

nishimoto2-Bryce

From: Norma Ebusu [nebisu@hawaii.edu]
Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2008 7:06 PM
To: TRNtestimony
Cc: 'Torano Harris'
Subject: Testimony for HB3011, 2/4/2008

LATE

Re: HB3011

Testimony submitted by: Norma Ebusu, private citizen, House District 34

Date of hearing: 2/4/2008, 9:45 am

Regarding the ADLRO's policy on not allowing the transfer of registration to a co-owner of a vehicle when one of the registrants is accused of a DUI:

The rules governing the approval of a Special MVR are too strict and rigid. The rights of the co-owner/registrant of a vehicle involved in a DUI case are not considered. I am a co-registrant/owner such a vehicle. I actually own the car in question. I put my daughter's name on the registration just so she could have 'pride of ownership', which, in light of recent events, proved to be unwise. We paid off the lien on the car, and then went to the DMV with the intent of transferring the title to me totally. The DMV informed me that the ADLRO put a stop on the vehicle, and an application would need to be filed to get it lifted. Upon doing so, my request for SMVR was denied by the ADLRO, following the logic that having a third car was deemed not a '*necessity of life*'. The rescinding of the registration for our vehicle has resulted in it being an inanimate object in our garage - although I own this vehicle, I can't use it.

In my opinion, we, the family of the accused drunk driver, are being penalized also. While not exactly a '*necessity of life*' it greatly inconveniences our family. Our family consists of 5 drivers, forced to handle all our transportation with 2 cars. The ADLRO director confirmed to me that one of my options was to '*buy a new car*' if I needed another car that badly (unfortunately, we're not rich enough). He stated that '*inconvenience*' does not come under the classification of '*necessities of life*'. While you may be right about that in the general sense, I take exception to the inference that my inconvenience should not be considered. Why should I have to be inconvenienced? It's my daughter who allegedly broke the law - not me or anyone in our family. He refused to budge in his judgment, insisting that our situation was not completely depended on the vehicle for the '*necessities of life*'. This even after I signed a statement swearing that I would take the appropriate measures to prevent my daughter access to the vehicle in question.

I'm so perturbed by all of this - I feel it's unjust. What recourse does the average law abiding citizen have when the interpretation of the law is so inflexible? Is our only option to quietly 'take our licks' and stick it out for 6 months? Doesn't seem fair.

I apologize for submitting this testimony so late. I unfortunately did not follow up on a message I received from my Representative's office. I hope, however, even without my testimony, HB3011 gets passed, only so that this does not happen to any more 'law abiding citizen' who is not totally cognizant of the Motor Vehicle Registration laws and how to interpret them.

Respectfully submitted,

Norma N. Ebusu
Private Citizen of House District 34

2/4/2008

LATE

(808)486-0214
nebisu@hawaii.edu

CC: Office of Representative K. Mark Takai