39:5-45

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY CHECK

Compiled by the NJ State Law Library

LAWS OF: 1999 CHAPTER: 423

NJSA: 39:5-45 (Traffic tickets—enforcement)

BILL NO: A1572

SPONSOR(S): Augustine and Quigley

DATE INTRODUCED: Pre-filed

COMMITTEE: ASSEMBLY: Transportation

SENATE: Law and Public Safety

AMENDED DURING PASSAGE: Yes

DATE OF PASSAGE: ASSEMBLY: January 10, 2000

SENATE: January 10, 2000

DATE OF APPROVAL: January 18, 2000

FOLLOWING ARE ATTACHED IF AVAILABLE:

FINAL TEXT OF BILL: Third Reprint

(Amendments during passage denoted by superscript numbers)

SPONSORS STATEMENT: (Begins on page 2 of original bill)

Yes

COMMITTEE STATEMENT: ASSEMBLY: Yes

SENATE: Yes

FLOOR AMENDMENT STATEMENTS: Yes 11-23-98

Yes 1-10-00

LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ESTIMATE: No

VETO MESSAGE: No

GOVERNOR'S PRESS RELEASE ON SIGNING: No

FOLLOWING WERE PRINTED:

To check for circulating copies, contact New Jersey State Government Publications at the State Library (609) 278-2640 ext. 103 or refdesk@njstatelib.org

REPORTS: No

HEARINGS: No

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES: Yes

[&]quot;Senate oks expiration for overdue parking tickets", The Record, 12-7-99, p. A5.

"3-year limitation gains for local parking tickets", <u>Star Ledger</u>, 12-7-99, p. 24.

P.L. 1999, CHAPTER 423, approved January 18, 2000 Assembly, No. 1572 (Third Reprint)

1 **AN ACT** concerning motor vehicles, supplementing P.L.1985, c.14 2 (C.39:4-139.2 et seq.) and amending R.S.39:5-45 ³[²,R.S.39:3-40] 3 and P.L.1985, c.14²] and R.S.39:3-40³.

4

5 **BE IT ENACTED** by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14 1. (New section) In any ¹ [case of a parking violation] <u>parking case</u>¹, if the municipal court fails ¹, ¹ within three years of the date of the violation ¹ [either to], to either ¹ issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest, or to order a suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or ¹ the defendant's ¹ non-resident reciprocity privileges ¹ [, as the case maybe,] ¹ or prohibit the ¹ [defendant] <u>person</u> ¹ from receiving or obtaining driving privileges, the matter shall be dismissed and shall not be reopened.

151617

2. R.S.39:5-45 is amended to read as follows:

Any person who collects ¹[a fine, or a fine and costs,] fines, costs ¹ 18 or cash bail, for a violation of this subtitle, shall¹[, upon receipt 19 thereof, 1 deliver to the foffender defendant a proper itemized 20 receipt ¹ [therefor, of which the magistrate shall retain a carbon copy 21 to be filed with the docket of the case. Any person who violates this 22 section shall be subject to a fine not exceeding 1 [twenty-five dollars] 23 (\$25.00) 1 [\$25], which may be either a "proper itemized manual 24 receipt" or a "proper itemized computer generated receipt." Such 25 receipt shall be created either manually or by computer. In the event 26 27 that the payment was made by mail, the defendant shall only be entitled 28 to a copy of the receipt if the defendant provides the court with a stamped self-addressed envelope. If a manual receipt is issued, a copy 29 of that receipt shall be filed with the case. 1 For the purposes of this 30 section, a "proper itemized 1manual 1 receipt" is one 1that is pre-31 numbered and which includes: the name and signature of the person 32 who received the payment, the date ¹ [and time] ¹ the payment was 33 34 received ¹[and a statement that the obligation for which the receipt is being issued is discharged in full, the name of the defendant, the 35 amount paid and the complaint or docket number. A "proper itemized 36 computer generated receipt" is one that is pre-numbered and which 37 includes: the identifying code of the person who received the payment, 38

EXPLANATION - Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets [thus] in the above bill is not enacted and is intended to be omitted in the law.

Matter underlined thus is new matter.

Matter enclosed in superscript numerals has been adopted as follows:

¹ Assembly floor amendments adopted November 23, 1998.

² Senate SLP committee amendments adopted March 15, 1999.

³ Assembly floor amendments adopted January 10, 2000.

