



FILED
5-04-15
09:21 AM

KJB/ek4 5/4/2015

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Joint Application of Comcast Corporation, Time Warner Cable Inc., Time Warner Cable Information Services (California), LLC, and Bright House Networks Information Services (California), LLC for Expedited Approval of the Transfer of Control of Time Warner Cable Information Services (California), LLC (U6874C); and the Pro Forma Transfer of Control of Bright House Networks Information Services (California), LLC (U6955C), to Comcast Corporation Pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 854(a).

Application 14-04-013
(Filed April 11, 2014)

And Related Matter.

Application 14-06-012

PRESIDING OFFICER'S RULING CONFIRMING E-MAIL RULING GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART JOINT MOTION OF COMCAST CORPORATION, TIME WARNER CABLE INFORMATION SERVICES (CALIFORNIA), LLC (U6874C), CHARTER FIBERLINK CA-CCO, LLC (U6878C), AND BRIGHT HOUSE NETWORKS INFORMATION SERVICES (CALIFORNIA), LLC (U6955C) TO STAY PENDING DEADLINES

1. Background

On April 27, 2015, the captioned parties (Joint Applicants) filed a motion to withdraw the application that initiated this proceeding, together with a motion to stay pending deadlines (Stay Motion) and a motion for an order shortening time to respond to the Stay Motion. In an e-mail ruling later confirmed by a formal ruling, I granted the motion for an order shortening time and directed intervenors to respond to the Stay Motion by noon on April 29, 2015. A timely

consolidated response to the Stay Motion was filed by the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, The Greenlining Institute, The Utility Reform Network, the Center for Accessible Technology, Media Alliance, Common Cause, and the Writers Guild of America West (collectively, Joint Intervenors). On April 29, 2015, I issued an e-mail ruling granting in part and denying in part the Stay Motion. This ruling confirms the e-mail ruling.

2. Discussion

The Stay Motion requests that I stay two specific pending deadlines:

1. Comments on the Alternate Proposed Decision (APD) of Commissioner Florio, scheduled to be filed on April 30, 2015.
2. Joint Applicants' response to the April 14, 2015 Presiding Officer's Ruling Directing Joint Applicants to Supplement the Record, also due on April 30, 2015.

In support of their motion, Joint Applicants take note of the recent decision by Comcast Corporation to abandon its efforts to acquire by merger Time Warner Cable Inc. They argue that Comcast's decision to abandon the proposed merger renders moot the related license transfers that are the subject of the application in this proceeding and removes the rationale for any further proceedings in this docket other than those necessary to close it.

Joint Intervenors take no position on the second of the two deadlines noted above but strongly oppose staying the comment cycle on Commissioner Florio's APD. Joint Intervenors argue that only Commissioner Florio can stay the comment cycle on his APD and that, in any case, allowing comments to be filed and permitting the APD to be voted on at a full Commission hearing is the appropriate way to bring this proceeding to a close. In particular, they note that allowing the APD to proceed to a decision preserves the record in this proceeding for the benefit of the Commission and future participants in similar

cases. They also note that terminating this proceeding without a decision on the merits potentially works an extreme hardship on intervenors who have participated actively and in good faith in this proceeding in the reasonable expectation of being able to claim compensation for their substantial contributions to the final outcome. In regard to the latter point, I am mindful that the Commission is in the process of revising its Rules of Practice and Procedure to protect good faith intervenors from loss of compensation when an entity seeking a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity fails to obtain it. While that situation is distinguishable from the present one, the policy rationale is identical: Intervenors who participate in good faith in a proceeding should not have to bear the risk of a company's unsuccessful effort to achieve a regulatory goal.

I am persuaded by this line of argument that it would be bad public policy to stay the comment cycle on the APD. In view of that conclusion, I find it unnecessary to address the question of the relative authority of a Presiding Officer and a Commissioner sponsoring an APD to stay comment on the alternate. Because of the extreme shortness of time, I am extending the deadline for Opening Comments on the APD to close of business on Monday, May 4th, as requested by Joint Intervenors. Reply comments will be due by close of business Monday May 11th.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The April 29, 2015 e-mail ruling denying the motion of Joint Applicants to stay the comment cycle on the Alternate Proposed Decision of Commissioner Florio is confirmed.

2. The April 29, 2015 e-mail ruling granting the motion of Joint Applicants to stay responses to the Presiding Officer's April 14, 2015 Ruling Directing Joint Applicants to Supplement the Record is confirmed.

3. Opening comments on the Alternate Proposed Decision shall be filed no later than close of business Monday, May 4, 2015.

4. Reply comments on the Alternate Proposed Decision shall be filed no later than close of business Monday, May 11, 2015.

Dated May 4, 2015, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ KARL J. BEMESDERFER

Karl J. Bemederfer

Presiding Officer