THE PRODUCTION OF RESPONSIVE DISCOVERY WITHIN 5 DAYS

This ruling grants the Motion to Compel Data Request Responses filed by the Public Advocates Office at the California Public Utilities Commission (Cal Advocates) and directs Charter Communications Inc., and Charter Communications Holdings, LLC, to produce full, complete, and unredacted responses to Cal Advocates' data requests within five business days.

1. Background

On December 23, 2025, Cal Advocates filed a Motion to Compel Data Request Responses, requesting a ruling ordering Charter Communications Inc., and Charter Communications Holdings, LLC (Applicant), to produce documents responsive to outstanding data requests propounded by Cal Advocates in Application (A.)25-07-016: Joint Application of Charter Communications, Inc., Charter Communications Holdings, LLC, and Cox Enterprises, Inc. for Approval Pursuant to Section 854 of the Indirect Transfer of Control of Cox California Telcom, LLC (U5684C).

This Motion to Compel Data Request Responses occurs after Cal Advocates and Applicant have met and conferred at length, as required by the California Rules of Practice and Procedure 11.3.[1]

On December 29, 2025, Applicant, with the addition of Cox Enterprises, Inc., filed a motion requesting a revised scoping memo and a shortened proceeding schedule, notwithstanding the outstanding data request responses.

On January 2, 2026, Applicant filed its response to Cal Advocates' Motion to Compel.

On January 5, 2026, and again on January 7, 2026, Cal Advocates sent an email to the proceeding service list requesting permission to file a reply to Applicant's Response to Cal Advocates' Motion to Compel. The request was denied.

2. Discussion

Cal Advocates' data requests seek information to inform Cal Advocates' testimony in this instant proceeding. A request for indirect transfer of control results in an increase in size of a company as it incorporates the other. Pursuant to the Pub. Util. Code Sections 309.5 and 314, Cal Advocates is afforded broad statutorily mandated discovery rights with respect to any transaction that might affect the interests of the ratepayers of a telephone corporation.[2] The data

[1] As part of the filing, Cal Advocates included its September 24, 2025, Data Request 03; Charter's response to Data Request 03; Cal Advocates' September 24, 2025, Data Request 04; Charter's October 8 and 21, 2025, response to Data Request 04 number 2, 3, and 15; Cal Advocates' November 18, 2025, Letter regarding Charter's Responses and Objections to Cal Advocates Data Request 03 and 04; and Cal Advocates' email granting Charter a final extension to produce responses, dated December 12, 2025.

[2] Furthermore, pursuant to the Commissions' Rules of Practice and Procedure 10.1, parties to a Commission proceeding may obtain discovery from any other party regarding any matter that is relevant to the subject matter involved in the pending proceeding, if the matter is itself admissible or reasonably calculated to lead to admissible evidence.

requests at issue seek agreements and related documents between Applicant and providers that utilize Applicant's network as part of an inquiry into Applicant's commercial relationships.

Applicant replies to Cal Advocates' motion to compel discovery responses claiming that the information Cal Advocates seeks exceeds the scope of Cal Advocates' discovery authority, is irrelevant to the proceeding, or is not responsive to the underlying data request. In this case, Applicant is wrong.

Applicant is not the arbiter of the breadth of Cal Advocates' discovery authority, but rather, the responding party. The scope of Cal Advocates' discovery authority is broad as indicated in statute and Commission rules.[3] As an arm of the Commission, Cal Advocates may request information under both Pub. Util. Code sections, and Applicant is obligated to provide the requested information. The Legislature specifically stated that Cal Advocates may compel the production of "*any information* it deems necessary to perform its duties from any entity regulated by the commission…."[4] Cal Advocates' discovery rights, therefore, are not limited to requesting information that is within the scope of this proceeding.

The scope of the proceeding at issue is necessarily broad to accommodate the complexity and input of the transaction proposed. With respect to the underlying data request, Cal Advocates seeks information that may be relevant to its forthcoming testimony and its potential impacts on California customers. With respect to the relevance, admissibility, or weight granted to evidence

[3] Pub. Util. Code sections 309.5(e) and 314 control. The standard for what is considered the appropriate scope of discovery is broad: the requested data must be relevant or may lead to relevant data. California Public Utilities Commission Rules of Practice and Procedure 10.1. *See also,* CA Govt. Code Sec 11181.

[4] Pub. Util. Code section 309.5(e) (emphasis added).

produced during the discovery process, it is the role of the assigned Administrative Law Judge to consider the information filed in support of, or against, any application before the Commission.[5]

Applicant and Cal Advocates have negotiated via the meet and confer process, as required. In response to the filed motion, Applicant has made clear that it understands what information requested by Cal Advocates remains outstanding. Applicant has also made clear its desire for a speedy adjudication of this application, as demonstrated by the December 29, 2025 motion requesting a revised scoping memo and a shortened proceeding schedule. Therefore, Applicant must produce full, complete, and unredacted responses to Cal Advocates' Data Requests within five business days of this Ruling.[6]

IT IS SO RULED.

Dated January 9, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ JAMIE ORMOND

Jamie Ormond
Administrative Law Judge

[5] Relevancy for discovery is a much broader standard than relevancy for introduction of evidence. *US v. Nixon*, 418 *US* 683 (1974). The courts decide whether the data is relevant once it is introduced by a party. The same is true for CPUC proceedings.

[6] Per Applicant's request for a speedy review of the application, time is of the essence.