

AFGØRELSE FRA ANKENÆVNET FOR BUS, TOG OG METRO

- Journalnummer:** 23-0077
- Klageren:** XX
USA
- Indklagede:** Movia
CVR-nummer: 29 89 65 69
- Klagen vedrører:** Kontrolafgift på 1.000 kr. grundet manglende straks-check ind på Rejsekort
- Parternes krav:** Klageren ønsker, at ankenævnet annullerer kontrolafgiften, og gør gældende, at hun stillede to tunge tasker på sædet, inden hun checkede ind, hvilket skete, mens bussen stadig holdt stille, og passagerer steg om bord. Hun viste efterfølgende sit indcheckede Rejsekort til kontrolløren
- Indklagede fastholder kontrolafgiften
- Ankenævnets sammensætning:** Nævnensformand, dommer Lone Bach Nielsen
Gry Midttun
Torben Steenberg
Helle Berg Johansen
Dorte Lundqvist Bang

Ankenævnet for Bus, Tog og Metro har på sit møde den 6. december 2023 truffet følgende

AFGØRELSE:

Movia er berettiget til at opretholde kravet om betaling af kontrolafgiften på 1.000 kr.

Beløbet skal betales til Movia, der sender betalingsoplysninger til klageren.

Da klageren ikke har fået medhold i klagen, tilbagebetales klagegebyret ikke, jf. ankenævnets vedtægter § 24, stk. 2, modsætningsvist.

-oOo-

Hver af parterne kan anlægge sag ved domstolene om de forhold, som klagen har vedrørt.

Klageren henvises til at søge yderligere oplysning om eventuel bistand i forbindelse med sagsanlæg fx på www.domstol.dk, www.advokatnoeglen.dk og /eller eget forsikringssselskab om eventuel forsikringsretshjælp.

SAGENS OMSTÆNDIGHEDER:

Klageren skulle den 17. januar 2023 rejse med buslinje 4A fra Nørrebro st. Bussens GPS viser, at den ankom til Nørrebro st. kl. 16:30:13 og afgik derfra igen kl. 16:30:55.

					Ank.	Afg.
16	Tagensvej (339)	●	●	16:20	16:20	16:19:29 16:20:22
17	Tuborgvej (340)	●	●	16:21	16:21	16:22:51 16:23:13
18	Landsdommervej (341)	●	●	16:22	16:22	16:24:53 16:25:07
19	Bispevej (342)	●	●	16:24	16:24	16:26:28 16:26:40
20	Frederikssundsvej (52041)	●	●	16:26	16:26	16:27:29 16:27:48
21	Nørrebro St. (53198)	●	●	16:28	16:28	16:30:13 16:30:55

Ifølge klageren steg hun ombord med to store tasker, som hun stillede på et sæde. Derefter ledte hun efter sit Rejsekort og gik op og checkede ind, mens bussen stadig holdt stille, og passagerer steg ombord. Hun er sikker på dette, fordi hun talte med en påstigende passager, der lod hende checke ind. Derpå gik hun tilbage til sit sæde. Ved den efterfølgende kontrol foreviste hun det indcheckede Rejsekort til den ene kontrollør, der godkendte kortet, men den anden kontrollør udstedte en kontrolafgift til hende, fordi kontrolløren påstod, at klageren kun checkede ind, fordi hun havde fået øje på kontrollørerne.

Ifølge Movia loggede kontrollørerne deres påstigning på bussen kl. 16:30:23. Klageren checkede ind på sit Rejsekort kl. 16:31:03, hvilket var efter, at bussen havde forladt stoppestedet kl. 16:30:55. Kontrolløren noterede på den interne kontrolafgift, at klageren sad ned, da kontrollørerne kom ind i bussen, og først rejste sig, da kontrolløren gik forbi klageren:

Linje	4A
Køretøjs nummer	3287
Stop nummer	53198
Stop	Nørrebro St.
Tur ID	0
Påstigning	17-01-2023 16:30:23
Udstedt dato/tid	17-01-2023 16:34:28
Stået af	17-01-2023 17:01:38
Passager tal	19
Kontrol spørgsmål stillet	Nej
Kunden har forespurgt chauffør	Nej
Jeg har forespurgt chauffør	Nej
Kort inddraget	Nej
Årsag	Rejsekort checket ind efter kontrollørs påstigning
Bemærkning	Hun sad ned der vi kom ind

