		H TO WASHINGT				
1		Filed: 05/07/2024 03:26 PM				
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	IN THE MUNICIPAL COURT OF THE CITY OF SEATTLE KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON					
7 8	THE CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipal corporation,)) Civil Case No.: 1240000005				
9	Plaintiff,)				
10	VS.) COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES				
1	MILES OLIVER HUDSON, a single person,)				
12	Defendant.					
13	The City of Seattle (City) alleges the following	ng:				
4	I. PARTIES AN	D JURISDICTION				
5	1.1 The City of Seattle is a municipal corpo	pration organized and existing under Title 35 of the				
6	Revised Code of Washington (RCW).					
7	1.2 Miles Olver Hudson (Defendant) is a single person who is a registered owner and operator of					
8	a 2023 Dodge Charger, VIN 2C3CDXL97PH50319	7, Washington License Number CKG6773, which				
9	he has operated in the City of Seattle during the relevant periods described herein.					
20	1.3 Chapter 35.20 RCW provides that the Seattle Municipal Court has jurisdiction over the					
21	subject matter and is the proper venue to adjudicate this case. This Court has jurisdiction over the parties.					
22						
23	//					
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 1 (City v. Hudson)	Ann Davison Seattle City Attorney 701 Fifth Ave., Suite 2050 Seattle, WA 98104,7095				

Seattle, WA 98104-7095 (206) 684-8200

1	II. APPLICABLE CODES				
2	The Seattle Noise Control Code				
3	2.1 Title 25 of the Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Environmental Protection and Historical				
4	Preservation regulates noise control, among other provisions.				
5	2.2 SMC 25.08.010 declares the policy of the City to minimize the exposure of citizens to the				
6	physiological and psychological dangers of excessive noise and to protect, promote, and preserve the				
7	public health, safety, and welfare. It is the express intent of the City Council to control the level of noise				
8	in a manner that promotes commerce; the use, value, and enjoyment of property; sleep, and repose; and				
9	the quality of the environment.				
10	2.3 SMC 25.08.060 defines "Administrator" as the Director of the Department of the Seattle				
11	Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI) or the Director's authorized representative.				
12	2.4 SMC 25.08.090 defines dB(A) as the sound level measured in decibels, using the "A"				
13	weighting network.				
14	2.5 SMC 25.08.180 defines "motor vehicle" as any vehicle that is self-propelled, used primarily				
15	for transporting persons or property upon highways and required to be licensed under RCW 46.16.010.				
16	2.6 SMC 25.08.200 defines "muffler" as a device consisting of a series of chambers or other				
17	mechanical designs for the purpose of receiving exhaust gas from an internal combustion engine, or for				
18	the purpose of introducing water to the flow of the exhaust gas and which is effective in reducing sound				
19	resulting therefrom.				
20	2.7 SMC 25.08.220 defines "noise" to mean the intensity, duration and character of sounds from				
21	any and all sources.				
22	2.8 SMC 25.08.250 defines "person" to mean any individual, firm, association, partnership,				
23	corporation, or any other entity, public or private.				
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 2 Ann Davison (City v. Hudson) Seattle City Attorney 701 Fifth Ave., Suite 2050 Seattle, WA 98104-7095 (206) 684-8200 (206) 684-8200				

SMC 25.08.270 defines "highway" to mean the entire width between the boundary lines of
 every way publicly maintained by the Washington State Department of Transportation or any county or
 city when any part thereof is generally open to the public for purposes of vehicular travel.

2.10 SMC 25.08.280 defines "public nuisance noise" to mean any unreasonable sound which either
annoys, injures, interferes with, or endangers the comfort, repose, health or safety of an entire community
or neighborhood, although the extent of damage may be unequal.

2.11 SMC 25.08.400 provides that it is unlawful for any person to cause sound, or for any person
in possession of property to permit sound originating from such property, to intrude into the real property
of another person whenever such sound exceeds the exterior sound level limits established by this
subchapter.

2.12 SMC 25.08.430 provides that it is unlawful for any person to operate upon any highway any
motor vehicle or any combination of motor vehicles under any conditions of grade, load, acceleration, or
deceleration in such a manner that the motor vehicle's exhaust noise or engine noise: (A) exceeds 95
decibels as measured by the Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) test procedure J1169 (May 1998); or
(B) can be clearly heard by a person of normal hearing at least 75 feet away from the vehicle.

