

**BEFORE THE TENNESSEE PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE**

June 6, 2024

IN RE:

**CHATTANOOGA GAS COMPANY PETITION
FOR APPROVAL OF ITS 2023 ANNUAL RATE
REVIEW FILING PURSUANT TO TENN. CODE
ANN. § 65-5-103(d)(6)**

)
)
)
)
)
)

**DOCKET NO.
24-00024**

**ORDER GRANTING CONSUMER ADVOCATE’S MOTION
TO ISSUE MORE THAN FORTY DISCOVERY REQUESTS**

This matter is before the Administrative Judge upon the *Consumer Advocate’s Motion to Issue More than Forty Discovery Requests* (“*Motion*”) filed by the Consumer Advocate Division of the Office of the Tennessee Attorney General (“Consumer Advocate”) on May 3, 2024, requesting leave to serve more than forty discovery requests on Chattanooga Gas Company (“CGC” or the “Company”) pursuant to Tennessee Public Utility Commission (“Commission” or “TPUC”) Rule 1220-1-2-.11(5)(a). The Consumer Advocate also filed a *Memorandum in Support of the Consumer Advocate’s Motion to Issue more than Forty Discovery Requests* (“*Memo*”) on May 3, 2024.

The Consumer Advocate seeks additional discovery to allow it to fully test the merits of CGC’s annual rate review mechanism (“ARRM”) filing, and the Consumer Advocate maintains there is good cause for its *Motion* as required by Commission Rule 1220-01-0-.11.¹ In its *Memo*, the Consumer Advocate states it seeks to present a “complete case” to the Commission by providing a parallel case to the Commission setting forth an alternative number for each one presented by the Company, not merely opposing selected parts of the Company’s *Petition*.² According to the Consumer Advocate, “[w]ithout the requested discovery – and without receiving discovery responses in the format requested – the Consumer Advocate will be severely constrained in

¹ *Memo*, p. 4 (May 3, 2024).

² *Id.*

representing the interests of households that constitute the Company's consumers."³ The Consumer Advocate argues that additional discovery is justified because the ARRM requests a rate increase for CGC customers of over \$8.4 million that has been capped at \$6.8 million with any excess revenues not recovered being carried forward to the following year resulting in a potential impact for CGC customers going forward as well.⁴

TPUC Rule 1220-1-2-.11 (5)(a) provides as follows:

No party shall serve on any other party more than forty (40) discovery requests including sub-parts without first having obtained leave of the Commission or a Hearing Officer. Any motion seeking permission to serve more than forty (40) discovery requests shall set forth the additional requests. The motion shall be accompanied by a memorandum establishing good cause for the service of additional interrogatories or requests for production. If a party is served with more than forty (40) discovery requests without an order authorizing the same, such party need only respond to the first forty (40) requests.

TPUC Rules allow a minimum of forty discovery requests to be served upon a party. Nevertheless, upon compliance with TPUC Rule 1220-1-2-.11(5)(a) and a showing of good cause, the Commission has been flexible in permitting supplemental discovery. Based on the foregoing, the Administrative Judge finds the Consumer Advocate has met the requirements of the Rule by showing good cause to issue additional discovery requests. Further, the Company did not object the *Motion*. Therefore, based on these findings, the Administrative Judge concludes the *Motion* should be granted.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

The *Consumer Advocate's Motion to Issue More than Forty Discovery Requests* is **GRANTED**.



Monica Smith-Ashford, Administrative Judge

³ *Id.* at 5.

⁴ *Id.*