

AEF

Decision No. ✓

ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

---oOo---

In the Matter of the Application of )  
the EAST SIDE CANAL and IRRIGATION )  
COMPANY for an order directing the )  
consumer to specifically designate )  
the particular portion of a holding )  
of land on which he does not pay )  
the water bill. )

Application No. 2340.

Decision No. 3326

BY THE COMMISSION.

O P I N I O N

In this application East Side Canal and Irrigation Company asks for an order of the Commission directing its consumers to designate by metes and bounds that portion of the tracts which they own, or are in charge of, and which they desire to have irrigated; and that if any portion of the tract not included within such designation is irrigated, that a charge of \$1.50 per acre per annum may be imposed upon the consumer for all such additional irrigation.

We do not believe there is any merit in this application. When a consumer first files his application for water he, of course, designates the acreage and the particular tract in which the irrigation is to be made. The Company may at any time investigate to see whether acreage in addition to that applied for is being irrigated. If additional acreage is being irrigated of course the consumer properly may be required to pay therefor at the rates fixed by the Commission.

The Commission can not allow any such charge as \$1.50 per annum per acre therefor, however, but only the rates already provided by the Commission.

O R D E R .

The Commission having given careful consideration to this application, and finding that there is no merit therein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this application be and the same is hereby dismissed.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 12<sup>th</sup>  
day of May, 1916.

Max Shelton  
H. H. K. K. K.

Frank R. Debn

Commissioners.