

LM

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 74006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITY OF SAN CARLOS, a Municipal
corporation,

Complainant,

vs.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY, a
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 8697
(Filed October 10, 1967)

Investigation on the Commission's
own motion into the Rates, Charges,
Rules, Operations, Practices,
Contracts, Leases, Service and
Facilities of all the vehicular
parking areas adjacent to railroad
stations between San Francisco and
San Jose, California, owned or
controlled by SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY.

Case No. 8700
(Filed October 10, 1967)

CONTEMPT PROCEEDING

Alan C. Furth and John MacDonald Smith,
for Southern Pacific Company, respondent.
Richard D. Gravelle, Counsel, for the
Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

On November 15, 1967, the Commission issued an order re-
quiring Southern Pacific Company to appear and show cause, if any it
had, why it should not be adjudged to be in contempt of the Commission
for failing to comply with certain provisions of a Commission order
dated October 10, 1967, as amended by Decision No. 73251 dated
October 24, 1967.

Public hearing on the Order to Show Cause was held on November 30, 1967 and December 21, 1967, at San Francisco, with the matter being submitted on the latter date.

The record indicates that by its order dated October 10, 1967, the Commission instituted an investigation into the operations of all vehicular parking areas adjacent to the railroad stations between San Francisco and San Jose, California, owned or controlled by Southern Pacific Company to determine the reasonableness of parking charges recently imposed or about to be imposed by Southern Pacific Company. Pending such investigation the order restrained Southern Pacific Company from charging or collecting parking tolls at any of its parking areas, adjacent to its tracks, between San Francisco and San Jose. By Decision No. 73251, dated October 24, 1967, following oral argument, the restraining order was modified by excluding therefrom the parking areas located at San Francisco and Mountain View; however, Southern Pacific Company was ordered to charge no more than 25 cents at the Mountain View lot. Decision No. 73251 also required respondent to remove or cover all rental signs and rental equipment from the parking areas made subject to the restraining order as amended.

The order of October 10, 1967, was served upon respondent by registered mail on October 12, 1967, and became effective on November 1, 1967. A copy of Decision No. 73251 was served upon respondent by registered mail on October 27, 1967, and the order became effective on October 30, 1967.

An affidavit in support of the Order to Show Cause was prepared by an employee of the Commission and was introduced as a part of Exhibit C-1. It was his testimony that he visited the parking areas herein considered on November 2, 3, 6 7 and 8, 1967,

and personally observed 44 separate and distinct violations of the Commission's restraining order, as amended. The witness testified that he personally purchased parking lot tickets and observed others purchasing tickets at the various lots. He further testified that respondent had failed to cover the rental signs and rental equipment at said parking areas. The witness also testified that he observed individuals paying 35 cents for parking lot tickets at the Mountain View area.

Respondent made no affirmative showing, but its President appeared pursuant to a subpoena and testified that upon being advised by counsel that the Commission's restraining order was invalid he personally made the decision on behalf of respondent not to comply with said order and that respondent continued its program of collecting parking fees notwithstanding the Commission's order to the contrary.

The record further indicates that the State Supreme Court of the State of California took the following course of action with respect to petitions and an application filed by respondent as a result of the Commission's restraining order:

- (1) November 8, 1967, denied respondent's petition for a writ of prohibition.
- (2) November 29, 1967, denied respondent's petition for a writ of prohibition and application for a stay of the Commission's restraining order.
- (3) December 20, 1967, denied respondent's petition for a writ of review of the Commission's restraining order.

Findings

The Commission finds as follows:

1. Southern Pacific Company is a public utility "railroad corporation" within the meaning of Section 230 of the Public Utilities Code and subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

2. On October 10, 1967, this Commission issued an order restraining Southern Pacific Company from charging or collecting parking tolls at any of its parking areas adjacent to its tracks between San Francisco and San Jose pending further order of the Commission. A copy of said order was served upon Southern Pacific Company by registered mail on October 12, 1967, and became effective on November 1, 1967.