2.13 SMC 25.08.430 prohibits any person from modifying the exhaust system of a motor vehicle
in a manner which will amplify or increase, the noise emitted by the engine of such vehicle above that
emitted by the muffler originally installed on the vehicle, and it shall be unlawful for any person to operate
a motor vehicle not equipped as required by Sections 11.84.060 and 11.84.080 or which has been amplified
as prohibited by this section. (RCW 46.37.390(3)).

2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure set forth in
2.14 SMC 25.08.490 provides that pursuant to the notice and order procedure s

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 3 (City v. Hudson)

to allow to originate from the property, sound which has been determined a public nuisance noise.

2 2.15 SMC 25.08.660 provides that unless provided otherwise by this chapter, the Chief of Police 3 shall be responsible for enforcing Sections 25.08.500, 25.08.505 and 25.08.515, the Chief of Police and 4 the Administrator shall be responsible for enforcing Subchapter IV of this chapter, and the Administrator 5 shall be responsible for enforcing the remaining provisions of this chapter. Upon request by the 6 Administrator or the Chief of Police, all other City departments and divisions are authorized to assist them 7 in enforcing this chapter.

8 2.16 SMC 25.08.730.A provides that in addition to other remedies provided by this chapter or by 9 law, whenever the Administrator has reason to believe that an exterior sound level limit established by this 10 chapter is being or has been exceeded, that a public nuisance noise is being emitted, that the terms of a 11 variance have not been met or are being violated, or that any other provision of this chapter that the 12 Administrator is authorized to enforce is being violated, the Administrator may issue a written notice of 13 violation to the owner or operator of the source, or to the holder of a variance.

2.17 SMC 25.08.730.B provides that the notice of violation shall contain a brief and concise
description of the conditions alleged to be in violation, the provision(s) of this Chapter alleged to have
been violated, the sound level readings, if taken, including the time and place of their recording, a statement
of the corrective action required, and if applicable, a reasonable time for correction.

2.18 SMC 25.08.730.C provides that nothing in this section shall be deemed to limit or preclude
any action or proceeding to enforce this chapter, and nothing shall be deemed to obligate or require the
Administrator to issue a notice of violation prior to the imposition of civil or criminal penalties.

2.19 SMC 25.08.760.A provides, in part, that any person significantly affected by or interested in
a notice of violation issued by the Administrator pursuant to the chapter may obtain a review of the notice
by requesting such review within ten days after service of the notice.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 4 (City v. Hudson)

1

1 2.20 SMC 25.08.765.A provides that where review by the Administrator has been conducted 2 pursuant to Section 25.08.760, the Administrator shall issue an order of the Administrator containing the 3 decision within fifteen days of the date the review is completed and shall cause the same to be mailed by 4 regular first class mail to the person or persons named in the notice of violation and mailed to the 5 complainant, if any.

2.21 SMC 25.08.765.B further provides that unless a request for review before the Administrator 6 is made pursuant to Section 25.08.760, the notice of violation shall become the order of the Administrator. 7 2.22 SMC 25.08.765.C provides that civil actions to enforce orders of the Administrator are 8 brought in Seattle Municipal Court and are not subject to judicial review pursuant to chapter 36.70C RCW. 9 2.23 SMC 25.08.800.A provides that in addition to any other remedy authorized by law or equity, 10 and except for violations of Sections 25.08.500, 25.08.505, 25.08.515, and Subchapter IV, any person 11 violating or failing to comply with any requirement of this chapter or order issued by the Administrator 12 shall be subject to a cumulative civil penalty of up to \$1,300 per day for each day that the violation or 13 14 failure to comply continues. Alternatively, for violations of Sections 25.08.410, 25.08.420, and 25.08.425, the Administrator may follow the citation process in Sections 25.08.900-25.08.970. 15

16 2.24 SMC 25.08.820 provides that penalties imposed by Sections 25.08.800, 25.08.805, and
17 25.08.960 are in addition to any other sanction or remedial procedure that may be available at law or equity.

