FILED
10/30/26
04:59 PM
C2511008

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez, Complainant, v. Pacific Bell d/b/a AT&T California (U1001C) and AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility (U3021C), Defendants.	Case C.25-11-008 (ECP)

COMPLAINANT'S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A LIMITED EVIDENTIARY RESPONSE, FOR A RESPONSE SCHEDULE, AND TO DEFER CLOSURE PENDING COMPLIANCE REVIEW

Prepared October 29, 2026

I. PRIOR APPROVAL AND RELIEF SOUGHT

1. Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez, self-represented Complainant, requests prior approval to file this motion and a separately prepared, limited evidentiary response in the compliance phase of Case C.25-11-008. This proposed motion is supplied for permission review. It is not represented as an accepted filing or as evidence already admitted.

2. The April 7, 2026 ruling, at page 2, requires the assigned Administrative Law Judge's prior approval before documents may be filed. Complainant acknowledges that requirement. On October 16, Complainant requested prior approval; on October 19, Administrative Law Judge Valerie U. Kao directed that the request be raised at the October 27 prehearing conference. Technical difficulties prevented Complainant from remaining connected and addressing that request.

3. Complainant asks for a clear written schedule for AT&T's compliance declaration and supporting billing records, a reasonable opportunity to respond after receiving the complete showing, and consideration of that response before closure. Complainant proposes 15 days after service of the complete showing, subject to the Administrative Law Judge's direction. This proposed period is a request, not an existing deadline or automatic extension.

II. THE LIMITED COMPLIANCE PROCEEDING

4. D.26-07-009, adopted July 2 and issued July 10, 2026, ordered a $720.60 reduction of the outstanding account balance. It granted relief in part, denied the remaining claims, and closed the original complaint. The decision did not find a violation of an applicable Commission rule, law, tariff, or statute on the original record. (D.26-07-009, pp. 1, 5-6, 9.)

5. The September 16, 2026 Order to Show Cause reopened the case to address compliance with that decision and whether sanctions are warranted. Complainant requests findings within that scope. Historical billing and collection events are offered as context and potential means of testing the compliance accounting; permission is requested before introducing them or seeking any broader inquiry. (Sept. 16 ruling, pp. 1-3.)

III. HOW THE ACCOUNT DISPUTE DEVELOPED

6. Service began in May 2024. The dispute developed through returned payment entries, later payments, recurring and other charges, suspensions, adjustments, cancellation, and collection referrals. Complainant seeks a transaction-by-transaction reconciliation so that a payment receipt, a posted credit, a reversal, and an actual bank debit are not treated as interchangeable.

7. A February 15, 2025 receipt records a $569.73 payment submitted by bank draft. The available account-history screenshot also shows a later reversal entry for that amount. The receipt establishes submission; bank settlement records and the reversal reason are needed to determine whether AT&T properly reversed the payment. The payment alone would not necessarily eliminate charges added in a later billing cycle.

8. Four later payments dated April 11, 13, 17, and 19, 2025 total $432.00. The independently supplied May 3, 2025 bill expressly credits all four. Complainant does not present those payments as missing. The proposed reconciliation will separately identify any additional payment supported by a settled bank debit that has no corresponding credit or has an unexplained reversal.

9. The May through August 2025 bills show continuing balances, new charges, and adjustments. Complainant challenges the authorization or treatment of particular charges where supported, rather than treating every new charge or repeated dollar amount as a duplicate. The private working chronology identifies the relevant bill, line item, offsetting credit, and remaining question. It is not attached to this proposed public motion because parts derive from protected account productions.

10. AT&T's October 3, 2025 letter states that service was suspended July 18, cancelled August 29, and a $5,132.56 balance assigned to Adam Agency on October 2. The original complaint followed in November 2025. These earlier matters were addressed in the original proceeding and are not automatically reopened by the present request.

