In the Matter of:

LAWRENCE KREIGER,

R-2012-119515

Respondent.

BEFORE:

PAUL MARASCO,

Hearing Examiner

Transcript of a proceeding held in the above matter at the Municipal Code Violations Bureau, 42 South Avenue, Rochester, New York, on January 23, 2013.

APPEARANCES:

LAWRENCE KREIGER,

Appearing Pro Se

TRANSCRIBED BY:

EXECUSCRIBE, INC.

620 Park Avenue, Box 336 Rochester, New York 14607 Tel. (888)521-6500 Ext. 101

Official Court Copy of Transcript

THE CLERK: Pleased be informed that this hearing is being tape recorded, so I'll need you to speak clear for the microphone.

Lawrence Kreiger, Red Light 2012-119515. Ticket issued December 22, 2012, 12:46 p.m., at Chestnut and Court for License Plate AKU-5991. The charge is failure to stop at a right light on a right turn.

THE COURT: Okay. Good afternoon, sir. Before we begin today let me advise you, you do have the right to get an adjournment to get an attorney or speak with an attorney, or we can proceed right now.

MR. KREIGER: Thank you. I'm ready to proceed.

THE COURT: All right.

(Whereupon LAWRENCE KREIGER was duly sworn.)

THE COURT: All right. So you've got a ticket here on December 22nd, 2012, at Chestnut Street and Court Street. It alleges your vehicle failed to stop at a red light for a right turn.

How do you want to plead to that, sir?

MR. KREIGER: Not guilty.

THE COURT: What's your explanation, please?

MR. KREIGER: Well, I have several procedural objections that I'd like to raise first.

THE COURT: Certainly.

MR. KREIGER: The first is that the ticket is

	2
1	defective on its face, in that it's issued to the
2	registered owner, but I'm only the registrant. I'm not
3	the registered the term "registered owner" is wrong.
4	I'm not the owner of the vehicle. I'm the registrant.
5	Secondly, the City's website and all the
6	information the City puts out about this says that the
7	vehicle owner is going to be issued the ticket. They use
8	the term "vehicle owner" in some instances and "registered
9	owner" in other instances. And in any case, I'm not the

Secondly, I think it is defective on, additionally --

THE CLERK: If he's not the owner, he can't have a hearing on the ticket, because they only allow the registered owner to have a hearing on the ticket.

MR. KREIGER: Wait a minute, are you the prosecutor?

Who is this lady?

THE COURT: This is my clerk.

THE CLERK: None of us are prosecutors.

THE COURT: She's my clerk.

THE CLERK: I'm the adjudication assistant.

THE COURT: Are you not the owner? Are you saying you're not the owner of the vehicle?

> I'm the registrant MR. KREIGER: of the

23

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

owner.

24

25

1 vehicle.

THE COURT: Well, the registered owner is who the ticket goes to, sir.

MR. KREIGER: Okay. Well, so for the record, I'm stating that that's procedurally defective.

THE COURT: I understand your argument. I'm rejecting that.

MR. KREIGER: Okay.

THE COURT: Do you have any other procedural arguments?

MR. KREIGER: Yes. Additionally, the ticket is also defective on the grounds that the accusatory instrument is defective. The ticket states -- well, there's no deponent. There is a scribbled signature with no name or title, but some kind of a machine-made signature, instead of a sworn statement from a complainant that states upon personal knowledge or upon information and belief. So it's defective.

The correct wording according to the case law, and what it should say or what would make a valid accusatory here is, "The foregoing is based upon personal knowledge, the source of which is your deponent's review of the video."

This doesn't state who the deponent is. It doesn't tell me that they reviewed it, and it doesn't base

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

it upon any kind of personal knowledge or upon information of belief. So I believe the accusatory or the information is defective.

Additionally, believe Ι that the statutory defective, in that it doesn't scheme provide a sufficient due-process safeguard. The statutory scheme provides for a strict liability to the owner. not a rebuttable presumption or any mechanism for a hearing on that issue before you're found liable. So I believe that's unconstitutional, for the record.

And the summary of my objection is that the statute and the law under which this was issued in invalid.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand your arguments, and I am declining to grant them.

MR. KREIGER: Fine.

THE COURT: So we're going to go on to the merits of this, which the ticket was issued on December 22nd, 2012, again, at Chestnut and Court Streets, failure to stop at a red light for a right turn. So do you wish to give any testimony as to the reasons that you're not guilty to the merits of the case?

MR. KREIGER: I believe that the digital recording does not represent what it purports to represent and no red-light violation took place.

THE COURT: Okay, let's take a look at the video. All right, is that your SUV in the right-hand lane? I'll show it again.

MR. KREIGER: That appears to be the vehicle that's registered to me.

THE COURT: Okay. And what are you objecting to or what are you saying is different than what really happened?

MR. KREIGER: Well, the video comes with a disclaimer that's not on the screen, but the photo notice website states that due to the formatting constraint, formatting constraints, and I guess other technical things, that the video is not a representation of the actual evidence. And there are technical issues that -- I can't determine if that's in real time, and it appears that no red-light violation took place.

THE COURT: What is that?

THE CLERK: From the copy, when they open it up.

THE COURT: Oh, yeah.

THE CLERK: It's the disclaimer, because it's a copy.

THE COURT: Well, the video I'm watching, sir, clearly shows a violation of a right turn. Are you saying it doesn't?

1	MR. KREIGER: I don't believe it does, because
2	that doesn't seem to be in real time, and there's no clock
3	running as well that would help to determine if that's a
4	real time and technically perfect representation of what
5	it purports to be.
6	THE COURT: Okay, but I'm not following you,
7	because it shows a red light and your vehicle way past it.
8	So even if it was stop motion, I'm not really following
9	your argument.
10	MR. KREIGER: Well, I'll just I'll stand on
11	my argument
12	THE COURT: Okay.
13	MR. KREIGER: that the disclaimer well, I
14	won't interrupt you.
15	THE COURT: Huh?
16	MR. KREIGER: I don't want to interrupt you.
17	THE COURT: That's all right. I didn't want to
18	interrupt you.
19	MR. KREIGER: No.
20	THE COURT: So go ahead.
21	MR. KREIGER: I'll just stand on my objection
22	and let you rule.
23	THE COURT: All right, then. Okay, I'm going
24	to find you guilty of that.
ر ا ا	All right oir Voulre all oot

FORM FED

PENGAD • 1-800-631-6989 • www.pengad.com

MR. KREIGER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you. (Whereupon this matter was concluded at LED 3678.)

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of

Сатега Ticket R-2012-119515, was prepared using the required

Violations Bureau in the matter of Lawrence Kreiger, Red Light

transcript of a proceeding held in the Municipal Code

ςθιτίτη

the foregoing

8

трат

STATE OF NEW YORK }

Margaret A. Henry,

February 19, 2013

Rochester, New York 14607

Hardank a. Herry

620 Park Avenue, Box 336

Execuscribe, Inc.

Margaret A. Henry

the proceedings.

(888) 521-6500 (Linda Yaniszewski, Ext. 101)

COUNTY OF MONROE

52

74

23

22

77

20

6 T

3 T

LI

9 T

SI

ΙЗ

15

TI

OI

6

8

:9jsd

9

ς

đ

ε

7





City of Rochester Parking & Municipal Code Violations Bureau 42 South Avenue Rochester, NY 14604

TO: Lawrence Kreiger P.O. Box 20189 Rochester, NY 14602