18

III. CODE VIOLATIONS BY THE DEFENDANT

19 3.1 In 2023, Defendant and his mother purchased the 2023 Dodge Charger with VIN
20 2C3CDXL97PH503197, Washington License Number CKG6773 (the Charger). Rebecca Hudson is
21 the listed as the registered owner, while Miles Hudson, her son, is listed as an additional registered
22 owner.

23

3.2 The Charger has a "Hemi" engine, which has a unique exhaust note. When the mufflers

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 5 (City v. Hudson)

are modified or removed, the noise is increased, and the "Hemi" exhaust note changes. The engine also
 has a control module for which the software code can be re-written to create a series of backfires when
 the throttle is transitioned.

3.3 The Charger's original color was black. It now has a custom "wrap" that displays a tan
background and an enlargement of the Street and Racing Technology (SRT) Hellcat logo. This design
appears over most of the vehicle as stripes. The vehicle also has distinctive headlights and taillights.

3.4 Defendant is the administrator of the Instagram account @srt.miles. The Instagram
8 account contains numerous videos of Defendant where he is talking and describing what is occurring.

9 3.5 On or about October 29, 2023, the first post on the @srt.miles Instagram account shows a
10 black Charger motor vehicle.

3.6 On or about November 8, 2023, a video was posted on the @srt.miles Instagram account.
The video shows the Defendant revving the Charger engine loudly while leaving the West Edge parking
garage in Seattle. "Revving" refers to increasing the running speed of an engine by pressing the
accelerator.

3.7 On or about November 8, 2023, a video was posted on the @srt.miles Instagram account.
The video depicts Defendant driving Northbound on 4th Avenue in Seattle in darkness while revving
the engine of the Charger.

3.8 On or about November 19, 2023, a video was posted on the @srt.miles Instagram account.
The video, taken from the inside of the Charger, shows that it is dark outside and that the time is 10:33
p.m. The Charger is heard revving as it exits the garage and then multiple times while driving in
downtown Seattle. The video shows other motor vehicles driving on the road.

3.9 On or about December 3, 2023, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account.
The video depicts Defendant revving the Charger while driving in downtown Seattle in the dark.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 6 (City v. Hudson)

3.10 On or about December 6, 2023, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account.
 The video depicts Defendant discussing the installation of a new intake on the Charger. Later in the
 video, Defendant is driving in downtown Seattle at night; the sound of the engine revving now much
 louder than in previous videos on the same account and includes a high-pitched whine. Defendant
 comments excitedly about the louder noise that his engine now makes.

3.11 On or about December 17, 2023, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account.
7 The video depicts Defendant stating he is going out for boba tea and that "it is 12:50 p.m." and "they
8 close at 1:00 a.m." It is dark outside. Defendant is driving the Charger in downtown Seattle while
9 loudly revving the engine.

3.12 On or about December 18, 2023, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account.
Defendant is driving the Charger at a high rate of speed, while revving and backfiring the engine.

3.13 On December 27, 2023, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account where, in
the beginning, Defendant is heard stating that "the cat is in the wrap shop."

3.14 On or about January 8, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account. The
video shows Defendant showing the Charger with its new wrap covering.

3.15 On or about January 9, 2024, Seattle Police Department (SPD) stopped the Charger at the
intersection at Second Avenue and Pike Street in Seattle for travelling at high speeds. SPD confirmed
that the Defendant was the driver and gave him a Citation Warning. SPD noted the Charger's new
appearance.

3.16 On or about January 10, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account.
The video depicts the Charger in downtown Seattle, by Pike Place Market, the engine revving and backfiring.

23

3.17 On or about February 7, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram video. The

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 7 (City v. Hudson)

video shows Defendant picking up the Charger at a mechanic's shop. After interacting with an
 employee, Defendant films the Charger in a parking lot as another person revs the engine loudly.
 Defendant excitedly approves of the loud sound. The video also depicts Defendant driving the Charger,
 loudly revving the engine.

5 3.18 On or about February 10, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account. 6 The video starts with the Defendant commenting that it is "like 2am" as he drives the Charger at a high 7 rate of speed while loudly revving the engine. On that video, Defendant is also heard commenting that 8 his car "sounds like a shotgun."