2

- 1 the date and time the payment was received, the name of the
- 2 <u>defendant, the amount paid and the complaint or docket number</u>¹.
- 3 Any outstanding charges against an offender ¹ [shall] may ¹ be
- 4 <u>immediately dismissed upon the offender's presentation of a proper</u>
- 5 <u>itemized receipt issued pursuant to this section evidencing the payment</u>
- 6 of the required fines and costs. ¹Properly itemized receipts, for use by
- 7 <u>municipal courts, may contain supplemental information as</u>
- 8 appropriate, but shall be on a form approved by the Administrative
- 9 <u>Director of the Courts.</u>¹
- 10 (cf: P.L.1942, c.334, s.12)

11 12

18

19

- ²3. R.S.39:3-40 is amended to read as follows:
- 39:3-40. No person to whom a driver's license has been refused or whose driver's license or reciprocity privilege has been suspended or revoked, or who has been prohibited from obtaining a driver's license, shall personally operate a motor vehicle during the period of refusal, suspension, revocation, or prohibition.
 - No person whose motor vehicle registration has been revoked shall operate or permit the operation of such motor vehicle during the period of such revocation.
- 21 **[**A**]** Except as provided in subsection i. of this section, a person violating this section shall be subject to the following penalties:
- a. Upon conviction for a first offense, a fine of \$500.00 and, if that offense involves the operation of a motor vehicle during a period when the violator's driver's license is suspended for a violation of R.S.39:4-50 or section 2 of P.L.1981, c.512 (C.39:4-50.4a), revocation of the violator's motor vehicle registration privilege in accordance with the provisions of sections 2 through 6 of P.L.1995,
- 29 c.286 (C.39:3-40.1 through C.39:3-40.5);
- 30 b. Upon conviction for a second offense, a fine of \$750.00, imprisonment in the county jail for not more than five days and, if the
- second offense involves the operation of a motor vehicle during a
- period when the violator's driver's license is suspended and that second
- 34 offense occurs within five years of a conviction for that same offense,
- 35 revocation of the violator's motor vehicle registration privilege in
- accordance with the provisions of sections 2 through 6 of P.L.1995, c.286 (C.39:3-40.1 through C.39:3-40.5);
- 27 2.200 (2.25.5 10.1 through 2.25.6 10.2),
- 38 c. Upon conviction for a third offense or subsequent offense, a
- 39 fine of \$1,000.00, imprisonment in the county jail for 10 days and, if
- 40 the third offense involves the operation of a motor vehicle during a
- period when the violator's driver's license is suspended and that third offense occurs within five years of a conviction for the same offense,
- 43 revocation of the violator's motor vehicle registration privilege in
- accordance with the provisions of sections 2 through 6 of P.L.1995,
- 45 c.286 (C.39:3-40.1 through C.39:3-40.5);
- d. Upon conviction, the court shall impose or extend a period of

1

1 suspension not to exceed six months;

- e. Upon conviction, the court shall impose a period of imprisonment for not less than 45 days, if while operating a vehicle in violation of this section a person is involved in an accident resulting in personal injury to another person;
- f. (1) Notwithstanding subsections a. through e., any person violating this section while under suspension issued pursuant to section 2 of P.L.1972, c.197 (C.39:6B-2), upon conviction, shall be fined \$500.00, shall have his license to operate a motor vehicle suspended for an additional period of not less than one year nor more than two years, and may be imprisoned in the county jail for not more than 90 days.
- 13 (2) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections a. through e. of 14 this section and paragraph (1) of this subsection, any person violating 15 this section under suspension issued pursuant to R.S.39:4-50, section 2 of P.L.1981, c.512 (C.39:4-50.4a) or P.L.1982, c.85 (C.39:5-30a et 16 17 seq.), shall be fined \$500, shall have his license to operate a motor 18 vehicle suspended for an additional period of not less than one year or 19 more than two years, and shall be imprisoned in the county jail for not 20 less than 10 days or more than 90 days;
- 21 g. In addition to the other applicable penalties provided under this 22 section, a person violating this section whose license has been 23 suspended pursuant to section 6 of P.L.1983, c.65 (C.17:29A-35) or the regulations adopted thereunder, shall be fined \$3,000. The court 24 shall waive the fine upon proof that the person has paid the total 25 26 surcharge imposed pursuant to section 6 of P.L.1983, c.65 27 (C.17:29A-35) the regulations adopted thereunder. or 28 Notwithstanding the provisions of R.S.39:5-41, the fine imposed 29 pursuant to this subsection shall be collected by the Division of Motor 30 Vehicles pursuant to section 6 of P.L.1983, c.65 (C.17:29A-35), and 31 distributed as provided in that section, and the court shall file a copy 32 of the judgment of conviction with the director and with the Clerk of 33 the Superior Court who shall enter the following information upon the 34 record of docketed judgments: the name of the person as judgment debtor; the Division of Motor Vehicles as judgment creditor; the 35 amount of the fine; and the date of the order. These entries shall have 36 37 the same force and effect as any civil judgment docketed in the 38 Superior Court;
- h. A person who owns or leases a motor vehicle and permits another to operate the motor vehicle commits a violation and is subject to suspension of his license to operate a motor vehicle and to revocation of registration pursuant to sections 2 through 6 of P.L.1995, c.286 (C.39:3-40.1 through C.39:3-40.5) if the person:
- 44 (1) Knows that the operator's license to operate a motor vehicle 45 has been suspended for a violation of R.S.39:4-50 or section 2 of 46 P.L.1981, c.512 (C.39:4-50.4a); or

