1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
2	COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ	
3	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL E. BARTON, JUDGE	
4		
5	THE PEOPLE OF THE) STATE OF CALIFORNIA,)	
6	Plaintiff,)	
7		
8	-vs-) No. 5SM085642, 4SM023894,) 4SM028271, 4WM021512,	
9	RICHARD JAMES QUIGLEY,) 3WMO18538, 4SM011246,) 4SM021812, 4SM044470,	
10	Defendant.) 4WM023363, 4WM034801.	
11		
12		
13	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	
14	OCTOBER 7, 2005	
15	DEPARTMENT 12, SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA	
16		
17		
18	APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:	
19	For The CHP: KAREN KIYO-HUSTER,	
20	Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice	
21	1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor P.O. Box 70550	
22	Oakland, CA 94612-0550	
23	For The Defendant: RICHARD JAMES QUIGLEY, In Priori Persona	
24	-and- KATE WELLS, Attorney at Law	
25		
26	REPORTED BY: ELLARAE RAMEY MARKHART, RPR, CSR #9298 Official Reporter	



1 Santa Cruz, California 2 October 7, 2005 3 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 4 5 THE COURT: We're going to start, hopefully finish 6 quickly because I have other things on this calendar. 7 Ms. Huster, where are we at? What's happening? 8 MS. HUSTER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 10 MS. HUSTER: Karen Kiyo-Huster on behalf of the 11 CHP. 12 MS. WELLS: Kate Wells on behalf of Richard 13 Quigley. 14 THE DEFENDANT: Richard Quigley on behalf of 15 Richard Quigley. 16 MS. HUSTER: Your Honor, we filed a petition yesterday. As the Court is aware there is some special 17 service requirements which I can take care of now. 18 19 I'm handing Mr. Quigley a copy of the petition. 20 And so we ask -- of course, it was just filed yesterday, we 21 don't have any decision on any sort of stay, the request for 22 the stay. And that's the status. 23 THE COURT: Now, I take it -- you have to bear with me, it's just been a long day today and I've not done a 24 great deal of -- hopefully you can fill in some of the 25 blanks, or Ms. Wells can fill in, or Mr. Quigley. 26

assuming that once they get this thing they will expect a briefing schedule.

MS. HUSTER: Well, it's entirely discretionary with the Court of Appeal whether they want to deal with me at all. So if they do, then I expect that's what will happen. However, we've set forth our arguments pretty extensively in the petition.

THE COURT: What you anticipate a time for -- or some type of response from -- what would you normally expect? Better question.

MS. HUSTER: Your Honor, unfortunately I don't have enough experience in this area. The information that I do have has not been consistent, so it would be difficult to give me a reliable guess. I apologize.

THE COURT: Thirty days?

MS. HUSTER: Why don't we come back in 30 days, and if there is an answer, there will be an answer. We'll move forward from there.

THE COURT: Ms. Wells, Mr. Quigley, thirty days? Stayed to that point?

MS. WELLS: Well -- well, I guess --

THE COURT: That will give you obviously both a chance to read the petition. I'm assuming at some point I'll get it in the mail, one way or the other, and then we'll see what the Sixth wants to do.

THE DEFENDANT: Well, Your Honor, with great

respect, I'll be moving immediately to get it out of the Sixth, because as the record will show the exhibits that I've given you there was a decision made years ago, and in exchange for three no contest pleas in Santa Cruz with Referee Mulligan for certified questions to be sent to the Sixth Appellate Court. And those certified questions had to do with how and if 40 -- 303.5 applied to criminal law violations. And I mean, there's -- it asked everything, if you remember the order. It was signed by Judge Atack and --Judges Atack and Danner, and they kicked it back, did nothing on that. And so I don't know what the rulings are for that kind of behavior, but it seems to me like there's one bite at the apple thing sort of gets in the way. had a shot at fixing this years ago before all the rest of these tickets. We were talking about six or seven tickets accumulated at that time. And we're 30 tickets beyond that And so I'm going to be -- I'm going to be asking the Supreme Court to reach down and grab this puppy.

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

26

In the meantime, there's a -- I brought you a story, because you know I love to bring you stories. I brought you a couple.

I was up in the park a few weeks ago and sans helmet, or anything I didn't want to call a helmet or anything I claimed was a helmet. In other words, making sure I wasn't going to develop any tan lines. And Ranger Brennen talked to me up there in Big Basin, and he was

bothered by the fact that I was sans helmet, and I believe his words were get a chance to write alleged ticket, you write the ticket, which I thought was an interesting way to put it. And I have a copy of that with me.

At the time that he wrote it he wrote it correctable and in accordance with the law. And I'll let you take a look at that. And then I'd like to show it to the Court. Subsequent to that he sent me out an amended ticket. Some guy by the name of Kevin Williams who is his boss or something got this ticket in front of him and he made a determination that it was not a correctable violation, which is something that is fairly consistent with catching it in its finest terms. It's a bigoted move, Judge, when it happens. I've never known anybody that didn't have a negative opinion towards bikers in general. They have move to noncorrectable or any other elements of this stuff.

I talked to Mr. Williams about this and he said that he reached this conclusion on his own reading the statutes. And apparently the day that he sent out -- had officer -- or Ranger Brennen sent out a corrected ticket, he stopped and talked with the highway patrol officer up there somewhere, his name escapes me, to affirm for him that these were in fact not correctable violations.

