MEIR J. WESTREICH CSB 73133 Attorney at Law 221 East Walnut, Suite 200 Pasadena, California 91101 626-440-9906 / FAX: 626-440-9970 meirim@aol.com Attorney for Plaintiffs	S DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOLUTIONS FOR UTILITIES, INC., a California Corporation; C A L I F O R N I A N S F O R RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC., a California Non-Profit Corporation, Plaintiffs, v. CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, an Independent California State Agency; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO., a California Corporation, Defendants.	Gese No.] (2075 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF JURY DEMANDED [16 U.S.C. §824, et seq.; 42 U.S.C. §1983 & §1988]
INTDO	DUCTION
	which Plaintiffs, Solutions for Utilities, Inc.
	ble Energy, Inc. ["CARE"], California based
	ing equitable relief and money damages from
Defendants, California Public Utilities	s Commission ["CPUC"] a California state
agency charged with inter alia Californi	a energy policymaking and delegated federal
regulation enforcement, and Southern C	alifornia Edison Co. ["SCE"], a state enabled

. . . _

monopoly energy corporation acting collusively and in concert with CPUC to
effectively undermine the federal policy of promoting the viability and integration of
small energy generating companies and protecting them from monopolistic practices,
to the great injury to Plaintiffs and the public interest.

Plaintiffs seek injunctive and/or declaratory relief compelling and/or 5 commanding Defendant CPUC to perform its federal-mandated regulatory duties, 6 including federally mandated standards in connection with the Public Utility 7 Regulatory Policies Act ["PURPA"], as prescribed by the Federal Energy Regulatory 8 Commission ["FERC"]. Plaintiffs also seek remedial money damages from ġ Defendants for Plaintiffs' economic injuries caused by Defendants' violations of said 10 federal laws and regulations, and punitive damages for Defendants' intentional and 11 repetitive violations of law. 12

Accordingly, Plaintiffs allege for their Complaint [each of the Paragraphs enumerated under a heading of "Common Allegations" are incorporated by this reference into each of the numbered claims]:

16 17

COMMON ALLEGATIONS JURISDICTIONAL AND PARTY ALLEGATIONS

This is a federal question action under the Public Utility Regulatory Polices
 Act ["PURPA"] and 42 U.S.C. §1983, to redress violations of federal laws
 committed by Defendants, *i.e.* to *inter alia* compel the enforcement of federal laws,
 for Plaintiffs' and the public's interests, and to secure remedial relief for Plaintiffs for
 damages caused by those violations.

23 2. The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §1331 and 28
24 U.S.C. §1343, this being an action arising under, and for the violations of, federal
25 laws.

3. Venue is properly located in the Central District of California pursuant to
27 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1) & (b)(2), because both Defendants reside within the same
28 State of California, with Defendant California Public Utilities Commission ["CPUC"]

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND FOUTTABLE RELIEF.

headquartered in the Northern District of California and Defendant Southern
 California Edison Company ["SCE"] headquartered in the Central District of
 California; and the acts complained of herein were consummated in substantial part
 in both districts.

4. Plaintiffs are Solutions for Utilities, Inc., a California Corporation
["SFUI"],and CAlifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc., a California Non-Profit
Corporation ["CARE"].

5. Defendants are: California Public Utilities Commission ["CPUC"], a 8 California state agency, established under the California State Constitution as an 9 independent agency, charged with inter alia California energy policymaking and, by 10 express terms of federal laws on which this action is based, express delegated federal 11 regulatory enforcement; and Southern California Edison Co., a California 12 Corporation ["SCE"] that is the primary energy supplier for a large portion of the 13 State of California with ownership of a substantial portion of the power grid in that 14 service area. 15

6. The Federal Power Act ["FPA"], 16 U.S.C. §791, et seq., and its followup
act, the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act ["PURPA"], 16 U.S.C. §824, et seq.,
were each adopted by Congress under the Commerce Clause of the United States
Constitution in light of the inter-state nature of the subject matter of the statutory
scheme, and expressly preempted state authority in that field to the extent (a)
provided therein or (b) state law conflicts therewith, under the Supremacy Clause of
the United States Constitution.

7. PURPA was adopted by Congress to encourage the development of nontraditional cogeneration and small power production facilities, to: (a) reduce the demand for traditional fossil fuels; and (b) rectify the problems that impeded development of nontraditional electricity generating facilities: (1) reluctance of traditional electricity utilities to purchase power from, or sell power to, nontraditional electricity generating facilities; and (2) state utility regulations of

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

alternative energy sources which impose financial burdens on nontraditional facilities
 and thus discourage their development.

8. PURPA authorizes the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission ["FERC"]
to enforce the requirements of PURPA by adoption of implementing regulations and
resolution of disputes about the meaning, implementation and application of the
federal laws and regulations.

9. In accordance with its aforesaid regulatory authority, FERC has duly adopted federal regulations to implement PURPA mandates for protections for small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities, including, *inter alia*, (a) mandatory requirements and standards therefor, (b) provision for certification of qualifying facilities as defined therein, and (c) enforcement obligations, powers and procedures. In so doing, FERC has issued interpretive rulings of PURPA provisions and its aforementioned regulations.

