STATE OF MARYLAND

IN THE

V.

CIRCUIT COURT

STANLEY H. KATZ

FOR

Defendant

BALTIMORE COUNTY

CASE NO: K-12-4963

ORDER

Having considered the Motion to Alter or Amend Judgment and the record herein, it is this 2/5t day of February, 2013 hereby

ORDERED, the Motion is denied.

The Court was persuaded by a preponderance of the evidence, that ACS Xerox is an operator of the speed monitoring system. Consequently, the fees paid to ACS Xerox on a per-citation issued basis violate Transportation Article 21-809(j)(2). The State admits that Baltimore County entered into a contract with ACS Xerox requiring ACS Xerox to "operate" 22 active speed cameras. The testimony of the witnesses confirmed that ACS Xerox is involved in the operation of the speed cameras.

JUDGE SUSAN SOUDER

Copies mailed to:

Jordan V. Watts, Jr., Esquire Assistant County Attorney Baltimore County Office of Law Courthouse, Second Floor 400 Washington Avenue Towson, Maryland 21204 James K. MacAlister, Esquire Saiontz & Kirk 3 South Frederick Street, Suite 900 Baltimore, Maryland 21202