

Carlos León - Nov. 5, 2018) (37)
③7-63 6 April 2018 document

the City of Austin Municipal Court to me.

Therefore, if the Notices to Appear are official acts of the Clerk of the Court, the Notices to Appear are not authenticated, meaning Mary Jane Grubb violated Texas Code of Criminal Procedure 45.012(g) by not authenticating them by not imprinting them with Official Court Seal.

However, if the Notices to Appear are unofficial acts of the Clerk, then Mary Jane Grubb simulated a legal process by recklessly causing those summonses to be delivered to me to cause me to submit to the putative authority of those documents by appearing at Austin Municipal Court on the appointed day + time, violating Texas Penal Code 32.48 (a)(2)(A, B).

Unofficial Seal 2



Official Seal



Unofficial
Seal 2

Unofficial Seal 2 was imprinted by electronic means on the electronically generated & filed Complaints that appear official for cases 8529140 & 8560652 (See Exhibits 2 and 5 from the Nov. 10, 2017 materials handed out at the Jan. 26, 2018 Board meeting), per a deputy clerk initializing those complaints as full, true, and correct copies of the originals on file.

However, comparing & contrasting the Official Seal handstamped imprint with Unofficial Seal 2's electronic imprint:

- 1) Unofficial Seal 2 is smaller than Official Seal;
- 2) Unofficial Seal 2's font type is different from & smaller than Official Seal's font type;
- 3) The shading of the petals of the "TEXAS" star on Unofficial Seal 2 is opposite that of Official Seal.

On each pair of petals surrounding a letter, like "T" the right petal is shaded on Unofficial Seal 2, instead of the left petal on Official Seal;

4) There's some empty space between the two small solid five point stars and "IN AUSTIN TEXAS" on Unofficial Seal 2, but almost no such empty space on Official Seal.

Therefore Official Court Seal was not used to authenticate the complaints recorded & used against me by the Clerk of the Court, Mary Jane Grubb.

Therefore, if the original complaints on file are official acts of the Clerk, the complaints are not authenticated, meaning Mary Jane Grubb violated Texas Code of Criminal Procedure 45.012(g) by not authenticating them by not imprinting them with Official Court Seal.

However, if the original complaints are not official acts of the Clerk, their authentication would be unnecessary & unlawful, meaning Mary Jane Grubb simulated a legal process by recklessly causing those complaints to be delivered to me against me so that I'd submit to the putative authority of those documents per Texas Penal Code 32.48 (a)(2)(A,B).

Also, if those original complaints are not official, then, logically, neither were Cases #529140 + #560652 generated by them, because the complaints are the charging instruments in class C misdemeanor cases in Municipal Court.

Unofficial Seal 3



Official Seal



Unofficial Seal 3

On the electronically generated AUSTIN MUNICIPAL COURT DOCKET REQUEST - NOTICE TO APPEAR for CASE NO. #529140 dated Feb. 1, 2017 (Exhibit J) and ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF AUSTIN, TEXAS for CASE NUMBER #560652 dated Apr. 12, 2017 (Exhibit K), Unofficial Seal 3 is electronically imprinted.

Though that NOTICE and ORDER appear official, comparing and contrasting the Official Seal handstamped imprint with the Unofficial Seal 3 electronic imprint shows:

- 1) Unofficial Seal 3's outermost diameter is almost identical to Official Seal's outermost diameter, but is minutely bigger;
- 2) Unofficial Seal 3's innermost diameter is similar to Official Seal's innermost diameter, but is slightly larger;
- 3) Unofficial Seal 3's font type appears almost identical to Official Seal's font type, though Unofficial Seal 3's font size is clearly smaller than Official Seal's font type;
- 4) Unofficial Seal 3 has no shading of the petals of the "TEXAS" star, but the Official Seal shades the left petal of each pair of petals surrounding each letter of "TEXAS";
- 5) On Unofficial Seal 3, each letter of "TEXAS" has been rotated one position counterclockwise (72°) about the center of the 5-point TEXAS Star compared to Official Seal, so that "E" on Unofficial Seal 3 is in the "T" position on Official Seal;

- 6) On Unofficial Seal 3, there are no small solid five point stars between "MUNICIPAL COURT" and "IN AUSTIN TEXAS" on Official Seal;
- 7) On Unofficial Seal 3, there is a comma between "AUSTIN" and "TEXAS" compared to Official Seal, which has no comma between "AUSTIN" and "TEXAS";

Note: That comma/no comma difference highlights Texas Government Code 30.000125(b), which explicitly says the comma must be between "Austin" and "Texas," meaning the official seal does not strictly follow that statute requirement, potentially invalidating Official Seal.

