

Decision No. 52

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Decision No. 52

C. H. JOHNSON, I. SELIG
and J. SELIG, DOING BUSINESS
UNDER THE NAME AND STYLE OF
J. C. JOHNSON,

Complainant,

No. 249.

vs.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY,

Defendant.

DECISION.

Loveland, Commissioner.

In this case complainants ask for reparation in the sum of \$14.28, or the difference between the charges assessed and collected on shipments of two carloads of cattle from Montague, California, to San Francisco, California.

Two grounds are set forth as a basis for demanding reparation, viz: First, misapplication of Southern Pacific Company Live Stock Tariff 645, C.R.C. 25, under the terms of which the through commodity rate Montague to San Francisco was greater than the combination rates Montague to Suisun and Suisun to San Francisco. Second, the alleged unreasonableness of the through commodity rate under which the traffic moved.

Docket No. 230 heretofore decided by this Commission comprehended the same facts and circumstances as are found in this case and by stipulation herunto attached and made a part of this decision, the parties to this action agree that this case may be decided on the record of Docket 230. For the reason, therefore, set forth in the decision in Case 230, to-wit, on the ground of the unreasonableness of the rate applied on the shipments in question, reparation is hereby awarded to complainants in the sum of \$14.28, which amount defendants are directed to pay to complainants.

The foregoing decision is hereby approved and ordered
filed as the decision of the Commission.

John W. Eckelman
H. D. ...
W. Gordon

Commissioners.

San Francisco, California.
March 15, 1912.

BEFORE THE RAILROAD COMMISSION OF CALIFORNIA.

J. G. JOHNSON, et al
Complainants,
vs.
SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY,
Defendant.

No. 249.

It is hereby stipulated by and between the parties to the above entitled proceeding that the same may be, and hereby is submitted to the Commission for decision upon the record heretofore made in the proceeding of Grayson-Owen Company, et al vs Southern Pacific Company, No. 230, C.R.C., the issues raised being the same in both cases.

J. B. Bracken
Attorney for Complainant.

C. H. Dubois and Geo. D. Quinn
Attorneys for Defendant.

Dated February 27th, 1912.