

Decision No. 21434.**ORIGINAL**

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

J. C. BOSWELL COMPANY,
 CALIFORNIA COTTON OIL COMPANY,
 CHEWCHILLA COTTON OIL COMPANY,
 (San Joaquin Cotton Oil Company,
 Successor)
 GLOBE COTTON OIL MILLS,
 SAN JOAQUIN COTTON OIL COMPANY,
 Complainants,

Case No. 2482.

vs.

THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE
 RAILWAY COMPANY,
 SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY,
 Defendants.

J. C. BOSWELL COMPANY,
 CALIFORNIA COTTON OIL COMPANY,
 GLOBE COTTON OIL MILLS,
 LOS ANGELES SOLE COMPANY,
 PACIFIC COTTONSEED PRODUCTS CORPORATION,
 SAN JOAQUIN COTTON OIL COMPANY,
 Complainants,

vs.

THE ATCHISON, TOPEKA AND SANTA FE
 RAILWAY COMPANY,
 CALIFORNIA WESTERN RAILROAD AND NAVIGA-
 TION COMPANY,
 NORTHWESTERN PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,
 PACIFIC ELECTRIC RAILWAY COMPANY,
 PETALUMA AND SANTA ROSA RAILROAD COMPANY,
 SANTA MARIA VALLEY RAILROAD COMPANY,
 SAN DIEGO AND ARIZONA RAILWAY COMPANY,
 SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY,
 THE WESTERN PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY,
 Defendants.

Case No. 2483.

BY THE COMMISSION:

ORDER DENYING REHEARING

An application in the above numbered cases seeking changes in our Opinion and Order No. 21298 of June 28, 1929, was filed July 8, 1929, by defendant carriers, The Atchison, Topeka

and Santa Fe Railway Company and Southern Pacific Company, in Case No. 2486, and by the complainants on July 16, 1929, in Cases Nos. 2482 and 2483.

In the first petition defendants object to the volume of the rates established between the points involved and to the establishing of transit privileges for the collecting, grinding, sacking and storing of cottonseed cake and meal in excess of the charges contemporaneously made for grinding, sacking and storing in transit of grain and grain products.

The complainants' petition is devoted almost entirely to a discussion of the reasons why defendants' petition should not be granted. It also on its own behalf argues for the payment of reparation two years prior to the filing of the complaints and during the pendency of the complaints.

The Commission has given careful consideration to these two petitions for rehearing and to each and every allegation contained therein, and has also reviewed the record and briefs; and being of the opinion that no good cause for granting the petitions has been shown,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the said petitions for rehearing be and the same are hereby denied.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that the effective date of our Decision No. 21298, rendered June 28, 1929, be made September 1, 1929.

IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED that in all other respects Decision No. 21298 remain in full force and effect.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this _____ day of August, 1929.

David L. Lawrence
J. H. Lawrence
W. M. D. [unclear]
Leon [unclear]