9 3.19 On or about February 13, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account.
10 The video starts with Defendant commenting that it is around 2:00 a.m. Defendant is then seen driving
11 the Charger while loudly revving the engine, and he appears to race another vehicle.

3.20 Two additional videos were posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account in February 2024,
both of which show the Charger revving loudly and backfiring in downtown Seattle.

14 3.21 During the months of February and March, complaints increased from residents and
15 workers in downtown Seattle regarding the Charger's loud engine.

3.22 On or about February 24, 2024, SPD stopped the Charger that was being driven by
Defendant. SPD gave Defendant a verbal warning for a moving violation.

3.23 On or about February 26, 2024, SPD received a call from Defendant's neighbor, who
complained about the loudness of Defendant's vehicle, and for what sounded like three gunshots fired.

3.24 On or about February 26, 2024, at approximately 12:43 a.m., SPD observed loud backfiring
that sounded like gunshots and saw the Charger speeding off in unknown direction.

3.25 On or about March 1, 2024, at just after midnight, SPD heard loud exhaust from several
blocks away. SPD caught up to the motor vehicle and observed Defendant revving the engine, which

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 8 (City v. Hudson)

caused the exhaust to 'pop,' sounding like a gunshot. SPD stopped Defendant and informed him that
 SPD had received several complaints about his vehicle. SPD then cited Defendant for an unlawful
 muffler and/or exhaust modification.

4 3.26 On or about March 7, 2024, at approximately 7:23 a.m., SPD received a complaint of a 5 motor vehicle driving around revving a loud engine.

6 3.27 On or about March 9, 2024, at approximately 4:36 a.m., SPD received a complaint of a
7 motor vehicle loudly revving and backfiring.

3.28 On or about March 14, 2024, at approximately 2:53 a.m., SPD received a call about a 8 Charger backfiring and revving. The complainant provided the license plate number, which matched 9 that of Defendant's Charger. A responding officer who heard loud exhaust and backfiring, saw the 10 Charger as he approached the area, but it was not visible when he arrived at the intersection. SPD 11 spoke to a nearby witness who said that Defendant was seen nightly driving the Charger – speeding, 12 revving the engine, and running red lights, sometimes for hours at a time. The witness showed SPD a 13 14 video they had taken of the Charger on Second Avenue in downtown Seattle, accelerating and running a red light. 15

3.29 On or about March 14, 2024, at approximately 2:51 a.m., SPD received a call about a male
revving the engine while driving the vehicle into the garage at/around the West Edge Apartments.

3.30 On or about March 14, 2024, a video was posted on the @srt.miles Instagram account. The
video appears to be late at night and shows Defendant remotely starting his Charger, which is parked
on Second Avenue, and remotely revving it from his balcony. In the video, the Charger's loud engine
can be heard from the balcony, which is many stories up from the street. Defendant comments on the
loud sound of the engine. The video then shows the Defendant driving, revving, and backfiring the
Charger.

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 9 (City v. Hudson)

3.31 On or about March 18, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account showing Defendant doing donuts after receiving instruction and revving and backfiring the Charger.

3.32 On or about March 20, 2024, SPD drafted an incident report and referred Defendant for
reckless driving based on an Instagram video from February 2024. The video showed the Charger
driving in Seattle and the speedometer is seen reaching over 100 MPH while racing another vehicle.

6 3.33 On or about March 20, 2024, an SPD Officer on the Yesler overpass measured, with a 7 Lidar Speed Measurement instrument, the Charger travelling 38 MPH in a 25 MPH zone. SPD initiated 8 a traffic stop. Defendant, who was driving, stated he was going to keep driving in this manner because 9 of his social media following and that it was lucrative. Defendant stated, "I'm going to keep doing 10 what I'm doing. I'm going to make a career out of this." Defendant showed the officer his Instagram 11 page, which was an administrator account. SPD confirmed Defendant's social media identity as that of 12 the @srt.miles handle and observed that his voice was similar to the voice on all the videos.

3.34 The officer recognized the sound of the Charger from several other incidents in which he
was working downtown, heard the Charger from several blocks away and then saw it. The officer has
considerable experience with racing engines and recognizes the unique tune of the Charger and its
modifications.

3.35 On or about March 22, 2024, the City of Seattle charged Defendant with two counts of
Reckless Driving in Seattle Municipal Court Case Number 4240000362.

