1						
2	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA					
3	COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ					
4	DEPARTMENT 12					
5	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL BARTON, JUDGE					
6	C _S 200					
7						
. 8	THE PEOPLE OF THE					
9	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff,					
10	vs. Case No.s RICHARD JAMES QUIGLEY, 3WM018538					
11	Defendant. 4SM011246 / 4SM021812					
12	4SM023894 4SM028271 4SM044470 4WM021512					
13						
14	4WM023363 4WM034801					
15	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS					
16	OSC HEARING					
17	November 14, 2005					
18						
19						
20	APPEARANCES:					
21	For the CHP: KAREN KIYO HUSTER.					
22	For the CHP: KAREN KIYO HUSTER, Deputy Attorney General					
23	For the Defendant: IN PROPRIA PERSONA &					
24	KATE WELLS, Amicus Curae					
25	Official Court Reporter: OSCAR A. MORENO, CSR 3441					
26	COK 2441					

Watsonville, California

PR

THE COURT: GOO

November 14, 2005

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Let's go then on the record in the Quigley matters. Mr. Quigley is present as well as Ms. Wells is present. Ms. Huster?

MS. HUSTER: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Karen Huster.

THE COURT: So I guess the question is is what, if anything, have you got as far as movement on the writ?

MS. HUSTER: Well, Your Honor, I did have my office contact the Court of Appeal and late on Friday they issued a stay of the order and Mr. Quigley will have a chance to prepare an opposition and then we'll have a chance to prepare apply so the wheels are in motion.

THE COURT: Mr. Quigley, Ms. Wells?

MS. WELLS: Well, I'll let Mr. Quigley take it.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Yes, and it was actually,
Thursday, Your Honor. It was late Thursday after the close of
business they apparently issued a stay and gave us a briefing
schedule. I've got to have something to them in response to
the brief that's in there by the 28th of November.

And they are supposed to have ten days to have to respond to that. My immediate concern now is going to become an issue. I think, what I have to do is figure out how I'm going to handle it but there has definitely a stay been issued if you haven't seen a copy of the order, neither have I but

it's on the website that they've issued one so I'm assuming that there is some basis in fact for that.

I've insisted here before you that I think the Attorney General is the wrong — they got a conflict of interest in this case. And I don't know, I don't think they should be bringing this thing in the first place to the Sixth and I'm trying to figure out as a real party in interest if I can challenge that or if this Court has to do that.

The other thing that I'm curious about, Your Honor, is their brief. The issues as they defined them have to do with a determination that this Court did not make as we've discussed earlier.

They came in and argued that the issue is whether or not 40610 and the provision of 40610 applied to violations of — and I'm not going to hold them up on the typo of the 87803(A) or whatever they had. It's 27803(A) so basically they argued whether or not 40610 applies to tickets for 27803 and I don't want to go to the Sixth and argue something that you didn't rule. And so I don't know how to handle that. And the third issue that I'm concerned with and I'm trying to figure out how to deal with is they want to raise the issue of disqualifying conditions and as I understand it, since this Court did not issue a specific finding of facts and conclusions of law that someone walking in off the street might look at and make a determination. I know because I sat there, and I believe that it is the case that this Court found

as a matter of fact that the disqualifying conditions set out in 40610(B) do not apply to these citations and they are wanting to raise that.

And in this matter as an issue to argue and I didn't know that we could argue issues of findings of fact at the appellate level either in a petition or on appeal. Those are the only things I know of.

Now, I've got the Court's back, Your Honor, as far as what I can do as a pro se litigant to prepare and have something to them by the 28th of November. But I just spoke to the people down in Los Angeles that I'm working with and I told them about my intention of getting a stay from the Supremes on the stay from the 6th on the basis that I laid out just now that we got a conflict of interest with the Attorney General, 40610 and the provisions thereof in subsection A; do not apply and whether or not findings of fact can be challenged so that's where I'm at.