- 8) On Unofficial Seal 3, there's some empty space between "MUNICIPAL COURT" and "IN AUSTIN, TEXAS," but there's almost no empty space between "MUNICIPAL COURT" and "IN AUSTIN TEXAS" on Official Seal.

Therefore, Official Court Seal was not used to authenticate the DOCKET REQUEST or the ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE.

Therefore if the DOCKET REQUEST and ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE are official acts of the Clerk of the Court, they are not authenticated, meaning Mary Jane Grubb violated Texas Code of Criminal Procedure 45.012(g) by not authenticating them by not imprinting them with the Official Seal for Austin Municipal Court.

However, if the DOCKET REQUEST & ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE are unofficial acts of the Clerk, authenticating them would be unnecessary & unlawful, meaning the Clerk simulated a legal process by recklessly causing those documents to be delivered to me to submit to the putative authority of those documents, per Texas Penal Code 32.48(a)(2)(A,B).

Clerk of The Court's Signature

Mary Jane Grubb vs. Mary Jane Grubel

Mary Jane Grubb is the Clerk of the Municipal Court of Austin, TX. However, on every electronically produced "official" Notice to Appear (summons) to me for cases #529140 & #560652 handed to me by deputy clerks at Austin Municipal Court, the electronic signature clearly says Mary Jane Grubel

(See Exhibit I for an example).

Therefore, I legally obtained two exemplars of Mary Jane Grubb's handwritten signature from Human Resource documents she signed by hand 10/19/15, per my 6/12/17 public information request (See Exhibits L, M, and N).

Because graphology is a science, I used a logical methodology to compare the handwritten exemplars with the electronic signature on the questioned "official" documents.

Because the devil is in the details of fundamental structure, I focused on loops, openness, width, & height of letters like the forgery detection methods in chapter 17 of The Definitive Book of Handwriting Analysis (2009) by Marc Seifer, Ph.D.




I coded the signatures as follows:

PI = Personal Information form, handwritten Signature (Exhibit L)

ARPP = Acknowledgement of Receipt of Personnel Policies handwritten Signature (Exhibit M)

NA = Notice to Appear, electronic
Signature (Exhibit ~~Z~~)

Here are the two handwritten
exemplars (PI & ARPP) + the one
electronic signature (NA) on top
of each other, as written:

Mary Jane Grubb	10/19/15
Employee's Printed Name	Date
	
Employee's Signature	Social Security Number (last four digits)/EIN
Approvals	
	10/19/15
Employee	Date
 	

Note the following differences in
descending order of importance:

- ① "y" in Mary

PI - lower closed loop, $3/16$ " width, $5/16$ " height
 ARPP - lower closed loop, $5/16$ " width, $7/16$ " height
 NA - no closed loop

② "J" in Jane

PI - lower closed loop, $2/16$ " width, $6/16$ " height
 ARPP - lower closed loop, $3/16$ " width, $6/16$ " height
 NA - no lower closed loop

③ 2nd "b" in Grubb

PI - "b" does not close
 ARPP - "b" does not close
 NA - "b" is closed

④ the "u" in Grubb

PI - "ll" has two loops
 ARPP - "ll" has two loops
 NA - "ll" has no loops

⑤ the "a" in Mary

PI - "a" has $1/8$ " width
 ARPP - "a" has $1/8$ " width
 NA - "a" has $1/16$ " width (50% thinner)

⑥ the "M" in Mary

PI - $3/8$ " height
 ARPP - $3/8$ " height
 NA - $2/8$ " height (33% shorter)

(47)

⑦ The entire signature, tail to tail,
bottom to top

PI - 2 1/4" width, 4/8" height
AARP - 2 1/2" width, 5/8" height
NA - 2" width, 3/8" height

Therefore, the electronic NA signature
has 11-20.10 less width + 25-40.10
less height than the handwritten
PI + AARP signatures.

Therefore, the conclusion that the electronic
signature of Mary Jane Gruleb is so
different than Mary Jane Grubb's
handwritten signatures that the
electronic signature appears to be a
forgery is based on a reasonable
degree of scientific certainty.

