**BEFORE THE**

**PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Petition of the Bureau of Investigation and **:**

Enforcement of the Pennsylvania Public Utility **:**

Commission for an Interim Emergency Order **:**

requiring Uber Technologies, Inc. to immediately **:** P-2014-2426846

cease and desist from brokering transportation **:**

service for compensation between points within **:**

the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. **:**

**ORDER GRANTING INTERIM EMERGENCY RELIEF**

**AND CERTIFYING MATERIAL QUESTION**

On June 26, 2014, the undersigned presiding officers conducted a hearing on the Petition of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I & E or Complainant)) for interim emergency relief (Petition or Emergency Petition) filed on June 16, 2014, against Uber Technologies, Inc., (Uber or Respondent). The Commission docketed the Petition at P-2014-2426846.

Procedural History

On June 5, 2014, Complainant filed a complaint with the Public Utility Commission (Commission). The Commission docketed the complaint at C-2014-2422723. The complaint alleges, *inter alia*, that Respondent provides internet and mobile application software (the Uber app) that connects passengers with individuals who have registered with Uber as drivers or driver operators (Uber driver). The Uber app permits a passenger’s phone to locate the nearest available Uber driver, and then alerts the Uber driver of the passenger’s ride request. Complaint ¶ 2. According to the complaint, Uber drivers use their personal vehicles to respond to ride requests.

Complainant avers that Respondent, through the Uber app, is acting as a broker of transportation in Pennsylvania without proper Commission authority. A “broker” is defined as:

Any person or corporation not included in the term “motor carrier” and not a bona fide employee or agent of any such carrier, or group of such carriers, who or which, as principal or agent, sells or offers for sale any transportation by a motor carrier, or in the furnishing, providing, or procuring of facilities therefor, or negotiates for, or holds out by solicitation, advertisement, or otherwise, as one who sells, provides, furnishes, contracts, or arranges for such transportation, or the furnishing, providing or procuring of facilities therefor, other than as a motor carrier directly or jointly, or by arrangement with another motor carrier, and who does not assume custody as a carrier.

66 Pa.C.S. § 2501(b).

Complainant avers that pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 2505(a), brokers of transportation in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania must obtain a brokerage license issued by the Commission prior to engaging in the business of being a broker, and that Respondent does not hold a brokerage license issued by the Commission. Complaint ¶¶ 5-6.

Complainant further averred that by letter dated July 6, 2012, Respondent was directed to cease and desist from acting as a broker of transportation without the authority to provide the service. Complainant avers that on March 13, 2014, Respondent announced the launch of UberX, a ride-sharing passenger transportation service in Pittsburgh that connects passengers with Uber drivers via the Uber app and posted a list of fares. Complaint ¶¶ 7-8, Exhibits 1-2.

Complainant alleged that between March 31, 2014, and April 21, 2014, I & E Motor Carrier Enforcement Manager Charles Bowser (Officer Bowser), after downloading the Uber app to a mobile phone, was transported on eleven (11) occasions by Uber drivers using their personal vehicles and a fare for each trip was billed, ranging from $5.00 to $8.00. Complaint ¶¶ 9-10.

Complainant avers that the Uber drivers who responded to Officer Bowser’s requests and provided transportation did not have proper Commission authority to transport persons for compensation within Pennsylvania, thereby violating 66 Pa.C.S. § 1101. Complaint ¶¶ 11-12.

On June 16, 2014, I & E filed a Petition of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement for Interim Emergency Relief (Petition or Petition for Emergency Relief). In its Petition, I & E avers, pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 3.6(a), it is entitled to emergency relief during the course of this proceeding. In its Petition, I & E incorporates the averments of I & E’s complaint.The Petition seeks an Order from the Commission directing Uber to immediately cease and desist from operating its ride-sharing passenger transportation service until it receives the requisite authority to do so.

