



1           **IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO**

2   Filing Date: March 18, 2024

3   **PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO,**  
4   **and PNM RESOURCES, INC.,**

5           Appellants,

6   v.

**NO. S-1-SC-39152**

7   **NEW MEXICO PUBLIC REGULATION**  
8   **COMMISSION,**

9           Appellee,

10   and

11   **NEW ENERGY ECONOMY,**  
12   **WESTERN RESOURCE ADVOCATES,**  
13   **INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD**  
14   **OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS LOCAL 611,**  
15   **and THE OFFICE OF THE NEW MEXICO**  
16   **ATTORNEY GENERAL, COALITION FOR**  
17   **CLEAN AFFORDABLE ENERGY, DINE CITIZENS**  
18   **AGAINST RUINING THE ENVIRONMENT, SAN**  
19   **JUAN CITIZENS ALLIANCE, TO NIZHONI ANI,**  
20   **NAVA EDUCATION PROJECT, BERNALILLO COUNTY,**  
21   **ALBUQUERQUE BERNALILLO COUNTY WATER**  
22   **UTILITY AUTHORITY, and NEW MEXICO**  
23   **AFFORDABLE RELIABLE ENERGY ALLIANCE,**

24           Intervenors-Appellees.

25   **In the Matter of The Joint Application of Iberdrola, S.A.,**  
26   **Avangrid, Inc., Avangrid Networks, Inc., NM Green**

I CERTIFY AND ATTEST:  
A true copy was served on all parties  
or their counsel of record on date filed.

*Micole Vigil*

Clerk of the Supreme Court  
of the State of New Mexico

1 **Holdings, Inc., Public Service Company of New**  
2 **Mexico and PNM Resources, Inc. For Approval of the**  
3 **Merger of NM Green Holdings, Inc. with PNM Resources,**  
4 **Inc.; Approval of a General Diversification Plan; and All**  
5 **Other Authorizations and Approvals Required to**  
6 **Consummate and Implement this Transaction,**  
7 **NMPRC Case No. 20-00222-UT**

8 **DECISION**

9 **BACON, Chief Justice.**

10 {1} This is an appeal from a final order of the New Mexico Public Regulation  
11 Commission (the Commission) rejecting the proposed merger between the Public  
12 Service Company of New Mexico and Avangrid, Inc. (Avangrid), et al., because the  
13 proposed merger is not in the public interest. *See* NMSA 1978, § 62-6-12 (1989)  
14 (providing that a merger is among the transactions that require Commission  
15 approval); NMSA 1978, § 62-6-13 (1941) (providing that the Commission shall not  
16 approve any proposed transaction that is inconsistent with the public interest). The  
17 Commission also in its final order imposed a \$10,000 penalty on Appellants<sup>1</sup> for  
18 violating discovery-related orders of the Commission. *See* NMSA 1978, § 62-12-4

---

<sup>1</sup>“Appellants” refers collectively to Avangrid, Inc. (Avangrid), Avangrid Networks, Inc. (Avangrid Networks), NM Green Holdings, Inc., Iberdrola, S.A. (Iberdrola), Public Service Company of New Mexico, and PNM Resources, Inc.

1 (1993) (providing that the Commission may impose a penalty from \$100 to \$100,000  
2 for violating an order of the Commission).

3 {2} After Appellants briefed numerous challenges to the Commission’s final order  
4 and the Court held oral argument on September 15, 2023, Appellants filed notices  
5 that the proposed merger agreement was terminated. Avangrid and its corporate  
6 affiliates—Avangrid, Avangrid Networks, NM Green Holdings, Inc., and Iberdrola  
7 (the Avangrid appellants)—then filed a notice to withdraw from the appeal. The  
8 Public Service Company of New Mexico and PNM Resources, Inc. (hereinafter  
9 PNM) filed a motion to dismiss all matters in this appeal except one: the challenge  
10 to the Commission’s \$10,000 sanction levied against Appellants. On January 22,  
11 2024, we issued an order granting withdrawal of the Avangrid appellants and  
12 dismissing all issues except the challenge to the sanction, which we adjudicate  
13 herein.

14 {3} PNM, which is the only appellant remaining, contends that the sanction levied  
15 against Appellants should be vacated because it is overbroad, given that only  
16 Avangrid failed to comply with discovery-related orders. We agree that the \$10,000  
17 penalty against Appellants is overbroad and must be vacated.

18 {4} Pursuant to NMSA 1978, Section 62-11-5 (1982), we must annul and vacate  
19 the final order in its entirety. *See Hobbs Gas Co. v. N.M. Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, 1993-

1 NMSC-032, ¶ 6, 115 N.M. 678, 858 P.2d 54 (concluding that the Court may declare  
2 parts of an order to be reasonable and lawful while vacating an order in its entirety  
3 pursuant to Section 62-11-5). We remand the case to the Commission for further  
4 proceedings as necessary and entry of an order consistent with this opinion. *See id.*  
5 (“Following remand to the Commission, the Commission may properly enter an  
6 order embodying those provisions in the earlier, vacated order that have been  
7 declared reasonable and lawful.”).

8 {5} We exercise our discretion to dispose of this appeal by nonprecedential  
9 decision. *See* Rule 12-405(B) NMRA (providing that a case may be disposed of by  
10 nonprecedential decision when, for example, “[t]he issues presented have been  
11 previously decided by the Supreme Court”). We therefore assume the parties’  
12 familiarity with the record and summarize the proceedings below only to the extent  
13 necessary to explain our reasoning.