A. A material inconsistency in the later compliance correspondence

11. AT&T's August 25, 2026 response states a balance of $5,132.56. Its August 31 follow-up says the $720.60 credit posted July 14 and appears on the August 3, 2026 bill, leaving $4,411.96. The difference is exactly $720.60. The first letter postdates the asserted posting date but quotes the unreduced balance. This requires a dated ledger and explanation; the letters alone do not establish that the credit was never posted.

IV. COLLECTIONS, ALLEGED RECORD ALTERATIONS, AND CREDIT

12. A Credence Resource Management notice dated March 5, 2026 seeks $5,132.56. In an April 10 email, AT&T's Office of the President stated that the account had been placed on hold in December 2025, was inadvertently assigned to an outside collection agency around March 3, 2026, and was recalled. AT&T said the balance would remain on hold during review, collection could resume when the dispute process ended, communications should cease within approximately five to seven business days, and the matter had not been reported to credit bureaus.

13. That acknowledgment supports scrutiny of AT&T's collection controls, but predates D.26-07-009 and does not itself prove a later violation of that decision. Complainant reports a third collection episode. Its agency, notice date, referral date, amount, and relationship to the post-credit balance must be documented. Receipt in October of a notice dated March would not by itself establish a new October referral.

14. Complainant reports harm to credit and financial stability. AT&T's April 10 denial of bureau reporting must be tested against actual bureau records, if obtained. The present materials do not establish a specific AT&T derogatory tradeline, a score change caused by AT&T, or a quantified resulting loss. Complainant requests permission to supply relevant, authenticated records and does not ask that those facts be presumed.

15. Complainant also disputes the reliability of certain invoices and the treatment of payments, and believes records or terms may have been changed. These are allegations requiring comparison of original versions, transaction dates, regeneration dates, posting logs, and bank records. The requested finding is an explanation of material discrepancies, not a presumption of falsification based solely on a changing balance or a different page count.

16. The June 3, 2025 invoice includes notice of terms updated effective May 14, 2025, describing International Day Pass treatment. That notice demonstrates an announced update, but does not identify a change to the provision governing charges during suspension or show a retroactive change intended to justify this account. The proposed evidence request would obtain the specific versions AT&T relied on, their effective dates, and applicable notice and assent records.

V. OCTOBER 27 ACCESS DIFFICULTIES AND THE REQUEST TO RESPOND

17. Complainant initially joined the October 27, 2026 conference but experienced significant audio problems. After leaving to try to resolve them, Complainant attempted to reconnect and could not regain access. Complainant cannot determine whether the cause was the internet connection, WebEx, or another technical problem. The interruption was not intended to abandon the complaint or waive participation.

18. At 11:10 a.m. Pacific Time that day, Complainant emailed the assigned Administrative Law Judge, reported the audio and reentry difficulties, affirmed the wish to participate, and requested procedural instructions and Spanish interpretation. Complainant acknowledges the Administrative Law Judge's efforts to assist: an 11:06 email announced a pause until 11:15; an 11:13 email resent WebEx information; and an 11:19 email supplied telephone access as the conference resumed. Complainant nevertheless did not regain access.

19. The transcript records the interruption and outreach and identifies the issues as compliance with D.26-07-009 and, if appropriate, sanctions. AT&T proposed a declaration within two weeks in lieu of an evidentiary hearing and sought closure. Counsel stated that the credit was issued July 14 and reflected on an August 3 bill. (Reporter's Transcript, Oct. 27, 2026, vol. 2, pp. 8-10, 12.)

20. Counsel's proposed timing is not treated here as an order establishing Complainant's response deadline. Complainant requests written direction concerning the operative schedule and any intervening orders. A focused documentary response could identify genuinely disputed compliance facts before the Commission decides whether a further hearing is necessary.

21. Complainant proposes to submit a short statement with numbered paragraphs and a source index, distinguishing personal knowledge, authenticated original records, AT&T's assertions, calculations, and matters still requiring proof. Historical material would be included only as authorized and with an explanation of its relevance to compliance. No settlement offer is relied on as an admission of liability.