A1572 [3R]

1 (2) Knows that the operator's license to operate a motor vehicle is 2 suspended and that the operator has been convicted, within the past 3 five years, of operating a vehicle while the person's license was 4 suspended or revoked; i. If the violator's driver's license to operate a motor vehicle has 5 been suspended pursuant to section 9 of P.L.1985, c.14 (C.39:4-6 7 139.10), the violator shall be subject to a maximum fine of \$100 upon proof that the violator has satisfied the parking ticket or tickets that 8 were the subject of the Order of Suspension.² 9 10 (cf: P.L.1995, c.286, s.1) 11 ³[²4. Section 9 of P.L.1985, c. 14 (C.39:4-139.10) is amended to 12 read as follows: 13 14 9. a. If a person has failed to respond to a failure to appear notice 15 in three separate parking cases or has failed to pay a parking judgment in three separate parking cases, the municipal court may give notice of 16 that fact to the division in a manner prescribed by the director. If 17 notice has been given under this section of a person's failure to 18 19 respond to a failure to appear notice or to pay a parking judgment and if the fines and penalties are paid or if the case is dismissed or 20 21 otherwise disposed of, the municipal court shall promptly give notice 22 to that effect to the division. 23 b. The judge or the division may suspend the driver's license of an 24 owner, lessee, or operator who has not answered or appeared in 25 response to a failure to appear notice or has not paid or otherwise satisfied outstanding parking fines or penalties. 26 27 c. The division shall keep a record of a suspension ordered by the court pursuant to subsection b. of this section.² 28 (cf: P.L.1985, c.14, s.9)]³ 29 30 2 [3.] 3 [5. 2] 4. This act shall take effect immediately. 31 32

35 36 Places time limit on processing of parking tickets; establishes "proper itemized receipt" for evidencing payment of motor vehicle fine.

33 34

ASSEMBLY, No. 1572

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

208th LEGISLATURE

PRE-FILED FOR INTRODUCTION IN THE 1998 SESSION

Sponsored by:

Assemblyman ALAN M. AUGUSTINE
District 22 (Middlesex, Morris, Somerset and Union)
Assemblywoman JOAN M. QUIGLEY
District 32 (Bergen and Hudson)

Co-Sponsored by: Assemblyman Garrett

SYNOPSIS

Places time limit on processing of parking tickets; establishes "proper itemized receipt" for evidencing payment of motor vehicle fine.

CURRENT VERSION OF TEXT

As Introduced.



(Sponsorship Updated As Of: 11/24/1998)