In fact, according to my in-person
6/12/17 conversation with Ms.
Shannon Flett, HR Records Manager,
Human Resources Department, Records
Division, City of Austin, an optical
image method is used to digitally
capture an employee's handwritten
signature, meaning Mary Jane Grubb's
electronic signature should be
virtually identical to her handwritten
signature.

(48)

Therefore, I dispatched Sergeant Investigator Todd Bircher from the Travis County District Attorney's Public Integrity Unit office to ask Mary Jane Grubb in person if the electronic signature of Mary Jane Grubb was hers.

Bircher later reported back to me, in person, that Grubb told him in person that the electronic Grubb signature was hers.

If Bircher's testimony is true & Grubb's testimony is true, why did she electronically sign my Notices to Appear, Mary Jane Grubb?

If she Mary Jane Grubb in the official, Constitutional lawful justice system but Mary Jane Grubb in the unofficial, unConstitutional, unlawful shadow anti-justice system?

Two track justice system - Austin Municipal Court

Her alleged good clerk (Grubb) / bad clerk (Grubb) split & duality makes sense if those two diametrically opposed systems, justice & anti-justice,

are operating simultaneously within the Austin Municipal Court system & being used to sort & separate all defendants onto two tracks, Constitutional & anti-Constitutional - one reality for those who know the law (Constitutional) & one anti-reality for those who don't (anti-Constitutional).

The Constitutional track is true, transparent, codified & liberty-based, where the defendant is innocent until proven guilty & Due Process & the law are followed.

The anti-Constitutional track is false, hidden, non-codified, & control-based, where the defendant is assumed to be guilty until proven innocent & Due Process & the law are not followed.

Clearly, McCoy, Gomillion, Moore, & Grubb/Grubbs tried falsely charging prosecuting & criminalizing me on the anti-Constitutional track, but make it appear Constitutional, to gaslight me into their anti-reality, without penalty.

Legal loophole allowing two-track justice system

The legal loophole that may have created

+ facilitated this bipolar duality may be found on page 38 of the 9/11 Commission Report, which explicitly states the White House requested implementation of Continuity of Government measures on 9/11/01.

Though there are no public documents explicitly stating what those measures are in detail, there are clues in other government documents + hearings, as well as published news articles, hinting or claiming that suspension of Constitutional law is one of those measures.

There also is no public document or record of 9/11's Continuity of Government measures officially ending, though there are records in the Federal Register of Presidents Bush, Obama, + Trump officially continuing the state of emergency (war on terror) that would legally continue those measures, whatever they were then or are now at the moment.

More importantly, how can public servants in the White House request the suspension of the Constitution for the United States of America when the public they serve choose to follow it?

What happens to a city, County, State, or nation when one sizable powerful group of people follow Constitutional law but another does not?

More telling, to whom did the White House make that request instead of President Bush issuing an executive order to implement continuity of government measures?

Does the White House answer to a shadow government that's anti-Constitutional and alien + anathemaic to humanity?

TO Conclusion



Conclusion

Texas Code of Criminal Procedure

45.201(d) says, "It is the primary duty of a municipal prosecutor not to convict, but to see that justice is done."

Since "justice" means in accordance with the law (State v. Thomas), Chase Reed Gomillion's primary duty as prosecutor for the Austin Municipal Court in cases 8529140 + 8560652 against me, the defendant, was to see that accordance with the law was done.

However, per Gomillion's documented words, writings, + actions, Gomillion did the exact opposite trying to convict me of crimes I clearly did not commit by seeing that accordance with the law was not done.

In fact, Gomillion allegedly was part of a criminal conspiracy with other public servants who also abused their official capacity to try officially oppressing me to falsely criminalize me.

