



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

FILED

01/23/26

04:59 PM

C2601014

Justin Troutman,

Complainant,

(ECP)

vs.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39E),

Defendant.

Expedited Complaint
(Rule 4.6)

COMPLAINANT	DEFENDANT
Justin Troutman 2311 Ivy Hill Way, Apt 711 San Ramon CA 94582 T: 828-215-1969 Email: justin.troutman@gmail.com	Pacific Gas and Electric Company (U39E) Attn: Cliff Gleicher, Managing Counsel 300 Lakeside Drive Oakland CA 94612 T1: 415-971-2678 E-mail 1: Cliff.Gleicher@pge.com E-mail 2: pgetariffs@pge.com

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(A) Justin Troutman

COMPLAINANT(S)

vs.

(B) Pacific Gas & Electric Company
Utility U-Number: U39E

DEFENDANT(S)

(Include Utility "U-Number," if known)

(for Commission use only)

(C)
Have you tried to resolve this matter informally with the Commission's Consumer Affairs staff?
☒ YES ☐ NO

Has staff responded to your complaint?
☒ YES ☐ NO

Did you appeal to the Consumer Affairs Manager?
☒ YES ☐ NO

Do you have money on deposit with the Commission?
☐ YES ☒ NO
Amount \$ _____

Is your service now disconnected?
☐ YES ☒ NO

COMPLAINT

(D)
The complaint of (Provide name, address and phone number for each complainant)

Name of Complainant(s)	Address	Daytime Phone Number
Justin Troutman	2311 Ivy Hill Way Apt 711	(828) 215-1969
	San Ramon, CA 94582	

respectfully shows that:

(E)
Defendant(s) (Provide name, address and phone number for each defendant)

Name of Defendant(s)	Address	Daytime Phone Number
Pacific Gas & Electric Company	77 Beale Street	(415) 973-7000
	San Francisco, CA 94105	

(F)

Explain fully and clearly the details of your complaint. (Attach additional pages if necessary and any supporting documentation)

See attached document "Full Complaint.pdf" to verify that this field contains the full text below:

I am a residential customer of Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E"), Account No. 4498283684-1, residing at the address listed above. I am currently facing a past-due balance of approximately \$11,099.50 and have received a 15-day notice of service disconnection, despite ongoing payments and sustained good-faith efforts to maintain service and resolve the matter informally.

Over the past several months, I have repeatedly attempted to work directly with PG&E to establish a sustainable payment arrangement that would cover both current monthly usage and arrearages. These attempts resulted in inconsistent information, limited flexibility, and payment arrangements that did not adequately reflect my communicated ability to pay.

There were periods during which I was unable to maintain payments due to employment disruption and financial hardship, which I communicated to PG&E at the time. Once my circumstances stabilized, I resumed payments and sought to establish a sustainable arrangement rather than allow further delinquency.

PG&E placed me on a payment plan requiring \$1,000 per month toward arrears in addition to current monthly charges. I made the first \$1,000 arrears payment and also paid my current monthly bill of \$638.39. I agreed to the most recent payment arrangement in order to avoid immediate disconnection, while communicating at the time

(G) Scoping Memo Information (Rule 4.2[a])

(1) The proposed category for the Complaint is (check one):

- ☒ adjudicatory (most complaints are adjudicatory unless they challenge the reasonableness of rates)
☐ ratesetting (check this box if your complaint challenges the reasonableness of rates pursuant to Rule 4.1(b))

(2) Are hearings needed (are there facts in dispute)? ☐ YES ☒ NO

(3) ☐ Regular Complaint ☒ Expedited Complaint (Rule 4.6)

(4) The issues to be considered are

(Example: The utility should refund the overbilled amount of \$78.00):

The utility should agree to a sustainable payment arrangement, ideally 24 months, of no more than \$1100 per month to accommodate current charges plus some towards arrears.

See attached file (Additional Considerations.pdf) for additional comments.

(5) The proposed schedule for resolving the complaint within 12 months (if categorized as adjudicatory) or 18 months (if categorized as ratesetting) is as follows:

Prehearing Conference: Approximately 30 to 40 days from the date of filing of the Complaint.

Hearing: Approximately 50 to 70 days from the date of filing of the Complaint.

Prehearing Conference (Example: 6/1/09): 2/3/26

Hearing (Example: 7/1/09): 2/10/26

Explain here if you propose a schedule different from the above guidelines.

Because this is time sensitive and likely facing a 48-hour notice as of 1/24/26, this should be expedited as soon as possible, or a stoppage on any disconnection be placed while this is being reviewed and considered.

(H)

Wherefore, complainant(s) request(s) an order: State clearly the exact relief desired. (Attach additional pages if necessary)

The utility should agree to a sustainable payment arrangement, ideally 24 months, of no more than \$1100 per month to accommodate current charges plus some towards arrears. Ideally, I would be reconsidered for AMP as I was formally enrolled and made the entire year's worth of payments in full and on time. This would provide immense relief and get us back on track, and make us eligible for budget billing.

(I)

OPTIONAL: I/we would like to receive the answer and other filings of the defendant(s) and information and notices from the Commission by electronic mail (e-mail). My/our e-mail address(es) is/are:

justin.troutman@gmail.com

(J)

Dated San Ramon, California, this 23 day of January, 2026
(City) (date) (month) (year)

Justin Troutman

Signature of each complainant

(MUST ALSO SIGN VERIFICATION AND PRIVACY NOTICE)

(K)

REPRESENTATIVE'S INFORMATION:

Provide name, address, telephone number, e-mail address (if consents to notifications by e-mail), and signature of representative, if any.

