

Corey Gets Dismissal in California – Cop Blows off Summons to Appear

Congrats to Corey in California for taking a principled stand against the predators in Blythe, California and getting a dismissal. Despite a criminal trial set, the police officer who wrote the ticket decided to not show up. No motion or notice to the court or Corey.

And thanks for Corey for sending me the documentary proof so I could post:

Case 164038CR - Defendants

Defendant	Next Court Date/Status/Agency / CR Number	Arrest Date / Court / Charge / Violation Date
Corey		N/A VC 4000A1 08/04/2016

Case 164038CR - Corey - Status

Filing Type: Citation
Ordered Set: \$0.00
D.A.: SSA B. Ferguson
Next Action: Assignment and Court Trial 08/15/2017 AT 1:00 PM DEPT. 201

Control: N/A
Filing Date: 08/15/2016
Fiscal Year: 00.00
Defence: Pro Per
County Report #: SSCAC-6L

Warrant	Type	Status	Issued	Without
NONE	N/A	N/A		

Production	Type	Ordered	Expiration
N/A	N/A	N/A	

Sentence	Committed Date	Fine and Penalty	Restitution
N/A			

Case 164038CR - Corey - Charges

Count	Charge	Severity	Description	Violation Date	Fine	Status
1	VC 4000A1	No Evidence	Current Registration	08/04/2016		DISMISSED

I'm already aware that tickets are dismissed and cops blow off criminal trials for a variety of reasons. What cannot be reasonably disputed is the cop was incapable of making an actual case and proving jurisdiction against Corey.

This was a criminal proceeding instituted by the cop who just didn't show. If Corey did that the judge would charge him with failure to appear and issue a warrant for his arrest. Good thing there are different rules for the King's men.

At no time has the cop, despite almost a year to do so, provide any proof of his claims against Corey, that is, facts proving the constitution and code apply to Corey just because he's physically in California. This goes to proving jurisdiction, personal and subject matter.

Critics will claim the cop doesn't have to prove this claim. Sure, that is true in practice because they're criminals. It's obviously a rigged game when one party (on the same team as the judge) gets to argue without evidence. Not only that, but have the argument treated as irrefutable, no defense permitted.

If arguing without evidence was not dishonest, then why can't we do so? Why is only one side permitted to do so? Because they are the side with a prison system at their disposal.

If one of the road pirates charges you, fight them tooth and nail, hold them to their burden of proof and expose them as the criminals they are.