Decision No. 67700

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Petition of) the CITY OF NORTH SACRAMENTO to) have fixed the just compensation) to be paid for the municipal water) system of CITIZENS UTILITIES COM-PANY OF CALIFORNIA existing within) and adjacent to the boundaries of said city.

Supplementary Petition of CITIZENS UTILITIES COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA for increase of the just compensation fixed by the Commission.

Supplementary Petition of the CITY OF NORTH SACRAMENTO under Section 1417 of the Public Utilities Code for a finding and order decreasing the total compensation fixed by the Commission's Decision No. 57344, dated September 15, 1958. Application No. 38629

ORIGINAL

 $\left(\cdot \right)$

ORDER FIXING EFFECTIVE DATE

Decision No. 66762, issued on February 4, 1964, found that the just compensation to be paid by the City of North Sacramento to Citizens Utilities Company of California for the taking of certain properties, fixed by the Commission in 1958 (Decision No. 57344, 56 Cal.P.U.C. 554), should be increased by the sum of \$232,000. Petition for rehearing was filed in time to stay Decision No. 66762 pending Commission action on that petition. The order denying rehearing further stayed the effective date of Decision No. 66762 for a period of thirty days. Thereafter, because of the contemplated filing of a petition for writ of review, on May 7, 1964 the effective date of Decision No. 56762 was stayed pending further Commission order.

KВ

1.

KB A. 386

Writ of review was denied by the Supreme Court of California on July 22, 1964. (<u>Citizens Utilities Company v Public Utilities</u> <u>Commission</u>, S.F. No. 21696.) Time to apply for a rehearing in the Supreme Court having expired, IT IS ORDERED that the effective date of Decision No. 66762 is the date of this order fixing effective date.

Dated at _	San Francisco	, California, this //
day of	AUGUST	 1964.
		Frederich B. Huleloff President Were Hill Henge I. Chover
	-	Commissioners
	De In	Dumissioner William M. Bennett, being becessarily absent, did not participate a the disposition of this proceeding.