A1572 AUGUSTINE, QUIGLEY

2

1 AN ACT concerning motor vehicles, supplementing P.L.1985, c.14

2	(C.39:4-139.2 et seq.) and amending R.S.39:5-45.
3	
4	Be It Enacted by the Senate and General Assembly of the State
5	of New Jersey:
6	
7	1. (New section) In any case of a parking violation, if the
8	municipal court fails within three years of the date of the violation
9	either to issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest, or to order a
10	suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or non-resident
11	reciprocity privileges, as the case maybe, or prohibit the defendant
12	from receiving or obtaining driving privileges, the matter shall be
13	dismissed and shall not be reopened.
14	
15	2. R.S.39:5-45 is amended to read as follows:
16	Any person who collects a fine, or a fine and costs, or cash bail, for
17	a violation of this subtitle, shall, upon receipt thereof, deliver to the
18	offender a proper itemized receipt therefor, of which the magistrate
19	shall retain a carbon copy to be filed with the docket of the case. Any
20	person who violates this section shall be subject to a fine not
21	exceeding [twenty-five dollars (\$25.00)] \$25. For the purposes of
22	this section, a "proper itemized receipt" is one which includes: the
23	name and signature of the person who received the payment, the date
24	and time the payment was received and a statement that the obligation
25	for which the receipt is being issued is discharged in full. Any
26	outstanding charges against an offender shall be immediately dismissed
27	upon the offender's presentation of a proper itemized receipt issued
28	pursuant to this section evidencing the payment of the required fines
29	and costs.
30	(cf: P.L.1942, c.334, s.12)
31	
32	3. This act shall take effect immediately.
33	
34	
35	STATEMENT
36	
37	This bill codifies a recent change in the rules governing the handling
38	of parking tickets by the municipal courts.
39	In conformance with the new rules, the provisions of the bill specify
40	that if the municipal court fails within three years of the date of a
41	parking violation to either (1) issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest

EXPLANATION - Matter enclosed in bold-faced brackets [thus] in the above bill is not enacted and is intended to be omitted in the law.

or (2) order a suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or non-

resident reciprocity privileges, as the case may be, or to prohibit the

42

A1572 AUGUSTINE, QUIGLEY

3

defendant from receiving or obtaining driving privileges, the matter is to be dismissed and may not be reopened.

3 The bill also amends R.S.39:5-45 to clarify what constitutes a 4 "proper itemized receipt" as evidence for paying past motor vehicle fines and costs. Current law requires that the person who collects a 5 6 fine, costs or cash bail from a person who has been charged for a motor vehicle violation must issue the payer a "proper itemized 7 8 receipt" and file a copy of that receipt with the docket of the case. 9 The bill specifies that a proper itemized receipt is one which includes 10 the name and signature of the person who received the payment, the 11 date and time the payment was received and a statement that the 12 obligation is discharge in full. Upon the presentation of such a proper 13 itemized receipt evidencing the payment of the required fines and 14 costs, any outstanding charges against that person are to be 15 immediately dismissed. This provision is designed to address those instances where municipalities have refused to acknowledge 16 documents presented by motorists, such as canceled checks, as 17 18 evidence that they have paid the fines and costs assessed against them for motor vehicle violations. Without an acceptable form of proof of 19 20 payment, motorists have no recourse but to pay the fines the 21 municipalities claim they owe, plus all accumulated penalties, or have

their driving privileges suspended.

ASSEMBLY TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

STATEMENT TO

ASSEMBLY, No. 1572

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

DATED: OCTOBER 5, 1998

The Assembly Transportation Committee reports favorably Assembly Bill No. 1572.

This bill codifies a recent change in the rules governing the handling of parking tickets by the municipal courts.

In conformance with the new rules, the provisions of the bill specify that if the municipal court fails within three years of the date of a parking violation to issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest, order a suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or non-resident reciprocity privileges, as the case may be, or prohibit the defendant from receiving or obtaining driving privileges, the matter is to be dismissed and may not be reopened.

The bill also amends R.S.39:5-45 to clarify what constitutes a "proper itemized receipt" as evidence for paying past motor vehicle fines and costs. Current law requires that the person who collects a fine, or a fine and costs or cash bail from a person who has been charged for a motor vehicle violation must issue the payer a "proper itemized receipt" and file a copy of that receipt with the docket of the case. The bill specifies that a proper itemized receipt is one which includes the name and signature of the person who received the payment, the date and time the payment was received and a statement that the obligation is discharge in full. Upon the presentation of such a proper itemized receipt evidencing the payment of the required fines and costs, any outstanding charges against that person are to be immediately dismissed. This provision is designed to address those instances where municipalities have refused to acknowledge documents presented by motorists, such as canceled checks, as evidence that they have paid the fines and costs assessed against them for motor vehicle violations. Without an acceptable form of proof of payment, motorists have no recourse but to pay the fines the municipalities claim they owe, plus all accumulated penalties, or have their driving privileges suspended.

SENATE LAW AND PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE

STATEMENT TO

[First Reprint] ASSEMBLY, No. 1572

with committee amendments

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

DATED: MARCH 15, 1999

The Senate Law and Public Safety Committee reports favorably and with committee amendments Assembly Bill No. 1572 (1R).

This bill codifies a recent change in the rules governing the handling of parking tickets by the municipal courts.

