. 1	KUSE L. ZIMINERWIAIN, State Dar 190, 1997/6		
2	City Attorney KELLY SCHOTT, State Bar No. 197514		
, ,	Assistant City Attorney	S. San San	
3	RHEAN FAJARDO, State Bar No. 227217 Deputy City Attorney		
4	City of Daly City		
5	333 90th Street Daly City, California 94615	•	
6	Attorneys for Real Party in Interest City of Daly City		
7	· ·	,	
8			
9	Triple and the second s		
10	Real Party in Interest City of Daly City		
11			
12	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA – COUNTY OF SAN MATEO		
13	The People of the State of California	Case No. AD 0	
	Plaintiff,	City of Daly City's	
14		Petition for Rehearing.	
15	-		
16	v. N Lopez	3	
17	Defendant.		
18			
19			
20	Real Party in Interest, City of Daly City		
	STATEMENT OF FACTS		
21			
22			
23	Defendant Lopez was charged with a violation of California Vehicle		
24	Code section 21453(a), an infraction issued by the City of Daly City (the "City") through the use		
25	of a red light camera automated enforcement system. Defendant is accused of failure to stop at a		
26	red light on February 19, 2009 at an intersection in Daly City, California. Defendant requested a		
27	court trial which took place on July 2, 2009. The trial court found Appellant guilty of a traffic		
28	infraction and assessed a fine in the amount of \$436.00. Appellant filed an appeal of the trial		

court's ruling on October 22, 2009. The City of Daly City, as a real party in interest, filed a response brief on November 30, 2009. However, the Appellate Department held a hearing on the matter on November 13, 2009. The Appellate Department reversed the Trial Court's ruling on December 3, 2009. The City received the Appellate Department's decision on December 8, 2009. The City, on behalf of the Police Department, hereby submits this Petition for Rehearing, as authorized by California Rules of Court Section 8.889.

1.2

ARGUMENT

The Police Department has been prejudiced by the Appellate Division's process in the handling of traffic court decision appeals. On or around October 30, 2009, the Daly City Police Department received an unsigned, unendorsed copy of Appellant's Brief. The Police Department did not receive any official Notice of Appeal from the Appellate Division. The Police Department did not receive any notification that a hearing had been scheduled in this matter, as required by the Superior Court of California County of San Mateo Local Court Rules ("LCR"). Under LCR, Rule 1.6., the hearing date will be subject to written notice to the parties at least 20 days prior to the hearing date. The Daly City Police Department is a party to this Appeal, as the District Attorney did not represent the People during the Traffic Court trial. Rather, a Daly City Police Department representative presented the evidence during the Traffic Court trial.

The City respectfully submits that the Daly City Police Department should have received notification prior to the hearing date, to allow a Police Department representative to appear and submit oral argument and submit the City's response brief for the Appellate Court's consideration.

Appellant mailed a non-conformed, unsigned copy of the Appellant's Opening Brief, dated October 22, 2009. The Police Department received Appellant's Opening Brief on or around October 30, 2009.

CONCLUSION

The Daly City Police Department respectfully requests that the Appellate Division grant this Petition for Rehearing on the grounds that it did not receive adequate notice of the November 13, 2009 hearing. The Daly City Police Department also respectfully requests that as part of granting of this Petition for Rehearing, that the Appellate Division allow the City's Response Brief to be taken under submission and considered in this matter. Dated: December 10, 2009 Respectfully Submitted, Ву Kelly Schott Asst. City Attorney Attorneys for Real Party in Interest City of Daly City