

Created on 12/18/15 8:12 PM

Elias Agredo-Narvaez

In care of:

™ELIAS AGREDO-NARVAEZ

1080-B East veterans highway

Jackson, New Jersey

[08527-9998]

TO: Attention

PROSECUTOR

Steven Zabarsky, Esq.

102 Jackson Drive

Jackson, NJ

08527

TO: Attention

Alternate Municipal Prosecutor

MATTHEW J. DORRY

248 Washington Street

Toms River, NJ, 08753

Fax # 732-349-0792

CC to:

Judge

Daniel F. Sahin

Fax: (732) 928-3276

Fax # 609-208-1399

**Court Administrator:** Erin J. DiCristina

Fax: (732) 928-3276

Acting ATTORNEY GENERAL

John Jay Hoffman

**Division of Highway Traffic Safety**

Fax # 609-633-9020

And Email

MAYOR: Michael Reina

Fax # 732-928-2613

And Email

Governor Chris Christie

By Email



**In re: summons # 162083**

**Attention all.**

Dear Foreign agents:

You are in receipt of this now public document because you are allegedly a party of a government agency and may or may not be properly informed of the procedure in question herein depending on the convenience or inconvenience of some other parties. It is therefore now, as has always been; my intention to protect or help to protect you and your agency from your own actions or inactions since government officials are so prone to ignore the vast majority of the violations of the inherent Rights of the Citizens of the state.

Please be advised that; this document is specifically directed to the prosecutor/s and the judge, however; the rest of you are receiving it as my good faith bona fide effort to have this matter resolved in an expeditious manner as it SHALL have been done by now, and with the least economic liability of your side since this matter involves questions of violation of inherent Rights, due process of law, conversion of an inherent right into a crime, and others.

Also, be advise. This is in it self, not yet and should not be construed as a formal complaint, however, it is essential that you all be informed of the fact that, at the beginning of this unlawful process, during the first special appearance, I was told/ or suggested by the judge, on the record [*if in fact there was any recording*] that the defendant [*willfully miss-identified by the court*] was not been charged with any serious charges and that the fine was very insignificant and that therefore it would be easier or more convenient for the alleged defendant to pay the fine than imposing **it self** with the burden of unnecessary litigation, proving; that, the proceeding is in fact, as I suggested in my first correspondence with the court, a staged, pre-arranged, and decided case even before any appearance occurs.

Be advise now, that I have never waved any inherent right nor do I intent to do so, neither knowingly nor unknowingly, willingly nor unwillingly, and, that; in fact I have legally and as required, made full reservation of all my rights and did so under UCC 1-308 expressly and that the prosecution has repeated times ignored such notices as published by news paper.

Also be advised that as a law abiding Citizen, I will defend and prosecute to the fullest extend of the laws any trespass, including but not limited to the unlawful impounding of my private conveyance because it was done under color of law by an armed private contractor AKA officer ID# 274, working for an unchartered corporation; even when said *armed individual* was advised/ informed of the consequences that he would be facing if



proceeding with such impounding ( *the armed individual accepted the liability of \$250,000 for the unlawful taking of said conveyance*) Damages awarded; TREAEVANT v. CITY OF TAMPA, 241F2D.336 (11TH CIR.1984) Motorist illegally held for 23 minutes in a traffic charge was awarded \$25,000 in damages. The above case sets the foundation for \$75,000 dollars per hour, or \$1,800,000 dollars per day.

All are now without any excuses, govern yourselves accordingly.

**CAUSE NO. 162083**

STATE	§	JACKSON TWP MUNICIPAL COURT
	§	
VS.	§	AT
	§	
™ELIAS AGREDO-NARVAEZ	§	OCEAN COUNTY

---

**NOTICE AND DEMAND  
DEPOSITION**

Regarding this particular Cause Number 162083 before the above captioned court:

In scheduled Trial/conference for this particular matter on the 22<sup>th</sup> day of December in the year 2015, beginning at 3:00pm

The man Elias Agredo-Narvaez, with consent of the court, in special/ limited appearance in propria persona, proceeding sui juris, unrepresented, not an attorney, NOT ELIAS AGREDO-NARVAEZ, not a corporation nor an officer of one or becoming one, as case manager in good faith, in defense of private property, reserving all rights without prejudice; and with consideration of and reliance on the following: I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