Name of Representative: _____

Address: _____

Telephone Number: _____

E-mail: _____

Signature: _____

VERIFICATION
(For Individual or Partnerships)

I am (one of) the complainant(s) in the above-entitled matter; the statements in the foregoing document are true of my knowledge, except as to matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

(L)

Executed on 1/23/26, at San Ramon, California
(date) (City)

Justin Troutman 
(Complainant Signature)

VERIFICATION
(For a Corporation)

I am an officer of the complaining corporation herein, and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf. The statements in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge, except as to the matters which are therein stated on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

(M)

Executed on _____, at _____, California
(date) (City)

Signature of Officer

Title

(N) NUMBER OF COPIES NEEDED FOR FILING:

If you are filing your formal complaint on paper, then submit one (1) original, six (6) copies, plus one (1) copy for each named defendant. For example, if your formal complaint has one (1) defendant, then you must submit a total of eight (8) copies.

If you are filing your formal complaint electronically (visit <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/efiling> for additional details), then you are not required to mail paper copies.

(O) Mail paper copies to: California Public Utilities Commission
Attn: Docket Office
505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2001
San Francisco, CA 94102

PRIVACY NOTICE

This message is to inform you that the Docket Office of the California Public Utilities Commission (“CPUC”) intends to file the above-referenced Formal Complaint electronically instead of in paper form as it was submitted.

Please Note: Whether or not your Formal Complaint is filed in paper form or electronically, Formal Complaints filed with the CPUC become a **public record** and may be posted on the CPUC’s website. Therefore, any information you provide in the Formal Complaint, including, but not limited to, your name, address, city, state, zip code, telephone number, E-mail address and the facts of your case may be available online for later public viewing.

Having been so advised, the Undersigned hereby consents to the filing of the referenced complaint.



Signature

1/23/26

Date

Justin Troutman

Print your name

- Whether PG&E failed to offer or maintain a reasonable and sustainable payment arrangement consistent with Electric Rule 17
- Whether PG&E unreasonably refused to modify payment timing after timely notice of changed circumstances
- Whether continued disconnection actions were appropriate under Electric Rule 11 given ongoing payments
- Whether PG&E reasonably administered payment-smoothing and energy-efficiency options
- Whether PG&E's conduct was just and reasonable under Public Utilities Code § 451

I am a residential customer of Pacific Gas and Electric Company ("PG&E"), Account No. 4498283684-1, residing at the address listed above. I am currently facing a past-due balance of approximately \$11,099.50 and have received a 15-day notice of service disconnection, despite ongoing payments and sustained good-faith efforts to maintain service and resolve the matter informally.

Over the past several months, I have repeatedly attempted to work directly with PG&E to establish a sustainable payment arrangement that would cover both current monthly usage and arrearages. These attempts resulted in inconsistent information, limited flexibility, and payment arrangements that did not adequately reflect my communicated ability to pay.

There were periods during which I was unable to maintain payments due to employment disruption and financial hardship, which I communicated to PG&E at the time. Once my circumstances stabilized, I resumed payments and sought to establish a sustainable arrangement rather than allow further delinquency.

PG&E placed me on a payment plan requiring \$1,000 per month toward arrears in addition to current monthly charges. I made the first \$1,000 arrears payment and also paid my current monthly bill of \$638.39. I agreed to the most recent payment arrangement in order to avoid immediate disconnection, while communicating at the time that the required payment amounts and timing might not be sustainable.

Subsequently, PG&E required an additional \$2,600 lump-sum payment earlier than originally discussed. When I promptly notified PG&E that this payment could not be made at that time due to lower-than-expected proceeds from company equity following a corporate acquisition and an unexpected medical expense, I requested that the payment be moved later within the payment plan rather than eliminated. PG&E denied this request without offering a reasonable alternative or reassessing the structure of the arrangement.

During the COVID-19 period, I successfully completed PG&E's Arrearage Management Plan (AMP), making all required payments on time and in full. This history demonstrates my willingness and ability to comply with structured payment arrangements when they are realistic and sustainable.

I am now steadily employed and able to pay **\$1,100 per month** toward my account, structured in installments, covering current usage plus a meaningful reduction of arrears. This amount reflects a sustainable level that I can maintain consistently and exceeds my average monthly usage.

While I previously indicated that a higher monthly payment might be possible, I am requesting approval of a more conservative payment amount to ensure sustainability and avoid the need for future modification.

PG&E's refusal to modify the timing or structure of required payments after I promptly communicated changed financial circumstances, while I continued to make payments, raises concerns under **PG&E Electric Rule 17**, which governs payment arrangements and emphasizes reasonableness, sustainability, and consideration of a customer's ability to pay.

PG&E's continuation of disconnection actions while I was actively making payments and seeking a reasonable restructuring further raises concerns under **PG&E Electric Rule 11**, which treats service discontinuance as a measure of last resort where reasonable alternatives exist and the customer is engaged in resolving the arrearage.

I have also requested enrollment in PG&E's Balanced Payment Plan and a home energy audit due to suspected HVAC inefficiency contributing to unusually high usage. Pending investigation of these usage drivers, continued reliance on current billing levels without review raises concerns consistent with the principles reflected in **PG&E Electric Rule 18**.

Taken together, PG&E's actions raise broader concerns under **Public Utilities Code § 451**, which requires that utility practices be just and reasonable. The administration of payment arrangements and disconnection actions in this instance warrants Commission review to ensure compliance with this standard.

I do not qualify for poverty-based assistance programs. However, I am proposing a payment arrangement that covers current charges plus substantial arrears, preserves service for my household, and aligns with CPUC policy favoring service continuity where customers are paying and engaging in good faith.