

ALJ/CS8/vj4 02/17/2026



FILED

02/17/26

01:14 PM

A2505001

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California
Gas Company (U 904 G) for Approval
of the Branch Offices Closure Proposal

Application 25-05-001

**EMAIL RULING DENYING THE UTILITIES MOTION FOR LEAVE TO
SUPPLEMENT JOINT TESTIMONY**

Dated February 17, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ CAROLYN SISTO

Carolyn Sisto
Administrative Law Judge

From: Sisto, Carolyn <Carolyn.Sisto@cpuc.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 17, 2026 11:46 AM
To: IBautista@SoCalGas.com; JMass@RSGlabor.com; Rucker, Catherine <Catherine.Rucker@cpuc.ca.gov>; Luke@UtilityAdvocates.org; AFall@turn.org; CentralFiles@SempraUtilities.com; Sisto, Carolyn <Carolyn.Sisto@cpuc.ca.gov>; JMock@SoCalGas.com; KHuliganga@SoCalGas.com; PDeang@SoCalGas.com; bpaul@socalgas.com; Jones, Caleb <Caleb.Jones@cpuc.ca.gov>; Berhane, Gelila <Gelila.Berhane@cpuc.ca.gov>; Stout, Jesse <Jesse.Stout@cpuc.ca.gov>; Hunter, Stacey <stacey.hunter@cpuc.ca.gov>; James@UtilityAdvocates.org; dramirez.calstrat@gmail.com
Cc: ALJ Support ID <alj_supportid@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Process <alj_process@cpuc.ca.gov>; ALJ Docket Office <ALJ_Docket_Office@cpuc.ca.gov>
Subject: A.25-05-001: Email Ruling Denying the Utilities Motion for Leave to Supplement Joint Testimony

To the Service List of A.25-05-001:

This email ruling denies the request of The Utility Workers of America, Local 132, and the International Chemical Workers Union Council, Locals 335, 478, and 995C (the Unions) for leave to supplement their joint direct testimony in Application (A.)25-05-001.

On February 11, 2026, I provided the schedule for the remainder of this proceeding. On the same date, the Unions filed a Joint Motion to supplement their provided testimony.

The Unions argued they were awaiting a response to their February 9, 2026, data request seeking more information from Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas), and provided that as rationale for requesting additional time to supplement their testimony.

On February 13, 2026, SoCalGas filed its opposition to the Unions' February 11, 2026, Motion, arguing that any additional evidence the Unions would submit in their supplemental testimony would solely reflect information the utility is expected to provide in response to the Unions' February 9, 2026, data request.

I agree. Any information the parties to this proceeding wish to be considered by the Commission may be incorporated into the record of this proceeding if the

document(s) are served, identified via a formal motion, and adopted as evidence by the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ).

The Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule) 13.6 provides guidance for the Commission's review of the admission or exclusion of evidence, and states no evidence shall be excluded from consideration, to ensure all parties and the public may meaningfully participate in every Commission Proceeding.

Pursuant to Rule 12.3, parties may present evidence and testimony on contested issues in any proceeding through settlement filings or documents filed to support their argument(s) during evidentiary hearing in contested proceedings. Further, Rule 12.7 notes that exhibits may be sponsored by two or more parties jointly.

IT IS RULED:

1. The Unions' Joint Motion dated February 11, 2026, to supplement their joint testimony is denied.
2. Should the Unions seek to admit additional or supplemental evidence, the Unions may do so by proposing a new exhibit or a motion to admit evidence separate from their direct testimony.
3. The assigned ALJ will consider whether to admit the Unions' motions of additional or supplemental evidence upon any separate filing(s) of new document(s).
4. The procedural schedule established in the February 11, 2026, ALJ ruling is not modified in this ruling.

The Docket Office shall formally file this email ruling.

Carrie Sisto
Administrative Law Judge
California Public Utilities Commission