

ALJ/GEW/sid

Mailed

JAN 21 1998

Decision 98-01-052 January 21, 1998

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

W. Victor,

Complainant,

vs.

GTE California Incorporated, GTE Corporation, and  
Does 1 through 20, Inclusive,

Defendants.

And Related Matters.

**ORIGINAL**

Case 89-11-027  
(Filed November 27, 1989)

Case 90-01-020  
Case 90-01-056  
Case 90-03-017  
Case 90-03-020  
Case 90-03-023  
Case 90-03-046  
Case 90-03-047  
Case 90-04-026  
Case 90-04-054  
Case 90-04-055  
Case 90-07-018  
Case 90-07-019  
Case 90-07-071  
Case 90-07-073  
Case 90-07-074  
Case 90-08-064  
Case 90-08-065

## O P I N I O N

### 1. Summary

This decision resolves 18 complaints of W. Victor<sup>1</sup> against GTE California Incorporated (GTEC) related to Victor's telephone service. We find no merit in Victor's allegations. Accordingly, the Commission dismisses these complaints and directs that all moneys deposited with the Commission with respect to these 18 complaints be released to GTEC. The issuance of this decision has been delayed, in part, while our staff attempted to deal with approximately 80 additional complaints or supplemental complaints filed by Victor against GTEC.

Our order today *consolidates* all pending complaints filed by Victor against GTEC with Case (C.) 92-02-032. We direct the assigned administrative law judge (ALJ) to schedule a hearing promptly on these consolidated complaints and any further complaints filed by Victor against GTEC. In addition to considering the merits of Victor's complaints, the ALJ is instructed to consider GTEC's motion for sanctions against Victor for allegedly engaging in frivolous and vexatious litigation. The 18 cases considered here are closed.

### 2. Procedural Background

Victor filed his first complaint, C.89-11-027, against GTEC on November 27, 1989, regarding service to phone number 374-xxxx. (Since Victor's phone numbers were unlisted, we will use only prefixes in this decision.) Victor later filed two additional complaints, C.90-01-020 regarding service to 318-xxxx, and C.90-01-056 concerning service to 473-xxxx.

Victor alleged in his complaints that GTEC had overbilled him, had become abusive when asked to correct bills, had refused to make adjustments promised by operators, had failed to send missing bills, had failed to repair service despite

---

<sup>1</sup> The complaints were filed under the names "W. Victor" and "Wm. Victor." For convenience, we will refer solely to "Victor" in this decision.

complaints of cross-talk, had failed to adequately explain the services provided, and, finally, had behaved in an unprofessional manner in dealing with Victor's complaints.

GTEC in its answers denied the allegations against it and moved to consolidate the complaints. GTEC alleged that it had made many accommodations to Victor over the years, and that it had written off hundreds of dollars in telephone charges based on Victor's representations of error. GTEC further alleged that Victor, who is an attorney, has a history of bringing frivolous complaints against public utilities. GTEC asked the Commission to deny the complaints brought by Victor and to require that moneys placed on deposit with the Commission be remitted to GTEC.

The assigned ALJ, Kathleen Kiernan-Harrington,<sup>2</sup> set a hearing for May 1, 1990, at the Commission Courtroom in Los Angeles. Victor informed the ALJ that he was not available until June 12, 1990. The hearing was rescheduled to that day by ruling dated April 18, 1990.

On June 6, 1990, another ALJ ruling was issued to memorialize the results of telephone conversations with complainant and defendants regarding discovery issues. The ruling stated that discovery and procedural issues related to C.89-11-027, C.90-01-020 and C.90-01-056 would be resolved at the June 12, 1990, hearing in Los Angeles. In addition, the ALJ informed the parties that oral argument on GTEC's motion to consolidate these proceedings would be heard.

The June 12, 1990, hearing convened as scheduled. Complainant was late in arriving. The ALJ reiterated that the purpose of the hearing was to resolve discovery issues and other matters related to the cases. The entire day was taken up with argument on several motions.

The first motion heard was Victor's motion for disqualification of the ALJ. The basis for Victor's motion was that the ALJ had informed him that she had read prior

---

<sup>2</sup> ALJ Kiernan-Harrington left state service in 1994. This decision originally was drafted by her. The decision has been revised by the Commission to reflect the passage of time and to deal with the approximately 80 subsequent complaints filed by this complainant since the matter was heard by ALJ Kiernan-Harrington.

decisions of the Commission relating to Victor's complaints against other utilities. Victor argued that this prejudiced the ALJ against him. The ALJ allowed Victor to go on at some length regarding his motion. GTEC opposed Victor's motion for disqualification and argued that no prejudice arose from an ALJ reading prior decisions. GTEC argued that prior Commission decisions regarding this complainant were relevant to the current complaints. Victor's motion that the ALJ be recused was denied.

