

Decision No. _____

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a
municipal corporation,

Complainant,

vs.

Case No. 890.

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC
COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant.

James B. Gibson, City Attorney, for
complainant.
Charles P. Cutten for defendant.

BY THE COMMISSION.

O P I N I O N.

The complaint of the City of Roseville, a municipality of the sixth class in Placer County, alleges, among other matters, that defendant, Pacific Gas and Electric Company, has been for the last five years, and still is, engaged in the business of supplying the inhabitants of the City of Roseville with electric energy; that except as to a few of its customers applicant has installed no meters, but is basing its charges upon a system of flat rates; that the charges made by defendant to its customers in the City of Roseville have been made without regard to other customers of the same class and have been unequal, unfair and discriminatory between its customers and users of the same class. The defendant, by

other words, the City has no relationship to the defendant except that of a competitor of the defendant within the City of Roseville. As far as the defendant's obligations are concerned, the City is an entire stranger to the defendant. If any existing or intending consumers of the defendant desire to complain of defendant, they can easily do so.

Under the facts herein disclosed, the complaint should be dismissed.

O R D E R

THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE having filed a complaint with the Railroad Commission against PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, a corporation, requesting this Commission to establish fair and reasonable metered rates to be charged and collected by defendant, and to order and require defendant to install meters for the purpose of measuring electric energy supplied to its several customers in said City of Roseville, and a public hearing having been held thereon at which both oral and written evidence was introduced, and the Commission finding that complainant's interest is not such as to justify this Commission in entertaining the complaint,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the above entitled proceeding be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 21st day of February, 1916.

Max Shellen

Arthur J. Brown

Edwin O. Edgerton

Frank R. Decker

Commissioners