Texas Penal Code 15.02(a)(1,2) says a person commits criminal conspiracy if, with intent that a felony be committed, he agrees with one or more persons that they or one or more of them engage in

conduct that would constitute the offense and that he or one or more of them performs an overt act in pursuance of the agreement. Texas Penal Code 15.02(b) says constituting an conspiracy may be inferred from acts of the parties.

per the evidence, APD officer Monika McCoy's (# 7553) wrongful pedestrian stop of me late evening on 1/8/17 for legally crossing Guadalupe at Maiden Lane and the missing/false information on Citation # P# 199822 allegedly led to governmental records being tampered with by APD Administrative Supervisor - Central Records, Renee Moore; Austin Municipal Court personnel under Clerk of Court Mary Jane Grubb; and the Travis County DA's office - Public Integrity Unit to defraud or harm me, to back up the false charges for cases #529140 & #560652, and to avoid holding the evil actors responsible for their criminal actions

Any unofficial acts by them simulated a legal process by recklessly causing documents that simulate court process to be delivered to me to cause me to submit to the putative authority of those

documents or take any action in response to the document, in compliance with the document, or on the basis of the document, per Texas Penal Code 32.48(a)(2)(A)(B).

In concert, the evidence shows a networked attempt to confuse + control me to effeminate + emasculate me to gaslight me to overwrite my healthy, sane, Constitutional, right-side up reality with their sick, insane, anti-Constitutional, upside-down, nightmare from hell anti-reality that threatens all us law-abiding Texans, the State Bar of Texas, + the Texas Justice System at large.

Though Ganillion's professional misconduct reeks of prosecutorial vindictiveness, such ass-backwards insanity is not limited to the legal arena.

Beyond, but likely connected to this evidence, I continue being gangstalled in Austin by homosexual male psychopaths trying to incite me to break the law to get myself legally arrested + jailed.

For example, recently, another older homosexual male followed me a younger, stronger STRAIGHT Christian Man, on + off the bus to repeatedly try forcing his unnecessary, uninvited, unwelcome

assistance or me to "help" me carry my own gear to take away from me my own personal private property to confuse & control me to effeminate & emasculate me, which I did not allow.

A day or two later, the same guy approached me from outside City Hall, where I was sitting inside, preparing this document. He repeatedly tried getting my attention verbally, which I ignored. So he then started banging on the glass behind me to try getting my attention, which I also ignored.

So he then entered City Hall, walked directly over to me, and stood way too close to me, standing over me, trying to talk to me to distract me, to stop me from doing my work, & to get my personal attention.

On the street that disrespectful behavior merits a physically violent response. However because Texas law would consider it assault for which arrest & jail are the consequences and punishment, I instead immediately got security, pointed at the perp, and told him to stay away from me.

When I then called out his homosexuality to his face, he called me crazy, trying to project his homosexual insanity onto me, just like Gomillion, Moore, Grubb, + co. tried projecting their ass-backwards anti-reality onto me. Hell no.

Set the record straight. Move my grievance against Chase Reed Gomillion forward as a complaint toward disbarring him for his blatant professional misconduct against me, The State Bar of Texas, + the Texas Justice System.

O There is no negotiation with evil. There must be no shadow and track justice system in the city of Austin, the state of Texas, or the United States of America.

Evil must be defeated and its works destroyed.

In Jesus name Amen.



Exhibit A

(57)

14/18/17 - 8 PM

Municipal Court Public Inquiry		
Code	Violation	Date Ticket Issued
42120	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	1/18/2017
Scheduled Events		
1	ISSUED	1/18/2017 08:30 AM
2	CITATION FILED	1/18/2017 10:59 AM
3	FRONT COUNTER NOT GUILTY DOCKET CALL	2/1/2017 07:45 PM
4	NOTICE TO APPEAR - DOCKET CALL	2/1/2017 07:46 PM
5	PLEA: NOT GUILTY	2/6/2017 06:00 PM
6	INITIAL APPEARANCE DATE	2/6/2017 06:00 PM
7	INITIAL APPEARANCE DATE	2/7/2017 03:54 PM
8	JUDICIAL ORDER MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE	2/7/2017 03:54 PM
9	NOTICE TO APPEAR - DOCKET CALL	2/7/2017 03:55 PM
10	DEFENDANT MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE FILED	2/22/2017 06:00 PM
11	TRAFFIC APPEARANCE DOCKET	3/1/2017 06:00 PM
12	TRAFFIC APPEARANCE DOCKET	3/1/2017 06:51 PM
13	NOTICE TO APPEAR - BENCH TRIAL	3/1/2017 06:53 PM
14	ORDER OF THE COURT - JUDGE'S ORDER	3/2/2017 07:37 AM
15	COMPLAINT GENERATED	3/3/2017 08:00 PM
16	BENCH TRIAL	3/3/2017 08:16 PM
17	ORDER OF THE COURT - JUDGE'S ORDER	3/3/2017 08:20 AM
18	PLEA: NOT GUILTY	3/3/2017 08:46 AM
19	TO BE SCHEDULED FOR BENCH TRIAL	3/3/2017 08:47 AM
20	COMPLAINT GENERATED	4/1/2017 09:44 AM
21	NOTICE TO APPEAR - BENCH TRIAL	4/1/2017 11:39 AM
22	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE - SENT TO JUDGE	4/1/2017 11:39 AM
23	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE FILED BY OFFICER	4/1/2017 02:05 PM
24	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE GRANTED	4/1/2017 04:49 PM
25	NOTICE - COURT CANCELLED	4/1/2017 04:49 PM
26	NOTICE TO APPEAR - BENCH TRIAL	4/1/2017 05:44 PM
27	MOTION FOR DISCOVERY	4/1/2017 05:46 PM
28	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE - SENT TO JUDGE	4/1/2017 05:46 PM
29	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE FILED BY DEF. - TRIAL	4/1/2017 06:01 PM
30	MOTION FOR CONTINUANCE GRANTED	4/1/2017 07:11 AM
31	NOTICE TO APPEAR - DISCOVERY DOCKET	5/1/2017 08:30 AM
32	BENCH TRIAL	5/3/2017 10:30 AM
33	DISCOVERY DOCKET	5/11/2017 08:30 AM
34	BENCH TRIAL	

