ALJ/TM3/asf 11/2/2026

FILED
11/02/26
03:53 PM
A2401020

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of SFPP, L.P. (PLC-9) for Authority to Increase Rates for Transportation of Refined Petroleum Products.	Application 24-01-020
And Related Matters.	Application 23-01-016 Application 22-01-016 Application 21-01-015

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE'S RULING DENYING MOTION TO HOLD PROCEEDING IN ABEYANCE

This ruling denies the Motion to Hold Proceedings in Abeyance to Allow Further Settlement Discussions (Motion), filed jointly by SFPP, L.P. (SFPP), Phillips 66 Company, and PBF Holding Company LLC. The moving parties request that the above-captioned proceeding be suspended while the parties continue settlement discussions.

The Motion refers to related Application (A.) 26-05-022, in which the parties requested that the related application be held in abeyance pending issuance of an interim decision in this proceeding. That request was granted. The procedural posture of A.26-05-022, however, does not establish that this proceeding also should be held in abeyance. The interim decision anticipated here is the event on which further action in A.26-05-022 depends; suspending this proceeding could therefore delay progress in both matters rather than promote their orderly resolution.

The Commission encourages parties to explore settlement, and the parties may continue those discussions while this proceeding advances. The Motion does not demonstrate that the existing procedural schedule prevents meaningful negotiations or that suspending all activity is necessary to facilitate a settlement. Nor does it identify a final defined period for the requested abeyance, a specific procedural milestone that must occur before the proceeding may resume, or other safeguards against indefinite delay.

On balance, maintaining the present course best serves procedural efficiency and the timely development of the record. Continuing the proceeding does not foreclose settlement. On the present record, the potential benefits of an abeyance do not outweigh the delay and administrative uncertainty it would create.

Accordingly, the Motion to Hold Proceedings in Abeyance to Allow Further Settlement Discussions is denied. The parties remain free to continue settlement discussions without suspending this proceeding.

IT IS SO RULED

Dated November 2, 2026, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ THERESA MOORE
Theresa Moore
Administrative Law Judge