

JS-6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

SOLUTIONS FOR UTILITIES, INC.,  
a California corporation,  
CALIFORNIANS FOR RENEWABLE  
ENERGY, INC., a California Non-  
Profit Corporation,  
MICHAEL E. BOYD, and,  
ROBERT SARVEY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES  
COMMISSION, an Independent  
California State Agency,  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON  
CO., a California Corporation,  
MARYBEL BATJER,  
MARTHA GUZMAN ACEVES,  
CLIFFORD RECHTSCHAFFEN,  
GENEVIEVE SHIROMA, and  
DARCIE L. HOUCK, in their official  
and individual capacities as current  
Public Utilities Commission of  
California,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:11-CV-04975-JWH-JCG

**JUDGMENT**

Pursuant to the “Memorandum Opinion and Order (1) Granting Motion of Defendants California Public Utilities Commission and Commissioners to Dismiss Seventh Amended Complaint [ECF No. 316]; and (2) Denying Plaintiffs’ Renewed Motion for Leave to File Eighth Amended and Third Supplemental Complaint [ECF No. 322]” entered substantially contemporaneously herewith, and in accordance with Rule 58 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,

It is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, and DECREED** as follows:

1. This Court possesses subject matter jurisdiction over the above-captioned action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 16 U.S.C. §§ 824a-3, *et seq.*

2. Plaintiffs Solutions for Utilities, Inc. and Californians for Renewable Energy, Inc. were previously **DISMISSED**. Defendant Southern California Edison Co. was previously **DISMISSED**.

3. The operative pleading is the Seventh Amended Complaint [ECF No. 298] filed by Plaintiffs Michael E. Boyd and Robert Sarvey (jointly, “Plaintiffs”).

4. The Seventh Amended Complaint is **DISMISSED without leave to amend**. Defendants California Public Utilities Commission and the current Commissioners of the CPUC shall have **JUDGMENT** in their favor, and **AGAINST** Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs shall take nothing by way of their Seventh Amended Complaint. This action is **DISMISSED**.

5. Other than potential post-judgment remedies (including those provided in Rule 54(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure), to the extent that any party requests any other form of relief, such request is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 13, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John W. Holcomb  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE