ORIGINAL

0

53066 Decision No.

GF

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Application of IVO S. KEYSER, HAROLD M. KEYSER, and) GERALD W. KEYSER, copartners doing) business as SANDERCOCK TRUCKING COMPANY,) Application No. 36103 for a certificate of public conven-ience and necessity to operate as a highway common carrier for the transportation of property.

<u>O P I N I O N</u>

Ivo S. Keyser, Harold M. Keyser and Gerald W. Keyser are engaged in the transportation of property in California pursuant to permits issued by this Commission.

Applicants seek an order authorizing them to conduct service as a highway common carrier for the transportation of general commodities generally between Los Angeles Basin Territory and Merced; Los Angeles Basin Territory and Paso Robles; Los Angeles Basin Territory and Taft and Maricopa; Brawley and points within 30 miles of Brawley, on the one hand, and the points above mentioned on the other, including intermediate and lateral points.

Notice of filing of the application was given all common carriers subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

This application was filed pursuant to Decision No. 50448, in Case No. 5478, dated August 17, 1954. In that decision, the Commission enunciated a policy under which it may consider operation as a highway permit carrier up to and including September 10, 1953, as evidence of public convenience and necessity, if it appears that such operation may be found to constitute common carriage under the terms of the Nolan decision (Nolan v. Public Utilities Commission, 41 C (2d) 392). The allegations of the application and the representations filed in this matter indicate, however, and the

-1-

-A-35103 GF

Commission finds that as of September 10, 1953, applicants were conducting their operations within the scope of the permits heretofore issued by this Commission. Such operations not having constituted highway common carriage, the sought certificate of public convenience and necessity is not a requisite for continuance of applicants' operations as conducted on the said date; and the application will be denied.

The applicants are hereby placed on notice that the Commission, by this decision, makes no finding and expresses no opinion as to whether applicants have or have not been conducting their operations within the scope of their permitted authority since September 10, 1953; and that the provisions of Section 1063 of the Public Utilities Code will be strictly enforced.

$\underline{O} \underline{R} \underline{D} \underline{E} \underline{R}$

The Commission has considered the application and representations filed herein, Now Therefore

IT IS ORDERED that Application No. 36103 is denied.

The effective date of this order shall be ninety days after the date hereof.

Dated at _____ Los Angeles , California, this // day May_, 1956. of resident ommissioners