PAYMENT CALLING, MEDICARE FEE CONTRACTS, STATE TAXES, LEGAL SERVICES, FINANCIAL PLANNING, ETC.

© MobiControl Inc. MobiControl sends some data to MobiTel so that we can improve your experience.

Choose What I See

Exhibit B

AUSTIN POLICE | AUSTIN WATER | CONVENTION CENTER | VISITORS BUREAU | OPEN GOVERNMENT

Pay Online Services Calendar Media Center Departments Log Out

5/3/17 10:30 AM

Municipal Court Public Inquiry

Public Inquiry > Criminal & Traffic Search > Person Listing > Person Detail

50

[Cases](#) [Case Summary](#) [Previous Payments](#) [Make a Payment](#)

Action Listing for Person - Leon, Carlos Alejandro

Case #	Violation	Event	Date	Time
1	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Records Request Processed @ front counter	4/26/2017	11:22 AM
2	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Changed Disposition from DRE to DRE	3/31/2017	08:20 AM
3	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Case Disposition: Dismissed - Refiled	3/31/2017	08:20 AM
4	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Order of the Court - Judge's Order	3/20/2017	08:18 PM
5	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Complaint Generated	3/21/2017	07:37 AM
6	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Order of the Court - Judge's Order	3/17/2017	08:53 PM
7	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Notice to Appear - Bench Trial	3/1/2017	08:53 PM
8	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Bench Trial	3/30/2017	08:00 PM
9	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Notice to Appear - Docket Call	2/7/2017	03:54 PM
10	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Judicial Order Motion for Continuance	2/7/2017	03:54 PM
11	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Traffic Appearance Docket	3/1/2017	08:00 PM
12	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Defendant Motion for Continuance Filed	2/7/2017	03:55 PM
13	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Notice to Appear - Docket Call	2/1/2017	07:48 PM
14	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Front Counter Not Guilty Docket Call	2/1/2017	07:45 PM
15	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Traffic Appearance Docket	2/22/2017	08:00 PM
16	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Plea: Not Guilty	2/1/2017	07:45 PM
17	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Citation filed	1/10/2017	10:59 AM
18	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING MIDBLOCK	Initial Appearance Date	2/6/2017	08:00 PM
19	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Bench Trial	5/3/2017	10:06 AM
20	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Records Request Processed	4/26/2017	11:15 AM
21	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Dismissal Ordered by Judge	4/27/2017	01:28 PM
22	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Case Disposition: Dismissed Insufficient Evidence	4/27/2017	01:28 PM
23	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Order of the Court - Judge's Order	4/27/2017	01:28 PM
24	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Discovery Docket	4/13/2017	08:11 AM
25	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Discovery Docket	5/3/2017	10:30 AM
26	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Continuance Granted	4/12/2017	08:01 PM
27	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Continuance Filed by Def. - Trial	4/12/2017	08:46 PM
28	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Continuance - Sent to Judge	4/12/2017	08:44 PM
29	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Discovery	4/12/2017	08:44 PM
30	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Bench Trial	4/12/2017	04:49 PM
31	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice - Court Cancelled	4/12/2017	04:49 PM
32	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Bench Trial	5/11/2017	08:30 AM
33	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Continuance Granted	4/12/2017	02:05 PM
34	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Continuance Filed By Officer	4/12/2017	11:39 AM
35	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Motion for Continuance - Sent to Judge	4/12/2017	11:39 AM
36	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Bench Trial	4/7/2017	09:44 AM
37	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Bench Trial	5/1/2017	08:30 AM
38	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Complaint Generated	3/31/2017	08:47 AM
39	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	To Be Scheduled for Bench Trial	3/31/2017	08:46 AM
40	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Issued	1/8/2017	08:20 AM
41	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Initial Appearance Date	2/6/2017	08:00 PM

