

ADF

Decision No. \_\_\_\_\_

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

---oOo---

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 3776

RICE ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA,  
PACIFIC RICE GROWERS ASSOCIATION,

Complainants,

vs.

Case No. 923.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY, THE ATCHISON,  
TOPEKA & SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY,

Defendants.

SACRAMENTO TRANSPORTATION COMPANY,  
FARMERS' TRANSPORTATION COMPANY,  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMPANY,  
and JOHN P. COGHILAN, Receiver of the  
Property of the NORTHERN ELECTRIC RAILWAY  
COMPANY,

Interveners.

BY THE COMMISSION.

OPINION ON APPLICATION  
FOR REHEARING.

On October 4, 1916, the defendants and interveners in this proceeding filed with the Railroad Commission an application for rehearing to which the Commission has given careful consideration.

This proceeding involves the reasonableness of the rates on paddy rice moving from various points in the Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys to San Francisco, Sacramento, Biggs and Gridley.

A hearing was had on the original complaint herein, and thereafter the Commission rendered its first decision on June 16, 1916. Thereafter, on application of the defendants and interveners, a rehearing was had into the entire subject matter of the proceeding. The Commission has accordingly twice gone very thoroughly into the

merits of this matter before making its final order.

We are satisfied that the rates for the transportation of paddy rice, which the Commission in its order made in this proceeding on September 23, 1916, ordered the defendants to put into effect, are just and reasonable rates. This is the only issue herein presented. In the previous order those rates were found to be just and reasonable, and we reiterate our finding of fact that those rates are just and reasonable.

The application for rehearing <sup>among other matters</sup> draws attention to certain statements in the decision of the Commission, which statements are of minor consequence and in no way affect the conclusion of the Commission as to the justness and reasonableness of the rates ordered in.

We see no merit in the application for rehearing.

ORDER DENYING APPLICATION  
FOR REHEARING.

The defendants and interveners having on October 4, 1916, filed an application for rehearing herein, and the Commission having given careful consideration to this application and being of the opinion that there is no merit therein,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that said application for rehearing be and the same hereby is denied.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 10<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1916.

Max Thelen  
H. Shoveland  
Chas. G. Anderson  
Edwin O. Edgerton  
Frank R. Durbin

Commissioners.