3. By Decision No. 73251, dated October 24, 1967, the Commission amended its order of October 10, 1967 and deleted therefrom the parking areas located at San Francisco and Mountain View, and in addition limited the parking charge at Mountain View to 25 cents. Said decision also required Southern Pacific Company to remove or cover all rental signs and rental equipment. A copy of Decision No. 73251 was served upon Southern Pacific Company by registered mail on October 27, 1967, and the order became effective on October 30, 1967.

4. On November 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8, 1967, an employee of the Commission visited the parking areas covered by the Commission's restraining order and personally observed 44 separate instances wherein Southern Pacific Company had failed to comply with the Commission's restraining order dated October 10, 1967, as amended by Decision No. 73251.

5. On November 15, 1967, the Commission by Decision No. 73352 issued an order requiring Southern Pacific Company to appear before Commissioner Bennett or Examiner Daly on November 30, 1967, at the Commission's Courtroom in San Francisco and then and there show cause, if any it had, why it should not be adjudged to be in contempt of this Commission and punished therefor in the manner prescribed by law for the 44 separate and distinct offenses of alleged contempt set

forth in the affidavit attached to the Order to Show Cause. A copy of said Order to Show Cause and copies of documents in support thereof were personally served upon an officer of Southern Pacific Company on November 15, 1967.

6. During the course of hearing upon the Order to Show Cause the President of Southern Pacific Company admitted that he was fully aware of the restraining order of the Commission, understood the content and nature thereof, but personally decided on behalf of Southern Pacific Company, not to comply with said order and that said company did in fact collect and continue to collect, as of December 21, 1967, parking charges at the parking areas covered by the Commission's restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended.

7. Southern Pacific Company at all the times mentioned herein did not, and now does not, specify rates and charges in its schedules filed with the Commission and in effect at such times applicable to the parking charges collected by it at the parking areas covered by the Commission's restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended; nor was Southern Pacific Company during any of such times authorized by the Commission to assess and collect such charges.

8. The restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended, has been in effect at all times since November 1, 1967.

9. The Supreme Court of the State of California on three separate occasions since November 8, 1967 has denied to Southern Pacific Company writs of prohibition and review and an application for a stay of the Commission's order of October 10, 1967, as amended.

10. Southern Pacific Company willfully, intentionally and flagrantly failed to comply with the Commission's restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended, on the 44 separate and distinct instances as set forth in the affidavit in support of the Order to Show Cause in Exhibit C-1 of this proceeding.

Conclusions

1. Southern Pacific Company in willfully and intentionally failing to comply with the Commission's restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended, on the 44 separate and distinct instances referred to in Finding 10 above is in contempt of the Commission.

2. Southern Pacific Company should be fined the sum of \$500 for each of such 44 instances, in the total amount of \$22,000, in the manner set forth in the following order.

3. Southern Pacific Company should be directed to formulate and file a plan with the Commission to refund all moneys collected by it as parking charges at the parking areas here involved from November 2, 1967 to the effective date of this order.

A recommended decision was presented to the Commission by Commissioner Bennett. Some revisions were made therein by the Commission, including an additional finding, conclusion and ordering paragraphs. In order that such recommended decision may be available to the parties, a copy thereof is attached hereto (Attachment "A").

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern Pacific Company is hereby adjudged to be in contempt of the Commission's restraining order dated October 10, 1967, as amended by Decision No. 73251 for failing to comply therewith on the 44 separate and distinct occasions as set forth in the affidavit in support of the Order to Show Cause as evidenced by Exhibit C-1 in this proceeding.


2. Southern Pacific Company, within ten days of the effective date hereof, shall formulate and file with the Commission a plan whereby it will refund parking charges to those persons from whom Southern Pacific Company, without authority from the Commission, collected them in connection with the parking areas named in the order of October 10, 1967, as amended. Such plan shall provide, among other things, that claimants for refunds shall have a period of ninety days, from May 7, 1968, the date upon which Southern Pacific Company shall cause to be published and posted a "Notice of Refund" in an appropriate place, to establish and file their claims.

3. Southern Pacific Company shall pay to the Commission a fine in the amount of \$22,000. Such sums as Southern Pacific Company shall pay out, pursuant to a plan referred to in paragraph 2 hereof and which plan will have been approved by the Commission, shall be credited against said fine. The entire amount of the fine remaining unpaid shall in any event be paid within ten days after the expiration of the ninety day period hereinabove mentioned.