Hun havde 2 poser med hvor hun har sat dem på plads og sad selv ned . Der min kollega gik forbi rejste hun sig op for at checke ind

Klagerens Rejsekorthistorik:

277	17-01-2023 16:31	Linje : 4A Nørrebro St.	16:35	Linje : 4A Mariendalsv./Ndr. Fasanv.	-18,00	100,50
Aktivitet	Type	Dato / Tid	Sted			
841	Check ind	17-01-2023 16:31:03	Nørrebro St.			
841	Kontrolmærke	17-01-2023 16:31:26	Nørrebro St.			
842	Check ud	17-01-2023 16:35:36	Mariendalsv./Ndr. Fasanv.			
Normalpris						
Betal for : Afstand			1 x Voksen	18,00		
			1 zone			
Total	Alle priser er i kr.					18,00

Den 3. februar 2023 anmodede klageren Movia om at frafalde kontrolafgiften og gjorde gældende, som refereret ovenfor.

Movia fastholdt kontrolafgiften den 7. februar 2023 med den begrundelse, at klageren ikke havde checket sit Rejsekort ind straks efter påstigning, og at kontrolløren havde noteret, at klageren sad ned og først rejste sig for at checke ind, da hun fik øje på kontrollørerne.

Derpå indbragte klageren sagen for ankenævnet.

ANKENÆVNETS BEGRUNDELSE FOR AFGØRELSEN:

Således som sagen foreligger oplyst med de elektroniske logs, lægger ankenævnet til grund, at bussen forlod stoppestedet kl. 16:30:55, at klagerens Rejsekort blev checket ind kl. 16:31:03, og at bussen således ikke holdt stille, da klageren checkede ind.

Selv om Rejsekortet rent faktisk var checket ind, da kontrolløren satte et kontrolmærke kl. 16:31:26, var Rejsekortet i relation til de Fælles landsdækkende rejseregler ikke gyldigt på kontroltidspunktet. Dette beror på, at Rejsekortet først blev checket ind 8 sekunder efter, at bussen havde forladt stoppestedet, 40 sekunder efter, at kontrollørerne som de sidste steg om bord ved samme stoppested kl. 16:30:23, samt at klageren satte sig ned, før hun checkede ind.

Det er udtrykkeligt fastlagt i de Fælles landsdækkende rejseregler, at Rejsekort skal checkes ind *straks* efter påstigning og *inden passageren sætter sig ned*.

Herefter blev kontrolafgiften for manglende straks-check ind pålagt med rette, og den omstændighed, at klageren skulle sætte to tunge tasker fra sig, gør ikke, at der har foreligget sådanne særlige omstændigheder, at kontrolafgiften skal frafalde.

Det af klageren anførte om, at hun med udstedelsen af kontrolafgiften dermed havde to gyldige rejsehjemler, kan ikke føre til et andet resultat. En kontrolafgift kan pålægges en passager, der ikke foreviser gyldig rejsehjemmel, og klagerens Rejsekort var i relation til rejsereglerne ikke at anse for gyldig rejsehjemmel, selv om Rejsekortet blev checket ind inden kontrollen.

RETSGRUNDLAG:

Ifølge lov om trafikkselskaber § 29 kan selskabet udstede kontrolafgift og pålægge ekspeditionsgebyr til en passager, der ikke på forlangende foreviser gyldig rejsehjemmel.

I de Fælles landsdækkende rejseregler (forretningsbetingelser), som trafikvirksomhederne har vedtaget, præciseres hjemmelen til udstedelse af en kontrolafgift.

Det anføres således bl.a., at passagerer, der ikke på forlangende viser gyldig rejsehjemmel, herunder er korrekt checket ind på Rejsekort til deres rejse, skal betale en kontrolafgift på 1.000 kr. for voksne. Det gælder også, hvis passageren har købt rejsehjemmel via en mobil enhed, der ikke kan kontrolleres, f.eks. hvis denne er løbet tør for strøm eller gået i stykker. Det er passagerens ansvar, at rejsehjemlen er endeligt modtaget på den mobile enhed før påstigning.

I busser, hvor check ind sker om bord, skal check ind ske straks efter påstigning uden unødigt ophold, og inden passageren sætter sig ned.