14 10. As an integral part of the regulatory scheme of PURPA, the individual
15 states and their respective energy regulatory agencies are required under Section 210
16 of PURPA, *see* 16 U.S.C. §824a-3, to enforce energy production and ratemaking
17 standards promulgated by FERC; and the regulatory scheme presupposes the creation
18 by the several states of respective state agencies to implement within their respective
19 jurisdictions the statutory policies and mandates of PURPA and federal regulations
20 adopted in connection therewith.

11. Defendant CPUC is the California state agency which is empowered to
 provide the regulatory authority and responsibility contemplated by FPA and PURPA,
 and their FERC adopted implementing regulations, and hence is subject to their
 respective regulatory authority.

12. Defendant CPUC has established a program involving ratemaking and
interconnection standards for private energy generating individuals or companies who
do so solely for their own use and hence are not governed by FPA or PURPA.
Concomitant with this "own use" program, CPUC has adopted regulations which

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

ostensibly seeks to address minor quantities of surplus energy incidentally generated
 by "own use" facilities, permitting the sale of that minimal amount of surplus energy
 while nevertheless still treating the facility as an "own use" facility not governed by
 PURPA's regulatory authority ["Rule 21 Facilities"].

5 13. However, CPUC and/or SCE, acting in concert, have misused Rule 21 to 6 apply to small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating 7 facilities who incidentally and typically use a small portion of their generated energy 8 for their own operations / use, despite the fact that they are substantively 9 indistinguishable from the facilities expressly subject to PURPA and its FERC 10 promulgated regulations, thereby circumventing the entire PURPA legislative and 11 regulatory scheme.

12 14. SCE is the owner of the power grid in the region where SFUI intended and 13 sought to interconnect and supply energy, at rates and otherwise in accordance with 14 the requirements and standards established by PURPA and FERC in its implementing 15 regulations. The owner of the power grid in the region where CARE intended and 16 sought to interconnect and supply energy, at rates and otherwise in accordance with 17 the requirements and standards established by PURPA and FERC in its implementing 18 regulations, are not named in this action.

15. PURPA also expressly authorizes FERC to enforce the requirements of
PURPA and related federal regulations against (a) any state regulatory agency, or (b)
any nonregulated electric utility, by action in federal district court, which has
exclusive jurisdiction over such enforcement actions; or, alternatively, to interpose
its own judgment on ratemaking and interconnection standards.

16. PURPA also expressly authorizes private utility companies and qualified facilities to enforce the requirements of PURPA and related federal regulations against (a) any state regulatory agency, or (b) any nonregulated electric utility, also by action in federal district court, which has exclusive jurisdiction over such enforcement actions, provided only that said company first petitions FERC to seek

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIFE

the specified enforcement, and within the following sixty (60) days FERC fails or
declines to do so.

17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that CPUC 3 has effectively surrendered its regulatory authority, if any, over SCE by affording 4 SCE undue influence and control over CPUC deliberations, decisions and actions to 5 the extent that they affect or impact SCE under a broadly expansive view of SCE's 6 portion of the energy market; and by politically incestuous relationships between 7 regulator [CPUC] and regulated [SCE] officials, which effectively preclude any 8 independent judgment and exercise of discretion in the implementation and 9 application of governing and controlling federal and state laws and regulations. 10

11 18. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that CPUC 12 and SCE, and their respective managers and staff, routinely engage in joint and 13 collaborative tasks, functions and decisonmaking, with mobility between respective 14 staffs, that render them generally indistinguishable, and further render the actions of 15 one the actions of the other.

16 19. CPUC has at all relevant times herein acted by affirmative conduct as well17 as its omissions to act despite having a duty to do so.

18 20. At all times pertinent to this Complaint, Defendants were each an agent of19 the other Defendant.

20 21. The Defendants herein, and each of them, have conspired to do the acts
21 and wrongs mentioned herein; and an act in furtherance thereof has been committed.

22 22. At all times pertinent to this Complaint, the Defendants and each of them
23 were acting in concert with each other and others not named as parties herein.

24 23. At all times pertinent to this Complaint, each of the Defendants authorized
25 and/or ratified the acts, omissions, representations and agreements of the other
26 Defendant.

27 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF.

24. All of the conduct alleged against each and all of the defendants mentioned
 herein was intentional, and intended to accomplish each and all of the unlawful
 purposes described herein.

4

5

6

CLAIM NO. 1 CLAIM FOR ENFORCEMENT OF PURPA – Plaintiffs SFUI and CARE – – Defendants CPUC and SCE – [16 U.S.C. §824a-3]

Plaintiff SFUI has at all relevant times been an electric utility which is
 within the class of small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity
 generating facilities subject to and contemplated by PURPA and its FERC
 promulgated regulations.

11 26. Plaintiff SFUI was misdirected and/or fraudulently induced by SCE to 12 pursue its efforts at securing interconnection with SCE and a concomitant 13 interconnection contract, and thereby obtain the benefits of its rights under PURPA 14 and its FERC promulgated regulations, by submission of an application as a Rule 21 15 Facility. Hence, Plaintiff SFUI did not seek nor obtain qualified facility status for 16 SFUI business projects addressed herein, although SFUI qualified therefor in 17 connection with a home office solar system, and readily could have done so; and SCE 18 then exploited this artificial, fraudulent advantage to ignore and violate the PURPA 19 and FERC approved regulatory scheme.

