



July 17, 2026

FILED

TO PARTIES OF RECORD IN CASE 25-06-004:

07/17/26

09:36 AM

This proceeding was filed on June 6, 2025, and is assigned to Commissioner Houck and Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Suman Mathews. This is the decision of the Presiding Officer, ALJ Mathews. C2506004

Any party to this adjudicatory proceeding may file and serve an Appeal of the Presiding Officer's Decision within 30 days of the date of issuance (*i.e.*, the date of mailing) of this decision. In addition, any Commissioner may request review of the Presiding Officer's Decision by filing and serving a Request for Review within 30 days of the date of issuance.

Appeals and Requests for Review must set forth specifically the grounds on which the appellant or requestor believes the Presiding Officer's Decision to be unlawful or erroneous. The purpose of an Appeal or Request for Review is to alert the Commission to a potential error, so that the error may be corrected expeditiously by the Commission. Vague assertions as to the record or the law, without citation, may be accorded little weight.

Appeals and Requests for Review must be served on all parties and accompanied by a certificate of service. Any party may file and serve a Response to an Appeal or Request for Review no later than 15 days after the date the Appeal or Request for Review was filed. In cases of multiple Appeals or Requests for Review, the Response may be to all such filings and may be filed 15 days after the last such Appeal or Request for Review was filed. Replies to Responses are not permitted. (*See*, generally, Rule 14.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure at www.cpuc.ca.gov.)

If no Appeal or Request for Review is filed within 30 days of the date of issuance of the Presiding Officer's Decision, the decision shall become the decision of the Commission. In this event, the Commission will designate a decision number and advise the parties by letter that the Presiding Officer's Decision has become the Commission's decision.

/s/ W. ANTHONY COLBERT for

Michelle Cooke

Chief Administrative Law Judge

MLC: hma/smt

Attachment

Decision **PRESIDING OFFICER'S DECISION OF ALJ MATHEWS**
(Mailed 7/17/2026)

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Richard Siaw,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
(U39E),

Defendant.

Case 25-06-004

**PRESIDING OFFICER'S DECISION DISMISSING
THE COMPLAINT OF RICHARD SIAW**

Summary

This decision grants the joint motion of Richard Siaw and Pacific Gas and Electric Company to dismiss the complaint in Case 25-06-004 with prejudice.

The proceeding is closed.

1. Procedural and Factual Background

On June 6, 2025, Richard Siaw (Mr. Siaw or Complainant) filed Case (C.) 25-06-004 (Complaint) against Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or Defendant) claiming that PG&E must lower or adjust the amount it charged Claimant for his alleged unauthorized electric use (or energy consumed but not billed) from March 2017 through April 2019.

PG&E filed its answer to the Complaint on July 17, 2025 (Answer). In the Answer, PG&E denied each and every material allegation made in the Complaint except as follows:

1. PG&E admits the electric service was cut at the Siaw property on March 7, 2020, at the electric distribution pole for safety due to arcing and smoke;
2. PG&E admits discovering an unauthorized electric meter bypass on March 7, 2020, which caused arcing of the electric service at the Siaw Property;
3. PG&E admits a PG&E Investigator spoke with Mr. Siaw about what he needed to do for restoration of electric service, that Mr. Siaw completed those steps, and that PG&E restored electric service shortly thereafter; and
4. PG&E admits sending Mr. Siaw a bill for \$44,206.53 for estimated energy consumed and unregistered at the Siaw Property for 2017 – 2019.

In addition, PG&E set forth the following affirmative defenses:

1. The Complaint fails to state a cause of action upon which relief can be granted; and
2. PG&E affirmatively alleges that it has complied with all applicable tariffs.

A telephonic prehearing conference (PHC) was held on September 29, 2025, to determine issues of law and fact, determine the need for hearing, set the schedule for resolving the matter, and address other matters as necessary. During the PHC, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) informed Mr. Siaw and PG&E that there were several contested, potentially material issues of fact.

On December 30, 2025, the Assigned Commissioner issued her Scoping Memo and Ruling (Scoping Memo) setting forth the issues to be determined or

otherwise considered in the matter. The Scoping Memo also set a schedule for the proceeding, with an Evidentiary Hearing scheduled for February 27, 2026.

On February 2, 2026, Mr. Siaw and PG&E filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss Complaint With Prejudice, indicating that after confidential negotiations, they have agreed to settle, and fully and completely dispose of any and all claims, potential claims, complaints, demands and causes of action related to the complaint.

1.1. Submission Date

This matter was submitted on December 30, 2025, upon issuance of the Scoping Memo.

2. Jurisdiction and Burden of Proof

The Commission has jurisdiction over the activities of public utilities.¹ PG&E provides electric and gas services. PG&E is a utility subject to the Commission's jurisdiction, control and regulation.

As Complainant, Mr. Siaw bears the burden of proof to show PG&E violated a rule, order, law, or tariff approved by the Commission.² As Complainant, Mr. Siaw must meet the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence.

3. Discussion

In the Scoping Memo, the assigned ALJ set February 27, 2026 as the date for the Evidentiary Hearing in this matter. However, on February 2, 2026, Mr.

¹ Pub. Util. Code § 216(a).

² In *Complaint of Service-All-Tech, Inc. v. PT&T Co.* (Cal. PUC, 1977) 83 CPUC 135, Decision (D.) No. 88223 (complaint relating to the disconnection of telephone service where the court found that complainant had the burden of proof and that complainant's "failure to present any evidence present[ed] a total lack of meeting that burden"); see also *Pacific Bell Telephone Company, d/b/a AT&T California vs. Fones4All Corporation* (Cal. PUC, 2008) D.08-04-043, 2008 Cal. PUC LEXIS 132.

Siaw and PG&E filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss Complaint, indicating that after confidential negotiations, they have agreed to settle, and fully and completely dispose of any and all claims, potential claims, complaints, demands and causes of action related to the Complaint and jointly seeking Commission's dismissal of the complaint with prejudice.

Informal resolution of the Complaint serves the public interest by resolving competing concerns in a collaborative and cooperative manner. By reaching a settlement agreement, the parties have also avoided the costs of extended litigation. Therefore, the Joint Motion to Dismiss the Complaint is granted.

4. Category of Proceeding

In the June 17, 2025 Instructions to Answer Notice to Defendant, this matter was categorized as adjudicatory.

5. Assignment of Proceeding

Darcie L. Houck is the assigned Commissioner and Suman Mathews is the assigned Administrative Law Judge and Presiding Officer in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. Mr. Siaw filed this Complaint on June 6, 2025.
2. PG&E filed its Answer to the Complaint on July 17, 2025.
3. On February 2, 2026, Mr. Siaw and PG&E filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss the Complaint With Prejudice.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Joint Motion to Dismiss the Complaint with Prejudice should be granted.
2. Case 25-06-004 should be dismissed with prejudice.
3. Case 25-06-004 should be closed.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Joint Motion to Dismiss the Complaint With Prejudice is granted.
2. Case 25-06-004 is dismissed with prejudice.
3. Case 25-06-004 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated _____, at San Francisco, California.