Next, Victor brought a motion to strike certain parts of GTEC's answer to C.89 11-027. Victor objected to any reference to other complaints that he had brought before the Commission. This motion was likewise denied.

Victor's third motion was to dismiss the answers to C.90-01-020 and C.90-01-056 on the grounds that he did not receive the answers. The certificates of service attached to the answers indicated that they were in fact mailed to Victor's correct post office box addresses. The ALJ denied the motion to dismiss the answers.

GTEC's motion to consolidate all three proceedings was heard. Victor objected, arguing that the three cases were different and that he had not received copies of GTEC's answers to the complaints. The ALJ ruled that Victor had received notice that GTEC's motion would be considered. Victor was given the noon recess to prepare his response to the motion to consolidate.

Victor stated that it was not the fault of GTEC or the Commission that he did not receive all of his mail. He stated that the postal service "remodeled that particular post office where I had my box since 1974, they found some of my mail from three years ago in one of the parts of the foundation." (RT. Vol. 1, p. 33.) As to the merits of the motion to consolidate, Victor's argument seemed to be that the three phone services were different kinds of services involving different people, that it would be confusing for him to present the evidence together. He stated that his preference would be to have three different ALJs hear the three cases. The ALJ informed Victor that if the cases were consolidated, evidence would be phased so that he would be able to deal with one phone number at a time. GTEC argued that the reason for the motion to consolidate was because there was a similarity of issues and witnesses, and it would save time for

the Commission and the parties to consolidate the record. The ALJ granted GTEC's motion to consolidate.

A lengthy debate then ensued regarding the number of witnesses who should be produced. Victor informed the ALJ that he wanted more than 30 witnesses produced by GTEC. GTEC objected to producing that many witnesses. The ALJ decided, based on GTEC's representation that it planned to call five witnesses of its own, to limit Victor to a selection of five witnesses from GTEC, in addition to his own testimony.

Victor also had an extensive request for documents. Because the end of the day was approaching, the ALJ directed that a conference call would be held the next day to determine the documents that GTEC would be ordered to produce and to identify which of the five witnesses that Victor intended to call. These discovery matters were handled over the objection of GTEC, which argued that the time for Victor to do discovery had long passed, and that this was merely another example of Victor's dilatory tactics.

On July 20, 1990, the ALJ issued a ruling memorializing the results of a June 13, 1990, conference call between the parties and herself. Included in that ruling was a consolidation of all the complaints filed to date by Victor against GTEC. At that time, the total was 13 complaints.<sup>3</sup> All the complaints related to the three numbers which were the subject of the original three complaints, and the allegations in each were substantially the same. Because document production related to prefix 374 in response to the ALJ's earlier rulings occurred two days late, Victor's request to extend the time to serve interrogatories was granted. However, the ALJ repeated an earlier ruling that each party would be limited to 15 interrogatories with no subparts.

---

<sup>3</sup> Prior to submission of this matter, five additional complaints filed by Victor were consolidated into this proceeding by ALJ rulings. The last of these consolidation rulings was issued on October 5, 1990, consolidating C.90-08-064 and C.90-08-065.

After consulting the parties, the ALJ set the evidentiary hearing for August 28 and 29, 1990, commencing at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission Courtroom in Los Angeles. The ruling also listed the five witnesses that Victor requested GTEC make available for him. The ruling stressed that the August 28 and 29 dates were firm, and no postponements would be granted.

The ALJ received a phone call from Victor on August 22, 1990, requesting a postponement of the hearings. Victor alleged that GTEC had not adequately answered his interrogatories. He also claimed that his mother was ill and he would have to be out of town on the days of the hearing. The ALJ sent a letter to Victor on August 23, 1990, by express mail. The letter informed Victor that he should be prepared to proceed with his case on the morning of August 28, 1990. The ALJ asked Victor to provide a sworn affidavit from his mother's attending physician attesting to the nature and severity of his mother's illness and explaining why Victor's presence was medically required. The ALJ informed Victor that an affidavit would not necessarily result in an automatic continuance of the case but would have to be provided if a continuance was to be considered. The letter closed with a reminder to Victor that since he was an attorney,<sup>4</sup> his failure to attend the hearing or have a representative present could result in a dismissal of his complaints.