3.36 On or about March 27, 2024, at approximately 1:25 a.m., SPD stopped the Charger for
noise violation at the intersection of Second Avenue and Pike Street. Defendant, who was driving,
again confirmed that the @srt.miles Instagram account was his social media page and that "the city
doesn't like me cause I'm pretty loud." SPD had a decibel meter and standing directly behind the
vehicle while it was in park and idling, read the decibel meter between 84-87 decibels. SPD gave

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 10 (City v. Hudson)

1

2

1 Defendant a verbal warning.

11

On or about March 29, 2024, the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections 3.37 2 (SDCI) issued a civil Notice of Violation (NOV) in Case No. 1057987-VI due to unlawful modification 3 of a motor vehicle resulting in amplifying or increasing noise and operating a motor vehicle in a manner 4 that the exhaust noise or engine noise can be heard more than 75 feet away. The NOV required that 5 the Defendant restore the vehicle to a condition that complies with the SMC and to pass an inspection 6 with SPD. The NOV also required that Defendant not operate any motor vehicle that causes sound in 7 violation of the SMC. SDCI gave Defendant until April 15, 2024, to correct the violation or be subject 8 to civil penalties of up to \$1,300 per day after the deadline. (See Exhibit 1 attached and incorporated 9 *herein by reference.*) 10

3.38 Defendant did not request a review of the NOV.

3.39 On or around April 9, 2024, the Seattle Municipal Court imposed conditions of release in
the reckless driving case, one of which was that Defendant was not to drive the Charger.

3.40 On or about April 16, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram report. The
video shows an unknown woman driving the Charger with Defendant riding in the front passenger seat.
At the beginning of the video, Defendant gives her the keys and she revs the engine loudly. The video
shows the Charger running several yellow or red lights in downtown Seattle, and the engine is heard
revving throughout most of the video.

3.41 On or about April 16, 2024, SDCI referred the noise violation case to the City Attorney's
Office for further civil enforcement action.

3.42 On or about May 3, 2024, the stories of the @srt.miles Instagram account video show
Defendant saying he is "switching cats with my homeboy Z." The Charger is visible from the motor
vehicle in which Defendant sits at a gas station. Another video story from the same handle shows the

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 11 (City v. Hudson) Charger parked at the Seattle waterfront.

3.43 On or about May 5, 2024, a video was posted to the @srt.miles Instagram account. The
video shows Defendant giving the keys to the Charger to a woman who then revs the Charger engine
at 2:15 a.m. The video then shows the woman driving the Charger, revving the engine, in downtown
Seattle with Defendant.

3.44 To date, Defendant continues to be out of compliance with the NOV and Title 25 and the
7 noise violations continue.

8

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

1

IV. CAUSES OF ACTION: CIVIL PENALTIES

9 4.1 Based on the violations and efforts to enforce outlined in paragraphs 3.1 to 3.44 above, and
10 pursuant to SMC 25.08.800, the City is entitled to entry of judgment for noncompliance penalties because
11 the conditions continue after the City has taken enforcement action.

4.2 The City is entitled to any other remedy authorized by law or equity.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

The City requests entry of an order that:

5.1 Directs Defendant to comply with the requirements of the NOV and SMC Title 25;

16 5.2 Awards Judgment to the City for noncompliance penalties for the period following the
17 compliance date in the NOV, which was April 15, 2024;

5.3 Awards the City its costs and statutory attorneys' fees; and

5.4 Grants other and further legal or equitable relief as the Court deems just and proper.

[SIGNATURE BLOCK ON FOLLOWING PAGE]

22 23

COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 12 (City v. Hudson)

1			
2	DATED this 7th day of May, 2024.		
3		ANN DAVISON	
		Seattle City Attorney	
4	Dev	/s/ Cin di Willimm	
5	By:	/s/ Cindi Williams CINDI WILLIAMS, WSBA #27654	
6		MAGDALENA PRATT, WSBA # 39610 Assistant City Attorneys)
7		Seattle City Attorney's Office 701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2050	
8		Seattle, WA 98104-7095	
9		Phone: 206-727-8441 Email: <u>cindi.williams@seattle.gov</u>	
10		<u>Magdalena.pratt@seattle.gov</u> Attorneys for Plaintiff, The City of Seattle	
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
	COMPLAINT FOR CIVIL PENALTIES - 13 (City v. Hudson)		Ann Davison Seattle City Attor



