

## **APPENDIX**

## TABLE OF APPENDICES

	Page(s)
Appendix A: Final Order (November 20, 2024): Denial of Petitioner's Writ of Error or Stay of Enforcement Actions.....	1a
Appendix B: Petition for Writ of Error: Addresses procedural irregularities, deletion/mischaracterization of filings, and constitutional violations.....	2a
Appendix C: Order Granting Summary Affirmance....	4a
Appendix D: Denial of hearing.....	6a
Appendix E: Abridged Opposition.....	8a
Appendix F: Replaced Filing.....	10a
Appendix G: Deleted Initial Appeal.....	11a
Appendix H: Refiled Injunction Requests.....	13a

**APPENDIX A**  
*(Final Order - November 20, 2024)*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
No. 24-CV-749

IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN,  
Appellant.

On consideration of appellant's "Petition for Writ of Error or Stay of Enforcement Actions," construed as a petition for rehearing, it is

ORDERED that the petition for rehearing is denied. Contrary to appellant's assertion that the court deleted his opposition, the court in fact granted his motion for leave, and filed and considered his lodged opposition. Further, appellant fails to provide reasons for this court to reconsider its decision.

Copies e-served to:  
Martin Akerman  
Caroline Van Zile, Esquire, Solicitor General - DC  
Anne Deng, Esquire, Office of the Attorney General

**APPENDIX B**  
*(Petition for Writ of Error - November 19, 2024)*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
No. 24-CV-749

IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN,  
Petitioner.

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF ERROR AND  
ALTERNATIVE REQUEST FOR STAY**

Comes now the Petitioner, Martin Akerman, and respectfully submits this Petition for Writ of Error based on the following grounds:

**Denial of Hearing and Confrontation Right**

The lower court denied the Petitioner the right to confront his accuser, specifically "Speed Camera Doe," an automated system responsible for issuing and adjudicating the Notice of Infraction (NOI F16900759). No opportunity was provided to examine the accuracy or reliability of the robotic adjudication process.

**Deletion of Critical Records**

The lower court's docket excluded the Petitioner's Opposition to Appellee's Motion for Summary Affirmance, an essential filing.

The absence of this document rendered the process procedurally defective.

**Mischaracterization of Appeal Fee and Retaliation**

The DC DMV improperly treated the \$10 appeal fee as a partial payment of the fine, misrepresenting it as an admission of guilt.

This misrepresentation resulted in additional penalties, including vehicle booting, towing, and service suspensions.

**Violation of First Amendment Right to Petition for Redress of Grievances**

The automated adjudication process obstructed the Petitioner's ability to seek redress through a meaningful appeal.

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

Petitioner respectfully requests that this Court:

Grant this Petition for Writ of Error, vacate the lower court's judgment, and remand the matter for proceedings consistent with due process protections.

Alternatively, issue a stay of all enforcement actions, including vehicle booting, towing, suspension of DMV services, or additional penalties related to Ticket No. F16900759, pending adjudication of a Petition for Writ of Mandamus.

Respectfully submitted,  
Martin Akerman, Pro Se  
2001 North Adams Street, Unit 440  
Arlington, VA 22201  
(202) 656-5601

*APPENDIX C*  
*(Order Granting Summary Affirmance - November 19,  
2024)*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
No. 24-CV-749

IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN,  
Appellant.

On consideration of appellant's motion for a temporary injunction, appellee's opposition and motion for summary affirmance, and appellant's motion for leave to file the lodged opposition to the motion for summary affirmance, it is

ORDERED that appellant's motion for leave is granted, and his lodged opposition is filed. It is further

ORDERED that appellee's motion for summary affirmance is granted. See Oliver T. Carr Mgmt., Inc. v. Nat'l Delicatessen, Inc., 397 A.2d 914, 915 (D.C. 1979). Because appellant failed to provide the trial court with an order of the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board and does not claim on appeal that the Board issued an order after reviewing the hearing examiner's decision, we discern no error in the court's decision denying his motion for reconsideration. See D.C. Code §§ 50-2303.06, 50-2303.11(f), 50-2304.02(a), and 50-2304.05.

Copies e-served to:

Honorable Todd E. Edelman, QMU - Civil Division  
Caroline Van Zile, Esquire, Solicitor General - DC  
Anne Deng, Esquire, Office of the Attorney General

**APPENDIX D**  
*(Superior Court Order - September 23, 2024)*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA  
CIVIL DIVISION**

**IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN**  
Case No. 2024-CAB-004978  
NOI F16900759  
Judge Todd E. Edelman

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court upon Martin Akerman's Motion for Reconsideration, filed August 14, 2024. Mr. Akerman previously filed an Application for Allowance of Appeal on August 7, 2024, seeking review from this Court for an alleged decision from the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board affirming his liability. However, the undersigned denied the Application because the decision appended to his Application was the Hearing Examiner's denial of reconsideration.