As in Federal Crop Insurance v. Merrill, 332 U.S. 380 (1947), the supreme Court ruled: "Whatever the form in which the government functions, anyone entering into an arrangement with the government takes a risk of having accurately ascertained that he who purports to act for the government stays within the bounds of his authority, ... even though the agent himself ... may be unaware of the limitations upon his authority." See Utah Power & Light Co. v. United States, 243 U.S. 389, 409; United States v. Stewart, 311 U.S. 60, 70, 108, and see, generally, In re Floyd Acceptances, 7 Wall. 666 (Emphasis added.) I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No;

and in

Continental Casualty Co. v. United States, 113 F.2d 284, 286 (5th Cir. 1940): "Public officers are merely the agents of the public, whose powers and authority are defined and limited by law. Any act without the scope of the authority so defined does not bind the principal, and all persons dealing with such agents are charged with knowledge of the extent of their authority," (Emphasis added.) I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and pursuant to



"It is not the function of our Government to keep the citizen from falling into error; it is the function of the citizen to keep the government from falling into error." American Communications Association v. Douds, 339 U.S. 382, 442 (1950) (Emphasis added.) I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; relying on the above and so

therefore, with all respect due, and in interest of full disclosure, lawful demand is hereby timely made on and to any one appearing or attempting appearance for the State at the above said trial/conference, and any other thing thereafter, to be fully and duly authorized and properly credentialed to be acting in any alleged capacity relating to this specific matter and the items of authentication be presented and properly entered into the record of this specific matter, agency cannot be proven by mouth of agent

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and

pursuant to Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990) "Federal Law & Supreme Court Cases apply to State Court Cases." I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and in addition to the above said,

any one appearing or attempting appearance for the State ("this State"), at the above said trial/conference, will be expected to bring answers, and corresponding things, to the requests of discovery of this 162083 matter and the following questions, as they relate to this particular matter, please provide certified copies of tangible items requested:

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

1. Who are you? \_\_\_\_\_
2. Who do you claim to represent? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Are you familiar with this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No
4. Who is your principal? \_\_\_\_\_
5. Who is the real party of interest? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Who understands this particular matter? \_\_\_\_\_
7. By what authority do you move in this particular matter?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Are you fully empowered to act for your superior in this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No



9. Are you prepared and duly authorized to bind your principal in this matter?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

10. Just exactly who is the / your principal?

11. Does there exist any manner or form of Federal funding or grant money involved in any way with this particular matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

12. For your job position, are you employed under a collective bargaining agreement?  
☐ Yes - ☐ No

13. What is the authority for the capital letter spelled names "THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY" and "ELIAS AGREDO-NARVAEZ"? \_\_\_\_\_

14. Do you think or feel that you represent Elias Agredo-Narvaez, or ELIAS AGREDO-NARVAEZ in any way? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

15. Pursuant to Pertinent law, Are you duly, and currently, licensed to practice Law? If yes, enter a certified copy of your license into the record. (A Bar card is not license.) ☐ Yes - ☐ No

16. Are you a member of the New Jersey Bar Association? If yes, place certified copy of your Bar card into the record. ☐ Yes - ☐ No

And pursuant to State vs. Jordan; 28 S.W.2d. 921, 922

"A person elected or appointed to an office or other public position must qualify by taking an oath or making affirmation & by giving bond, if so required by law."

17. Are you under an oath? If yes, enter a certified copy of it into the record.

☐ Yes - ☐ No



18. Do you have bond for this matter? If yes, enter a certified copy of it into the record. ☐ Yes - ☐ No
19. Are you aware of circumstances under which you would be, or could be, committing an (US Constitution) Article III impeachable felony offense?  
☐ Yes - ☐ No
20. Is there any evidence that CRANE vs. STATE OF TEXAS case no. 83-1650; wherein the U.S. Court of Appeals, 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit held: "... the Dallas County system of issuing misdemeanor capias violated both Texas law & the United States Constitution...." is not applicable in this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No
21. Is there any evidence that Pullman v. Allen, 466 U.S. 522 (1984). "Incarceration to coerce bond is unconstitutional." is not applicable in this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No
22. Is there any evidence that Trezevant v. City of Tampa 741 F.2d 336 is not applicable in this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No
23. Please enter into the record any presumptions under which you may be operating.
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
24. Who specifically instigated this matter? Is the [that] person competent?  
☐ Yes - ☐ No