Noise Control Notice of Violation Case No.: 1057987-VI

March 29, 2024

RESPONSIBLE PARTY: MILES OLIVER HUDSON

Miles Oliver Hudson 5611 S. Bangor ST Seattle, WA 98178

Miles Oliver Hudson 18607 104[™] PL S.E. Renton, WA 98055

Miles Oliver Hudson 1430 2ND AVE. Seattle, WA 98101

Rebecca Ann Hudson 18607 104th Pl. S.E. Renton, WA 98055

We received a complaint about the vehicle described below. Noise Control Program Manager John Thomas, John.Thomas@seattle.gov, investigated and found a violation or violations of the Seattle Noise Control Code, Chapter 25.08 of the Seattle Municipal Code 25.08.010, 25.08.280, 25.08.430, 25.08.450, 25.08.490, 25.08.660, 25.08.730, 25.08.800, and 25.08.820.

THE VIOLATION(S) MUST BE CORRECTED BY APRIL 15, 2024.

The specific violation(s) and correction(s) are as follows:

Violations:

1. Unlawful modification of a motor vehicle, to wit, a 2023 Dodge Charger, License Number CKG6773, VIN 2C3CDXL97PH503197, to amplify or increase noise and operating a motor vehicle that is not equipped as required by Seattle Municipal Code.

Exhibit 1

CASE NO. 1057987-VI Page 2 of 3

2. Operating a motor vehicle under any conditions of grade, load, acceleration, or deceleration in such a manner that the motor vehicle's exhaust noise or engine noise can be clearly heard by a person of normal hearing at least 75 feet away from the vehicle.

Corrections:

- 1. Restore the vehicle to a condition that complies with all requirements of the Seattle Municipal Code and pass an inspection by the Seattle Police Department. Contact Lt. Randy Ward to arrange inspection at randy.ward@seattle.gov.
- 2. Do not operate any motor vehicle that causes sound in violation of the Seattle Municipal Code.

PENALTIES/FINES

You may be subject to civil penalties (fines) of up to **\$1300 per day** beginning the day after the deadline above. and continuing until the violation is corrected.

If you do not correct the violations by the deadline listed above, the city may file a lawsuit against you to collect the penalty. If this case goes to court, the city will have to prove that the code violation exists/existed in order to collect any penalties.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION

You can ask the inspector for more time to complete correction of the violations. The request must be in writing and must explain why you need more time. Extensions will be granted only if substantial progress toward compliance has already been made.

RECORDING

We may file a copy of this Notice of Violation with the King County Recorder's Office.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REVIEW

If you disagree with this Notice of Violation, you may request a review of this Notice by a Department Administrator. The Administrator will review the facts of the case and determine whether the Notice of Violation was properly issued. The Administrator can extend the compliance date for a short period of time even if the violation is upheld. But the Review Officer cannot allow a violation to continue or grant a variance.

The Review may be requested by writing to the Director of Code Compliance, in care of Noise Control Program Manager John Thomas,

CASE NO. 1057987-VI Page 3 of 3

Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections 700 5th Avenue, Suite 2200 PO Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019

If you request a review by the Administrator, the request.

- must be in writing,
- must be received by the Administrator no later than ten (10) days following service of this Notice, and
- must contain the signature, mailing address and telephone number of the person requesting the review.

The request should also include a brief statement including.

- specific objections to the Notice of Violation
- How the requestor is significantly affected by, or interested in, the Review by the Administrator.

If more than one person is cited in the Notice, the request for Review by the Administrator should specify the person to be contacted about the Review.

If needed, Noise Control Program Manager John Thomas will meet with you or someone representing you to discuss how you will bring the matter into compliance with the Noise Control Code.

Once you have corrected the violation, the Seattle Police Department must inspect to verify compliance. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Ist John Thomas

John Thomas Noise Control Program Manager Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections 700 Fifth Ave, Suite 2200 PO Box 34019 Seattle, WA 98124-4019 (206) 684-8600 seattle.gov/sdci