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

Seq	Defendant	Next Court Date	Status	Agency / DR Number	Arrest Date	Count 1 Charge	Violation Date
1	[redacted] COREY [redacted]				N/A	VC 4000A1	09/04/2016

Case 164038CR - [redacted], COREY [redacted] - Status

		Custody	N/A
Filing Type	Citation	Filing Date	09/15/2016
Ordered Bail	$0.00	Posted Bail	$0.00
D.A.	DDA B. Ferguson	Defense	Pro Per
Next Action	Arraignment and Court Trial 06/15/2017 AT 1:30 PM DEPT. 260	Deputy Reason #	RSRC-BL

Warrant	Type	Status	Issued	Affidavit
		NONE	N/A	N/A
Probation	Type	Granted	Expiration	
	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Sentence	Committed Date	Fine and Penalty	Restitution Fine	
	N/A	A	0	

Case 164038CR - [redacted], COREY [redacted] - Charges

Filed Charges

Count	Charge	Severity	Description	Violation Date	Plea	Status
1	VC 4000A1	I	No Evidence Current Registration	09/04/2016		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.