20
 27. The use by CPUC of Rule 21 Facilities standards for small power
 21
 21
 22
 23
 23
 24
 24
 25
 26
 27. The use by CPUC of Rule 21 Facilities standards for small power
 28
 29
 20
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 29
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 29
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 29
 20
 21
 21
 22
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 29
 20
 21
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 29
 20
 21
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 24
 25
 25
 26
 27
 27
 28
 29
 29
 20
 21
 21
 21
 21
 22
 23
 24
 24
 25
 24
 25
 26
 27
 <li

28. Plaintiff CARE has at all relevant times been an organization representing
 electric utilities which are Qualified Facilities ['QF"] and within the class of small

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND FOULTABLE RELIFE.

power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities subject
 to and contemplated by FPA and PURPA, and the latter's FERC promulgated
 regulations.

29. Plaintiff SFUI made repeated and long-standing efforts to obtain contracts
with SCE in accordance with PURPA and its implementing regulations, and the
economic viability afforded thereby, but has been unable to do so because of refusal
of SCE to abide with PURPA and its implementing regulations, and the refusal of
CPUC to enforce PURPA and its implementing regulations, despite repeated efforts
by Plaintiff SFUI to secure same.

30. On March 11, 2011, Plaintiff SFUI petitioned FERC to enforce PURPA
and its implementing regulations and compliance therewith by CPUC and SCE. On
May 19, 2011, FERC declined to do so.

31. Plaintiff CARE made repeated and long-standing efforts to obtain contracts
with local power grid providers in accordance with PURPA and its implementing
regulations, and the economic viability afforded thereby, but has been unable to do
so because of refusal of the local power grid providers to abide with PURPA and its
implementing regulations, and the refusal of CPUC to enforce PURPA and its
implementing regulations, despite repeated efforts by Plaintiff CARE to secure same.

32. On January 28, 2011, Plaintiff CARE petitioned FERC to enforce PURPA
and its implementing regulations, and enforce compliance therewith, by CPUC and
local power grid providers. On March 17, 2011, FERC declined to do so.

33. As a result of the failure and refusal of CPUC, SCE and other relevant
local power grid providers to comply with and/or enforce compliance with PURPA
and its implementing regulations, Plaintiffs have been frustrated in their efforts to
enter the energy market, and prevented from doing so in a manner and in accordance
with the public policies set forth in PURPA and its implementing regulations.

27 34. PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing regulations mandate the28 following:

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

a. Small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity
 generating facilities must be afforded means to rapidly and expeditiously interconnect
 with existing power grids of the major utilities.

b. Major utilities / power grid owners must purchase energy from
available small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating
facilities ["Must Take Mandate"], which *de facto* means permitting reasonable and
expeditious interconnection with their grids and not imposing artificial barriers to
doing so or entering into contracts with larger power facilities as a means of blocking
inter-connection and contracts with small power production facilities and

c. Wholesale power rates-of-payment are mandated by FERC that the 11 rate to be paid by major utilities / power grid owners to small power production 12 facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities must be: (1) just and 13 reasonable to electric consumers and in the public interest; (2) not discriminatory 14 against small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating 15 facilities; and (3) reflective of the avoided cost to the major utility / power grid 16 owners of alternative electric energy. It also means that the major utilities / power 17 grid owners may not favor contracts with larger power production facilities as a 18 means of manipulating the energy market to ensure a lack of economic viability of 19 small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities. 20

d. "Avoided costs" is defined as the incremental costs to an electric 21 utility of electric energy or capacity or both which, but for the purchase from the 22 qualifying facility, such utility would generate itself or purchase from another source. 23 The factors to be considered in determining avoided costs include: (1) the utility's 24 system cost data; (2) the terms of any contract including the duration of the 25 obligation; (3) the availability of capacity or energy from available small power 26 27 production facilities or nontraditional electricity generating facilities during the system daily and seasonal peak periods; (4) the relationship of the availability of 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

energy or capacity from a small power production facility or nontraditional electricity
generating facility to the ability of the electric utility to avoid costs; and (5) the costs
or savings resulting from variations in line losses from those that would have existed
in the absence of purchases from the small power production facility or nontraditional
electricity generating facility.

e. Calculation of avoided cost includes that cost which the major utility
/ power grid owner would generate itself or would have purchased from another
developer, at a technology specific and tiered sizing comparison; and, when
appropriate, including the cost of creating new generating facilities.

f. Purchase power agreements between the major utility / power grid 10 owners and small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating 11 facilities must contain non-price terms which are fair and just under the totality of the 12 circumstances, in light of the intent of PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing 13 regulations to facilitate and promote small power production facilities and 14 nontraditional electricity generating facilities. This also means that the major utilities 15 / power grid owners may not impose non-price terms that effectively prevents the 16 economic viability of small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity 17 generating facilities. 18

g. State utility commissions are required to implement a trading market with rates to be paid to renewable energy developers – *i.e.* small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities – for renewable energy credits ["RECs"]. This means that such commissions may not bundle the RECs and/or assign them, without compensation therefor, to major utilities / power grid owners.

35. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that PURPA
and its implementing regulations, as set forth in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-34,
have been repeatedly violated by CPUC, SCE and/or other local power grid
providers, as follows:

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND FOLITABLE RELIEF

a. SFUI and CARE, as well as other small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities, have not been afforded means to rapidly and expeditiously interconnect with SCE and/or existing power grids of the major utilities, because of the use of devices – such as Rule 21 enabled by CPUC – which enable circumvention of PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing regulations.

b. SCE and other major utilities / power grid owners have repeatedly 7 and generally avoided purchasing energy from available small power production 8 facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities, and failed to permit 9 reasonable and expeditious interconnection with their grids, by imposing artificial 10 barriers to doing so and entering into contracts with larger power facilities as a means 11 of blocking inter-connection and contracts with small power production facilities and 12 nontraditional electricity generating facilities. For instance, with CPUC approval, 13 they enter into contracts with larger energy suppliers who cannot inter-connect for 14 many years, and then posit those contracts as a basis for claiming that there is no 15 inter-connection capacity for Plaintiffs and other immediately available small power 16 production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities. 17

Wholesale power rates of payment for small power production 18 c. facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities, set by FERC as mandated 19 by PURPA and its implementing regulations – i.e. avoided cost – have been ignored 20by CPUC, which instead set a much lower rate for use by SCE and other major 21 utilities / power grid owners, denominated as the "Market Price Referent." This 22 unlawful rate renders economically unfeasible the operation of Plaintiffs and other 23 small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities. 24 It also enables the major utilities / power grid owners to favor contracts with larger 25 26power production facilities as a means of manipulating the energy market to ensure a lack of economic viability of small power production facilities and nontraditional 27 electricity generating facilities. 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF.

d. Purchase power agreements offered by the major utility / power grid 1 owners to Plaintiffs and other small power production facilities and nontraditional 2 electricity generating facilities, with CPUC approval, contain non-price terms which 3 are not fair and just under the totality of the circumstances, in light of the intent of 4 PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing regulations to facilitate and promote 5 small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities, 6 that effectively prevents the economic viability of Plaintiffs and other small power 7 production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities. 8

e. For instance, without limitation, imposition by SCE, with CPUC 9 approval, of unilateral curtailment powers and weasel clauses imposed revenue flow 10 risks and uncertainties that effectively denied Plaintiff SFUI necessary developer 11 financing. These provisions were not reasonably necessary for SCE or regulatory 12 purposes of CPUC, were predictably a death knell to any development financing, and 13 further undermined the purposes of PURPA to enable small power production 14 facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities notwithstanding 15 traditional obstacles from major utilities / power grid owners and state regulators. 16

f. CPUC approved SCE's scheme to bundled RECs and assign them,
without just and fair compensation therefor to SFUI, in contravention to PURPA and
FERC approved implementing regulations.

36. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that
Defendants CPUC and SCE have repeatedly collaborated and enabled each other in
the implementation of matters as set forth in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-35, and in
so doing CPUC failed to perform its regulatory function and instead has encouraged
and enabled SCE in continued efforts to suppress and prevent small power production
facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities.

26 37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that
27 specifically, but without limitation, CPUC has provided SCE with its approval of a
28 form contract for use by SCE with interconnecting facilities - SCE's CREST

Agreement – which form contract embodies and perpetuates the aforementioned
 failures to comply with PURPA and FERC approved implementing regulations and
 the concomitant abdication by CPUC of its federally mandated regulatory duties and
 obligations.

5 38. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that SCE has 6 entered into contracts with larger energy suppliers which violate the requirements of 7 PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing regulations, and serve to prevent and 8 undermine small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating 9 facilities, many of the contracts having been adopted with the approval and/or 10 concurrence of CPUC, or otherwise enabled by CPUC.

39. SCE has refused to enter into a contract with Plaintiff SFUI which
complies with PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing regulations, instead
imposing the CPUC approved CREST Agreement, with its deficiencies as previously
described herein. Likewise, the relevant local major utility / power grid owner has
refused to enter into contracts with Plaintiff CARE which comply with PURPA and
its FERC adopted implementing regulations.

40. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that CPUC
has generally failed to perform its regulatory functions as mandated by PURPA and
its FERC adopted implementing regulations; to the contrary, CPUC has repeatedly
approved contracts, activities and proposals of SCE and other major utility / power
grid owners which do not comply nor conform with PURPA and its FERC adopted
implementing regulations.

41. Plaintiffs have repeatedly and concurrently complained informally and
 formally about the above-described unlawful acts and omissions of Defendants CPUC
 and SCE, and each of them, including without limitation the failure to properly and
 sufficiently regulate the field and the major utility / power grid owners, as required
 under PURPA and its FERC adopted implementing regulations, often with detailed
 cross-references to statutes, regulations and other actions. In each case, CPUC

and/or SCE, as relevant, failed and/or refused to take corrective action, sometimes
 simply failing to act at all after protracted delays.

42. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and based thereon allege, that the actions of Defendants have harmed the public interest by undermining the public policy purposes of PURPA, including but not limited to making available additional energy supplies, utilization of alternative and renewable energy sources, holding down energy costs by increased and broader market competition, and enabling small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating facilities.

