а

Decision No. 80487

## ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the matter of the Application of THE PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, a corporation, for authority to increase certain intrastate rates and charges applicable to telephone services furnished within the State of California.

Application No. 51774 (Filed March 17, 1970)

William M. Bennett, Consumer Spokesman, and Consumers Arise Now, and association,

Complainants,

VS.

The Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company, a corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 9036 (Filed April 13, 1970)

144 SPANISH-SPEAKING TELEPHONE SUB-SCRIBERS FROM SAN FRANCISCO, SONOMA, AND IMPERIAL COUNTIES, THE SPANISH SPEAKING/SURNAMED POLITICAL ASSOCI-ATION, THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN POLITICAL ASSOCIATION, THE HEALDSBURG AND WINDSOR LOCAL ACTION COUNCILS,

Complainants and (Proposed) Protestants,

vs.

THE PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, a corporation,

Defendant and Applicant in Proposed Rate Increase #51774.

Case No. 9042 (Filed April 2, 1970) WILLIAM M. BENNETT, Consumer Spokesman, and Consumers Arise Now, an association,

Complainants,

vs.

Western Electric Company, joining Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company and American Telephone and Telegraph Company as Interested Parties,

Defendants.

Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the rates, tolls, rules, charges, operations, separations, practices, contracts, service and facilities of the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Investigation on the Commission's own motion into the rates, tolls, rules, charges, operations, separations, practices, contracts, service and facilities of the telephone operations of all the telephone corporations listed in Appendix A, attached hereto.

In the Matter of the Application of THE PACIFIC TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH COMPANY, a corporation, for authority to increase certain intrastate rates and charges applicable to telephone services furnished within the State of California in any amount necessary to offset increases in wage and salary rates.

Case No. 9043 (Filed April 6, 1970)

Case No. 9044 (Filed April 7, 1970)

Case No. 9045 (Filed April 7, 1970)

Application No. 52794 (Filed August 6, 1971)

ORDER GRANTING REHEARING AND STAY, IN PART, OF DECISION NO. 80346 AND DENYING REHEARING AND STAY IN DECISIONS NOS. 80347 AND 80348

William M. Bennett and Consumers Arise Now, the City of Hos Angeles, General Telephone Company of California, Garret Shean and Consumers Arise Now, the City of San Diego, Continental Telephone Company, California Independent Telephone Association, and Sylvia M. Siegel have filed petitions for rehearing and stays of

Decisions Nos. 80346, 80347 and 80348. The Commission has considered each and every allegation therein and is of the opinion that good cause for rehearing and a stay, in part, of Decision No. 80346, as hereafter specifically described, has been set forth.

IT IS ORDERED that rehearing of Decision No. 80346 is hereby granted, but limited, however, to the issue of refunds required to be made by General Telephone Company of California, Continental Telephone Company of California and all other independent telephone companies named as respondents in Case No. 9045, in ordering paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of Decision No. 80346. In conformance with the foregoing a stay is hereby granted, until further order of this Commission, of said ordering paragraphs 3, 4, and 5. Such rehearing shall be held at such time and place and before such Commissioner and Examiner as may hereafter be designated. In all other respects rehearing and stay of Decision No. 80346 are hereby denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondent independent telephone companies in Case No. 9045 shall continue to maintain records for possible refund purposes and to accumulate interest on such refunds at the rate of 7 percent per annum.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that rehearing and stays of Decisions Nos. 80347 and 80348 are hereby denied.

Dated at San Francisco, California, this /2 day of SEDTEMBER, 1972.

President

William Jynus

so Die

Commissioners

Commissioner J. P. Vukasin, Jr., being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.