Som passager uden gyldig rejsehjemmel betragtes også passager, der benytter kort med begrænset tidsgyldighed (f.eks. pensionistkort) uden for kortets gyldighedstid, eller hvis andre rejsebegrensninger ikke overholdes (f.eks. for hvornår cykler må medtages, eller om der er betalt metro-tillæg). Passagerer, der rejser alene på andres Rejsekort Personligt eller med en anden kundetype, end passageren er berettiget til, rejser uden gyldig rejsehjemmel. Kortindehaveren skal altid selv være checket ind på kortet på de rejser, hvor et Rejsekort Personligt benyttes.

PARTERNES ARGUMENTER OVER FOR ANKENÆVNEN:

Klageren anfører følgende:

" Dear members of the appeal board,

I am writing to complain about an inspection ticket that I believe was wrongfully issued to me while I had a valid ticket fare.

On 17 Jan 2023, I get on the 4A bus parked at Nørrebro station with two full hands of heavy bags which I carry to a seat. While the bus is still parked and waiting for passengers to come in, I search for my Rejsekort and proceed to check in my card. I vividly remember the bus still being parked and loading passengers as I had an encounter with a specific passenger who was boarding the bus while I was about to check-in, and he kindly lets me check in first. I go back to my seat where I had dropped my bags and the journey starts as the bus leaves Nørrebro station. One of the inspectors approaches me to check my ticket, which turns out to be valid; but the other inspector claims that I only checked in when I saw her.

The ticket was therefore issued based on the assumption that I only checked in because I saw the inspector, which is the inspector's subjective opinion. I understand that the rules state that a check-in must be made as soon as possible and without unnecessary delay, but in my case the delay was 'necessary' as it wouldn't have been humanly possible to check in while I was carrying two heavy bags with both hands and I needed to drop them on a seat before I could check in. I would also understand if the bus had left the stop, that the delay would have meant that I am using Movia's service without paying for it, however in my case, since the bus hadn't left the stop, then at no time was I abusing Movia's service, as at all time that the bus was moving (and therefore providing me with its intended service) I had a valid ticket (checked in Rejsekort)

Also, as long as the bus is still parked, it means that passengers can both come in and out until the bus doors close. There may be a situation where a passenger comes in and realizes before checking in that they are on the wrong bus and decides to leave again. In that situation, would the passenger also be charged an inspection fee for merely being on the bus? I consider myself being in a similar situation as the timepoints in which I did not have a valid card only corresponds to time where the bus was parked and where I could have made a decision to leave. So, if I proceed with the logic of the inspector, if I didn't want to pay and only checked in because I saw the inspector, then why wouldn't I have just left the bus when I saw the inspectors?

Furthermore, according to the Joint National Travel Regulations (<https://dinoffentligetransport.dk/en/customer-service/rules-and-guidelines/all-travel-regulations/>), section 2.7.1. states that 'Customers who do not, when requested, present valid travel documents, including having checked in correctly on Rejsekort for their travel, must pay an inspection fee.'

The abovementioned rule goes hand in hand with section 2.7.3 which states that 'inspection fee will constitute a travel document for an uninterrupted journey to the station indicated by the customer, and only with the company which issued the fee. In buses, the inspection fee constitutes the travel document to the bus terminus.'

On the basis of these two rules, there seems to be a discrepancy or a gap with what the inspectors executed on. In my case, I was able to check in correctly and present a valid card for my journey. At the same time I was issued a ticket, which constitutes a second form of payment for my journey. If the inspector issued a ticket based on section 2.7.1, then section 2.7.3 no longer makes sense, or becomes redundant because in this case I already had a paid ticket. I don't understand how one is applicable but not the other.

Based on the above, I would like to appeal against the inspection fee issued to me, first because I had a valid checked-in Rejsekort, and second because once the inspector issued the fine, then it meant that for the rest of my journey, I technically had two valid travel documents. I kindly ask you to review my case. Thank you for your time and attention."

Indklagede anfører følgende:

" Movia maintains that the inspection fee is rightly imposed, and we do so on the grounds that complainant did not present a valid check in on the ticket inspectors' inquiry in the bus.

Using a rejsekort

A rejsekort is used to pay for journeys. To pay as you go, you reload your card with money. After each journey, the cost of that specific journey is deducted from your card account. When your rejsekort is checked in, the card constitutes a legally valid travel document.

Rejsekort must be checked in correctly before the start of the journey. Failure to check in means that the card bearer travels without a legally valid travel document and a fare evasion ticket may therefore be issued.

Joint National Travel Regulations:

2.2. Customer categories

It is the customer's responsibility to have a valid travel document issued for the correct customer category.

