



ALJ/VUK/abb 5/1/2026

**FILED**

05/01/26

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

03:17 PM

C2511008

Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell d/b/a AT&T California and  
AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation  
Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility,

Defendants.

(ECP)

Case 25-11-008

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DENYING  
COMPLAINANT'S APRIL 13, 2026, MOTION**

This ruling denies the *Motion Requesting Permission for Acceptance of Petition for Redetermination* filed on April 13, 2026, by Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez (Complainant).

A hearing was held on January 23, 2026, for this proceeding. Following the hearing, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) directed AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility (AT&T or Defendant) to provide supplemental information to determine the outstanding issue in the proceeding; namely, whether Defendant charged Complainant for services not rendered, and if so by what amount. The proceeding record was closed upon receipt of Defendant's April 1, 2026, response.

Since the initial hearing, Complainant has made several attempts to tender documents for filing without prior direction, and without having sought and

obtained permission to file those documents. By ruling dated April 7, 2026, the assigned ALJ confirmed the proceeding record was closed and instructed the parties that documents may not be filed in this proceeding without her prior approval.

On April 13, 2026, Complainant filed a document titled *Motion Requesting Permission for Acceptance of Petition for Redetermination*. The title of the motion is erroneous because a determination/outcome of the proceeding has not been reached. Aside from the deficient title, the motion seeks to introduce additional information into the record of the proceeding. As indicated, *supra*, the record in this proceeding is closed. Our standard for determining whether to grant the instant motion is whether the information contained therein has the potential to be more probative than not to our ultimate adjudication of the proceeding. The information contained in Complainant's April 13, 2026, motion is not probative to the issue that must be determined in this proceeding.

The motion is denied.

**IT IS SO RULED.**

Dated May 1, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

          /s/ VALERIE U. KAO            
Valerie U. Kao  
Administrative Law Judge