

1 STEPHANIE M. HINDS (CABN 154284)  
United States Attorney

2 THOMAS A. COLTHURST (CABN 99493)  
3 Chief, Criminal Division

4 JEFFREY B. SCHENK (CABN 234355)  
5 NOAH STERN (CABN 297476)  
Assistant United States Attorneys

6 450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055  
7 San Francisco, California 94102-3495  
Telephone: (415) 436-7200  
8 FAX: (415) 436-7234  
Jeffrey.b.schenk@usdoj.gov  
9 Noah.stern@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for United States of America

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION  
13

14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. CR-14-00175-WHA  
15 Plaintiff, ) UNITED STATES' STATUS REPORT  
16 v. )  
17 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, )  
18 Defendant. )  
19

20 The United States, through Assistant United States Attorneys Jeffrey Schenk and Noah Stern,  
21 submits this status report regarding the pending Form 12 charging PG&E with violating the terms of its  
22 probation. Dkt. No. 1513.

23 On January 26, 2017, after PG&E was convicted of six federal felony offenses, the Court  
24 sentenced PG&E to the maximum fine and maximum five-year term of probation on each count, with  
25 the terms of probation imposed to run concurrently. The terms of probation expire on January 26, 2022.  
26 An extension of probation pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3564(d) is only permitted "if less than the maximum  
27 authorized term was previously imposed." Alternatively, the Court may conduct a full resentencing  
28

1 upon the revocation of probation but, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3564(b), “[m]ultiple terms of probation,  
2 whether imposed at the same time or at different times, run concurrently with each other.” 18 U.S.C. §  
3 3564(b). Since terms cannot run consecutively, PG&E would presumably receive credit for the full  
4 terms already served at this point, in the event of resentencing. Accordingly, based on the unique  
5 history and circumstances of this case, the United States does not intend to seek an extension of PG&E’s  
6 probationary term or imposition of a new one, while acknowledging that there appears to be no binding  
7 caselaw on point.

8         The United States does not believe that an evidentiary hearing on the pending Form 12 is  
9 necessary. The allegations in the Form 12 are closely intertwined with two pending state criminal  
10 prosecutions of PG&E, in Sonoma and Shasta counties. *See California v. PG&E*, No. SCR-745228-1  
11 (Sonoma Cnty. Super. Ct.); *California v. PG&E*, No. 21-06622 (Shasta Cnty. Super. Ct.). The subject  
12 of the Shasta County case is the 2020 Zogg Fire. This Court has already held extensive proceedings  
13 relating to the cause of that fire and the actions PG&E could take to prevent a similar fire in the future.  
14 *See generally* Dkt. Nos. 1246-1388. The subject of the Sonoma County case is the 2019 Kincade Fire.  
15 Similarly, this Court has already developed the record relating to the inspections of the jumper cable that  
16 appears to have caused that fire. *See generally* Dkt. Nos. 1111, 1119, 1136, 1146. In the prior  
17 proceedings, the Court modified PG&E’s probation conditions as it saw fit and consistent with its  
18 authority under 18 U.S.C. § 3563(c). *See, e.g.*, Dkt. Nos 1243, 1388.

19         Further evidentiary proceedings regarding PG&E’s liability for starting the Zogg and Kincade  
20 fires in this Court are unlikely to further the goals of sentencing set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a)(2). In  
21 fact, given the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3564, penalties against PG&E for the conduct alleged in the  
22 Form 12 appear to be unavailable in this federal forum at this time. Conversely, the District Attorney’s  
23 offices in Sonoma and Shasta counties are actively prosecuting felony criminal cases against PG&E for  
24 the same underlying conduct. At this juncture, it appears that the state courts are the proper forum for  
25 further development of the evidence. Furthermore, if PG&E is convicted, a broader array of sentencing  
26 options will be available in that forum.

1 For the foregoing reasons, the United States recommends that the Court vacate the evidentiary  
2 hearing scheduled for January 10, 2022 and dispose of the Form 12 by taking judicial notice of the  
3 allegations set forth therein.

4  
5 DATED: January 6, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

6 STEPHANIE M. HINDS  
7 United States Attorney

8  
9 /s/  
10 JEFFREY B. SCHENK  
11 NOAH STERN  
12 Assistant United States Attorneys  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28