sjg /ms

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 79503

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DOLORES M. CONNELLY,

Complainant,

vs

PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, and John Doe/s, Mary Doe/s

Defendants.

Case No. 9236
(Filed June 16, 1971)

No appearances for complainant.
Richard A. Siegfried, Attorney at Law, for defendant.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

The above complaint was filed on June 16, 1971. Therein, the complainant prays for the following:

"Complainant requests an order for compensation from Defendant(s), charges Defendant(s) with trespass; invasion of privacy; civil rights; breakage and entry; leaving back door of residence and gate of Complainants open and ajar, respectively; nervous strain. Likewise for undue, sarcastic insinuation of being "a crook," refusal on Defendant's part to believe Complainant's statements. Likewise reimbursement for time and effort compiling this and/or telephone calls and/or any and all subsequent legal fees should same be necessary; replacement of glass on service porch of Complainant's residence; an order from making inquiry re Complainant; removal of John Doe(s) and Mary Doe(s) responsible

for this, and/or their Supervisors; holding 388-9914 and not giving this number to another subscriber; loss of rent; wasteful expenditures on advertising showing 388-9914 as the contact; any effects lost and/or removed from Complainant's residence, 249 South Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, California 90004, any medical bills which may be the outcome of this upsetment and/or nervousness, or revival of my health problem, and any and all other medical, physical, or personal injury resulting from this incident caused by Defendant(s)."

On July 30, 1971, the defendant filed an answer including various defenses.

On September 20, 1971, the Commission set the complaint for hearing before Examiner Rogers on Thursday, October 28, 1971 at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission Courtroom, State Office Building, 107 South Broadway, Los Angeles, California. Notice of the hearing was mailed to the complainant and defendant.

On Thursday, October 28, 1971, the matter was called for hearing by Examiner Rogers at the time and place prescribed in the notice of hearing. There was no appearance by or for the complainant.

Richard A. Siegfried, Attorney at Law, appeared for the defendants.

There being no appearance by complainant at 10:00 a.m., the examiner continued the matter until ten minutes after 10 o'clock. There was no appearance by the complainant. The defendant, through its legal counsel, Richard A. Siegfried, moved for a dismissal of the complaint for lack of prosecution.

Thereafter by letter dated November 8, 1971 and addressed to complainant at 249 South Gramercy Place, Los Angeles, the Commission requested that complainant advise it if she desired a hearing. As of December 2, 1971, the complainant has failed to respond to such letter.

Therefore, IT IS ORDERED that the motion is granted and the complaint is dismissed.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 21st day of DECEMBER, 1971.

Chairman

Commissioners