25. Who specifically signed the charging affidavit, the FOR THE ALLEGED CHARGES, as found in the folder of this matter? Is the [that] individual competent?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

26. Who specifically signed the Information as found in the folder of this matter? Is the [that] individual competent? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

27. Who specifically signed the Complaint as found in the folder of this matter? Are the individual persons each competent? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

28. Is the Information in this matter consistent with the New Jersey constitution?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

29. Is the Information competent? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

30. Is the Complaint in this matter consistent with the New Jersey constitution?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

31. Is the Complaint competent? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

32. Does either the Complaint or the Information, or both, in this matter present a justiciable case or controversy? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

33. Are you aware of this United States Supreme Court ruling: "courts only adjudicate justiciable controversies." United States v. ICC, 337 U.S. 426, 430 (1949)?

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

34. Are all parties to this matter properly identified? ☐ Yes - ☐ No



35. Are all parties to this matter properly joined? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

36. Are you competent in this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

37. What is the specific charge in this matter?

---

38. Is there any evidence of overbreath? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

39. Does the alleged charge correspond with constitutionally enacted law?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

40. Specifically, and as expressed, is the alleged charge constitutional as expressed in your letter of opposition to an alleged motion to dismiss? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

41. Does this apply to this matter? "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; affords no protection' it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed." see, Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425, Quoting from Marbury v Madison (1803), Marbury holds that a void act is void ab initio. "... **the Constitution requires the judiciary to refrain from enforcing laws enacted contrary to the Constitution...**"

☐ Yes - ☐ No

42. Does there exist evidence of barratry? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

43. Do you have standing in this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

44. Does the individual who instigated this matter have standing? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

45. Does the individual who signed the charging affidavit have standing? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

46. Is there evidence of a complaining party? If yes, what is the evidence and who specifically gave it to you? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

47. Are you concealing any evidence concerning the accused in this matter?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

48. Is there any evidence that goes to show anyone's legal rights were violated?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

49. Is the individual man/woman who signed the charging affidavit willing to stand charges for wrongdoing? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

50. Are you willing to stand charges for wrongdoing? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

51. Will you state to anything other than the truth during the trial/conference? \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Yes - ☐ No

52. Considering the above lawful challenges regarding standing and the notion that any competent prosecutor knows [now] that standing must be proven through de facto, not prima facie, evidence - it is perhaps the most important of the jurisdictional doctrines - how say you? \_\_\_\_\_

53. Does there exist any manner of any thing that goes to show that the State in this matter is not subject to the CLEARFIELD TRUST DOCTRINE, see Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States, 318 U.S. 363-371 (1942)? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

54. What compels performance? \_\_\_\_\_

55. Does there exist some manner of form of contract compelling performance in this specific instance? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

56. On what authority can you compel performance without full disclosure?

57. Does there exist any thing that overturns or otherwise annuls, "The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent



contract." see, Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 or as the Supreme Court has stated clearly, "...every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent." CRUDEN vs. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70? Are you aware that the man Elias Agredo-Narvaez did not and does not give his consent to this matter? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

58. Does there exist any thing that overturns or otherwise annuls, "The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." as per Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

59. As one's "name" is one's property, for one's "name" to enjoy Sui Juris status that "name" must be free of explicit legal disability resulting from some contract, indenture or commercial agreement which is "held-in-due-course" by a fellow citizen, corporation or by an agency of government; since Elias Agredo-Narvaez is proceeding, and claims Sui Juris status in connection with His property, or "name / NAME", if there be dispute to the above said then this is lawful demand, to have whatever exists to rebut and the item itself be placed into the record of this matter. I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

60. What supposed authority is there to contravene, transgress or otherwise trespass personal affairs and recorded private property?

---

61. Does there exist competent evidence, as may be introduced at trial, to show that the prosecution going forward in this matter is not a conspiracy of mal-intent and ill-humored individuals in malevolent cabal to unlawfully create controversy where none exists? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

62. Does there exist competent evidence, as may be introduced at trial, to show that the prosecution in this matter is not attempting by artful conversion to create a colorable persona under colorable law by unauthorized use of the NAME, the recorded trade-name, of capital spelled "™ELIAS AGREDO-NARVAEZ"? ☐ Yes- ☐ No



63. Pursuant to Hagans v. Lavine, 415 US 528 at 533 (1974) "Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven." Are you in possession of anything that clearly goes to jurisdiction in this action? If yes, enter a copy of it into the record.