The Secretary of the Commission shall cause a copy of this order to be personally served upon Southern Pacific Company and the effective date of this order shall be twenty days after such service.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 16th
day of APRIL 1968.

[Signature]
President



William J. Squorsky
Fred P. Moursley
Commissioners

LM

Attachment "A"

Decision No. _____

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITY OF SAN CARLOS, a Municipal
corporation,

Complainant,

vs.

SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY, a
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 8697
(Filed October 10, 1967)

Investigation on the Commission's
own motion into the Rates, Charges,
Rules, Operations, Practices,
Contracts, Leases, Service and
Facilities of all the vehicular
parking areas adjacent to railroad
stations between San Francisco and
San Jose, California owned or
controlled by SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY.

Case No. 8700
(Filed October 10, 1967)

CONTEMPT PROCEEDING

Alan C. Furth and John MacDonald Smith,
For Southern Pacific Company, respondent.
Richard D. Gravelle, Counsel, for the
Commission staff.

O P I N I O N

On November 15, 1967, the Commission issued an order re-
quiring Southern Pacific Company to appear and show cause, if any it
had, why it should not be adjudged to be in contempt of the Commission
for failing to comply with certain provisions of a Commission order
dated October 10, 1967, as amended by Decision No. 73251 dated
October 24, 1967.

Attachment "A"

Public hearing on the Order to Show Cause was held before Commissioner Bennett and Examiner Daly on November 30, 1967 and December 21, 1967, at San Francisco, with the matter being submitted on the latter date.

The record indicates that by its order dated October 10, 1967, the Commission instituted an investigation into the operations of all vehicular parking areas adjacent to the railroad stations between San Francisco and San Jose, California, owned or controlled by Southern Pacific Company to determine the reasonableness of parking charges recently imposed or about to be imposed by Southern Pacific Company. Pending such investigation the order restrained Southern Pacific Company from charging or collecting parking tolls at any of its parking areas, adjacent to its tracks, between San Francisco and San Jose. By Decision No. 73251, dated October 24, 1967, following oral argument, the restraining order was modified by excluding therefrom the parking areas located at San Francisco and Mountain View; however, Southern Pacific Company was ordered to charge no more than 25 cents at the Mountain View lot. Decision No. 73251 also required respondent to remove or cover all rental signs and rental equipment from the parking areas made subject to the restraining order as amended.

The order of October 10, 1967, was served upon respondent by registered mail on October 12, 1967, and became effective on November 1, 1967. A copy of Decision No. 73251 was served upon respondent by registered mail on October 27, 1967, and the order became effective on October 30, 1967.

An affidavit in support of the Order to Show Cause was prepared by an employee of the Commission and was introduced as a part of Exhibit C-1. It was his testimony that he visited the parking areas herein considered on November 2, 3, 6 7 and 8, 1967;

Attachment "A"

and personally observed 44 separate and distinct violations of the Commission's restraining order, as amended. The witness testified that he personally purchased parking lot tickets and observed others purchasing tickets at the various lots. He further testified that respondent had failed to cover the rental signs and rental equipment at said parking areas. The witness also testified that he observed individuals paying 35 cents for parking lot tickets at the Mountain View area.

Respondent made no affirmative showing, but its President appeared pursuant to a subpoena and testified that upon being advised by counsel that the Commission's restraining order was invalid he personally made the decision on behalf of respondent not to comply with said order and that respondent continued its program of collecting parking fees notwithstanding the Commission's order to the contrary.

The record further indicates that the State Supreme Court of the State of California took the following course of action with respect to petitions and an application filed by respondent as a result of the Commission's restraining order:

- (1) November 8, 1967, denied respondent's petition for a writ of prohibition.
- (2) November 29, 1967, denied respondent's petition for a writ of prohibition and application for a stay of the Commission's restraining order.
- (3) December 20, 1967, denied respondent's petition for a writ of review of the Commission's restraining order.

Findings

After consideration the Commission finds as follows:

1. Southern Pacific Company is a public utility "railroad corporation" within the meaning of Section 230 of the Public Utilities Code and subject to the jurisdiction of this Commission.

