

## **\$10,000 Reward!**

Read how messed up the California courts are. At a recent hearing in the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, I was refused a trial de novo, as permitted by law, by Judge Pro Tem GLORIA BLUME. At the second hearing I complained to judge JULIUS M. TITLE that I never had a trial de novo. He said I did and refused to allow my appeal to proceed. I will pay ten thousand dollars to the first person who can prove to me that a trial de novo was held as shown in the certified transcript of those proceedings shown below. Respond with any comments you may have to [Paul@Rebel101.com](mailto:Paul@Rebel101.com). And be sure to read the bottom of this page to read a letter I received trying to collect my reward. Must have been by a law student who had bad spelling habits.

### **FIRST HEARING**

On November 4, 2004 at 1:30 PM. CASE #04C01472 in the Superior Court West District, Santa Monica Courthouse, I appeared for a trial de novo as permitted under CVC 40215 (California Vehicle Code)

After stipulating for the assignment of a judge pro tem, I waited until "judge" pro tem Gloria Blume walked in and took the bench. Looking through the papers she called my case first. The following is the exchange between the judge and myself. (This OCR copy of the actual transcript, word for word shows how people really talk with the all the double words and um and aw.)

THE COURT: Paul, is it Bezaire?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Bezaire. You're her to appeal a ruling.

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: I'm, I'm here on a trial de nova. I'm supposed to have a trial today on my, on my traffic citation.

THE COURT: Well, my paperwork says that you're appealing a ruling that you owe the City forty-five dollars (\$45)?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: I'm appealing that, but I'm also under 40230 of the Vehicle Code, I'm, I'm, I'm here within ninety days for a trial de novo, and the City is not here to respond to it, and I suggest that that requires a dismissal.

(Court and Clerk Confer)

THE COURT: Okay. Actually, the City responded by sending a packet of information. What are your grounds for appealing the ruling? **She shouldn't even be questioning me on this matter. She should just be getting the trial under way.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: That the City hasn't standardize their parking tickets --I mean, their, their parking fines that's required by the code.

THE COURT: What do you mean standardized? **Again a dumb question for someone pretending to be a judge.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Well, all --every city in L.A. County has different amounts for parking violations.

THE COURT: Correct.

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: But the code requires that they be standardized.

THE COURT: And why isn't the forty-five dollars (\$45) standardized? Is it different in every jurisdiction?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Well sure. One city might have twenty-five dollars (\$25), the other one might have fifty dollars (\$50), they're all different.

THE COURT: Okay. Well –

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: And pursuant to 412, 412 -- pursuant to 40230.5 of the Vehicle Code it says that, "To the extent possible issuing agencies within the same county shall standardize all parking penalties." **I blame myself for not objecting to all these foolish questions**

THE COURT: Okay. To the extent that it's possible, and each jurisdiction sets their own standard.

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Right.

THE COURT: And sometimes it is impossible to standardize it amongst the different jurisdiction. So the -- the amount in this jurisdiction is forty-five dollars (\$45), and that really --the relevancy of what the other jurisdictions do because of possibility is not relevant to ours, so yours is forty-five dollars (\$45).

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Well, Your Honor, the fact still remains that I --I have a Constitutional Right to confront the, the City here, my, my witnesses and to cross-examine them.

THE COURT: This is an infraction I believe, so you do not have that right. **How dumb can she get. She doesn't even recognize the concept of a denial of due process.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Then you don't agree with 40230.5 –

THE COURT: Well –

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: --where I'm entitled to a trial de novo ?

THE COURT: --actually, I'm not as conversant in that. But I will hold and affirm the judgment that you owe the City forty-five dollars (\$45) .Thank you. **She finally admits she is ignorant of the law.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: I think that's judicial error, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

SECOND HEARING

I appeared for the hearing and, instead of the trial judge being there to prepare a settled statement on appeal, Julius M. Title who appeared to me to be well beyond retirement age took his seat. Below is the court transcript of the proceeding;

THE COURT: Paul Bezaire.