As the Court previously explained, D.C. Code § 50-2304.05 states that “[a]ppeals from decisions of the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board shall be by application for the allowance of an appeal filed in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia within 30 days of the decision of the appeals board.”

Because Mr. Akerman has provided no decision from the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board for the Court to review, and because his original filing was based on a Hearing Examiner's decision, the Court has no jurisdiction to review the matter.

ORDERED that Mr. Akerman's Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

Copies to:

Martin Akerman

Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board, 301 C Street, N.W.,  
Suite 1018, Washington, D.C. 20001

David M. Glasser, General Counsel - DMV

Pamela Washington, Esq., Assistant General Counsel -  
DMV

**APPENDIX E**  
*(Abridged Opposition - October 27, 2024)*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
No. 24-CV-749

IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN,  
Appellant.

OPPOSITION TO APPELLEE'S MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY AFFIRMANCE

Comes now the Appellant, Martin Akerman, and submits this opposition to the Respondent's Motion for Summary Affirmance, stating as follows:

The Clerk of Court deleted substantive portions of the Petitioner's filings, obstructing this Court's ability to conduct a meaningful review.

The DMV improperly processed the appeal fee as a partial payment, falsely implying an admission of guilt. The Petitioner's right to due process under the Fifth Amendment was violated as he was denied an opportunity to confront "Speed Camera Doe."

The automation of enforcement mechanisms without human oversight raises constitutional concerns and demands judicial intervention.

Denial of the right to petition for redress of grievances, in violation of the First Amendment, occurred due to the procedural barriers erected by the lower courts.

For the reasons stated, Appellant requests denial of the Respondent's Motion for Summary Affirmance and reinstatement of a fair appellate review.

Respectfully submitted,  
Martin Akerman, Pro Se

**APPENDIX F**  
*(Replaced Filing - October 27, 2024)*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
No. 24-CV-749

IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN,  
Appellant.

NOTICE OF FILING ERROR

On October 27, 2024, the Appellant filed an Opposition to the Respondent's Motion for Summary Affirmance. However, the Clerk of Court improperly replaced the full opposition with only the motion for leave to file, stripping the opposition of its substantive arguments.

This procedural action:

Prevented judicial review of due process violations;  
Concealed critical arguments from consideration;  
Prejudiced the Petitioner's ability to challenge the enforcement system.  
Appellant requests immediate correction of the record and proper docketing of the original opposition in full.

Respectfully,  
Martin Akerman, Pro Se

**APPENDIX G**

*(Deleted Initial Appeal - September 23, 2024)*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA  
CIVIL DIVISION**

**IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN  
Case No. 2024-CAB-004978  
NOI F16900759**

**MOTION FOR TEMPORARY INJUNCTION AND  
APPEAL OF TRAFFIC VIOLATION**

Comes now the Petitioner, Martin Akerman, seeking injunctive relief and appellate review, stating as follows:

The Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board failed to issue a decision, leaving the Petitioner without a proper avenue of appeal.

The Superior Court Clerk's Office deleted the Petitioner's initial appeal, barring review.

The Petitioner's due process rights under the Fifth Amendment were violated when procedural barriers were erected to prevent meaningful appeal.

Automated enforcement systems lack proper oversight, and their unchecked operation violates constitutional principles.

12a

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

Petitioner requests the Court to:

Issue a Temporary Injunction halting enforcement actions related to NOI F16900759.

Order the reinstatement of the original appeal filing for proper review.

Respectfully submitted,  
Martin Akerman, Pro Se

**APPENDIX H**

*(Refiled Injunction Requests - September 30 – October  
2, 2024)*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA  
CIVIL DIVISION**

**IN RE: MARTIN AKERMAN**  
Case No. 2024-CAB-004978  
NOI F16900759

**REFILED MOTION FOR TEMPORARY INJUNCTION**

Petitioner, having discovered the deletion of his initial appeal and injunction request, refiles the Motion for Temporary Injunction, asserting the following:

The failure of the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board to issue a decision creates an unconstitutional barrier to appellate review.

The Clerk's deletion of prior filings effectively denied the Petitioner access to the courts.

The use of AI-driven enforcement mechanisms without human oversight violates fundamental rights and requires judicial scrutiny.

The DMV's mischaracterization of the appeal fee as a partial payment altered the legal standing of the Petitioner.

**RELIEF REQUESTED**

Grant a Temporary Injunction against further enforcement actions.

