

Decision 26-06-021 June 11, 2026

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Holly A. Carlyle and Jeffery A.  
Burgess,

Complainants,

vs.

Case 25-06-027

Southern California Edison Company  
(U338E),

Defendant.

**ORDER EXTENDING STATUTORY DEADLINE**

**Summary**

This decision extends the statutory deadline in this proceeding until September 17, 2026.

**1. Background and Justification**

**1.1. The Complaint**

Public Utilities Code (Pub. Util. Code) Section 1701.2(i) provides that adjudicatory proceedings shall be resolved within 12 months of the date the proceeding is initiated, unless the Commission makes a written determination

that the deadline cannot be met and issues an order extending the deadline. The statutory deadline for this proceeding is June 27, 2026.

On June 27, 2025, Holly A. Carlyle and Jeffrey A. Burgess (the Complainants) filed a complaint (C.) 25-06-027 with the Commission, alleging that a fire which occurred on September 29, 2021, on their business property located at 56001 29 Palms Hwy in Yucca Valley, CA 92284, was the result of a downed, energized service conductor owned by Southern California Edison Company (SCE). They allege that SCE violated General Orders 95, 165, 167, and Pub. Util. Code § 702 and § 2106.<sup>1</sup> They also allege that SCE reported false information to the Commission.

### **1.2. The Prior Civil Lawsuit**

Prior to filing the Complaint with the Commission, Complainants hired legal counsel and filed a civil lawsuit in San Bernardino County Superior Court on January 12, 2023, seeking damages for the losses from the September 29, 2021 incident.<sup>2</sup> The facts at issue in the civil lawsuit are substantively the same as those underlying this Complaint.

### **1.3 CPUC Safety and Enforcement Division (SED) Investigation**

The Commission's SED Electric Safety and Reliability Branch (ESRB) conducted an investigation and prepared an Incident Investigation Report

---

<sup>1</sup> See Complaint Form page 2, item F.

<sup>2</sup> Case No. CIV SB 2302343. Complainants and SCE have engaged in two years of civil discovery, including depositions of numerous parties and a mediation. In their court case, Complainants originally sought economic and non-economic damages in excess of \$3,000,000.

dated March 7, 2025.<sup>3</sup> SED's Investigation Report concluded that no General Order 95 violations on the part of SCE were found, and SED issued a Closure Letter on March 7, 2025.

#### **1.4 SCE's Answer**

On August 14, 2025, SCE filed its answer (Answer) to the Complaint. SCE answers that the San Bernardino Fire Department arrived at the scene after the fire incident, investigated and did not attribute the cause of the fire to SCE facilities. SCE contends that the Complainants' allegations in the Complaint filed June 27, 2025 are an attempt to have the same facts adjudicated in two separate forums, and are an inappropriate collateral attack on the superior court proceeding.

#### **1.5 The Prehearing Conference (PHC)**

A PHC was held on August 27, 2025, to address issues of law and fact, to determine the need for an evidentiary hearing, to set the schedule for resolving the matter, and to address other matters as necessary.<sup>4</sup>

#### **1.6 Extension of Time Granted to Complainants**

SCE filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint on October 7, 2025. Pursuant to Rule 11.1 (e), Complainant had 15 days to respond to the Motion to Dismiss filed by SCE but did not do so. The Commission extended the time for the

---

<sup>3</sup> SED Investigation report E20230522-01. SED's Incident Investigation Report acknowledges that the SBCFD concluded that a specific origin of the fire could not be located due to extensive fire damage and that the cause of the fire was undetermined.

<sup>4</sup> See Miscellaneous Filing dated October 10, 2025 at pages 81 to 95. SCE filed a Motion to Dismiss the Complaint pursuant to Rules §112 on October 7, 2025.

Complainants to file a response to the Motion to Dismiss to January 26, 2026, and gave SCE until the close of business February 6, 2026, to reply to the Complainant's response.

**2. Justification for Order Extending Statutory Deadline**

Additional time is needed to address the issues in this proceeding.

Consequently, it is necessary and appropriate to extend the statutory deadline for this proceeding to September 17, 2026.

**3. Waiver of Comment Period**

Under Rule 14.6(c)(4) of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, the Commission may waive the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment on a decision that extends the deadline for resolving adjudicatory proceedings set forth in Public Utilities (Pub. Util.) Code Section 1701.2(i) Under the circumstances of this proceeding, it is appropriate to waive the 30-day period for public review and comment.

**4. Assignment of Proceeding**

Karen Douglas is the assigned Commissioner and Patricia Miles is the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) and presiding officer in this proceeding.

**Findings of Fact**

1. On June 27, 2025, C.25-06-027 was filed with the Commission.
2. The current statutory deadline for resolving C.25-06-027 is June 27, 2026.
3. C.25-06-027 cannot be completed by June 27, 2026.
4. An extension of the statutory deadline until September 17, 2026 is necessary to allow adequate time to complete this proceeding.

**Conclusion of Law**

1. Pursuant to the authority granted to the Commission under Pub. Util. Code Section 1701.2(i), the statutory deadline should be extended to September 17, 2026.

**IT IS ORDERED** that the statutory deadline for completion of this proceeding is extended until September 17, 2026.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 11, 2026, at Sacramento, California.

JOHN REYNOLDS  
President  
DARCIE L. HOUCK  
KAREN DOUGLAS  
MATTHEW BAKER  
CHRISTINE HARADA  
Commissioners