### **3. Evidentiary Hearing**

#### **3.1 Preliminary Matters**

As scheduled, the evidentiary hearing was convened at 10:00 a.m. on August 28, 1990, in the Commission Courtroom in Los Angeles. Complainant arrived

---

<sup>4</sup> At the June 12, 1990, hearing, GTEC's counsel read into the record Victor's State Bar attorney number, which carried with it the same mailing address Victor uses for a phone number. Victor objected to any reference to his status as an attorney, arguing that it was irrelevant. The objection came despite the fact that Victor in his motion for recusal of the ALJ stated that Victor himself had functioned as a hearing officer on occasion. Victor's objection was overruled.

35 minutes late, having called the Los Angeles Commission office to state that he was delayed in traffic.

Victor arrived with a two-page motion entitled "Emergency Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Response to Interrogatories and/or for Sanctions and Continuance." In his motion, complainant requested sanctions against GTEC, including a dismissal of GTEC's answers and a penalty of no less than \$1 million to be deposited into an advocate trust fund to reimburse complainant and other persons as a result of the defendants' failure to comply with the letter and spirit of the California Public Utilities Code. Complainant argued his motion at some length (30 pages of transcript) and stated his belief that GTEC had not answered his interrogatories adequately. GTEC argued that the motion was an example of dilatory tactics by complainant. GTEC contended that it had appropriately answered the interrogatories and had made only those objections it considered legitimate. The ALJ denied Victor's motion. Victor moved for time to appeal the motion to the assigned Commissioner before going forward with the hearing. That request also was denied.

As previously scheduled, GTE Corporation's motion to quash service of complaints on GTE Corporation was argued. Defendant GTE Corporation specially appeared for this motion. The motion was made on grounds that GTE, a New York corporation, was not a public utility corporation as defined under the Public Utilities Code, and that this Commission lacked jurisdiction over it. GTE Corporation was the parent of GTEC. While Victor had been given the opportunity to file a written response to the motion to quash, he elected to argue against the motion orally. One of his points in response to a question from the ALJ as to why he needed GTEC's parent corporation involved was:

"What's the problem in having the parent then? What is good for the goose is good for the gander. Obviously, it makes a difference because they wouldn't go to the trouble of wasting all of our time if it didn't make a difference.

"In fact, I want the federal jurisdiction here. I want to apply the U.S. Constitution." (RT Vol. 2, p. 174.)

The ALJ granted GTE Corporation's motion to quash and informed Victor that it was a standing order to apply to all complaints filed so that he could avoid the cost of service on the Connecticut corporation.

The next preliminary matter addressed was Victor's concern that he did not know what complaint number applied to which of his complaints. This was because he did not get conformed copies of his complaints when he filed them. After lengthy discussion, the following exchange took place:

"ALJ Harrington: Mr. Victor, I think it is evident, particularly to somebody who is a member of the Bar of California, to keep conformed copies of a filing.

"Mr. Victor: That's not in evidence, and I assure you that it has nothing to do - I'm not a second class citizen. I'm a citizen. I don't practice PUC law, and I object to your characterization as anything but a subscriber of a utility.

"ALJ Harrington: Well, Mr. Victor, you may object, but I'm going to hold you to the standards of a member of the Bar of California." (RT Vol. 2, p. 186.)

The hearing then turned to which complaints were being dealt with at hearing on that day. The ALJ stated that the hearing would deal with all the consolidated complaints. After interrupting the ALJ several times, Victor made the following remarks:

"Let me tell you, your honor, I am giving notice now in Department 80 tomorrow I'm going for an ex parte application in exactly 24 hours from now for stay of this proceeding. Okay. Until further notice, you will be aware that I am going to the Superior Court for an ex parte application to stay this proceeding based on the bias that has been exhibited by you this afternoon and this morning, and by virtue of the fact of the civil rights I have involved in this suit." (RT Vol. 2, pp. 190-91.)

In an apparent attempt to return the courtroom to order, ALJ Harrington made the following remarks:



"Let the record reflect that Mr. Victor is agitated, is shouting at me, and is clearly in violation of Rule 1 of the Code of Ethics that he is supposed to comport his conduct before the PUC.

"Mr. Victor, good luck to you in Superior Court. If they will give you more due process than I am attempting to give you here, I admire them.

