EA/nf

JUN 13 1978

Decision No. 88942

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FRED H. ISRAELSON,

Complainant,

vs.

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY, a California corporation, (ECP) Case No. 10515 (Filed March 9, 1978)

Defendant.

<u>Fred H. Israelson</u>, for himself, complainant. <u>John R. Stobbs</u> and Larry L. Gifford, for defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

This is an Expedited Complaint Procedure pursuant to Rule 13.2 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure and Section 1702.1 of the Public Utilities Code. A public hearing was held before Administrative Law Judge Wright in San Clemente on May 4, 1978 and the matter was submitted. Complainant testified on his own behalf. Testimony on behalf of defendant was presented by John R. Stobbs and Larry L. Gifford.

Complainant's electric bills for the last six months have ranged from a low of \$46.36 to a high of \$146.41. Although defendant has cooperated with him in field testing and bench testing his meter and replacing it as well, complainant believes it impossible that he could have used the 2819 kilowatt-hours (kwhrs) charged to him in November and the 3080 kwhrs charged to him in December: He seeks an adjustment for these two months of service.

-1-

C.10515 EA.

The evidence shows that complainant moved into his present home on or about September 21, 1977 from another home of approximately the same size in defendant's service area. His bill for electric energy increased more than double following the move.

Defendant tested complainant's meter on January 19, 1978 and it was bench-tested on March 13, 1978, both tests being within the variance permitted by the tariif.

Complainant's family is five in number and complainant had two guests from the second week of October 1977 to January 9, 1978. Complainant also informed defendant that he had used a portable heater with a capacity in excess of 3000 kwhrs during the two months when metered use was highest, but testified that, because the heater was controlled by a thermostat, it could not have consumed more than 1000 kwhrs per month. A further factor contributing to a difference in use in complainant's present residence as compared with his prior residence is that in the former he utilizes a second refrigerator in the garage.

The evidence is clear that neither of the meters at complainant's premises was in error and that they were properly read. In these circumstances, we are compelled to conclude that the high use complained of must in fact have occurred. It is the duty of defendant to charge and collect for all energy used as provided in the tariffs.

-2-

C-10515 nf

IT IS ORDERED that the relief requested is denied. The effective date of this order shall be thirty days after the date hereof.

	Dated	at	San Francisco	California, this	
1312	day	of	JUNE 1	1978.	

Valutt dent Ommi ss] oners