2.3. Purchase of travel documents

To be able to travel by train, bus and Metro, the customer must be in possession of a valid travel document.

2.4. Purchase of travel document

Public transport in Denmark is an open system with widespread self-service, and it is therefore always the customer's responsibility to have a valid travel document upon boarding, including by ensuring that the Rejsekort has been checked in correctly.

2.4.3. Use of Rejsekort

Rejsekort, issued by Rejsekort Rejseplanen A/S, can be used as a travel document. A Rejsekort must be checked in before the start of the journey. For all means of transport for which check in takes place inside the means of transport, the customer must check in immediately after boarding, without any unnecessary delay, and before taking a seat.

If the customer does not adhere to the aforementioned check in rules, the customer will be deemed to be without a valid single ticket, which incurs an inspection fee.

2.6. Inspection of travel documents

If a valid travel document cannot be presented on request during inspection, it will not be possible to have to get a reduction or cancellation of an inspection fee by subsequent presentation of travel documents.

2.7.1. Inspection of travel documents

Customers who do not, when requested, present valid travel documents, including having checked in correctly on Rejsekort for their travel, must pay an inspection fee.

A valid ticket is thus a passenger's documentation of the right to be transported in public transport. According to the principle of self-service it is the passenger's own responsibility to have a valid ticket from the start of the journey and to be able to present it at the ticket inspector's request.

Inspection fee

The ticket inspectors enter the bus at bus stop Nørrebro St. and observes complainant sitting in the bus. When one of the ticket inspectors' heads for the back of the bus complainant gets up and checks in.

Årsag

Rejsekort checket ind efter kontrollørs påstigning

Ny besked	Hun havde 2 poser med hvor hun har sat dem på plads og sad selv ned . Der min kollega gik forbi rejste hun sig op for at checke ind	MEZ
-----------	---	-----

The ticket inspectors take into consideration special circumstances regarding the issuance of fare evasion tickets e.g., luggage, baby strollers etc. In the situation in question complainant is already on the bus, has found a seat and must therefore be able to show a valid ticket. The ticket inspectors do not consider that complainant has taken the necessary steps to be in possession of a valid ticket and issue an inspection fee in accordance with the applicable travel regulations.

Comments and decision

The bus arrives at Nørrebro St. at 16:30:13 and departs at 16:30:55:

#	Stoppested	Stopindikator	Pl. ank.	Pl. afg.	Obs. ank.	Obs. afg.
1	Buddinge St. (7204)	● ●	15:57	15:57	15:52:00	15:57:23
2	Buddinge Torv (11)	● ●	15:59	15:59	16:01:42	16:01:56
3	Gladsaxe Ringvej (327)	● ●	16:02	16:02	16:03:32	16:03:45
4	Vandtårnsvej (328)	● ●	16:03	16:03	16:05:54	16:06:07
5	Gyngemosevej (329)	● ●	16:05	16:05	16:07:15	16:07:27
6	Isbanevej (330)	● ●	16:06	16:06	16:08:29	16:08:29
7	Høje Gladsaxe (331)	● ●	16:08	16:08	16:09:19	16:10:02
8	Dalen (332)	● ●	16:09	16:09	16:10:48	16:10:48
9	Mars Allé (315)	● ●	16:09	16:09	16:11:19	16:11:19
10	Lauggårds Allé (333)	● ●	16:11	16:11	16:12:42	16:12:55
11	Engkrogen (334)	● ●	16:11	16:11	16:13:21	16:13:30
12	Gladsaxevej (335)	● ●	16:13	16:13	16:15:10	16:15:21
13	Emdrup Torv (336)	● ●	16:15	16:15	16:16:30	16:16:45
14	Bispebjerg Parkalle (337)	● ●	16:16	16:16	16:17:32	16:17:32
15	Bispebjerg Torv (338)	● ●	16:18	16:18	16:18:28	16:18:28
16	Tagensvej (339)	● ●	16:20	16:20	16:19:29	16:20:22
17	Tuborgvej (340)	● ●	16:21	16:21	16:22:51	16:23:13
18	Landsdommervej (341)	● ●	16:22	16:22	16:24:53	16:25:07
19	Bispevej (342)	● ●	16:24	16:24	16:26:28	16:26:40
20	Frederikssundsvej (52041)	● ●	16:26	16:26	16:27:29	16:27:48
21	Nørrebro St. (53198)	● ●	16:28	16:28	16:30:13	16:30:55