Attachment "A"

2. On October 10, 1967, this Commission issued an order restraining Southern Pacific Company from charging or collecting parking tolls at any of its parking areas adjacent to its tracks between San Francisco and San Jose pending further order of the Commission. A copy of said order was served upon Southern Pacific Company by registered mail on October 12, 1967, and became effective on November 1, 1967.

3. By Decision No. 73251, dated October 24, 1967, the Commission amended its order of October 10, 1967 and deleted therefrom the parking areas located at San Francisco and Mountain View, and in addition limited the parking charge at Mountain View to 25 cents. Said decision also required Southern Pacific Company to remove or cover all rental signs and rental equipment. A copy of Decision No. 73251 was served upon Southern Pacific Company by registered mail on October 27, 1967, and the order became effective on October 30, 1967.

4. On November 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8, 1967, an employee of the Commission visited the parking areas covered by the Commission's restraining order and personally observed 44 separate instances wherein Southern Pacific Company had failed to comply with the Commission's restraining order dated October 10, 1967, as amended by Decision No. 73251.

5. On November 15, 1967, the Commission by Decision No. 73352 issued an order requiring Southern Pacific Company to appear before Commissioner Bennett or Examiner Daly on November 30, 1967, at the Commission's Courtroom in San Francisco and then and there show cause, if any it had, why it should not be adjudged to be in contempt of this Commission and punished therefor in the manner prescribed by law for the 44 separate and distinct offenses of alleged contempt set

Attachment "A"

forth in the affidavit attached to the Order to Show Cause. A copy of said Order to Show Cause and copies of documents in support thereof were personally served upon an officer of Southern Pacific Company on November 15, 1967.

6. During the course of hearing upon the Order to Show Cause the President of Southern Pacific Company admitted that he was fully aware of the restraining order of the Commission, understood the content and nature thereof, but personally decided on behalf of Southern Pacific Company, not to comply with said order and that said company did in fact collect and continue to collect, as of December 21, 1967, parking charges at the parking areas covered by the Commission's restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended.

7. The restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended, has been in effect at all times since November 1, 1967.

8. The Supreme Court of the State of California on three separate occasions since November 8, 1967 has denied to Southern Pacific Company writs of prohibition and review and an application for a stay of the Commission's order of October 10, 1967, as amended.

Conclusion

Southern Pacific Company willfully, intentionally and flagrantly failed to comply with the Commission's restraining order of October 10, 1967, as amended, on the 44 separate and distinct instances as set forth in the affidavit in support of the Order to Show Cause in Exhibit C-1 of this proceeding.

During the course of hearing Southern Pacific Company filed a petition to disqualify Commissioner Bennett. The Commission denied the petition, but the denial will be affirmed in the ensuing order.

Attachment "A"

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Southern Pacific Company is hereby adjudged to be in contempt of the Commission's restraining order dated October 10, 1967, as amended by Decision No. 73251 for failing to comply therewith on the 44 separate and distinct occasions as set forth in the affidavit in support of the Order to Show Cause as evidenced by Exhibit C-1 in this proceeding and within ten days after the effective date of this order shall pay to this Commission a fine in the amount of twenty-two thousand dollars (\$22,000).

2. The petition of Southern Pacific Company to disqualify Commissioner William M. Bennett is hereby denied.

The Secretary of the Commission shall cause a copy of this order to be personally served upon Southern Pacific Company and the effective date of this order shall be twenty days after such service.

Dated at _____, California, this _____ day of _____, 1968.

C. 8697

WILLIAM M. BENNETT, COMMISSIONER, DISSENTING OPINION

This case had its genesis in proceedings before this Commission concerned with establishing a reasonable fee applicable to Peninsula parking lots owned and operated by the Southern Pacific Company. On November 6, 1967, counsel for Southern Pacific in public hearing before this Commission in Case 8697 was candid in stating on the record that the Southern Pacific Company would not comply with a restraining order previously issued by this Commission on October 10, 1967, and signed by Commissioners Mitchell, Gatov and Symons. Southern Pacific took the position at that time and even during the proceedings herein that the restraining order of the Commission was invalid. Even repeated refusals by the Supreme Court of the State of California to nullify such order was disregarded by the Southern Pacific.