"But we're going to proceed and call these witnesses, but let me tell you this: you will treat them civilly. You will not raise your voice to them on the stand.

"I'm tolerating far more from you than I had ever tolerated from any party appearing before me at the PUC, as far as your conduct and your tone of voice, but I will not allow any witness to be so abused." (RT Vol. 2, p. 192.)

After these preliminary matters, the first witness called by complainant was brought to the stand some time after 2 p.m. on August 28, 1990.

### **3.2 Complainant's Case**

Complainant called five GTEC witnesses in addition to testifying himself. It is difficult from the record developed to describe exactly what conduct by GTEC is alleged to have violated the law or a Commission rule or order. Although Victor requested two extensions of time to file a brief, he did not do so. Complainant was told that, if he filed a brief after the date of November 13, 1990, he would have to accompany it with a motion to accept a late-filed brief. Well into 1991, complainant called the ALJ periodically to inquire whether she had received a motion and brief, alleging more problems with mail service. The ALJ responded that she had received nothing in the form of a brief or motion.

Regardless of the absence of a brief, we will attempt to summarize Victor's evidence from the record before us.

Victor stated that his prefix 374 service began in November 1988. He alleged that he received no bills for his number until March 1989, and at that point he received copies of bills that he could not understand. He then sought listing information for many numbers. He stated that he was promised credits by phone

company personnel that were never received. He claimed that his call forwarding service had not worked consistently. In the spring of 1989, Victor filed an informal complaint with the Commission's consumer affairs staff. The formal complaint was filed in October 1989.

Victor also complained of hearing voices on his line:

"Sometimes I would get no dial tone and sometimes I would get people telling me there was a short—and there were voices. And I met some of the nicest people in Palos Verdes and throughout the whole L.A. Basin who were on my line talking with me. Some of them identified themselves, others didn't." (RT Vol. 3, p. 359.)

Victor's first witness was John Templeton, GTEC's state director of customer contact. Templeton stated that he had little or no knowledge of the telephone problems described by Victor, and Victor's examination and cross-examination produced no support for any of the allegations of the complaints.

Victor's second witness was William Hogan, an installer/repairman for GTEC. Hogan stated that he could not recall ever speaking with Victor. Hogan testified that he was at Victor's property at 116 Ninth Street and at that time detected no voices or cross-talk on the telephone line.

Victor also examined Patricia Yandrich, a GTEC customer billing supervisor. Yandrich testified that she sent Victor duplicate bills for his 374 prefix service. Yandrich testified that Victor received numerous credits for calls he claimed he did not make. Yandrich said that Victor requested listing information for a large number of the calls on his bills. For his December 1988 bill, Victor requested listing information for 144 local calls. Yandrich further testified that Victor was issued credits for late payments and reconnection charges based on his statement that he did not receive his bills. Yandrich testified that Victor received credit for some calls because he stated that they were misdialed, that he reached a wrong number, or that he was cut off during the call.

The final two GTEC witnesses called by Victor were technicians Michael Warren and Paul Butters. Each of these witnesses testified that he had visited the site of

the 374 prefix phone in response to Victor's complaints. Each witness testified that he had detected no evidence of cross-talk or other physical problems with the phone line.

### **3.3 Defendants' Case**

Defendant GTEC on brief argues that the testimony provided at hearing make it evident that Victor had engaged in a pattern of abuse against this utility and its employees. GTEC contends that Victor has repeatedly claimed that he had not received his monthly telephone bills so that he could delay payment without incurring late charges.

Ann Hall, a witness called on behalf of GTEC, testified that if a customer called to complain that he had not received his monthly telephone bill, the customer representative would check the customer's address in GTEC's computer records and then verify the address with the customer. She testified that a duplicate bill would be sent to a customer on request and, as a courtesy, the customer would receive an additional grace period within which to submit payment.

GTEC noted that Victor testified that the mailing address he provided to GTEC for billing purposes on his 374 prefix was Post Office Box 24BB5, Los Angeles, CA 90024. When asked how long he had maintained that post office box, Victor objected that the question was irrelevant and later replied that he could not recall whether he had maintained that postal box for fewer or more than five years. Victor testified that he had more than a dozen post office box addresses at the time of hearing.