The ticket inspectors enter the bus at 16:30:23:

Stop	Nørrebro St.
Tur ID	0
Påstigning	17-01-2023 16:30:23

We can see that complainant checks in at 16:31:03 which is after the bus departs at 16:30:55:

-	277	17-01-2023 16:31	Linje : 4A Nørrebro St.	16:35	Linje : 4A Mariendalsv./Ndr. Fasanv.	-18,00	100,50
Aktivitet	Type	Dato / Tid		Sted			
841	Check ind	17-01-2023 16:31:03		Nørrebro St.			
841	Kontrolmærke	17-01-2023 16:31:26		Nørrebro St.			
842	Check ud	17-01-2023 16:35:36		Mariendalsv./Ndr. Fasanv.			
Normalpris							
Betal for : Afstand				1 x Voksen		18,00	
				1 zone			
Total		Alle priser er i kr.				18,00	

Movia finds this confirms the ticket inspector's observation.

There is one check in registered at the card reader complainant uses:

Vehicle 3287 @ 2023-01-17 16:28:00

Stop	Tid	1 (CI)	2 (CU)	3 (CI)	4 (CU)	5 (CI)	6 (CU)
		133F1A	133C9A	133254	133888	135E2C	1331D0
Gladsaxe Ringvej (327)	16:03:38	2	0	0	0	0	0
Vandtårnsvej (328)	16:05:57	2	0	0	0	0	0
Høje Gladsaxe (331)	16:09:29	0	0	1	0	0	0
Lauggårds Allé (333)	16:12:33	0	0	1	2	0	0
Gladsaxevej (335)	16:15:12	2	0	0	0	0	0
Emdrup Torv (336)	16:16:34	1	0	2	0	0	0
Bispebjerg Torv (338)	16:18:38	0	0	1	0	0	0
Landsdommervej (341)	16:24:59	0	0	1	0	0	0
Bispevej (342)	16:25:56	2	0	1	0	0	1
Nørrebro St. (53198)	16:30:17	2	0	1	1	0	0

Transaktionsnr.	5688068399	Transaktionstype	Check ind
Transaktionsdato	17-01-2023 16:31:03	Modtagelsesdato	17-01-2023 20:10:19
Sted	Nørrebro St.	Udstyr	VAL_45082 - 133254
Sekvensnr.	841	Filnavn	1332541P.50F

The customer is obliged to check in immediately after boarding. Complainant checked in after the bus departed the bus stop and the check in can therefore not be considered valid. If a valid travel document cannot be presented on request during inspection, subsequent presentation will not be accepted.

When an inspection fee is issued, we have no reason to believe that it is anything but a regrettable mistake, but on the other hand, Movia has no way of assessing whether the missing travel document is due to a mistake, attempt at deliberate cheating, oversight, or other things.

An inspection fee is not conditional on whether a customer have deliberately tried to evade payment or whether there are errors or misunderstandings, but only if the customer can present a valid ticket during inspection. Since complainant does not make a correct check in immediately after boarding and therefore has not been able to present a valid ticket during ticket inspection Movia finds that inspection fee has been correctly issued.

It is an area with a high risk of circumventing the rules on being able to present a valid ticket if it is accepted that you can check in your rejsekort after finding a seat and after the ticket inspectors enters the bus."

Hertil har klageren gjort gældende:

"I have read Movia's reply and would like to proceed with the complaint and appeal against their decision. Please find below comments to their statements:

'Movia maintains that the inspection fee is rightly imposed, and we do so on the grounds that complainant did not present a valid check in on the ticket inspectors' inquiry in the bus.'

This statement is incorrect as I did have a valid ticket on my Rejsekort when asked by the inspector. Throughout my comments below, I will explain why my ticket was valid.

'The bus arrives at Nørrebro St. at 16:30:13 and departs at 16:30:55. [...] We can see that complainant checks in at 16:31:03 which is after the bus departs at 16:30:55'

When I checked-in, there were passengers still boarding the bus, therefore 16:30:55 may not be the exact time the bus physically left the location, but the time that is marked in the system. This can be verified via CCTV surveillance footage which will prove that the bus had not departed when I checked in.

Furthermore, this means that the accuracy and legitimacy of the timetables is debatable as they may not be a reliable indicator of what happened in reality.

In consequence the following statement needs to be validated with additional evidence:

'Complainant checked in after the bus departed the bus stop and the check in can therefore not be considered valid.'