The refusal of the Southern Pacific Company was so notorious that undoubtedly this explains the failure of that company to present any testimony whatsoever by way of a defense to the proceedings initiated or by way of mitigation for its contemptuous action. Southern Pacific conducted itself with an air of certainty almost as though it had suddenly become immune to the jurisdiction and process of this Commission.

But for the candor of Southern Pacific counsel in freely admitting to violation of the Commission's orders, this matter would not have come to the Commission. It is most curious, perplexing and beyond explanation that neither the staff of this Commission, the Director of Transportation nor the Chief Counsel brought to our attention the disregard by Southern Pacific of a Commission order. Only the frankness of Southern Pacific counsel in the public proceedings apprised us that a lawful order of the Commission was being disobeyed. This is hardly in keeping with the concept of a vigorous, independent staff acting in the public interest. And it is so unlike staff action of recent years when it did exhibit initiative, independence and simply performed statutory duty. We

can well ask why staff personnel knowing of Southern Pacific's disregard for a Commission order chose to remain silent. I think it correct to state that but for the information supplied by Southern Pacific counsel as to the railroad's disregard for a lawful order that there never would have been knowledge of contempt let alone proceedings to impose punishment for contempt.

That the Southern Pacific Company considers itself beyond the reach of this Commission and the Supreme Court of this state is plain. It makes its own determination as to that which is binding upon it and obeys or disobeys accordingly.

The interests of its commuters, the authority of this Commission, the public service obligations of this corporation, all are seemingly of little or no concern to the management of Southern Pacific Company. This corporation should realize as should all other California public utilities that if regulation is to be ignored, if a permissive regulatory climate is to inhibit the vigor of this Commission, then the public will not be served or protected by this Commission, and the raison d'etre for its being will be gone. And when the public realization becomes widespread and if the historical process repeats itself then the only answer toward control of a public service corporation as here lies in public ownership. And shortsighted management enraptured with profit and indifferent to public need can only hasten that day.

The convenient story of the President of Southern Pacific that he believed counsel's advice that the restraining order was not valid discloses a woeful inadequacy upon the part of Southern Pacific counsel and Southern Pacific management. Obviously this was the testimony that had to be given. Merely giving it does not make it credible. Southern Pacific was here testing the Commission and almost got away with it. The difficulty was however that the contempt was so open and flagrant that it could not be disregarded. The distressing thing here is the spectacle of management totally callous toward public responsibilities and indifferent to the obligations of law.

Some comments are in order. The order of my brethren ruling upon my qualifications is irrelevant, unnecessary and beyond their power. As a Commissioner I take my authority from the constitution-- not from my colleagues. Further, I had thought that the California Supreme Court had clearly determined this matter when they denied the efforts of the Southern Pacific Company to disqualify me from the case.

Concerning the parking lot decision the majority embarks upon a most curious discussion concerning the tax liability of California railroads. The record is quite clear that Southern Pacific has a tax expense associated with each parking lot which is the subject of today's order. Heretofore the Commission has always recognized that a public utility whether it be a railroad corporation or other is entitled in the rate fixing process to compensation for taxes paid. And further in the parking lot decision in this Commission dated June 20, 1967, Decision No. 72615 the majority which is now reversing itself found specifically that SP is entitled to recoup taxes, assessments, improvements and maintenance of parking lots. Not only is the Commission disregarding its recently enunciated parking lot order but it is disregarding all of the regulatory concepts which heretofore have been considered well established, as part of the rate fixing process of this Commission. We are prompted to wonder why. Today's order insofar as it relates to the parking lots merely sets aside the decision of an impartial examiner who heard the fresh testimony and who judged the credibility of witnesses and the majority arbitrarily rewrites the decision. In seeking to reach some unformulated goal or objective the majority of necessity does violence to basic regulatory principles and law. Does the majority actually hold by this decision that there is question as to whether taxes are an operating expense in a rate proceeding? So far as the staff position is concerned there is no evidence whatsoever from the staff rebutting in any wise the hard fact that Southern Pacific has a tax liability upon each parking lot.