☐ Yes - ☐ No

64. Are you in possession of anything that clearly goes to abrogate or otherwise annuls the items of public policy as found in the record of this matter?

☐ Yes - ☐ No

65. Please offer an explanation as to why there has been no response, except silence, to any requests for discovery as found in the folder of this matter thus far. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

66. Does the prosecutor know that he/she is obligated by law to make known material information to Me and the general public when asked? County attorneys have thus far refused to give responsive answers to legitimate inquiry and thus have violated their fiduciary responsibilities and committed fraud as per McNally v. U.S., 483 U.S. 350, 371-372 (1987), Quoting U.S. v Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304, 307: "Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit - and this is one of the meanings that fraud bears in the statute, see United States v. Dial, 757 F.2d 163, 168 (7th Cir. 1985) - includes the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public, including, in the case of a judge, the litigants who appear before him, and if he deliberately conceals material information from them he is guilty of fraud.

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

67. Is the State willing to admit that this **162083 matter** is unwarranted - unfounded - unlawful and as such is fraud upon the court and as such should have not been bought into this honorable court - and that this 162083 matter should be dismissed and with proper restitution of all economic burden bore in the recovery of my stolen private conveyance under color of law ordered and with proper expungement also ordered and then accomplished in timely manner by the State? ☐ Yes - ☐ No

68. What items are destined to be presented at trial? Please identify each and every item.

\_\_\_\_\_



69. What witnesses are destined to be presented at trial? Please identify each with proper identifying information including where they, each, may receive process.

---

"The law creates a presumption, where the burden is on a party to prove a material fact peculiarly within his knowledge and he fails without excuse to testify, that his testimony, if introduced, would be adverse to his interests." citing Meier v CIR, 199 F 2d 392, 396 (8th Cir. 1952) (quoting 20 Am Jur, Evidence, Sec 190, page 193 (Emphasis added.) I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and

Silence is acquiescence. See: Connally v. General Construction Co., 269 U.S. 385, 391,

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and

Notification of legal responsibility is "the first essential of due process of law". See also: U.S. V. Tweel, 550 F.2d.297. "Silence can only be equated with fraud where there is a legal or moral duty to speak or when an inquiry left unanswered would be intentionally misleading." (Emphasis added.), I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

Fraud: Deceit, deception, artifice, or trickery operating prejudicially on the rights of another, and so intended, by inducing him to part with property or surrender some legal right. 23 Am Jur 2d Fraud § 2. Anything calculated to deceive another to his prejudice and accomplishing the purpose, whether it be an act, a word, silence, the suppression of the truth, or other device contrary to the plain rules of common honesty. 23 Am Jur 2d Fraud § 2. I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

"Sovereign immunity does not apply where (as here) government is a lawbreaker or jurisdiction is the issue." Arthur v. Fry, 300 F.Supp. 622, I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and

"Knowing failure to disclose material information necessary to prevent statement from being misleading, or making representation despite knowledge that it has no reasonable basis in fact, are actionable as fraud under law." Rubinstein v. Collins, 20 F.3d 160, 1990, I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and that [a]

"Party in interest may become liable for fraud by mere silent acquiescence and partaking of benefits of fraud." Bransom v. Standard Hardware, Inc., 874 S.W.2d 919, 1994, I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; see



Ex dolo malo non oritur actio. Out of fraud no action arises; fraud never gives a right of action. No court will lend its aid to a man who founds his cause of action upon an immoral or illegal act. As found in Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition (page 509), I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and

"Fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters," Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S. 426. "Fraud vitiates everything" Boyce v. Grundy, 3 Pet. 210, "Fraud vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents and even judgments." U.S. v. Throckmorton, 98 US 61, I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

## **LEGAL NOTICE TO ALL INVOLVED PARTIES**

The inability to answer, or non-response to any question above, or to not supply requested information will be construed to be and will be violation of due process and tacit admittance that either nothing exists regarding the inquiry or that there is unlawful movement with secret information.