Reinstate the appeal and provide proper judicial review.

Respectfully submitted,  
Martin Akerman, Pro Se


## **RULE 33.1 CERTIFICATION**

An original and 40 booklets of this Petition are accompanied by a \$300 money order and comply with the Court's type-volume limitation, as the Petition contains 1,077 words, which is within the 9000 word limit for a petition for an extraordinary writ.

The text of this supplemental brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Google Docs in Century, 12 point font size.

Dated and respectfully submitted, this 3rd day of February, 2025.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Martin Akerman, Pro Se  
P.O. Box 100057  
Arlington, VA 22210

No. \_\_\_\_\_

---

In The  
*Supreme Court of the United States*

---

MARTIN AKERMAN, PRO SE,  
On Behalf of Himself and Humanity,

*Petitioner,*

v.

SPEED CAMERA DOE,


*Respondent.*

---

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS  
SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX

---

Martin Akerman, Pro Se  
PO BOX 100057  
Arlington, VA 22210  
(202) 656 - 5601



## **SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX**

This supplemental filing is submitted in response to the Supreme Court Clerk's letter dated April 11, 2025, which returned Petitioner's original petition for a writ of certiorari (filed February 3, 2025) for non-compliance with Rules 14.1(i) and 33.1.

The Clerk required the inclusion of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia's order in the appendix and proper formatting. This supplement addresses those requirements by including the Superior Court's order (Appendix I) and adds two additional documents (Appendices J and K) to support Petitioner's argument that the District of Columbia Department of Motor Vehicles' (DC DMV) administrative appeals process is unconstitutional under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

These additional documents demonstrate that the DC DMV requires payment of the full fine, penalties, and appeal fees as a prerequisite to filing an appeal, creating an unconstitutional barrier to appellate review. The Clerk's letter is included as Appendix L for reference.

## **TABLE OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDICES**

	Page(s)
Appendix I: Superior Court of the District of Columbia Order (August 13, 2024) .....	1sa
Appendix J: DC DMV Appeal Instructions .....	4sa
Appendix K: DC DMV Partial Payment Enforcement Notice Photo Ticket (September 13, 2024) .....	7sa
Appendix L: Supreme Court Clerk's Letter (April 11, 2025) .....	10sa

*APPENDIX I*  
*Superior Court of the District of Columbia*  
*Order (August 13, 2024)*

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF  
COLUMBIA  
CIVIL DIVISION**

In re: MARTIN AKERMAN  
Case No. 2024-CAB-004978  
NOI F16900759  
Judge Todd E. Edelman

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court upon Martin Akerman's Application for Allowance of Appeal ("Application"), filed August 7, 2024. Mr. Akerman declined to use the Court's Application form, but more importantly, did not include a copy of the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board's decision affirming his liability.

D.C. Code § 50-2304.05 states that "[a]ppeals from decisions of the [Traffic Adjudication] appeals board shall be by application for the allowance of an appeal filed in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia within 30 days of the decision of the appeals board." Mr. Akerman asserts in his Application that "[o]n June 24, 2024, the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board issued a Final Decision affirming the liability without affording Appellant a hearing."

However, the decision appended in "Attachment B" to the Application is not an affirmance issued by the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board, but a decision by the Hearing Examiner denying Applicant's request for reconsideration. Brief at 8-14. Indeed, the Hearing Examiner's June 24, 2024 decision denying the Mr. Akerman's request for review informs the Applicant that "[i]f the Hearing Examiner denied your request for reconsideration, you can appeal the decision to the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board." June 24, 2024 Hearing Examiner Denial at 2 (emphasis added).

It appears that Mr. Akerman has not yet appealed the denial of his request for consideration to the Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board, and thus, there is no reviewable decision before the Court.

SO ORDERED.

Date: August 13, 2024

Copies to:

Martin Akerman  
makerman.dod@gmail.com  
Applicant

Traffic Adjudication Appeals Board  
301 C Street, N.W., Suite 1018  
Washington, D.C. 20001

3sa

**David M. Glasser**  
**David.glasser@dc.gov**  
**General Counsel - DMV**

**Pamela Washington, Esq.**  
**Pamela.washington@dc.gov**  
**Assistant General Counsel - DMV**

**Wanda Butler**  
**Wanda.butler@dc.gov**  
**Administrator, Adjudication Services - DMV**

**Kimberly Johnson**  
**Kimberlym.johnson@dc.gov**  
**Chief of Civil Enforcement - OAG**

**Charles Coughlin**  
**Charles.Coughlin@dc.gov**  
**Assistant Chief of Civil Enforcement - OAG**

**Additional material  
from this filing is  
available in the  
Clerk's Office.**