

ORIGINAL



0000122284

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

2011 JAN 28 P 1:43

JAN 28 2011

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

DOCKETED BY

COMMISSIONERS

GARY PIERCE - Chairman
BOB STUMP
SANDRA D. KENNEDY
PAUL NEWMAN
BRENDA BURNS

CHARLES J. DAINS,

COMPLAINANT,

V.

RIGBY WATER COMPANY,

RESPONDENT.

DOCKET NO. W-01808A-09-0137

**STAFF'S RESPONSE TO
MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE**

As directed by the Procedural Order dated January 12, 2011, the Utilities Division ("Staff") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") responds to the motion to consolidate Docket No. W-01808A-09-0137 ("Complaint Docket") with the ("Transfer Docket") Docket No. W-01808A-10-0390, filed by the Estate of Charles Dains ("Dains").

Staff opposes Dains' request for consolidation. Consolidation is not warranted because there are substantially different legal and factual issues presented by these dockets. Further consolidation would cause undue delay in the Complaint Docket.

Commission rules allow for consolidation when the cases rely upon the same law, facts and witnesses. See A.A.C. R14-3-109(A). The Commission has ordered consolidation when the cases rely upon the same law, facts and witnesses. However, even when cases have common issues, consolidation is discretionary, not mandatory. In considering whether consolidation is appropriate, A.A.C. R14-3-109(H) is instructive. It provides that cases should be consolidated only when "the rights of parties will not be prejudiced by such procedure."

While there are common parties in the two dockets, the issues are not substantially the same. In the Complaint Docket, it involves a dispute over the terms of a main extension agreement. The Transfer Docket relates to the City of Avondale, Arizona's condemnation of Rigby and the transfer of assets relative to the condemnation.

1 The Complaint Docket is nearly complete. Post-hearing briefs and the reply briefs have been
2 filed by the parties and Staff. A Decision is pending. Consolidating the two matters would result in a
3 delay in the resolution of the Complaint Docket. Further the consolidation of the matters would tax
4 the resources of Staff, who have already used its resources to participate in the Complaint Docket.

5 Dains has intervened in the Transfer Docket. Dains has the ability to protect whatever interest
6 it may have by being a party in the Transfer Docket.

7 Staff would respectfully request that the motion to consolidate be denied.

8 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 28th day of January, 2011.

9
10
11 

12 Robin R. Mitchell
13 Attorney, Legal Division
14 Arizona Corporation Commission
15 1200 West Washington Street
16 Phoenix, Arizona 85007
17 (602) 542-3402

18 Original and thirteen (13) copies
19 of the foregoing were filed this
20 28th day of January, 2011 with:

21 Docket Control
22 Arizona Corporation Commission
23 1200 West Washington Street
24 Phoenix, Arizona 85007

25 Copies of the foregoing were mailed
26 this 28th day of January, 2011 to:

27 Craig A. Marks
28 CRAIG A. MARKS, PLC
10645 North Tatum Blvd., Suite 200-676
Phoenix, Arizona 85028
Attorney for the Estate of Charles J. Dains

Steven A. Hirsch
Stanley B. Lutz
BRYAN CAVE LLP
Two North Central Avenue, Suite 2200
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-4406
Attorneys for Rigby Water Company

