

Decision 26-07-009 July 2, 2026

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez,

Complainant,

vs.

Pacific Bell d/b/a AT&T California and
AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation
Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility,

Defendants.

(ECP)

Case 25-11-008

DECISION GRANTING RELIEF IN PART AND DENYING RELIEF IN PART

Summary

This decision finds that Complainant has failed to show by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant violated any applicable Commission rule, law, tariff or statute. However, this decision finds that Defendant acted unreasonably in imposing charges during timeframes when Defendant suspended or terminated Complainant’s wireless services. As a result, this decision directs Defendant to deduct \$720.60 from the outstanding balance on Complainant’s account.

The Complainant’s request for relief is granted in part and denied in part.

Complaint 25-11-008 is closed.

1. Factual and Procedural Background

On November 14, 2025, Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez (Complainant or Mr. Rodriguez) filed the instant complaint alleging that AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility (AT&T or Defendant) billed him for services not rendered and provided credits that were not properly applied. Complainant also alleges that Defendant improperly referred his account to collections.¹ Defendant answered the complaint on December 19, 2025.

On January 23, 2026, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) held a hearing in this expedited complaint proceeding. Following the January 23, 2026, hearing, the assigned ALJ issued several rulings directing Defendant to file supplemental information addressing whether Defendant charged Complainant for services not rendered, and if so by what amount. This matter was submitted as of April 1, 2026, upon receipt of Defendant's response to the March 10, 2026 and March 25, 2026 rulings.

According to billing records provided by Defendant, Complainant received wireless telephone service from Defendant beginning in May 2024. Complainant also entered into financing arrangements with Defendant for multiple wireless devices. From May 2024 to October 2025, Complainant incurred total charges greater than \$6,000. Complainant submitted payments totaling \$4,003.94, of which \$2,279.74 was reversed. Defendant suspended Complainant's services for nonpayment during the following timeframes:

- June 5, 2024 – June 7, 2024
- September 6, 2024 (service restored on same day)

¹ Complaint at page 2.

- March 13, 2025 (service restored on same day)
- April 7, 2025 – April 15, 2025
- May 22, 2025 - June 4, 2025
- June 13, 2025 – June 20, 2025
- July 18, 2025 – August 29, 2025

On August 29, 2025, Defendant cancelled Complainant's account for nonpayment. As of August 29, 2025, Complainant's outstanding charges totaled \$5,132.56.

2. Complainant's Contentions

Complainant asserts that Defendant billed him for services not rendered during multiple periods of suspended service and provided credits that were not properly applied. Complainant further asserts his account was improperly referred to collections despite "final credits and adjustments recognized by AT&T's Office of the President." Complainant asserts that Defendant's interruption of his service directly impacted his ability to attend medical appointments and employment opportunities. The complaint lists the following "key facts":

- "AT&T provided some credits (\$568.23, \$100, and \$140.90 refund) but continued to claim and attempt to collect a final balance of \$1,258.58.
- "Service was interrupted and repeatedly disconnected from May through August 2025.
- "My attempts for informal and formal resolution with both AT&T and regulatory agencies have not resulted in fair relief.

- “The disputed amount was sent to collections despite AT&T admitting the existence of credits and errors.”²

The complaint asks the Commission to determine whether AT&T billed Complainant for services not provided, failed to properly apply credits, and improperly referred the balance to collections after confirming errors and credits.³ The complaint requests that “AT&T be ordered to remove all charges for periods without service, apply all acknowledged credits, withdraw my account from collections, and correct my consumer record.”⁴

3. Defendant’s Contentions

Defendant denies all allegations of the complaint and further denies that Complainant is entitled to any relief.⁵

4. Discussion

To succeed in an expedited complaint, Complainant bears the burden of proving, by a preponderance of evidence, that Defendant violated an applicable law, rule, tariff or statute administered by the Commission. Here, Complainant alleges that Defendant charged him for services not provided, failed to properly apply credits, and improperly referred the balance of Complainant’s outstanding charges to collections.

² Complaint at page 2.

³ Id.

⁴ Complaint at page 3.

⁵ *Answer of Pacific Bell Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T California (U1001C) and AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility (U3021C) to Expedited Complaint of Luis Enrique Landa Rodriguez*, filed December 19, 2025 (Answer) at 1-8.

4.1. Charging for services not provided

Complainant alleges that Defendant charged him for time periods during which Defendant had suspended or cancelled service. Defendant confirms that it charged Complainant for time periods during which service was suspended or cancelled, and states these charges are consistent with the terms and conditions of Complainant's service agreement. We find that Defendant acted improperly in maintaining that Complainant should pay for services he did not receive. According to Defendant's billing records, Defendant assessed a total of \$720.60 to Complainant's account for time periods during which service was suspended or cancelled.⁶ Defendant shall reduce Complainant's outstanding account balance by \$720.60.