Due process means fundamental fairness. see Hampton v. United States, 96 S.Ct. 1646, 1652 N. 6 (1976) (Emphasis added.), I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No; and

A bad faith prosecution violates constitutional rights. See Cornet v. Longois, 871 F.Supp. 918, 921-922 (E.D. Texas 1994) I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

### **Memorandum: Immunity depends upon delegated authority.**

When a Citizen challenges the acts of a federal or state official as being illegal, that official cannot just simply avoid liability based upon the fact that he is a public official. In United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220, 221, 1 S.Ct. 240, 261, the United States claimed title to Arlington, Lee's estate, via a tax sale some years earlier, held to be void by the Court. In so voiding the title of the United States, the Court declared:

"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives. "Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights." I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No;



and also See Pierce v. United States ("The Floyd Acceptances"), 7 Wall. (74 U.S.) 666, 677 ("We have no officers in this government from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who does not hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority"); Cunningham v. Macon, 109 U.S. 446, 452, 456, 3 S.Ct. 292, 297 ("In these cases he is not sued as, or because he is, the officer of the government, but as an individual, and the court is not ousted of jurisdiction because he asserts authority as such officer. To make out his defense he must show that his authority was sufficient in law to protect him... It is no answer for the defendant to say I am an officer of the government and acted under its authority unless he shows the sufficiency of that authority"); and Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 287, 5 S.Ct. 903, 912.

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

WHEREAS, officials and even judges have no immunity (SEE your own courts ruling: Owen Vs City of Independence, 100 S Ct. 1398; Maine Vs Thiboutot, 100 S. Ct. 2502; and Hafer Vs Melo, 502 U.S. 21; officials and judges are deemed to know the law and sworn to uphold the law; officials and judges cannot claim to act in good faith in willful deprivation of law, they certainly cannot plead ignorance of the law, even the Citizen cannot plead ignorance of the law, the courts have ruled there is no such thing as ignorance of the law, it is ludicrous for learned officials and judges to plead ignorance of the law therefore there is no immunity, judicial or otherwise, in matters of rights secured by the Constitution for the United States of America. SEE, your law: Title 42 USC Sec. 1983. I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

This deposition neither confers jurisdiction nor does it constitute a plea.

I am aware of this ☐ Yes - ☐ No

### VERIFICATION

Before me, the undersigned notary, on this day personally appeared \_\_\_\_\_, a person whose identity was made known to me by means of \_\_\_\_\_. After I administered an oath to him / her, upon his / her oath he / she said that he / she read the foregoing questions and statements and that the facts so showing above and the answers so given are within personal knowledge true and correct and that he / she is duly authorized to make them.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PROSECUTOR: Steven Zabarsky, Esq.

Alternate Municipal Prosecutor, MATTHEW J.DORRY

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing answers of \_\_\_\_\_,  
the witness forenamed, were signed and sworn to before me on the above said date by said  
witness.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Notary Public in and for the State of New Jersey

My Commission Expires  
\_\_\_\_\_



TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 12/18/2015 12:52  
NAME : ELIAS AGREDO  
FAX : 7323644127  
TEL : 7323644127  
SER.# : J2J946909

DATE, TIME	12/18 12:48
FAX NO./NAME	7329283276
DURATION	00:04:29
PAGE(S)	16
RESULT	OK*
MODE	PHOTO
	ECM

\* :COLOR FAX NOT AVAILABLE

*court administrator*

TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 12/18/2015 13:01  
NAME : ELIAS AGREDO  
FAX : 7323644127  
TEL : 7323644127  
SER.# : J2J946909

DATE, TIME	12/18 12:56
FAX NO./NAME	6096339020
DURATION	00:04:33
PAGE(S)	16
RESULT	OK*
MODE	PHOTO
	ECM

\* :COLOR FAX NOT AVAILABLE

AG. Div of highway traffic  
safety



TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 12/18/2015 13:07  
NAME : ELIAS AGREDO  
FAX : 7323644127  
TEL : 7323644127  
SER.# : J2J946909

DATE, TIME	12/18 13:03
FAX NO./NAME	7323490792
DURATION	00:04:22
PAGE(S)	18
RESULT	OK*
MODE	PHOTO
	ECM

\* :COLOR FAX NOT AVAILABLE

Matthew J. Dory  
alternate municipal  
prosecutor

TRANSMISSION VERIFICATION REPORT

TIME : 12/18/2015 13:24  
NAME : ELIAS AGREDO  
FAX : 7323644127  
TEL : 7323644127  
SER.# : J2J946909

DATE, TIME	12/18 13:14
FAX NO./NAME	7329282613
DURATION	00:10:00
PAGE(S)	18
RESULT	OK*
MODE	PHOTO

\* :COLOR FAX NOT AVAILABLE

Mayor Rafael Reina