



ALJ/SCD/vj4 01/20/2026

FILED

01/21/26

10:40 AM

A2505016

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Joint Application
of Platinum Equity Capital Partners
IV, L.P. and SCRS Intermediate
Holding Corporation, Requesting
Expedited Approval of Indirect
Transfer of Control of Securus
Technologies, LLC (U-6888-C)
Pursuant to California Public Utilities
Code Section 854(a)

Application 25-05-016

**RULING DENYING JOINT APPLICANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
WITH PREJUDICE AND ADJUSTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

Dated January 20, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ SHANNON CLARK

Shannon Clark
Administrative Law Judge

From: Clark, Shannon <Shannon.Clark@cpuc.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 20, 2026 8:16 AM
To: paul.besozzi@squirepb.com; ThailaSundaresan@dwt.com; AGreen@turn.org; krupy@wiley.law; sbouboulis@wiley.law; WJohnsen@Wiley.law; michael.lozich@securustechologies.com; Schmitt, Edwin "Eddie" <Edwin.Schmitt@cpuc.ca.gov>; jholland@platinumequity.com; Gallardo, Enrique <Enrique.Gallardo@cpuc.ca.gov>; Bonino, Nicholas <Nicholas.Bonino@cpuc.ca.gov>; Clark, Shannon <Shannon.Clark@cpuc.ca.gov>; DavidHuang@dwt.com; suzannetoller@dwt.com; dwtcpucdockets@dwt.com; lfitzpatrick@turn.org; telecom-service@turn.org; Telecom-service@turn.org; Rehman, Uzma <Uzma.Rehman@cpuc.ca.gov>
Cc: ALJ Support ID <alj_supportid@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Docket Office <ALJ_Docket_Office@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Process <alj_process@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: A.25-05-016: Ruling Denying Joint Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration With Prejudice and Adjusting Briefing Schedule

To the Service List in A.25-05-016:

On January 16, 2026, Joint Applicants filed a motion for reconsideration of the January 9, 2026 ruling granting Intervenors' motions to de-designate as confidential Joint Applicant's Response to TURN Data Request 4-4 and the portions of the December 16, 2025 Evidentiary Hearing Transcript. In their motion, Joint Applicants argue that the Response to TURN Data Request 4-4 and the corresponding portions of the December 16, 2025 transcript (lines 51:10-52:17) should be treated as confidential because the information constitutes a trade secret and the public interest weighs in favor of non-disclosure.

Joint Applicants' motion for reconsideration is denied with prejudice. This ruling is issued in accordance with Rule 11.1(g), which authorizes the assigned Administrative Law Judge to rule on a motion before responses or replies are filed.

First, Joint Applicants have failed to meet their burden to show that the information is a trade secret. "Merely stating that information was helpful or useful to another person in carrying out a specific activity, or that information of that type may save someone time, does not compel a factfinder to conclude that the particular information at issue was 'sufficiently valuable to afford an economic advantage over others.'" (*Yield Dynamics, Inc. v. TEA Systems Corp.*

(2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 547, 564-565 [citing Rest. 3d. Unfair Competition, § 39].) “The fact finder is entitled to expect evidence from which it can form some solid sense of how useful the information is, e.g., how much time, money or labor it would save, or at the least that these savings would be ‘more than trivial.’” (*Ibid.*) Here, Joint Applicants only state that the disclosure would “negatively impact [Aventiv’s] ability to solicit investments and lenders in the future,” and would put Aventiv at a “competitive disadvantage.” (Joint Applicant’s Response to Motion of The Utility Reform Network to De-Designate as Confidential Applicants’ Response to TURN Data Request 4-4 at 6.) Joint Applicants also say that disclosure could harm the named entities because the disclosure “could be used by their competitors to undercut future investment opportunities or by advocacy groups to discourage financial investment in the industry.” (*Ibid.*) These assertions are not sufficient to meet their burden.

Similarly, Joint Applicants have failed to meet their burden of demonstrating that the public interest weighs in favor of non-disclosure. Where an information submitter cites to Government Code 7922.00 as the legal authority for the Commission to withhold the document from public release, “then the information submitter must demonstrate with granular specificity on the facts of the particular information why the public interest served by not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record. A private economic interest is an inadequate interest to claim in lieu of a public interest.” (GO-66-D at 3.)

For these reasons, Joint Applicant’s motion for reconsideration is denied with prejudice.

Opening briefs are currently due to be filed January 23, 2026 and reply briefs are due February 6, 2026 pursuant to the Assigned Commissioner’s Scoping Memo and Ruling. To accommodate any delays resulting from my consideration of Joint Applicants’ motion, the briefing schedule in this proceeding is hereby adjusted as follows:

- Concurrent Opening Briefs shall be filed and served by January 27, 2026
- Concurrent Reply Briefs shall be filed and served by February 10, 2026

IT IS SO RULED.

THE DOCKET OFFICE SHALL FORMALLY FILE THIS RULING.

Shannon Clark (she/her)
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission
Shannon.clark@cpuc.ca.gov