## Tables

## I. Petitions for Constitutional Interpretations

Number	Petitioners	Original Cases or Final Judgments by the Court of Last Resort	Provisions at Issue	Scope of Review
		16, 20, 22, 24, 28, 31, 32, 34, 39, 40, 44, 46, 48, 51, 52, 54, 61, 63, 67, 73, 74, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83, 91, 100, 124, 158, 162, 164, 169 and 175 Cases of contestation for violations	deferred prosecution and suspended sentences in Article 26, Paragraph 2 of the Administrative Penalty Act	First and Second Provisions at Issue
	Judge of the HSIEN Unit, Court of Administrative Litigation, Taiwan Miaoli District Court	2012 Chiao-13, 2013 Chiao- 35 and 51 Cases of traffic adjudication (3 cases in total)	Paragraph 2 of the	First and Second Provisions at Issue
J.	Taiwan Taoyuan District Court	Court 2012 Chiao-11, 24,134, 137, 2013 Chiao-56, 88, 121, 175, and 2015 Chiao-6 Cases of traffic adjudication (9 cases in total)	prosecution and suspended sentences in Article 26, Paragraph 2 of the	First and Second Provisions at Issue

7.	CHAO Unit, Court of Administrative	Chiao-7, 20, 55, 245, and 2014 Chiao-77 Cases of traffic adjudication (6 cases in total)	prosecution and suspended	First and Second Provisions at Issue
J.	YU Unit, Court of Administrative	Court 2012 Chiao-94 Case of traffic adjudication		First and Second Provisions at Issue

6.	Unit, Court of Administrative Litigation,	of traffic adjudication (4 cases in total)	(1) The part regarding deferred prosecution in Article 26, Paragraph 2 of the Administrative Penalty Act (2) Article 45, Paragraph 3 of the Administrative Penalty Act (3) Article 26, Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Administrative Penalty Act (4) Article 35 Paragraph 8 of the Road Traffic Act	First and Second Provisions at Issue
7.	Unit, Court of		(1) The part regarding deferred prosecution in	First and Second Provisions at Issue

8.	Yu-Zhen He	Taiwan High Court Taichung Branch Court 2012 Jiao- Kang-418 Ruling	Administrative Penalty Act (2) Article 45, Paragraph 3 of the	First and Second Provisions at Issue
9.	Chieh-Chiang Lo, Yu-Hua Pang and Shao- Yeh Huang	Supreme Administrative Court 2017 Tsai-377 Ruling, Taipei High Administrative Court 2016 Su-1116 Decision	Penalty Act The part regarding deferred prosecution in Article 26,	First Provision at Issue
11.	Li-Er Huang Yu-Feng Huang	Supreme Administrative Court 2009 Tsai-2506 Ruling, Taipei High Administrative Court 2009 Su-397 Decision Supreme Administrative Court 2013 Tsai-903 Ruling, Taipei High Administrative Court 2012 Su-1778	(2) First Letter at Issue	
12.	Shi-Wei Lin	Decision  Supreme Administrative Court 2011 Pan-1967 Decision, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-409 Decision	(1) First Letter at Issue (2) Second Letter at Issue	First Letter at Issue

		Supreme Administrative Court 2011 Pan-2020 Decision, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-408 Decision	(1) First Letter at Issue (2) Second Letter at Issue	First Letter at Issue
		Supreme Administrative Court 2013 Pan-93 Decision, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-2046 Decision	(2) Second Letter at Issue	First Letter at Issue
13.	Petitioner Wan- Hsing Hsu	Supreme Administrative Court 2011 Tsai-2147 Ruling, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-387 Decision	<ul><li>(1) First Letter at Issue</li><li>(2) Second Letter at Issue</li></ul>	First Letter at Issue
		Supreme Administrative Court 2011 Pan-1968 Decision, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-384 Decision	(1) First Letter at Issue (2) Second Letter at Issue	First Letter at Issue
		Supreme Administrative Court 2012 Pan-400 Decision, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-1747 Decision	<ul><li>(1) First Letter at Issue</li><li>(2) Second Letter at Issue</li></ul>	First Letter at Issue

Supreme Administrative Court 2012 Tsai-1753 Ruling, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-1748	<ul><li>(1) First Letter at Issue</li><li>(2) Second Letter at Issue</li></ul>	First Letter at Issue
Supreme Administrative Court 2012 Tsai-2240 Ruling, Taipei High Administrative Court 2011 Su-1749 Decision	<ol> <li>First Letter at Issue</li> <li>Second Letter at Issue</li> </ol>	First Letter at Issue

## II. Petitions for Uniform Interpretation

The Petitioners of Appendixes 12 and 13 above considered that the judgments such as Supreme Administrative Court 2011 Pan-1967 Decision etc. (see the above chart for all relevant judgements) and the First and Second Rulings at Issue have adopted diverse viewpoints on the application of one single law and therefore petitioned for a uniform interpretation.