VI. TARGETED RECORDS AND PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL

22. Complainant requests that AT&T's declaration include, or identify and produce under an appropriate protective procedure, the following records to the extent relevant to the compliance determination:

(a) The complete August 3, 2026 invoice and account ledger showing the $720.60 credit, its transaction identifier, effective date, posting date, allocation, and resulting balance. The August 3, 2025 bill is a different document and cannot establish the claimed 2026 posting.

(b) An explanation of the unreduced balance in the August 25 letter and its reconciliation with the August 31 letter, including what balance was supplied to any collection agent after the ordered adjustment.

(c) Collection placement, hold, recall, re-placement, and balance-update records identifying each agency and relevant date; whether any collection activity after the decision sought an amount inconsistent with the ordered reduction; and any consumer-reporting instructions or corrections relevant to compliance.

(d) For any specifically disputed payment permitted within scope, the payment identifier, amount, receipt and posting dates, application, reversal date and reason, and any corresponding return or refund record. This request does not assume that every payment receipt represents settled funds.

(e) For any material invoice-version discrepancy the Administrative Law Judge permits Complainant to raise, the original statement and any regenerated version, generation dates, underlying ledger entries, and a written explanation of the difference.

(f) If AT&T relies on a contractual provision in its compliance showing, the actual version relied on, its effective date, relevant change notices, and the basis for its application to the dates at issue.

23. Ordering Paragraphs 1-3 of D.26-07-009 protect specified productions. Complainant requests instructions for citing or lodging protected material and does not attach it to this proposed public motion. A separate private working chronology is for preparation only. Any public version, confidential submission, service restriction, or further evidence will follow an express ruling; an unmarked copy is not assumed to remove an existing protection.

VII. AUTHORITY, SANCTIONS, AND REQUESTED ORDER

24. Rule 11.1 provides the motion procedure; Rule 13.11 allows the assigned Administrative Law Judge to direct further evidence. The case-specific prior-approval ruling governs this tender. If a response requires reopening a submitted compliance record, Complainant requests direction concerning Rule 13.15(b) and the particular additional proof required. This motion does not assert that the original merits have been reopened.

25. The September 16 Order to Show Cause identifies Public Utilities Code sections 701, 702, 2107, 2108, and 2113 and reserves sanctions supported by the record. Complainant requests findings on whether AT&T complied with the ordered reduction and any applicable compliance directions, including through its agents. If a violation is established, Complainant asks the Commission to consider appropriate corrective relief and sanctions within its jurisdiction. Complainant does not request a predetermined penalty, presume contempt, count each notice as a separate proven violation, or equate a regulatory fine with compensation payable to Complainant.

26. Complainant respectfully requests an order:

A. Granting prior approval to file this motion and a separately prepared, limited evidentiary response, subject to scope and confidentiality directions;

B. Acknowledging the reported October 27 connection difficulties and contemporaneous efforts to participate;

C. Requiring a complete, served compliance showing and a written explanation of the August 25/August 31 balance discrepancy;

D. Setting a response period of 15 days after service of the complete showing, or another period expressly ordered, and deferring closure until that period expires and a timely response is considered;

E. Authorizing relevant evidence and objections under a clear schedule; identifying any issues requiring a hearing; and addressing Spanish interpretation for any further conference or hearing;

F. Determining compliance and, if noncompliance is established, considering corrective orders and sanctions supported by the record.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND SIGNATURE

27. Complainant seeks an orderly opportunity to test the compliance showing with specific documents and reconciled calculations. The request rests on the discrepancy in the later balance correspondence, the need for primary proof of the ordered adjustment and its downstream application, and the inability to address the prior-approval request during the October 27 conference.

28. Complainant remains willing to participate respectfully and efficiently. Complainant requests findings supported by a reconciled ledger, dated source records, and an opportunity to address material discrepancies. Permission to present relevant evidence will allow the Commission to evaluate the ordered adjustment, the resulting balance, and any established basis for corrective relief or sanctions before closure.

Respectfully submitted,

Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez
Complainant, self-represented

7121 Woodley Ave., Apt. 118
Van Nuys, CA 91406
Telephone: (818) 235-5538
Email: luenle881@gmail.com