42	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Defendant Motion for Continuance Filed	2/7/2017	03:55 PM
43	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Plea; Not Guilty	2/1/2017	07:46 PM
44	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Initial Appearance Date	2/6/2017	06:00 PM
45	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Bench Trial	3/30/2017	06:00 PM
46	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Traffic Appearance Docket	3/1/2017	06:00 PM
47	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Traffic Appearance Docket	2/22/2017	06:00 PM
48	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD.	Order of the Court - Judge's Order	3/30/2017	08:16 PM
49	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Complaint Generated	3/2/2017	07:37 AM
50	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Order of the Court - Judge's Order	3/1/2017	06:53 PM
51	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Bench Trial	3/1/2017	06:51 PM
52	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Docket Call	2/7/2017	03:54 PM
53	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Judicial Order Motion for Continuance	2/7/2017	03:54 PM
54	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Notice to Appear - Docket Call	2/1/2017	07:46 PM
55	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Front Counter Not Guilty Docket Call	2/1/2017	07:45 PM
56	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Citation filed	1/10/2017	10:59 AM
57	8560652	PEDESTRIAN IN ROADWAY CITY ORD	Plea; Not Guilty	3/31/2017	08:20 AM

Exhibit C

(60)

The pedestrian stop C
for ticket 14199822
took place late evening
on 1/8/17.

Officer McCoy failed
to mark "PM"

rate. It was
Maiden Lane &
Guadalupe for
the
unnecessary
pedestrian
stop.
location
of
the alleged, but false
PED CROSSING MID BLOCK
violation

AUSTIN CITATION - TRAFFIC STOP		14199822				
DATE: 1/8/17		TIME: 10:47 PM				
LICENSE NUMBER: [REDACTED]						
CITY: Austin STATE: TX ZIP CODE: [REDACTED]						
TRAILER#:	TRAILER ST:	DATE OF BIRTH:				
SEX: M	HEIGHT: 5'8"	EYES: Brown				
EMPLOYER OR SCHOOL: [REDACTED]	BLOOD ALCOHOL LEVEL: [REDACTED]					
INSURANCE VALID? YES NO						
VEHICLE COLOR: [REDACTED]	YEAR: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE MAKE: [REDACTED]				
VEHICLE MODEL: [REDACTED]	BODY TYPE: [REDACTED]	STATE: [REDACTED]				
VIOLATION DATE: 1/8/17		VIOL TIME: AM <input type="checkbox"/> PM <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
CONDITIONS: Dry light		Dark				
NAME OF PARK OR SCHOOL: [REDACTED]		Wet				
VIOLATION LOCATION: 25TH ST / GUADALUPE		VIOL CODE: [REDACTED]				
VIOLATION (A): CONSTITUTE UNPREC		VIOL CODE: [REDACTED]				
VIOLATION (C):		VIOL CODE: [REDACTED]				
REASON FOR STOP (REQUIRED): SEE A						
RK: 2 PS: 2	VS: [REDACTED]	RFS: 1				
Cell phone: <input type="checkbox"/>	STEP: <input type="checkbox"/>	CAD: 17081477				
ALTERED SPEED: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SPEED LIMIT: <input type="checkbox"/>	RADAR: <input type="checkbox"/>	LASER: <input type="checkbox"/>	DR. DRV: <input type="checkbox"/>	END DRV: <input type="checkbox"/>	COLLISION: <input type="checkbox"/>
VEHICLE: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE: [REDACTED]	VEHICLE: [REDACTED]
APPEARANCE DATE: [REDACTED] COURT: [REDACTED] JUDGE: [REDACTED] ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: [REDACTED]						
I HAVE READ THE WRITTEN NOTICE TO APPEAR AND I WILL APPEAR BEFORE THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL COURT ON THE DATE AND TIME SET DOWN THEREON. I UNDERSTAND THAT IF I FAIL TO APPEAR, A MUNICIPAL JUDGE OR CLERK MAY ISSUE A WARRANT FOR MY ARREST AND I MAY BE HELD IN CUSTODY FOR VIOLATING THIS ORDER.						
I HEREBY AGREE NOT TO REMOVE MY VEHICLE FROM THE ESTABLISHED AREA FOR PRESENTATION AS A WITNESS UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL COURT OR BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN POLICE DEPARTMENT. I FURTHER AGREE NOT TO REMOVE MY VEHICLE FROM THE ESTABLISHED AREA UNTIL THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL COURT HAS MADE A FINAL DECISION IN THIS MATTER. INFORMATION: [REDACTED]						
I HEREBY AGREE NOT TO REMOVE MY VEHICLE FROM THE ESTABLISHED AREA FOR PRESENTATION AS A WITNESS UNLESS AUTHORIZED BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL COURT OR BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN POLICE DEPARTMENT. I FURTHER AGREE NOT TO REMOVE MY VEHICLE FROM THE ESTABLISHED AREA UNTIL THE CITY OF AUSTIN MUNICIPAL COURT HAS MADE A FINAL DECISION IN THIS MATTER. INFORMATION: [REDACTED]						

