

ORIGINAL

Decision No. 89186 AUG 8 - 1978

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

MAX C. ROCHFORD,)
)
 Complainant,)
)
 vs.)
)
 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON CO.,)
)
 Defendant.)

(ECP)
 Case No. 10568
 (Filed May 11, 1978)

Max C. Rochford, for himself,
 complainant.
D. E. Sparks and Charles Craze,
 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 Los Angeles on July 6, 1978 and the matter was submitted. Complainant testified on his own behalf. Testimony on behalf of defendant was presented by Charles Craze.

Complainant complains that he has been billed incorrectly in that his bill for the bimonthly period from November 10, 1977 to January 12, 1978 was \$96.58 as compared with an average billing in the range of \$45 to \$55 for the preceding and the succeeding months. He seeks a reduction of the bill to the average bill for 1977 which he computes to be \$50.82.

The evidence shows that complainant has resided at his present premises since March 12, 1976, and during only one billing period has his electric energy consumption approximated that of which he complains in this proceeding. He did not complain at the earlier occasion because he was at that time using his air conditioner in a fashion which would have generated the billing he received, i.e., \$93.67. However, he complains of the present bill for the reason that the air conditioner was not used during that period and for the further reason that no other excessive use of electrical appliances was made. As to complainant, the relatively large bill for the period closing January 12, 1978 is completely unexplained.

Defendant testified that the meter at complainant's premises was tested and found to be operating accurately. Further, the meter readings were confirmed by defendant.

While complainant believes it impossible that he could have used the amount of energy for which he was billed for the bimonthly period ending January 12, 1978, the evidence is clear that the meter at complainant's premises was not in error and was 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 tariff.

IT IS ORDERED that the relief requested is denied and that the sum of \$147.78 impounded by the Commission be paid to defendant together with any other sums impounded with respect to this proceeding.

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

Dated at San Francisco, California, this 8th day of AUGUST, 1978.

Robert Bateman
President

Yesson L. Sturgeon
Robert D. Good

Commissioners

Commissioner William Symons, Jr., being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.

Commissioner Claire T. Dedrick, being necessarily absent, did not participate in the disposition of this proceeding.