14 **THE COMMISSION’S \$10,000 PENALTY LEVIED AGAINST ALL**  
15 **APPELLANTS IS OVERBROAD**

16 {6} The Commission in its final order ordered Joint Applicants (i.e., Appellants)  
17 to pay a penalty of \$10,000 pursuant to its sanction power under Section 62-12-4.  
18 *See id.* (providing that “[a]ny person or corporation . . . which fails, omits or neglects  
19 to obey, observe or comply with any lawful order, or any part or provision thereof,  
20 of the commission is subject to a penalty of not less than one hundred dollars (\$100)

1 nor more than one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) for each offense”). The  
2 Commission grounded the penalty in Joint Applicants’ “failure to obey orders  
3 related to discovery.”

4 {7} PNM argues that the sanctions were erroneously imposed as to Appellants  
5 other than Avangrid because “[t]here is no evidence that the Appellants as a group  
6 failed to comply with discovery rules or orders” and the other parties were not given  
7 notice or an opportunity to respond, resulting in a due process violation.

8 {8} The Commission concedes that it erroneously sanctioned parties other than  
9 Avangrid because it agrees with PNM that there is no evidence in the record that any  
10 party other than Avangrid violated a discovery rule or order. Although we are not  
11 bound by the Commission’s concession, *In re Final Order in Alta Vista Subdivision*  
12 *DP No. 1498 WQCC 07-11(A)*, 2011-NMCA-097, ¶ 11, 150 N.M. 694, 265 P.3d  
13 745, we find it meaningful that the adjudicative body that imposed the sanction now  
14 substantively rejects it.

15 {9} Intervenor New Energy Economy (NEE) argues that we should affirm the  
16 sanction against Appellants because all, or apparently all, relevant filings were made  
17 on behalf of Joint Applicants as a group including, specifically, the responses and  
18 objections to discovery requests. Additionally, we note that the related orders of the  
19 Hearing Examiner (HE) from May 11, 2021, and June 14, 2021, were directed at

1 Joint Applicants. In these orders, the HE demanded information from Joint  
2 Applicants, not merely Avangrid, and also warned that Joint Applicants could be  
3 subject to sanctions.

4 {10} Yet we perceive an issue with NEE's theory of shared liability. Iberdrola was  
5 not joined into the case until June 8, 2021, and it was not a party in the case when  
6 Joint Applicants filed incomplete responses to NEE Interrogatory 4-55. Nor was  
7 Iberdrola a party on May 18, 2021, the date that Joint Applicants filed the response  
8 to the HE's May 11, 2021 order that the HE concluded was incomplete. And  
9 although Iberdrola was a party when the HE issued the June 14, 2021 order, that  
10 order was retrospective, requiring information about potential violations that took  
11 place prior to Iberdrola's entry into the case. In sum, Iberdrola does not appear to  
12 have been a party in the case when Joint Applicants failed to provide information in  
13 response to the discovery requests at issue and failed to respond adequately to the  
14 HE's orders. In our view, this undermines NEE's theory of joint liability based on  
15 jointly filed responses.

16 {11} Moreover, the Commission did not explain in its final order why Appellants  
17 are liable as a group or what specific orders Appellants did not follow. Thus, we  
18 cannot fully evaluate the Commission's reasoning or the specific facts that informed  
19 its decision.

1 {12} Given that the Commission concedes on appeal that it improperly expanded  
2 the sanction to parties beyond Avangrid, Iberdrola seemingly was not joined into the  
3 case until after the violations identified by the HE, and the Commission did not in  
4 its order provide an explanation for expanding liability to Appellants other than  
5 Avangrid, we conclude that the sanction on all Appellants was “unreasonable, or  
6 unlawful” under NMSA 1978, § 62-11-4 (1941). *See Resolute Wind 1 LLC v. N.M.*  
7 *Pub. Reg. Comm’n*, 2022-NMSC-011, ¶ 20, 506 P.3d 346 (“The appropriate inquiry  
8 in determining whether an order of the Commission is unreasonable or unlawful is  
9 whether the Commission’s decision was arbitrary and capricious, unsupported by  
10 substantial evidence, or an abuse of the agency’s discretion.” (text only)<sup>2</sup> (citation  
11 omitted)).

12 {13} The statutory remedy for an erroneous Commission order is clear. Section 62-  
13 11-5 provides that

14 [t]he [S]upreme [C]ourt shall have no power to modify the action or  
15 order appealed from, but shall either affirm or annul and vacate the  
16 same. The [S]upreme [C]ourt shall vacate and annul the order  
17 complained of if it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the court that  
18 the order is unreasonable or unlawful.

---

<sup>2</sup>“(Text only)” indicates the omission of nonessential punctuation marks—including internal quotation marks, ellipses, and brackets—that are present in the text of the quoted source, leaving the quoted text otherwise unchanged.

1 “Following remand to the Commission, the Commission may properly enter an order  
2 embodying those provisions in the earlier, vacated order that have been declared  
3 reasonable and lawful.” *Hobbs Gas Co.*, 1993-NMSC-032, ¶ 6.

4 **CONCLUSION**


5 {14} We declare the discovery sanction directed at Appellants unreasonable and  
6 unlawful. In accordance with Section 62-11-5, we annul and vacate the final order  
7 in its entirety and remand to the Commission for further proceedings and the entry  
8 of an order consistent with this opinion.

9 {15} **IT IS SO ORDERED.**




10  
11 **C. SHANNON BACON, Chief Justice**


12 **WE CONCUR:**



13  
14 **MICHAEL E. VIGIL, Justice**



15  
16 **DAVID K. THOMSON, Justice**



17  
18 **JULIE J. VARGAS, Justice**



19  
20 **BRIANA H. ZAMORA, Justice**