

**BEFORE THE WASHINGTON  
UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

HARBHAJAN MANGAT,	)	DOCKET UE-120522
	)	
Complainant,	)	
	)	ORDER 02
v.	)	
	)	
PUGET SOUND ENERGY, INC.,	)	ORDER DENYING REVIEW
	)	OF ORDER 01
Respondent.	)	
	)	
.....	)	

**BACKGROUND**

- 1 On April 17, 2012, Harbhajan Mangat (Complainant) filed with the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) a formal complaint against Puget Sound Energy, Inc. (PSE or Company), contesting the reasonableness of PSE’s Tariff G, Rate Schedule 85 – Line Extensions and Service Lines. Rate Schedule 85 provides that when a person pays for installation of a new primary voltage line extension to a planned residential neighborhood development, as in this case, they are entitled under limited circumstances to certain refunds as development ensues.
- 2 PSE answered the complaint on May 14, 2012. Among its affirmative defenses, PSE asserts as affirmative defenses that Harbhajan Mangat fails to state a claim upon which the Commission can grant relief, and that the Company’s acts and practices comply fully with Washington law, the Commission’s rules and PSE’s tariffs.
- 3 On June 5, 2012, Administrative Law Judge Dennis Moss issued Order 01, Order Dismissing Complaint. This initial order found the Complaint deficient as a matter of law because the Complainant does not satisfy the requirements in RCW 80.04.110 for bringing a complaint. Order 01, therefore, dismissed the Complaint for failure to state a claim on which the Commission can grant relief.
- 4 On June 15, 2012, Harbhajan Mangat filed a pleading seeking reconsideration of Order 01. The Commission construed the pleading as a petition for administrative review of that initial order and required responses to the pleading to be filed by June

29, 2012. PSE filed a response opposing the requested relief. The Complainant also filed a response.<sup>1</sup>

**DISCUSSION**

- 5 The Commission denies review of Order 01. Harbhajan Mangat's series of pleadings make increasingly clear that her sole challenge is to the reasonableness of PSE tariff provisions establishing the rates for line extensions. The legislature precludes the Commission from entertaining such a complaint unless it is signed by the local municipal governing body, 25 consumers of the service, or 25 percent of the purchasers of that service.<sup>2</sup> Ms. Mangat alone signed the Complaint. Accordingly, Order 01 correctly concluded that the Commission lacks jurisdiction to entertain the Complaint.

**ORDER**

- 6 The Commission Orders that the petition for review of Order 01 is denied, and the Complaint filed by Harbhajan Mangat on April 17, 2012, against Puget Sound Energy, Inc., is dismissed.

Dated at Olympia, Washington, and effective July 12, 2012.

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**JEFFREY D. GOLTZ, Chairman**

**PATRICK J. OSHIE, Commissioner**

**PHILIP B. JONES, Commissioner**

---

<sup>1</sup> Commission rules do not authorize the party seeking review of an initial order to make any further filing in support of its petition. *See* WAC 480-07-825. We nevertheless will consider the additional filing to the extent that it clarifies the relief the Complaint requests.

<sup>2</sup> RCW 80.04.110.

**NOTICE TO PARTIES: This is a final order of the Commission. In addition to judicial review, administrative relief may be available through a petition for reconsideration, filed within 10 days of the service of this order pursuant to RCW 34.05.470 and WAC 480-07-850, or a petition for rehearing pursuant to RCW 80.04.200 or RCW 81.04.200 and WAC 480-07-870.**