

This is a companion case presenting the same basic question as *People v. Hernandez*: whether the officer acted with sufficient particularized suspicion to justify a traffic stop.

The parties disagree as to whether the factual differences between this case and *People v. Hernandez* are legally significant. In *Hernandez*, the officer saw an apparently valid temporary permit in the rear window of Mr. Hernandez's truck, but disregarded it. In this case, minor Raymond C.'s car had neither license plates *nor* a temporary permit in the rear window. It did have a temporary permit in the front window, which is another place where a temporary permit may be legally displayed. From his position behind Raymond's car, however, the officer did not notice the permit in the front window before he made the traffic stop.

Raymond C. contends his conviction for driving under the influence of alcohol should be reversed because the officer stopped him without particularized suspicion — that is, without taking the measures necessary to determine whether his car had a temporary operating permit in one of the other places it might be validly displayed, other than the rear window.