I & E argued that 66 Pa.C.S. § 2505(a), prohibits any person or corporation from engaging in the business of a broker within the Commonwealth without a brokerage license issued by the Commission. I & E avers that Uber is a broker, as defined by 66 Pa.C.S. § 2501(b), as it arranges transportation service for third-party passengers. I & E further asserts that Uber engages non-professional drivers, who are not certificated motor carriers, using their personal vehicles for commercial transportation, in violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 2505(a).

The purpose of an interim emergency order is to grant or deny injunctive relief during the pendency of a proceeding. 52 Pa.Code § 3.1. I & E asserts that the need for relief is immediate and ongoing as it has attempted to stop Uber from unlawfully brokering transportation service using non-certificated drivers, without success. I & E also avers the injury would be irreparable if relief is not granted. I & E argues that by using uncertificated drivers to transport the public, Uber has unilaterally deprived the Commission of its obligation to ensure driver integrity, vehicle safety and the maintenance of sufficient insurance coverage. I & E further asserts that since Uber drivers are not certificated motor carriers, the Commission cannot be certain that its regulations pertaining to driver safety are being met. Likewise, I & E asserts the Commission cannot be sure that the vehicles of Uber drivers comply with its vehicle safety requirements, which include equipment standards, and compliance with PennDot vehicle inspection and Commission inspection requirements, nor evidence of insurance.

Finally, I & E asserts the relief is not injurious to the public interest. I & E argues that Uber has no lawful right to broker transportation for compensation between points within the Commonwealth. I & E avers, until Uber becomes licensed and its drivers are certificated, the Commission is unable to guarantee that Uber is brokering transportation using drivers who adhere to the Commission’s safety and insurance regulations, all of which were designed to safeguard the public.

On June 23, 2014, Respondent filed an Answer of Uber Technologies, Inc. to Petition for Interim Emergency Relief. Uber averred, *inter alia*, that I & E failed to establish the existence of an emergency, failed to demonstrate its right to relief in the underlying complaint is clear, that the need for relief is immediate, that the injury would be irreparable if relief is not granted, and that the relief requested is not injurious to the public interest. Answer ¶ 1.

In its answer, Uber avers that it is not a broker, but instead, is a software company that licenses a smartphone application. Uber asserts, in Pennsylvania, it licensed its smartphone application to Gegen LLC. Uber asserts that by granting the requested relief, the Commission would be ordering a software company to stop operating, without a comprehensive review of whether any activities violate the Code. Such relief, Uber avers, would be injurious to the public interest by depriving the public access to an innovative, economic and reliable service that is not available from traditional transportation providers. Answer ¶ 3.

By Hearing Notice issued June 17, 2014, the Commission advised the parties that a hearing on the Petition would be held on Thursday and Friday, June 26-27, 2014 at a Pittsburgh hearing room, beginning at 9 a.m. A Prehearing Order was issued by the undersigned ALJs on June 18, 2014, advising the parties of the hearing date, place and time and outlining various procedural requirements related to the hearing on the Petition.

The undersigned ALJs conducted the hearing as scheduled on June 26, 2014, which was concluded on that date. At the hearing, Michael L. Swindler, Esquire, represented I & E and presented the testimony of one witness,I & E Motor Carrier Enforcement Manager Charles Bowser (Officer Bowser). I & E offered three (3) exhibits: I & E Exhibit 1, a certification from the Secretary of the Public Utility Commission dated June 24, 2014 certifying that Uber Technologies, Inc., has not been issued a certificate of public convenience to operate as a motor carrier of passengers between points within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for compensation and has not been issued a license to broker transportation in the Commonwealth; Exhibit 2, a twenty-nine (29) page document consisting of email communications and receipts for payment between Uber and Officer Bowser; Exhibit 3, a twenty-two (22) page document, marked as pages 1 through and including 22, consisting of purported news releases from the Insurance Department of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and various other states regarding insurance issues related to Transportation Network Companies (TNCs). I & E Exhibit 3, pages 1 and 2, consisting of a news release from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and a press release related to Uber were admitted into evidence. The objection by counsel for Uber to the admission of the remaining pages 3 through 22 was sustained.

