Decision No. 24497.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STANDARD PACKING COMPANY WOODWARD-BENNETT PACKING COMPANY COAST PACKING COMPANY DISTRIBUTORS PACKING COMPANY UNION PACKING COMPANY MERCHANTS PACKING COMPANY NEWMARKET COMPANY GLOBE PACKING COMPANY LOS ANGELES PACKING COMPANY ASSOCIATED MEAT COMPANY ASSOCIATED MEAT COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA SAN ANTONIO MEAT COMPANY PEFRLESS PACKING COMPANY W. H. GOODNO D. H. LILLYWHITE WASHEURN & CONDON SOUTHWEST COMMISSION COMPANY CALIFORNIA LIVE STOCK COMMISSION COMPANY, INC. Complainants,

Case No. 3040.

ARGINA

SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY HOLTON INTER-URBAN RAILWAY COMPANY

VS.

Defendants.

Richard T. Eddy, for complainants and The Cudahy Packing Company, intervener.

James E. Lyons and H. H. McElroy, for defendants.

CARR, Commissioner:

OPINION ON REHEARING

The rehearing herein was granted largely upon defendents' representation that they had been taken by surprise at the original hearing and had not properly presented their defense. Following this, various hearings were had at which the defendants, as well as the complainants, were given rather wide latitude in presentation of additional evidence. At the request of the parties briefs were permitted. These were finally filed on December 26, 1931, and the case submitted.

1.

JIA

At one stage of the proceedings on rehearing defendants argued that the rule of tariff construction announced by this Commission in <u>Griffith Co. et al. vs. P.E.Ry.Co.</u>, 34 C.R.C. 796, and later by the United States Supreme Court in <u>Great Northern R.Co</u>. vs. <u>Delmar Co.</u>, 75 L. ed. 1349, admittedly taking precedence over the embiguity rule stated in the original opinion, should be applied in interpreting the tariff in question. Subsequently however the defendants, for reasons of their own, withdrew all evidence supporting the application of this rule.

With the record as thus deliberately left, no ground has been shown for departing from the reasoning and conclusions contained in the original opinion, which should therefore be reaffirmed.

I recommend the following form of order:

ORDER ON REHEARING

Hearings on rehearing having been had and the case finally submitted, and the Commission being fully advised,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the original opinion and order herein be reaffirmed as the opinion and order of the Commission.

The effective date of this order shall be thirty (30) days from the date hereof.

The foregoing opinion and order on rehearing are hereby adopted as the opinion and order on rehearing of the Railroad Commission of the State of California.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 1877 any of January, 1932.

2.