



ALJ/KWZ/asf 8/13/2026

FILED

08/13/26

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

03:17 PM

C2606024

Delia Lovell,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Gas Company
(U409G).

Defendant.

Case 26-06-024

NOT CONSOLIDATED

Delia Lovell,

Complainant,

vs.

Southern California Edison Company
(U338E).

Defendant.

Case 26-07-006

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING CONVERTING TO REGULAR
COMPLAINT AND PERMITTING REILING OF ANSWER TO COMPLAINT 26-
06-024**

This ruling converts Case (C.) 26-06-024 from an expedited to a regular complaint and permits the Answer to C.26-06-024 to be refiled by August 26, 2026.

1. Background

On June 23, 2026, Delia Lovell (Complainant) filed C. 26-06-024 as an expedited complaint, alleging that Southern Gas Company (SoCalGas) issued fraudulent bills, illegally disconnected service, and failed to produce accurate billing records, causing substantial harm. In C. 26-06-024, Complainant disputes an outstanding bill amount of \$5,381.81 as of September 2025 and seeks relief in the amount of \$11,948.23.

On July 7, 2026, Complainant filed C. 26-07-006 a regular complaint with similar allegations against Southern California Edison (SCE). In C.26-07-006, Complainant disputes an outstanding bill amount of \$14,241.63 as of April 23, 2026 and seeks relief in the amount of \$1.343 million.

In both cases, Complainant requests that SoCalGas and SCE restore service, produce billing records, reflect both accounts as paid in full and in good standing, and provide the relief requested.

As directed, on August 4, 2026, SoCalGas filed its Answer to C.26-06-024. The SCE Answer to C.26-07-006 is due to be filed on August 16, 2026. In a ruling issued August 10, 2026, the assigned Administrative Law Judge set a prehearing conference in both matters for August 31, 2026, commencing at 2:00 p.m., remotely via the Webex platform.

2. Conversion to Regular Complaint

C. 26-06-024 against SoCalGas is noticed as an Expedited Complaint Proceeding (ECP), while C.26-07-006 against SCE is noticed as a regular

complaint, because the amount at issue in C.26-07-006 exceeds the jurisdictional limit of \$12,500 and cannot be considered as an ECP.¹ Complainant asserts:

The two complaints are independent in their legal bases but are factually connected: both utilities simultaneously subjected the same permanently disabled homeowner to fraudulent billing, illegal disconnect, and systematic denial of record – a coordinated pattern causing compounded and aggravated harm.”²

The cases are factually connected. The disputes and allegations regard service to the same customer at the same address. For procedural efficiency, we shall consider the cases together. Pursuant to California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules) Rule 4.6(g), it is in the public’s interest to convert the matter to a regular complaint in order to consider the cases together.

The Commission’s regular complaint procedure follows the formal rules for proceedings, uses a court reporter to create a comprehensive written record, permits the consideration of a wide range of possible remedies, and provides for the participation of attorneys. I remind parties to familiarize themselves with the Commission Rules and adhere to formal filing requirements. The Commission offers assistance to self-represented litigants through the Public Advisor’s Office.

3. Permission for SoCalGas to Refile Answer by August 27, 2026

SoCalGas filed its Answer to C.26-06-024 before the conversion of C.26-06-024 from an ECP to regular complaint. To preserve due process, SoCalGas may

¹ Pursuant to California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule) Rule 4.6(a), an ECP applies to complaints against utilities where the amount of money claimed does not exceed the jurisdiction limit of small claims court. Through incorporation of the California Code of Civil Procedure Section 116.221, the amount is not to exceed \$12,500.

² Lovell v. Southern California Gas Company C.26-06-024 at Page 3.

refile its Answer to C.26-06-024 under the rules for regular complaints on or before August 26, 2026.

4. Instructions for Prehearing Conference

The prehearing conference shall be held virtually via Webex. Parties shall be prepared to have video enabled for the PHC. If a party is unable to enable video for the prehearing conference, they must request permission from the assigned Administrative Law Judge in advance of the prehearing conference to appear otherwise.

IT IS RULED that:

1. Case 26-06-024 is converted from an Expedited Complaint Proceeding to a regular complaint.
2. Southern California Gas Company may file an Answer to the complaint in Case 26-06-024 on or before August 26, 2026.
3. Parties must appear at the remote prehearing conference scheduled for August 31, 2026 with video enabled.

Dated August 13, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ CAMILLE WATTS-ZAGHA

Camille Watts-Zagha
Administrative Law Judge