

<p>Phil Lepanto, 1D01 phil.lepanto@gmail.com</p>	<p>Mount Pleasant Advisory Neighborhood Commission</p>	<p>Gregg Edwards, 1D04 Chair g@ge1.org</p>
<p>Oliver Tunda, 1D02 tunda21@hotmail.com</p>		<p>Dave Bosserman, 1D05 orilla@comcast.net</p>
<p>Jack McKay, 1D03 Secretary and Treasurer jack.mckay@verizon.net</p>	<p>1380 Monroe St NW, #117, Washington, DC 20010 Tel: 234-6646 Web: www.anc1d.org e-mail: anc1d@googlegroups.com</p>	<p>Angelia Scott, 1D06 Vice Chair pastorascott@yahoo.com</p>

Parking tickets should identify the parking regulation violated

Resolved, that ANC1D advises the Parking Enforcement branch of the Department of Public Works, and the Metropolitan Police Department, that parking violation citations should state explicitly what parking regulation has been violated.

Why: Parking tickets commonly indicate only vaguely, or even inaccurately, what the parking violation was. Frequently the tickets merely state "No Parking Anytime", code P055, with no hint of why the location was so posted, nor what Municipal Regulation was actually violated.

This complicates any attempt to challenge the validity of such a ticket. A specific problem has to do with parking distance from an intersection, where the standard minimum distance is 40 feet, but certain District regulations permit cars to be parked as close as 25 feet from the intersection. With no clear indication on the parking citation of exactly what regulation has been violated, it is hard to argue which regulation is applicable to the situation, and perhaps overrides the presence of a "no parking" signpost.

The Sixth Amendment is not applicable, but its sense of justice is clear: a person accused of a violation is entitled "to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation". When a parking ticket fails to note explicitly what the parking violation was, the spirit of this constitutional right is violated.

The awkwardness of attempting a defense against such a vague accusation is compounded upon the appeal of a parking ticket to the District of Motor Vehicles Appeals Board. Again, there is no clear description of the charge, and it is hard to prepare a defense against such a vague charge. In a current case in Mount Pleasant, the Board itself cannot state what parking regulation has been violated, and yet has upheld the "conviction", and the penalty, for violating some unnamed parking regulation.

Passed by 5 to 0 vote at the legally noticed, public meeting of ANC1D on July 20, 2010, with a quorum present. Voting "yes": Commissioners Bosserman, Tunda, McKay, Edwards, Lepanto.