4.2. Alleged improper application of credits

Complainant alleges that Defendant improperly or incorrectly applied credits to Complainant's account balance. Defendant confirms that it provided courtesy credits of \$563.19, which was applied to the Complainant's bill. Defendant denies Complainant's allegation of improper application of credits.⁷ We find that the Complainant has not demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant has violated an applicable law, rule, tariff or statute with regards to this allegation.

⁶ *AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility's Response to Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Directing Supplemental Information*, filed March 20, 2026 at Attachments C and D; *AT&T Mobility Wireless Operation Holdings d/b/a AT&T Mobility's (U3021C) Response to Administrative Law Judge's Ruling Setting Hearing*, filed April 1, 2026 at Attachment E.

⁷ Answer at 1-4.

4.3. Alleged improper referral of account balance to collections

Complainant alleges that Defendant improperly referred Complainant's account balance to an outside collection agency. Defendant does not deny that it referred Complainant's account to an outside collection agency, noting that it suspended and subsequently cancelled service to Complainant due to nonpayment. At the time of cancellation, Complainant owed an outstanding balance of \$5,132,56.⁸ There are consequences to non-payment of bills and Complainant was apprised of this by the service agreement. We find that the Complainant has not demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that Defendant has violated an applicable law, rule, tariff or statute with regards to this allegation.

5. Conclusion

For all the reasons discussed above, we find that Complainant has failed to show that Defendant violated any applicable Commission rule, law, tariff or statute. We find that Defendant acted unreasonably in demanding payment for time periods during which Complainant's service was suspended or cancelled. Defendant shall reduce the amount of Complainant's outstanding charges by \$720.60.

The Complaint is granted in part and denied in part. The proceeding is closed.

⁸ Answer at 1-4.

6. Procedural Matters

On February 13, 2026, Defendant filed a motion to file under seal Attachments A and B to its February 13, 2026 response. Defendant states that these documents contain confidential customer information, and that Defendant has duties under California and federal law to protect confidential subscriber information.

On March 20, 2026, Defendant filed a motion to file under seal Attachments A and B to its March 20, 2026 response. Defendant states that these documents contain confidential customer information, and that Defendant has a duty to protect confidential information belonging to its customers.

On April 1, 2026, Defendant filed a motion to file under seal Attachment E to its April 1, 2026 response. Defendant states that these documents contain customer network proprietary information, and that Defendant has a duty to protect such information under 47 U.S.C. Section 222.

The Commission received no objection or other response to any of Defendant's motions for confidential treatment. We have reviewed the identified information and confirm that it contains confidential customer information that should be filed under seal. We therefore grant Defendant's February 13, 2026, March 20, 2026, and April 1, 2026 motions.

This decision affirms all rulings made by the Administrative Law Judge and assigned Commissioner in this proceeding. All other motions not ruled on are denied.

7. Waiver of Comment Period

Under Rule 14.7(b), the Commission may waive the otherwise applicable 30-day period for public review and comment on the decision of the assigned ALJ in a complaint under the expedited complaint procedure. Under the circumstances of this case, it is appropriate to waive the 30-day period for public review and comment.

8. Assignment of Proceeding

Commissioner Karen Douglas is the assigned Commissioner and Valerie U. Kao is the assigned Administrative Law Judge in this proceeding.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Defendant's February 13, 2026 motion is granted. The identified information shall be received under seal, shall remain under seal, and shall not be made accessible to the public or disclosed to anyone other than Commission staff, except upon further order or ruling of the Commission.

2. Defendant's March 20, 2026 motion is granted. The identified information shall be received under seal, shall remain under seal, and shall not be made accessible to the public or disclosed to anyone other than Commission staff, except upon further order or ruling of the Commission.

3. Defendant's April 1, 2026 motion is granted. The identified information shall be received under seal, shall remain under seal, and shall not be made accessible to the public or disclosed to anyone other than Commission staff, except upon further order or ruling of the Commission.

4. Complainant's request for relief is granted in part and denied in part.

5. Defendant shall reduce the amount of Complainant's outstanding charges by \$720.60.

6. All other claims, not granted in Ordering Paragraph 5, are denied.

7. Complaint 25-11-008 is closed.

This order is effective today.

Dated July 2, 2026, at Fort Bragg, California.

JOHN REYNOLDS

President

DARCIE L. HOUCK

KAREN DOUGLAS

MATTHEW BAKER

Commissioners

Commissioner Christine Harada being absent did not participate in the vote of this item.