43. In enacting PURPA, Congress made express findings that the federal 9 regulatory scheme was necessary to respond to the existing, persistent and widespread 10 recalcitrance of state regulatory agencies and major utilities / power grid owners to 11 permit small power production facilities and nontraditional electricity generating 12 facilities; or worse, to affirmatively undermine the latter. The combined efforts of 13 CPUC, SCE and other major utilities / power grid owners, as above described, have 14 effectively perpetuated the very conduct of state regulatory agencies and major 15 utilities / power grid owners which Congress found to exist and wished to remedy; 16 and these entities have conspired and colluded to do so. 17

CLAIM NO. 2 CLAIM FOR DAMAGES FOR DEPRIVATION OF FEDERAL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW – Plaintiff SFUI – – Defendants CPUC and SCE – [42 U.S.C. §1983]

18

19

20

21

44. The federal and constitutional rights of Plaintiff SFUI have been deprived
in that, by virtue of the unlawful acts as above-described in Claim No. 1:

a. The federal statutory rights of Plaintiff SFUI – as set forth in FPA and
 PURPA, and implementing federal regulations – have been deprived;

b. Plaintiff SFUI was denied its right to reasonably profit from its
business enterprises, thereby constituting an unlawful and unconstitutional taking

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND FOULTABLE RELIEF.

without just compensation and/or due process of law, as secured by the takings and
 due process clauses of the United States Constitution; and/or

c. Plaintiff SFUI was denied its right to contract, as secured by the
contracts clause of the United States Constitution.

5 45. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant CPUC and each of its 6 commissioners and agents acted under color of state law; further, each of them at all 7 times acted under color of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages 8 of the State of California and/or CPUC; further, said commissioners and agents were 9 each of them at all times acting within the course and scope of his/her authority and 10 agency, and further acting as authorized agents for CPUC and each other.

46. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant CPUC and each of its
commissioners and agents executed the policies and customs established by directive
and/or practice, by State of California and/or CPUC; further, the commissioners and
agents by words, action and/or inaction caused and/or ratified the unlawful acts of
Defendant SCE.

47. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: The actions, decisions and
omissions of Defendants and each of them have been made or omitted pursuant to
official policy of the relevant entity and each of them, and all decisions have been by
the person(s), body and/or entity with final authority to do so for the relevant entity.
48. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Each of the Defendant entities
were acting as agents and/or principals of each other.

49. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendants, acting through their respective principals and agents, have conspired with one another to effect the illegal purposes alleged herein; to engage and engaged in the illegal conduct here mentioned, to the injury of Plaintiff SFUI of the rights, privileges and immunities secured to Plaintiff SFUI by the laws of the United States, as above-described in *inter alia* Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43. One or more acts in furtherance of the conspiracy have been committed.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

50. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendants, and their respective principals and agents, acted in concert to engage in the illegal conduct here mentioned, to the injury of Plaintiff SFUI of the rights, privileges and immunities secured to Plaintiff SFUI by the laws of the United States, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43.

51. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendants, their principals and 6 agents, and each of them, knew or should have known that the wrongs here 7 mentioned involving Plaintiff SFUI were about to be committed; and further each of 8 them had the power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of the same. 9 Despite this, said Defendants, their principals and agents, and each of them, refused 10 and/or failed to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of said wrongs, and said 11 wrongs were in fact committed, denving Plaintiff SFUI its rights secured under the 12 laws of the United States, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43. 13

52. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendants, their principals and
agents, and each of them, set in motion a chain of events which each knew or
reasonably should have known, would cause the wrongs here mentioned, as abovedescribed in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43, and/or the consequential injuries and
damages to Plaintiff SFUI.

19 53. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendants, their principals and
20 agents, and each of them, participated in and/or caused the unlawful conduct
21 mentioned herein, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43.

54. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant SCE, and each of its principals and agents, by virtue of conspiring and/or acting in concert with CPUC, and its commissioners and agents, and/or acting to further the decisions and actions of CPUC, acted under color of state law.

26 55. Defendants CPUC and SCE, their respective principals and agents, and
27 each of them, participated in and/or proximately caused the aforementioned unlawful
28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF.

conduct, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43, and each acted in
 concert with each other to that effect.

56. Plaintiff SFUI incurred, and continues to incur, economic injuries, damages and expenses, lost business opportunities, and other consequential damages, past, present and future, all of which were caused by the aforementioned conduct of the Defendant CPUC and SCE, their respective principals and agents, and each of them, in an amount to be proved at trial.

8 57. Plaintiff SFUI incurred, and continues to incur, legal fees and expenses,
9 all of which were caused by the aforementioned conduct of the Defendant CPUC and
10 SCE, their respective principals and agents, and each of them, in an amount to be
11 proved at trial.

58. The acts, omissions, decisions and conduct of the Defendants CPUC and
SCE, their respective principals and agents, and each of them, caused all of the
aforementioned injuries and damages of Plaintiff SFUI.

59. As a direct and proximate result of the aforementioned acts and/or
omissions of the Defendants CPUC and SCE, their respective principals and agents,
and each of them, Plaintiff SFUI was subjected to economically intolerable
conditions.

60. Plaintiff SFUI has acted reasonably to mitigate its damages caused by and
arising from the aforementioned acts and/or omissions of the Defendants CPUC and
SCE, their respective principals and agents, and each of them.

61. At all relevant times herein, Defendants CPUC and SCE, their respective
principals and agents, and each of them, acted with malice and reckless disregard for
the federal constitutional, statutory and regulatory rights, under the laws and
Constitution of the United States, entitling Plaintiff SFUI to punitive damages from
Defendant SCE.