GTEC presented evidence to show that the post office address for the 374 account was the same that appears on copies of Victor's telephone bills. (Exhibit 8.) After being told by Victor that vandalism had occurred at the post office, GTEC sent an employee to the post office to inquire into the alleged break-ins of post office boxes. The employee testified that she was informed by post office representatives that no such break-ins had occurred. Based on the record evidence, GTEC asks the Commission to draw an inference that Victor was in fact receiving his telephone bills in a timely fashion at his postal address, but simply was not paying his bills on time. In support of such an inference, GTEC cited California Evidence Code § 641, which states the presumption

that a letter correctly addressed and properly mailed is presumed to have been received in the ordinary course of mail.

GTEC witness Brian McLeavy testified that on three separate occasions in 1989 he or employees who reported to him inspected the equipment and associated wires that serve Victor's 374 account. He testified that these inspections each took about two hours to complete and involved detailed visual and circuit checks. In an effort to respond to Victor's suggestion that there was a "hot drop" on his line (an unauthorized connection allowing another party to place calls at his expense), the inspectors looked for evidence of such a hot drop and found none. Moreover, company personnel found nothing unusual about the wires and equipment which service the 374 account, and they found no evidence of tampering.

GTEC witness Geoffrey Dameron, qualified as an expert in central office equipment, testified that he performed an inspection of central office equipment serving the 374 account and found nothing wrong with its operations.

GTEC witness Hall stated that she had been working with Victor to resolve his problems on his 318 account during the years 1982 through 1989. Hall stated that Victor typically would telephone her requesting listing information on calls he did not recognize. GTEC would prepare the call detail and mail it to Victor, who then would request credit on calls he did not recognize. GTEC credited the calls and sent adjusted bills to Victor. Hall testified that it was GTEC's policy to take the customer's word that he had not placed the disputed calls, and would credit the account if the amount did not exceed \$35. Exhibits sponsored by Hall showed that Victor had obtained credits in excess of \$35. (Exhibits 23-26.) Hall stated that GTEC in 1989 stopped issuing Victor credits on his 374 and 318 numbers because of what Hall termed a pattern of abuse.

The final witness called by GTEC, Edward Duffy, state staff administrator for regulatory affairs, testified that he had performed a study of calling pattern activity for Victor's 374 number from December 1988 to the time of hearing. Duffy compared calls that appeared on the 374 and 318 accounts, concluding that Victor had called many of the same numbers that appeared on both accounts. (Exhibit 27.) Based on his study,

Duffy testified that Victor had been requesting listing information for numbers with which he was familiar, since those number appeared frequently on both 374 and 318 accounts.

#### 4. Receipt of Exhibits into Evidence

Complainant did not have copies of exhibits that he sought to offer into evidence. The ALJ ruled that complainant would mail copies of the exhibits to the Commission and to GTEC by the end of August 1990. Both sides then would have until September 14, 1990, to file objections to exhibits. GTEC later withdrew its Exhibit 15. Victor objected to the receipt into evidence of Exhibits 9, 16, 18, 19, 20-25, 26, 27, and 28. GTEC responded to Victor's objections on October 25, 1990. GTEC's responses were well taken, and Victor's objections to the receipt of these exhibits were overruled. With the exception of Exhibit 15, Exhibits 1 through 28 were received into evidence.

#### 5. Discussion

In filing a complaint before the Commission, a complainant has the burden of showing, by a preponderance of evidence, that an

"...act or thing done or omitted to be done by any public utility, including any rule or charge heretofore established or fixed by or for any public utility, [is] in violation...of any provision of law or of any order or rule of the [C]ommission." (Public Utilities Code (PU Code) § 1702(a).)

This is a complaint case not challenging the reasonableness of rates or charges, and so this decision is issued as part of an "adjudicatory proceeding" as defined in PU Code § 1757.1.

Despite ample opportunity to do so, complainant has presented no credible evidence in support of his allegations. On this record, GTEC not only has refuted the allegations brought against it, it has shown that its employees went beyond their public utility obligation in responding to Victor's complaints and in seeking to accommodate him through credit adjustments, research and mailing of call detail, and service visits.

The ALJ found that Victor's credibility was questionable, and we agree. It is difficult to give credence to complainant's assertions that monthly phone bills were not delivered to the post office box address that had been confirmed as accurate. Victor's

statements that his postal box had been vandalized were shown to be incorrect. Repeated service checks found no fault in his telephone lines and no evidence to support his claim of cross-talk on the telephones. Victor's many requests for listing information on telephone numbers with which he must have been familiar suggest a pattern of abuse on his part.