So I wanted you -- I wanted you to know that at least some people can read this law and come to the same

conclusion that the officers in Hollister have, and that the 1 officers -- some of the officers here in town have over the 2 So you know what the statutes say. You've already 3 4 ruled on that. 5 Oh, I gave you the wrong ticket. Totally. This is Ranger Brennen. 6 Is this -- no. Yeah. I'm sorry. This is 7 the one. Ranger Brennan. I need that other ticket back. I'm sorry. It was the one incorrectly issued the day I went to get that order signed. Anyway, I didn't make you a copy of it, Judge. I'll leave it with you. I don't know if you can bring that

ticket up and put it with the rest of them or not.

THE COURT: We'll see what's going to happen on the My question is, on that date what would you prefer, 8:30 or 1:30?

> MR. QUIGLEY: 1:30.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

THE COURT: That work? I mean, unless obviously I get something from either the Appellate or Supreme Court that says everything is stayed, then everybody has to appear.

> MS. HUSTER: At this point it's taken off calendar? THE COURT: Sure.

Well, the other thing, brought you more MS. WELLS: than one story. It's been two months, Judge.

Last week I'm in Santa Cruz. I'm stopped by an officer. One of the finest I've ever been stopped by, by the way. Pulls me over. I was wearing my -- out of respect to Lieutenant Martinez my two helmet configuration, the small hard plastic helmet and one that looks very much like a baseball cap helmet. And he pulls me over and wanted to know where my helmet was. And I chuckled. And I says, "Don't they test you guys -- test you guys before they give you a gun? I'm wearing two."

And he's says, "You're wearing two helmets?"

And I says, "Yeah." I take the one off, looks like
a baseball cap, and I hang it on the mirror. And took the
other one off and hang it on the mirror. And he picks it up
and reveals what I believe to be the most fundamental

Words out of his mouth were, "Is this DOT approved?"

problem with the helmet law in California today.

Helmet law has been in effect since 1992, we're 13 years into it. I'm dealing with an absolutely fine officer working out of his quick code, and his belief was until I talked to him that DOT approves helmets. I don't know how to get the courts to understand and recognize that the devastating effect of that belief on enforcement, on compliance. It under -- it undermines whatever they wanted to do legitimately and supports whatever they wanted to do illegitimately, which I've felt the helmet law has always been. Brought in with lies being enforced with -- I mean -- ad hock, arbitrary, capricious, all of those words. All of

those words. And as long as that myth persists, and it doesn't look like it's ever going away, that will be proof to be the first standard. Behind that they will fall back to a position to well somebody's got to approve them, and they never let go of that. You can't get them to let go of the main contention, and you can't get people to let go of the belief behind that that somebody has got to approve of these things. I don't know how to deal with that in this context.

THE COURT: I think that's why I've done sort of

THE COURT: I think that's why I've done sort of all the strange and bazaar things that I have done. And I have no doubt that there are -- there's a great divide on this, which is both sides think I'm totally out of my mind.

THE DEFENDANT: Who does?

THE COURT: Both sides.

THE DEFENDANT: Not this side.

THE COURT: I don't think that there is a doubt in that. But the issue becomes that hopefully either the Appellate Court on the Sixth, or the Supreme Court will tell us where we are on the 7th. So I'll see all back here 1:30.

I have another calendar to get to, so be real quick.

THE DEFENDANT: This is going to be a hat dropper. I've been diagnosed with advanced lymphoma.

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

THE DEFENDANT: It is what it is.

THE COURT: Okay.

THE DEFENDANT: Time is not a luxury I have now. So that as we move with this I'd appreciate if the Court would acknowledge the restraint on this. I did promise you early on that if you followed the law as best you can, given the nature of the way it's written, that I'd back your act all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, if necessary. I probably won't be able to do that directly. My attorney will keep this case alive, Kate Wells, for as long as is necessary to make sure that you're not left hanging out there. And the American Motorcycle Association through Michael Asborne has assured me that they, on behalf of their 23,000 members is also prepared to step in on this issue of your ruling and back your act all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court if necessary.

In the mean time, I don't know if the Court can, I will ask, for all the reasons that are right and just, that between now and the 7th of next month that you consider some sort of an order that will allow me the exemption of the helmet law for my remaining days.

They're -- they're stated attempt to provide another safety benefit does not really apply in my case at this point, and I would generally like to finish out what I got left free.

THE COURT: I'll consider that, Mr. Quigley. So we'll see you all on the 7th, 1:30 here.

```
1
              MS. HUSTER: Your Honor, would the Court consider
  2
     allowing me to appear by court call?
  3
              THE COURT: Sure.
  4
              MS. HUSTER: All right. Thank you very much.
  5
              THE DEFENDANT: And you're going to get the ticket
     from the rangers, and if they get ahold of me I'll tell them
  6
  7
     you got that case?
  8
              THE COURT:
                          Yeah.
  9
              THE DEFENDANT: And the ticket I got from the
    officer when I was coming to get that order signed?
 10
              THE COURT: I'll keep that one at this point.
11
12
              THE DEFENDANT: It's not going to be dismissed
13
    yet?
14
              THE COURT:
                          Not yet.
15
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             You'll keep that case here as
16
    well?
17
             THE COURT:
                           And it will not go to warrant.
             THE DEFENDANT: By the way, the wake will be the
18
19
    13th of November.
20
             MS. WELLS:
                         The 12th.
21
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             The 12th of November. And you're
    invited.
22
23
                         You know what, I hope I don't go.
             THE COURT:
24
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             No, the wake's going -- it's a
25
    living wake, Judge.
26
             THE COURT: Oh, okay, then I'll come.
```

THE DEFENDANT: I've got time, and I know it's I see the shots, but I figure -coming. THE COURT: You got it. THE DEFENDANT: I figure that would be better for anybody. Thank you. THE COURT: We're done. -000-