PED CROSSING MID BLOCK was the only alleged violation & re
for a minor one

(15 x)

Exhibit D

(61)

Location: Maiden Ln &
Guadalupe

OPEN RECORDS REQUEST

Incident Type: Pedestrian
Stop

Date of Request:

3/31/17

Approximate time: Late
evening

I hereby request the full report for incident no.

CAD# 170081471

that occurred

on 01/08/17.

RECD BY

AP7363

3/31 C

Name:

Carlos León

Mailing Address:

14:23

Email:

Phone No:

Fax No:

- REFUSED TO GIVE

ADDRESS & PHONE #

I would like my report to be:

mailed
faxed
picked up
by me, in person only

Signature

by me, in person only

Additional Comments:

In addition to the full report required by Texas
Code of Criminal Procedure 2.133(b), I request
the dashboard camera video from Officer McCoy's (#7553)
Vehicle showing the entire pedestrian crossing of Guadalupe that
NOTE: Requested information cannot be emailed.

She claimed, on record
to have seen visually

DDP/KLH



City of Austin

Founded by Congress, Republic of Texas, 1839
Police Department, 715 East 8th Street, Austin, Texas 78701-3397 Telephone 512/974-5000

Exhibit E

(62)

April 3, 2017

Carlos Leon

RE: ORR #3-06708 for 17-0081471

Dear Mr. Leon:

On March 31, 2017, we received your public information request dated March 31 for the incident report and dash cam video for the above-referenced incident involving you. In order to promote governmental efficiency and encourage the prompt release of information, as required by the Public Information Act, we have relied upon Open Records Letter No. 2016-10001 (2016) in responding to your request. We do so within five business days of your request.

The department has made a good faith determination the information you requested:

- deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime and the release of the records would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of an open or pending criminal matter.

This information is subject to Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The Department has also determined you have not previously requested this information.¹ Therefore, pursuant to the previous determination granted by the Office of the Attorney General in Open Records Letter No. 2016-10001, the Department is releasing no information to you as there is no incident report, and is withholding the remaining responsive information subject to Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

- Video recording(s)


If you have questions regarding the use of this previous determination, please call the Department at 512-974-5117, or for more information concerning your rights and the responsibilities of the Department, please visit the Office of the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/og/information-about-552.108a1-previous-determinations>, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839.

Carlos Leon
April 3, 2017
Page 2

(63)

You may also review general information about the Public Information Act, including the types of information included in basic information, in the 2016 Public Information Handbook at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/publicinfo_hb.pdf.

Sincerely,



Renee Moore
Administrative Supervisor
Central Records
Austin Police Department

¹If you request this information a second time, the department must request a ruling from the Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") in order to withhold the information. See Open Records Letter No. 2016-10001.