In sum, there simply is no evidence to support these complaints beyond the conclusory assertions of the complainant himself, and his claims and actions throughout the course of this proceeding do little to bolster his credibility. Indeed, GTEC has moved to have this Commission declare Victor a vexatious litigant under Sections 391-391.7 of the Code of Civil Procedure and sanctioned accordingly.<sup>5</sup> We take official notice that Victor has continued to take advantage of the Commission's complaint procedure and has filed approximately 80 complaints against GTEC – all of them essentially the same – since close of hearing on the 18 complaints before us today.

Based on the evidence before us, we find that the 18 complaints considered by the ALJ have no merit and should be dismissed. However, because of the passage of time since this matter was heard, we decline at this time to consider sanctions against the complainant. Instead, we will direct the Administrative Law Judge Division to consolidate all outstanding complaints by Victor against GTEC and proceed promptly to hearing on those complaints. We intend that Victor be offered every opportunity to present evidence in support of his allegations, and we will expect him to respond to GTEC's allegation that Victor has been and continues to be engaged in a pattern of frivolous litigation.

---

<sup>5</sup> Victor has filed numerous complaints against utilities. (See, e.g., Victor v. Pacific Lighting Corporation (1988) D.88-01-038, 1988 Cal. PUC LEXIS 15; Victor v. Southern California Edison Company (1995) 61 CPUC2d 348; Victor v. Southern California Edison Company (1994) 54 CPUC2d 368.) In Victor v. Southern California Gas Company (1988) D.88-03-080, 1988 Cal. PUC LEXIS 198, Victor was placed on notice "that the bringing of additional frivolous complaints before the Commission may cause the Commission to invoke its contempt power as well as other remedies." (D.88-03-080, Ordering Paragraph 3.)

**Findings of Fact**

1. Victor filed the first of these 18 complaints against GTEC on November 27, 1989.
2. The evidence supports a presumption that Victor received his GTEC phone bills at the post office box address that he maintained.
3. Victor on numerous occasions requested listing information for telephone numbers he frequently called.
4. No evidence supports Victor's allegations of cross-talk, hot drops or unknown voices on his telephone line.
5. Based on his representations to GTEC of erroneous calls, lost calls and interrupted calls, Victor received numerous adjustments to his telephone bills.
6. No evidence supports Victor's assertion that he was treated in a rude manner by GTEC personnel.

**Conclusions of Law**

1. GTE Corporation should be dismissed as a defendant from this action.
2. Complainant has not shown that an act or thing done or omitted to be done by GTEC is in violation of the law or of an order or rule of the Commission.
3. The 18 complaints brought against GTEC lack merit and should be dismissed.
4. Customer deposits made to the Commission in connection with these 18 complaints should be released to GTEC.
5. All pending complaints and supplemental complaints filed by Victor against GTEC should be consolidated with C.92-02-032 and should be scheduled for hearing promptly.
6. This order should be made effective today in order to proceed promptly to consideration of complainant's pending cases.
7. This is a complaint case not challenging the reasonableness of rates or charges, and so this decision is issued in an "adjudicatory proceeding" as defined in Public Utilities Code § 1757.1.

**O R D E R**

**IT IS ORDERED that:**

1. The motion of GTB Corporation to be dismissed from these proceedings is granted.
2. The 18 complaints of W. Victor against GTB California Incorporated (GTEC) are dismissed.
3. All moneys deposited with the Commission in connection with the 18 complaints considered here shall be released to GTEC.
4. The Commission's Administrative Law Judge Division is directed to order consolidation of all pending complaints of W. Victor or William Victor against GTEC and to proceed to hearing promptly.
5. The following cases are closed:
  - Case (C.) 89-11-027
  - C.90-01-020
  - C.90-01-056
  - C.90-03-017
  - C.90-03-020
  - C.90-03-023
  - C.90-03-046
  - C.90-03-047
  - C.90-04-026
  - C.90-04-054
  - C.90-04-055
  - C.90-07-018
  - C.90-07-019



C.89-11-027 et al. ALJ/GEW/sid

C.90-07-071

C.90-07-073

C.90-07-074

C.90-08-064

C.90-08-065

This order is effective today.

Dated January 21, 1998, at San Francisco, California.

P. GREGORY CONLON

President

JESSIE J. KNIGHT, JR.

HENRY M. DUQUE

JOSIAH L. NEEPER

RICHARD A. BILAS

Commissioners