27 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND FQUITABLE RELIEF

CLAIM NO. 3 CLAIM FOR DAMAGES FOR DEPRIVATION OF FEDERAL RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF STATE LAW – Plaintiff CARE – – Defendant CPUC – [42 U.S.C. §1983]

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

13

14

62. The federal and constitutional rights of Plaintiff CARE have been deprived in that, by virtue of the unlawful acts as above-described in Claim No. 1:
a. The federal statutory rights of Plaintiff CARE – as set forth in FPA and PURPA, and implementing federal regulations – have been deprived;

b. Plaintiff CARE was denied its right to reasonably and economically
 operate its nonprofit business enterprises, thereby constituting an unlawful and
 unconstitutional taking without just compensation and/or due process of law, as
 secured by the takings and due process clauses of the United States Constitution;
 and/or

c. Plaintiff CARE was denied its right to contract, as secured by the contracts clause of the United States Constitution.

At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant CPUC and each of its
 commissioners and agents acted under color of state law; further, each of them at all
 times acted under color of the statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages
 of the State of California and/or CPUC; further, said commissioners and agents were
 each of them at all times acting within the course and scope of his/her authority and
 agency, and further acting as authorized agents for CPUC and each other.

64. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant CPUC and each of its
 commissioners and agents executed the policies and customs established by directive
 and/or practice, by State of California and/or CPUC; further, the commissioners and
 agents by words, action and/or inaction caused and/or ratified the unlawful acts of
 Defendant SCE.

65. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: The actions, decisions and omissions of Defendant CPUC, its commissioners and agents, and each of them, have

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF

been made or omitted pursuant to official policy of the relevant entity and each of
 them, and all decisions have been by the person(s), body and/or entity with final
 authority to do so for the CPUC.

At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant CPUC, its 66. 4 commissioners and agents, and each of them, knew or should have known that the 5 wrongs here mentioned involving Plaintiff CARE were about to be committed; and 6 further each of them had the power to prevent or aid in preventing the commission of 7 the same. Despite this, said Defendant, its commissioners and agents, and each of 8 them, refused and/or failed to prevent or aid in the preventing the commission of said 9 wrongs, and said wrongs were in fact committed, denying Plaintiff CARE its rights 10secured under the laws of the United States, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 11 15-16 & 25-43. 12

67. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendants CPUC, its commissioners and agents, and each of them, set in motion a chain of events which each knew, or reasonably should have known, would cause the wrongs here mentioned, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43, and/or the consequential injuries and damages to Plaintiff CARE.

68. At all times pertinent to this Complaint: Defendant CPUC, its
commissioners and agents, and each of them, participated in and/or caused the
unlawful conduct mentioned herein, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16
& 25-43.

69. Defendant CPUC, its commissioners and agents, and each of them, participated in and/or proximately caused the aforementioned unlawful conduct, as above-described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43, and each acted in concert with each other to that effect.

70. Plaintiff CARE incurred, and continues to incur, economic injuries,
damages and expenses, lost business opportunities, and other consequential damages,
past, present and future, all of which were caused by the aforementioned conduct of

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIFE.

the Defendant CPUC, its commissioners and agents, and each of them, in an amount
 to be proved at trial.

71. Plaintiff CARE incurred, and continues to incur, legal fees and expenses
all, of which were caused by the aforementioned conduct of the Defendant CPUC, its
commissioners and agents, and each of them, in an amount to be proved at trial.

72. The acts, omissions, decisions and conduct of the Defendant CPUC, its
commissioners and agents, and each of them, caused all of the aforementioned
injuries and damages of Plaintiff CARE.

73. Plaintiff CARE has acted reasonably to mitigate its damages caused by and
arising from the aforementioned acts and/or omissions of the Defendant CPUC, its
commissioners and agents, and each of them.

12

13

14

15

CLAIM NO. 4 EQUITABLE RELIEF INJUNCTIVE RELIEF; DECLARATORY RELIEF – Plaintiffs SFUI and CARE – – Defendant CPUC – [PURPA; 42 U.S.C. §1983]

74. Plaintiffs, and each of them, are entitled to orders declaring the conduct,
whether by acts omissions, of Defendant CPUC, its commissioners and agents, and
each of them, are each and all unlawful, in each and all of the particulars described
in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43.

75. Plaintiffs, and each of them, are entitled to orders enjoining the unlawful 20conduct, whether by acts omissions, of Defendant CPUC, its commissioners and 21 agents, and each of them, to remedy each and all of the particulars described in 22 Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43 and the consequences thereof. Plaintiffs, and each 23 of them, are seeking and are entitled to temporary, preliminary and injunctive relief. 24 76. Plaintiffs, and each of them, are being irreparably harmed by the unlawful 25 conduct, whether by acts omissions, of Defendant CPUC, its commissioners and 26agents, and each of them, as described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43, and will 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIFE.

continue to be so harmed unless and until the requested declaratory and/or injunctive
 relief is granted as prayed.

CLAIM NO. 5 EQUITABLE RELIEF INJUNCTIVE RELIEF; DECLARATORY RELIEF – Plaintiff SFUI – – Defendant SCE – [PURPA; 42 U.S.C. §1983]

7 77. Plaintiff SFUI is entitled to orders declaring the conduct, whether by acts
8 omissions, of Defendant SCE, its principals and agents, and each of them, are each
9 and all unlawful, in each and all of the particulars described in Paragraphs 6-11, 1510 16 & 25-43.