In addition to that, in the first timetable provided, you mention that the bus arrives at Nørrebro St at 16:30:13. However, in the second timetable, it is stated that the bus arrives at Nørrebro St at 16:30:17. This discrepancy between the two sources indicates that there is not one single source of truth regarding those timepoints or the **real** time of departure, which means that the evidence presented in the first timetable is not necessarily accurate either.

'When an inspection fee is issued, we have no reason to believe that it is anything but a regrettable mistake, but on the other hand, Movia has no way of assessing whether the missing travel document is due to a mistake, attempt at deliberate cheating, oversight, or other things.'

Using the same reasoning mentioned above, if Movia cannot assess whether the missing travel document is due to a mistake, attempt at deliberate cheating, oversight, or other things; then similarly, Movia should **not** make assumptions about a valid travel document.

If the bus really departed at 16:30:55, then there is a lag time of 8 seconds from bus departure to check-in, which is a humanly reasonable margin of error. Additionally, given the fact that the timetables presented by Movia may have an error rate of at least +/- 4 seconds (comparison between timetable 1 and 2), and that the bus may have not physically left the bus stop at exactly 16:30:55, then I reconfirm that my ticket was valid and that the fine was wrongfully issued to me.

As Movia inspectors did not have this level of detail at the time of issuing the fine, it seems like it was also not a valid reason to issue a fine at the time. On a daily basis, passengers check-in as the bus departs. It is likely that some passengers will check-in during or within seconds of departure. This minimal lag time should be taken into account, as otherwise it wouldn't be realistically possible to have all check-ins before departure, unless drivers are instructed to only depart when all passengers have checked in. I use Movia services on a daily basis and in practice this is rarely the case.

In conclusion, the evidence presented by Movia needs to be validated or supplemented.

I understand the importance of having rules and regulations to govern your systems, processes and people (passengers, drivers, inspectors, and others), however, it is important that these rules and regulations are realistic and take into account a reasonable margin of error. Movia should also ensure that the process is

followed and implemented consistently among all users, so if it is expected that all passengers check-in before departure, then drivers should give a chance for passengers to board and check-in before departure. Similarly, the systems used by Movia to track buses and check-ins need to be aligned to show one truth and that truth needs to reflect the reality of what happens in practice.”

Movia har svaret:

This statement is incorrect as I did have a valid ticket on my Rejsekort when asked by the inspector.

It is not question whether a Rejsekort is checked in at inspection but whether it is checked in in connection with boarding the bus.

The bus departs at 16:30:55 and check in happens at 16:31:03:

In addition to that, in the first timetable provided, you mention that the bus arrives at Nørrebro St at 16:30:13. However, in the second timetable, it is stated that the bus arrives at Nørrebro St at 16:30:17. This discrepancy between the two sources indicates that there is not one single source of truth regarding those timepoints or the **real** time of departure, which means that the evidence presented in the first timetable is not necessarily accurate either.

This is a registration of Rejsekort in the bus and not a time schedule nor a GPS. 16:30:17 is when the first check in is registered in the bus at bus stop Nørrebro St.:

16:30:17:0 VAL	133f1a	3	87	Successful Transactic Card number : 308431
16:30:17:0 VAL	133f1a	2	104	Transactic TTIM01: 75
16:30:17:0 VAL	133f1a	3	101	Screen display Name : SC Text: GOD REJSE

Vehicle 3287 @ 2023-01-17 16:28:00

		1 (CI)	2 (CU)	3 (CI)	4 (CU)	5 (CI)	6 (CU)
Stop	Tid	133F1A	133C9A	133254	133888	135E2C	1331D0
Gladsaxe Ringvej (327)	16:03:38	2	0	0	0	0	0
Vandtårnsvej (328)	16:05:57	2	0	0	0	0	0
Høje Gladsaxe (331)	16:09:29	0	0	1	0	0	0
Lauggårds Allé (333)	16:12:33	0	0	1	2	0	0
Gladsaxevej (335)	16:15:12	2	0	0	0	0	0
Emdrup Torv (336)	16:16:34	1	0	2	0	0	0
Bispebjerg Torv (338)	16:18:38	0	0	1	0	0	0
Landsdømmervej (341)	16:24:59	0	0	1	0	0	0
Bispevej (342)	16:25:56	2	0	1	0	0	1
Nørrebro St. (53198)	16:30:17	2	0	1	1	0	0

”

På ankenævnets vegne



Lone Bach Nielsen
Nævningsformand