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Bezaire, there's no appeal from a de novo hearing. The law does not permit it. There's case law which says that, so you've got no appeal to take. **From the start he is dead wrong. He is only professing his ignorance of the law.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: I haven't had a de novo hearing yet.

THE COURT: You haven't had a de novo hearing?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: No.

THE COURT: You haven't?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: She denied it to me.

THE COURT: Wait, pardon?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: She denied it.

THE COURT: Well, that's the hearing. Were you here in Court? **(I will pay \$10,000 dollars to the first person who can show me where I had a trial de novo at the first hearing.)**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Sure.

THE COURT: And she was here?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Sure.

THE COURT: And she denied it, that's your hearing. What else do you want? You, you - I want sanity in the Santa Monica courthouse. **So do I.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Your Honor –

THE COURT: --talk --here, the ticket was given to you, listen to me please, the ticket was given to you. You had the administrative hearing, they said it was a good ticket --

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Uh-huh.

THE COURT: --and you filed an appeal with the court.

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Um-hum.

THE COURT: You're entitled to what we call a de novo or a brand new hearing, which you had before the judge. She said no, it's a good ticket, you got to pay it. That's. the end of the road under the law. **He is as bad of a judge as the first one but I can allow some excuse based on his age and a judge that just came out of retirement and has not kept up with the law.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Your Honor, isn't a de novo hearing a hearing starting with no evidence at all? It's –

THE COURT: Sir, I --here's the point. I didn't hear the case, she heard it. Whatever she did that's the end of the road because there is an appellate case which says there's no appeal from a de novo hearing. The hearing was done, over, you were turned down. That's the end of the road. **WRONG AGAIN!!!**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Well, there --there was no evidence presented

THE COURT: Sir –

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: --and I didn't have a hearing

THE COURT: --were you here in court?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Yes, I was here in court.

THE COURT: Was she here?

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Yes, she was here.

THE COURT: That's, that's the end of the story. I can't do anything about that. I wasn't here. So I'll -- just --I'll send it up to the court indicating there's no possibility of an appeal because that's what the case says and that's the end of it, okay? **Is he saying the appellate court could not decide on their own that this is not appealable as he indicates. He sounds like a frustrated attorney who wants to act like an appellate judge. He should not indicate anything to the appellate department**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Well, at a de novo hearing isn't there suppose to –

THE COURT: Sir –

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: --be evidence presented of the –

THE COURT: --I've tried, I've tried to explain it to you. You were here. I don't know what happened at the hearing and that can't be my concern. I --I don't know what occurred then. As far as I'm concerned the hearing was held, you were here, the judge was here, she turned it down. End of story, okay? That's it. Sorry. I can't change the law. I don't make those cases. All right. Anything further? **He admits he doesn't know what happened at my first trial so how can he say I had a trial de novo.**

PLAINTIFF BEZAIRE: Well, I think it's wrong but --

PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED

An appeal (# BV 025763) to the appellate department of Superior Court said I filed an appeal from a non appealable judgment. The ORDER, citing the same bad law, was signed by judges WASSERMAN and McKAY who were also ignorant of the law.

The Second District Court of Appeal, (# B185249) also citing the same bad law, denied my Petition for Writ of Mandate. The ORDER was signed by judges RUBIN, BOLAND and FLIER

The seven Justices of the California Supreme Court denied my Petition for Review (# S-136993)

I am amazed that thirteen judges have not been able to understand the law. God help any criminal who might face these California "judges" in a death penalty case.

I receive letters stating that I am too outspoken and cocky. I think I am more disappointed to think that California has judges that cannot understand the law. If that's cocky, so be it. But I thoroughly researched the law while these judges did not. If they had done their homework instead of relying on their incompetent clerks they would have realized that judge Title sent some bad law to the appellate department and like a herd of sheep, all the other judges fell for it. I visualize the blindfolded lady of justice having been raped by a gang of California judges. Not a single person has taken me up on my one \$10,000.00 offer so I repeat it here.

Did or did I not have a trial de novo at the first hearing? I repeat my offer of \$10,000.00 dollars to the first person who can prove that I had a trial de novo as decided by "judge" Julius Title at my second appearance in this case.