Decision No. 8512.

é,

BEFOR	E TI	e raij	ROAD	COMMISSION
0 <i>3</i>	THE	STATE	OF C.	ALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of) James A. Murray, Wm. G. Henshaw and) Ed Fletcher, copartners, doing business under the name and style of the) Cuyamaca Water Company for an order) Application No. 4515 authorizing and permitting an increase in the rentals, tolls and charges for water furnished by them and service) rendered by them in furnishing water) in the County of San Diego.

In the Matter of the Application of James A. Murray, Wm. G. Henshaw and Ed Fletcher, doing business under the firm name and style of the Cuyamaca Water Company, for an order authorizing and permitting them to place a surcharge upon their present rentals, tolls and charges for water furnished by them, such surcharge being necessary on account of the increased cost of operation.

Robert Ross et al.,

Complainants,

-72-

James A. Murray et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1272

Application No. 4670

BY THE COMMISSION:

OPINION AND ORDER DENVING REHEARING

Application for rehearing was filed herein on October 8, 1920, by John C. Brewer and a large number of other consumers. This application, among other things, sets forth that the opinion and order as to which rehearing is sought (Decision No. 8145), is in error in stating that the parties to the proceeding stipulated that the records of all prior proceedings concerning the applicant water company should be deemed in evidence as part of the record in this proceeding. An examination of the transcript indicates that applicants are correct in this contention, the fact being that such records of prior proceedings were ordered by the Commissioner presiding at the hearing to be admitted in evidence as a part of the record in this proceeding. Applicants, however, did not consent to such order, but objected thereto.

Incomuch as the statement complained of appears only in the opinion, and constitutes no part of the order as to which rehearing is sought, it is not deemed material in passing upon the application for rehearing.

After fully considering the matters set forth in the application on the grounds therein specified for rehearing, the Commission is of the opinion, and therefore orders, that the said application for rehearing should be, and the same is hereby, denied.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 4/2 day of January, 1921.

2.