C. 1697

Turning to the contempt proceeding the Commission has mixed two cases terribly. There is nothing whatsoever even by employment of the single word "refund"--about refunds in the contempt case. The opinion in the contempt case which is judicial in nature is supposed to be based upon the order to show cause, the allegations of contempt associated therewith and only the evidence pertaining to these matters adduced at public hearing. There is nothing in the contempt proceedings about refunds and therefore it is improper for the Commission to be mixing parking charges, refunds, and a punitive fine in one composite order. The staff has advised us that the contempt order is erroneous in presenting for the first time and in the ultimate majority decision discussion of refunds.

There is, however, a sly benefit to the Southern Pacific by the intrusion of the irrelevancy of refunds. Southern Pacific well knows that refunds are not part of a contempt order. And all today's majority order does is to defer and to place in doubt a specific fine of \$22,000. Southern Pacific is required to set up some type of plan detailing the manner in which it shall refund parking charges. And the logical question arises at this point whether or not Southern Pacific is to base a refund plan upon Examiner Daly's original decision which provides for a 35 cent daily parking charge or whether the refund plan is to be based upon the majority's tentative daily charge of 25 cents. Standing plain in all of this is the fact that the 25 cent daily charge of the majority is not final in that the majority parking lot decision sets the matter down for further testimony to decide the tax issue and upon resolution of that issue conceivably the parking lot charge will, unless we abandon all past regulatory precedent, revert to the 35 cent charge which includes taxes as proposed by the examiner herein originally.

There is nothing in the majority order which covers the period of refunds by way of termination and all today's majority orders do is to defer any real decision either on parking lot charges or by way of imposing a \$22,000 fine now for perhaps the most flagrant contempt ever visited upon this body. Further, the confusion contained in today's contempt order whether deliberate and calculated by way of deliberate error to constitute reversal error on an appeal or whether coming from lack of expertise in the regulatory field has the same end result. And that end result is that nothing is being done to Southern Pacific. The Commission has given the Southern Pacific a beautiful error as the basis for rehearing--indeed the majority being placed upon notice of the deliberate error were quick to point out that Southern Pacific could ask for a rehearing.

One wonders whether or not the contempt order as it has been doctored and diluted by the extraneous element of refunds and as it has been rewritten has in fact given the Southern Pacific due process. My brethren do not seem to realize that contempt is a judicial proceeding and because of the penalties involved rights are to be scrupulously observed. The handling of today's orders is unique. Apparently now parties before us are to be treated to the copycat decision. And the Commission at least to its credit advertises the pure results of an impartial examiner and then illustrates its absolute power by arbitrarily assigning a decision to an examiner who never heard a line of testimony and to a commissioner who did not set on even one day's hearing. Southern Pacific is to be congratulated. A friendly Commission can achieve its ends either by an outright bold favor or if they be too much for public consumption then it can write a decision and place in it very carefully and deliberately a finding and a procedure here concerning refunds which constitutes in my opinion the basis of a successful appeal. Better then a friend of the court utilities now are served by friends at the court.

The decisions proposed by Examiner Daly were the ones which should be signed. In short, Southern Pacific should be ordered to pay and at once a \$22,000 fine. Their contempt was notorious, flagrant, self-serving and illustrative of a consistent public be damned attitude. As to the parking lot charges if the Commission does not know that since 1912 we have allowed taxes as an operating expense, they are free to wend their way through that concept and to arrive inevitably at the result contained in the examiner's original report. Southern Pacific today by the gentle treatment accorded them now has a license to be indifferent, arrogant and, if necessary, contemptuous.



/s/ WILLIAM M. BENNETT

WILLIAM M. BENNETT
Commissioner

Dated: San Francisco, California
April 16, 1968

27
C-8697
C-8700 MM

Decision No. 74006

COMMISSIONER GATOV DISSENTING:

It is my opinion that Southern Pacific Company wilfully and intentionally failed to comply with the Commission's Restraining Order of October 10, 1967 (as amended) on forty-four separate and distinct instances, and is in contempt of the Commission.

Further, it is my opinion that Southern Pacific Company should be fined in the sum of \$500.00 for each of the forty-four instances, or a total amount of \$22,000.00.

I do not concur in the order of the majority of the Commission in this case.



Commissioner

Dated: San Francisco, California,
April 16, 1968.