78. Plaintiff SFUI is entitled to orders enjoining the unlawful conduct, whether
by acts omissions, of Defendant SCE, its principals and agents, and each of them, to
remedy each and all of the particulars described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43
and the consequences thereof. Plaintiff SFUI is seeking and is entitled to temporary,
preliminary and injunctive relief.

79. Plaintiff SFUI is being irreparably harmed by the unlawful conduct,
whether by acts omissions, of Defendant SCE, its principals and agents, and each of
them, as described in Paragraphs 6-11, 15-16 & 25-43, and will continue to be so
harmed unless and until the requested declaratory and/or injunctive relief is granted
as prayed.

21 22

3

4

5

6

FURTHER COMMON ALLEGATIONS - CAUSATION AND DAMAGES -

80. At all times pertinent to this Complaint, the Defendants CPUC and SCE,
their respective principals and agents, and each of them, intended to do the acts
described herein, and/or to fail to do the acts required of them in respect to any
omissions described herein.

27 81. Each of the Defendants CPUC and SCE, their respective principals and
28 agents, and each of them, participated in and/or proximately caused the

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIFE

aforementioned unlawful conduct, and acted in concert with the other named
 Defendant and its respective principals and agents, and each of them, and other
 persons whose identities and/or extent of involvement are not yet known to Plaintiffs.

82. Plaintiffs are entitled to recover their reasonable attorneys' fees, by statute,
and by virtue of their acting herein as private attorneys general, advancing substantial
public interests under FPA and PURPA.

83. The Defendants CPUC and SCE, their respective principals and agents, and 7 each of them, in engaging in the aforementioned conduct, acted with malice. The acts 8 and omissions of each Defendant, and of their respective principals and agents, and 9 each of them, was ratified by the Defendants and/or each of them, who were each 10 informed of the unlawful conduct of its agents and either approved the acts or failed 11 to take any corrective action despite having the power and opportunity to do so. 12 Plaintiff SFUI is entitled to recover punitive damages from Defendant SCE, in an 13 amount to be proved at trial. 14

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs seek judgment against defendants jointly and
severally, except as specifically indicated, for:

1. Compensatory damages, according to proof;

15

16

19

23

24

20 2. Special consequential damages, including but not limited to economic
 21 damages, financial losses, damage to business and economic opportunities, attorneys'
 22 fees, legal costs, and other as yet undetermined damages, according to proof;

3. Punitive damages from SCE for Plaintiff SFUI, according to proof;

4. Declaratory relief as prayed herein, and as may appear necessary and proper;

25 5. Temporary, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief as prayed herein,
26 and as may appear necessary and proper;

6. Reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit pursuant to statute and as private
attorneys general; and

7. For such further relief as the Court may deem necessary and proper. Dated: June 10, 2011 Westreic Meir L Westheich Attorney for Plaintiffs Plaintiffs demand trial by jury. Dated: June 10, 2011 Mein Westeric Meir J. Westheich Attorney for Plaintiffs COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND FQUITABLE RELIFF.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge S. James Otero and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Jay C. Gandhi.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV11- 4975 SJO (JCGx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

[X] Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012 Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516 L] Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

CV-18 (03/06)

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

Name & Address: Meir J. Westreich CSB 73133 Attorney at Law 221 East Walnut Street, Suite 200 Pasadena, Ca. 91101 Tel. 626-440-9906 / FAX 626-440-9970

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SOLUTIONS FOR UTILITIES, INC., a California Corporation; CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC., a California Non-Profit Corporation, PLAINTIFF(S) V.	CASE NUMBER	04975	୍ତ JCG [×]
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILTIES COMMISSION, an Independent California State Agency; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO.,a California Corporation DEFENDANT(S).		SUMMONS	

TO: DEFENDANT(S): CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILTIES COMMISSION, an Independent California State Agency: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY, a California Corporation

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within ____ ∂ _ days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it), you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached ⊠ complaint □______ amended complaint □ counterclaim □ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, <u>Meir J. Westreich</u>, whose address is 221 East Walnut Street, Suite 200, Pasadena. Ca. 91101 ______. If you fail to do so, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file

judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Clerk, U.S. District Court

Dated: ______ 1 0 000

By: _____ CHRISTOPHER FOWERS

Deputy Clerk

(Seal of the Court)

[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

CV-01A (12/07)

SUMMONS



UNITED STATES _ISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT L_ CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