In conformance with the new rules, the provisions of the bill specify that if the municipal court fails within three years of the date of a parking case to issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest, order a suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or the defendant's non-resident reciprocity privilege, or prohibit the person from receiving or obtaining driving privileges, the matter is to be dismissed and may not be reopened. This language in section 1 of the bill exactly parallels the language that appears in Rule 7:8-9(f).

The bill also amends R.S.39:5-45 to clarify what constitutes a "proper itemized receipt" as evidence for paying past motor vehicle fines and costs. Current law requires that the person who collects a fine, or a fine and costs or cash bail from a person who has been charged for a motor vehicle violation must issue the payer a "proper itemized receipt" and file a copy of that receipt with the docket of the case. The bill specifies that a proper itemized receipt is one which includes the name and signature of the person who received the payment and the date and time the payment was received. The bill also provides that the information required on properly itemized receipts must conform to the information currently provided on receipts generated by the Automated Traffic System (ATS), the computer system used by municipal courts to process motor vehicle violations.

Upon the presentation of such a proper itemized receipt evidencing the payment of the required fines and costs, the municipality may immediately dismiss any outstanding charges against that person. This provision is designed to address those instances where municipalities have refused to acknowledge documents presented by motorists, such as canceled checks, as evidence that they have paid the fines and costs assessed against them for motor vehicle violations. Without an acceptable form of proof of payment, motorists have no recourse but

to pay the fines the municipalities claim they owe, plus all accumulated penalties, or have their driving privileges suspended.

The committee amended the bill to provide that a person whose driver's license was suspended pursuant to section 9 of P.L.1985, c.14 (C.39:4-139.10) who is charged with driving while under suspension pursuant to R.S.39:3-40 would be subject to a maximum fine of \$100 if the person could prove that he had satisfied the parking ticket or tickets that were the subject of the order of suspension.

The amendments also specify that a muncipal court would not give notice to the Division of Motor Vehicles until a person had failed to respond to a failure to appear notice in three separate parking cases or had failed to pay three separate parking tickets.

STATEMENT TO

ASSEMBLY, No. 1572

with Assembly Floor Amendments (Proposed By Assemblyman AUGUSTINE)

ADOPTED: NOVEMBER 23, 1998

Assembly Bill No. 1572 codifies New Jersey Supreme Court Rule 7:8-9(f) by specifying that a municipal court which fails within three years of the date of a parking violation to either (1) issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest or (2) order a suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or non-resident reciprocity privileges, as the case may be, or to prohibit the defendant from receiving or obtaining driving privileges is to dismiss the matter and may not reopen it.

The bill also amends R.S.39:5-45 to clarify what constitutes a "proper itemized receipt" as evidence for paying past motor vehicle fines and costs.

These Assembly floor amendments revise the language in section 1 of the bill so that it exactly parallels the language as it appears in Rule 7:8-9(f).

The amendments also make changes to section 2 of the bill to ensure that the information required on properly itemized receipts under the bill conforms to the information currently provided on such receipts as generated by the Automated Traffic System(ATS), the computer system used by municipal courts to process motor vehicle violations.

The provision in section 2 that subjects court employees to a fine of up to \$25 for failing to provide a defendant with a properly itemized receipt has also been deleted because of the concern that municipal courts would be held vicariously liable for the payment of these fines.

Finally, the amendments give the municipal court discretion in dismissing outstanding charges when a person presents a properly itemized receipt. This is to address a concern that the bill, as currently drafted, would require all outstanding charges to be dismissed even if the receipt evidenced only partial payment of the outstanding debt.

STATEMENT TO

[Second Reprint] ASSEMBLY, No. 1572

with Assembly Floor Amendments (Proposed By Assemblyman AUGUSTINE)

ADOPTED: JANUARY 10, 2000

This bill codifies a recent change in the rules governing the handling of parking tickets by the municipal courts.

In conformance with the new rules, the provisions of the bill specify that if the municipal court fails within three years of the date of a parking case to issue a warrant for the defendant's arrest, order a suspension of the defendant's driving privileges or the defendant's non-resident reciprocity privilege, or prohibit the person from receiving or obtaining driving privileges, the matter is to be dismissed and may not be reopened. This language in section 1 of the bill exactly parallels the language that appears in Rule 7:8-9(f) of the New Jersey Court Rules.

These Assembly amendments remove a provision of the bill specifying that a muncipal court would not give notice to the Division of Motor Vehicles until a person had failed to respond to a failure to appear notice in three separate parking cases or had failed to pay three separate parking tickets.