



ALJ/MMV/cg7 10/06/2026

FILED

10/06/26

10:44 AM

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Case 26-07-020

Beverly J. Taylor,

Complainant

vs.

Pacific Bell d/b/a AT&T California
(U1001C),

Defendant.

(Complaint)
Case 26-07-020

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING
CONVERTING EXPEDITED COMPLAINT PROCEEDING
TO REGULAR COMPLAINT**

This ruling converts Case (C).26-07-020 from an Expedited Complaint Proceeding to a Regular Complaint Proceeding.

1. Background

On July 27, 2026, Beverly J. Taylor filed an expedited complaint (Complainant). Complainant alleges that Pacific Bell d/b/a AT&T California (AT&T California) reneged on its promise to restore services at her home and as a result she has been without landline service since August 2024. Complainant requests that AT&T California be ordered to restore her services, refund her for fax and copy expenses incurred, be assessed penalties for violating laws and regulations and credit her for wireline bill charges. On September 3, 2026,

Defendant AT&T filed its answer to the Complainant. Defendant denied the allegations made in the Complaint.

On August 20, 2026, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued a Ruling setting a hearing on the ECP for September 18, 2026, at 11:00 a.m. via Webex. The Complainant appeared, via video, at the hearing and was ready to proceed as ordered. Defendant was not prepared for the hearing, including not having video on and not having direct knowledge of the circumstances/issues in the complaint. The assigned ALJ had to end the hearing due to the Defendant's lack of preparedness. Defendant's failure to be prepared for the hearing suggests that Defendant does not take the Commission's regulatory authority and/or proceedings seriously.

Upon basic questioning by Assistant Chief ALJ W. Anthony Colbert, it became clear that Defendant's representative had no direct knowledge about the Complainant's allegations, any investigation surrounding Complainant's allegations, Complainant's history of service disruptions and any remediation and repair provided by AT&T California surrounding Complainant's allegations.

Engaging in illegal *ex parte* communications, another representative of the Defendant contacted the Chief Administrative Law Judge shortly after the September 18, 2026, initial hearing to complain about Assistant Chief ALJ Colbert being present at the hearing and questioning the individual appearing for the Defendant on why the representative did not have his camera on at the hearing. It appears that Defendant believes it can use its status and power to engage in one-sided private contact with Commission decision-makers without the opposing party present.

At the September 18, 2026, hearing, the assigned ALJ advised the parties that the ECP hearing would be postponed and that an Order to Show Cause

(OSC) hearing would be set. After careful consideration, and in the interest of administrative efficiency, this ALJ will convert this Expedited Complaint Proceeding to a Regular Complaint Proceeding without requiring Defendant to show cause on why sanctions should not be imposed against Defendant.

2. Conversion to Regular Complaint

It is in the public interest to convert the ECP to a Regular Complaint so that a transcribed record may be produced.

The Commission's regular complaint procedure, pursuant to Rule 4.1, has 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. Therefore, pursuant to Rule 4.6(g), this proceeding is converted from an ECP to a regular complaint.

3. Evidentiary Hearing on the Complaint

An evidentiary hearing will be scheduled to resolve the merits of this complaint. AT&T California provided its answer to the expedited complaint on September 3, 2026. AT&T California's September 3, 2026, answer is deemed responsive to this complaint. A ruling shall be issued noticing the evidentiary hearing on the complaint.

IT IS RULED that:

1. This Expedited Complaint Proceeding is converted to a Regular Complaint Proceeding.
2. The defendant's September 3, 2026, answer to Complainant's July 27, 2026, expedited complaint is deemed responsive to this complaint.
3. A ruling shall be issued noticing an evidentiary hearing on the Regular Complaint Proceeding.

Dated October 6, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ MARGERY L. MELVIN

Margery L. Melvin
Administrative Law Judge