SOLUTIONS FOR UTIL	k if you are representing yourself ,TTHES, INC., a California Corpo RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC., forporation.	(]) pration;	DEFENDANTS CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITITIES COMMISSION, an Independent California State Agency; SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO., a California Corporation,			
yourself, provide same.) Meir J Westreich, Attorna 221 East Walnut Street, S	uite 200	you are representing 440-9970	Attomeys (If Known)			
IL BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Place an X in one box only.)		SHIP OF PRINCIPAL PART		es Only	
🔲 I U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party		PTF	DEF 1 Incorporated or of Business in th		
2 U.S. Government Defendant				of Business in A		
-		Citizen or Sub	jeet of a Foreign Country 123	LI 3 Foreign Nation		
Proceeding State Co	ed from 3 Remanded from ouri Appellate Court	Reopened	18/11/11/11/11/11/11/11/11/11/11/11/11/1	Dis Liti	lti- □ 7 Appeal to District triet Judge from gation Magistrate Judge	
V. REQUESTED IN COMPL CLASS ACTION under F.R.C			es' only if demanded in complai		ng to Proof	
	e the U.S. Civil Statute under whi	an a	MONEY DEMANDED IN C			
	C sec. 1983. Enforcement of Pub					
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Plac	e an X in one box only.)					
OTHER STATUTES ↓400 State Reapportionment ↓410 Antitrast ↓430 Banks and Banking ↓450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 1400 □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Secentics/Commodities/ Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 □ USC 3410 Magricultural Act □ 891 Agricultural Act □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 900 Apecal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	CONTRACT CONTRA	TORTS PERSONAL INUT8 310 Airplane 3115 Airplane Product Inability 320 Assuuk, Libel Slander 330 Fed, Employer Liability 340 Marine 340 Marine 340 Marine 340 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury 363 Asbestos Perso Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Perso Injury Product Liability IMMIGRATION 462 Neturalization Application 463 Habeas Corpus Alten Detainec 369	PROPERTY act 370 Other Fraud 370 Other Fraud 386 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 UVIL RIGHTS 441 Vating 442 Employment minodations ity 444 Welfare minal 445 American with Disabilities - Employment 446 American with Disabilities - Other Uther Civil Richts	PRISONER PETITIONS D510 Motions to Vacate Sentence Habeas Corpus 530 General 535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus' Other 555 Prison Condition FORFEITURE / PENALTY 610 Agriculture 620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Track 650 Airline Regs 660 Occupational Safety Alealth 690 Other	791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	
				<u>Alor</u>		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Number:			04215	α. Σ	
AFTER C	OMPLETING THE FRONT SI	DE OF FORM CV-71	, COMPLETE THE INFORM	IATION REQUESTED	BELOW.	

· · · · - - - - · · · -

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 1 of 2

•

UNITED STATE. ISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has this action been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed^{\circ} \mathbb{I} No \Box Yes If yes, list case number(s): ______

VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have any cases been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case? No \Box Yes if yes list case number(s)

Civil cases are deemed related if a previously filed case and the present case:

B. Call for determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or

- C. For other reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or
- D. Involve the same patent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.

IX. VENUE: (When completing the following information, use an additional sheet if necessary.)

(a) List the County in this District; California County outside of this District; State if other than California: or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides.
Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b).

County in this District *	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
San Diego County	Santa Cruz County

(b) List the County in this District: California County outside of this District: State if other than California: or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides.
I Check here if the government, its agencies or employees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c).

 County in this District.*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country
 Los Angeles County	San Francisco County

(c) List the County in this District, California County outside of this District, State if other than California: or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose, Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved.

County in this District:*	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California, or Foreign Country
	San Diego County Santa Cruz County
	San Francisco County

* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, Riverside, Ventura, Santa Barhara, or San Luis Obispo Counties Note: In land condemnation cases, use the location of the tract of land involved

X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER)

Date June 10, 2011

Notice to Counsel/Parties: The CV-71 (JS-44) Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed but is used by the Clerk of the Court for the purpose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)

Key to Statistical codes relating to Social Security Cases.

Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action
861	НА	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 (30 U.S C 923)
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended: plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42.U.S.C. 405(g))
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. (g))

CV-71 (05/08)

Page 2 of 2

NAME, ADDRESS & TELEPHONE NUMBER OF ATTORNEY(S) FOR, OR, PLANTIFF OR DEFENDANT IS PLAINTIFF OR DEFENDANT IS PRO PER MEIR J. WESTREICH CSB 73133	
Attorney at Law 221 East Walnut Street, Suite 200 Pasadena, Ca. 91101 Tel. 626-440-9906 / FAX 626-440-9970	LIJUNIO PH 4:03 CLEAR TOLDY PH 4:03 CENTRALT FT FCALF. LIGANTELIC
ATTORNEYS FOR Plaintiffs	i: Y :
	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
SOLUTIONS FOR UTILITIES. INC., a California Corporation; CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY, INC., a California Non-Profit Corporation Plaintiff(s), v.	CASE NUMBER GV11 04975 JCG
CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMM'N, a California Independent Agency: SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO. a California Corp. Defendant(s)	CERTIFICATION AND NOTICE OF INTERESTED PARTIES (Local Rule 7.1-1)

TO: THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES APPEARING OF RECORD:

The undersigned, counsel of record for <u>Plaintiffs</u> (or party appearing in pro per), certifies that the following listed party (or parties) may have a direct, pecuniary interest in the outcome of this case. These representations are made to enable the Court to evaluate possible disqualification or recusal. (Use additional sheet if necessary.)

PARTY

CONNECTION

(List the names of all such parties and identify their connection and interest.)

Solutions for Utilities, Inc. ["SFUI"], a California Corporation Mary Hoffman

CAlifornians for Renewable Energy, Inc. ["CARE"], a California Non-Profit Corporation Michael Boyd

California Public Utilities Commission, a California Independent Agency Southern California Edison Co., a California Corporation Plaintiff President of Plaintiff SFUI

Plaintiff President of Plaintiff CARE

Defendant Defendant

June 10, 2011

Date

Sign

Meir J. Westreich

Attorney of record for or party appearing in pro per

CV-30 (04/10)

NOTICE OF INTERESTED PARTIES