THE COURT: Well, I think that as far as a couple of issues you brought up, most of them are going to end up either in perhaps the Sixth or the Supremes because I think you have a -- I'm not exactly sure, but I believe that in your response you would have the ability to challenge the standing of the AG and their position, more than you do here.

I think that's just where it has to happen. It's not going to happen here. I could be wrong and they may bounce that back to me. At least that's my first thought.

The other issues I think also are issues you need to respond or raise in your brief which then might shift the focus of the stay.

Ms. Huster, in relation again, because I do not -or have not done appellate level cases as a general rule, so
if Mr. Quigley files by the 28th then have you ten days to
respond as he indicated; is that correct?

MS. HUSTER: I believe that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then they will then pick -- set out a date in your response unless Mr. Quigley requests more time or files for some other type of response, will they then pick a date for argument?

MS. HUSTER: It sounds like you are asking two questions: You are asking one question about seeking of extension of time to prepare papers and the second question as to do with setting of oral argument; is that correct?

THE COURT: No, what I'm saying is unless
Mr. Quigley asks for time beyond your response, once you have
filed your response they'll set a date for argument; is that
correct?

MS. HUSTER: Correct.

THE COURT: And generally how far out is that?

MS. HUSTER: Your Honor, I don't know. It really depends on how backlogged the Court is at that time and I don't -- I just don't know the answer to that question.

THE COURT: Mr. Quigley.

1 THE DEFENDANT: One more question, Your Honor, and that is the -- as I pointed out in the brief itself there is 2 no request for any action and what they have moved on at the 3 Sixth according to what I could get off the internet because 4 I've not sent anything else -- I did see a copy of the letter 5 -- yes, a copy of the letter from the attorney general's 6 7 office, that letter did not come from counsel that we're talking to but it came from Supervisor Neary, so I'm wondering 8 is that not a change of Counsel on that side or did we just --9 10 I work with Ms. Huster until suddenly, boom, somebody pops in for one shot. It's a little hard for me to figure out who I'm 11 12 dealing with here. 13 THE COURT:

THE COURT: I believe it's probably Ms. Huster unless they substitute or file some form of substitution.

One second.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Did you file the request for stay, Ms. Huster?

MS. HUSTER: Are you talking to me?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. HUSTER: It's Huster.

THE COURT: I keep forgetting, I'm sorry.

MS. HUSTER: You are asking if I filed a petition?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. HUSTER: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: So it's basically in your ballpark?

MS. HUSTER: Your Honor, if Mr. Quigley is wondering who he needs to deal with in our office that would be me. The

reason that Mr. Neary handled the correspondence is it is a bit unorthodox for the Attorney General's office to be contacting the Court of Appeals in this way and it was recommended that a supervisor handle that and that's how it happened.

> THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, being just for clarification for the record, I never said that she didn't file a petition.

> THE COURT: Okav.

THE DEFENDANT: What I said was the documents that actually caused the court to move and cause and effect being what they are onto the 9th they got the letter and on the 10th they issued the stay. I would say that probably the letter is what the caused the stay, that was filed by an attorney named Neary and not by an attorney named Huster.

THE COURT: But as she indicated that's her supervisor and I guess the office felt that the Sixth might pay more attention to a supervisor and, no offense meant, than a line deputy.

> MS. HUSTER: No offense taken, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So let's do this: I'll set this back on calendar on the 19th of December. That gives you time for your response, their response, and then hopefully a briefing date and we'll note what the next step is.

> THE DEFENDANT: That's good with me, Your Honor.

16 17

20

18

19

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

21

22

23

24

25

26

					
. 1		THE COURT:	Same time.	It's a Monday;	does that
2	work?				
. 3		MS. HUSTER:	1:30?		
4		THE COURT:	1:30.		
5		MS. HUSTER:	Thank you,	Your Honor.	
6		THE COURT:	All right.		
7					
8		(End of pro	ceedings.)		
9					
10					
11	·				
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					1
23	·				
24					
25					İ
26					