Karen O. Moury, Esquire appeared and represented Uber. Uber did not present any witnesses or exhibits.A transcript of the hearing was generated but was not available at the time this Order was entered.

Legal Standards

Initially, the Commission has jurisdiction to resolve the instant proceeding. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 66 Pa.C.S. § 501. The general rule granting jurisdiction in this matter provides, in pertinent part:

In addition to any powers expressly enumerated in this part, the commission shall have full power and authority, and it shall be its duty to enforce, execute and carry out, by its regulations, orders, or

otherwise, all and singular, the provisions of this part, and the full extent thereof….

66 Pa.C.S. § 501.

The issue the Commission must resolve in this emergency proceeding is whether I & E has established the requisite need to order that Uber immediately cease and desist from utilizing its digital platform to facilitate transportation for compensation to passengers using non-certificated drivers in their personal vehicles within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We conclude that I & E has sufficiently established the need to grant the emergency relief requested.

Evidence Presented at the Hearing

I & E witness Officer Bowser, the Enforcement Manager for the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement’s Western Region, testified that he is charged with enforcing the Public Utility Code (Code) and that he and his enforcement officers have police powers which include the ability to enforce the public safety provisions of the Code. Officer Bowser testified that he and his enforcement officers possess the ability to stop any vehicles, examine facilities, and examine drivers and records related to certificated motor carriers. He testified that he, along with motor carrier enforcement officers, conduct inspections of vehicles and issues related to the safety of vehicles, drivers, and facilities to ensure public safety and to ensure compliance with Commission regulations. Enforcement officers also have the authority to obtain lists of all drivers and vehicles related to certificated motor carriers, to ensure that drivers’ licenses are valid and not suspended, to evaluate drivers’ records and moving violations and determine whether to disqualify a driver, to ensure that proper insurance is being maintained and evidence is provided to the Commission regarding vehicles, insurance coverage, and driver qualifications. Enforcement officers also verify that certificated drivers possess a current valid operator’s license, and evaluate operators’ driving and criminal records.

As Uber drivers are not certificated by the Commission, the Commission is unable to exercise any oversight over the drivers or vehicles. The failure to provide such oversight can also have a detrimental impact on the public safety and could result in a large number of vehicles being operated in a condition of disrepair, resulting in potential accidents and injuries as well as other detrimental effects upon the safety of the public. Certificated drivers may be removed from providing services upon cause found by the enforcement officer.

Officer Bowser testified that he learned of the activities of Uber in arranging transportation and securing rides between drivers and riders, from media sources and an Uber blog in March of 2014. He testified that utilizing Uber software is the only way to arrange the transportation between the riders and Uber drivers.

In March of 2014, Officer Bowser downloaded the Uber app on his smartphone. He was required by Uber to register his credit card information and to provide an email address in order to complete the download of the Uber app. Officer Bowser testified that he then requested service, which was provided on approximately eleven occasions. After the service was provided, Officer Bowser was advised of the charge and made payment with the credit card information previously provided. He testified the invoices indicated the charge was made by Uber.

Officer Bowser further testified that currently, there is no Commission oversight of Uber operators and no Commission inspection of the private vehicles providing transportation services. He also testified there were no markings on the vehicles regarding identification of the drivers or vehicles, nor any information or numbers as to how a rider would file a complaint or raise an issue with the Commission. Officer Bowser testified that certificated vehicles are required to carry a sticker with the number to contact the Commission and to make complaints to the Commission.

Officer Bowser testified he has no knowledge whether the Uber vehicles are insured, how often they are inspected, and has no information regarding driver histories, policies regarding drivers, criminal records and driving records.

Officer Bowser testified that, to his knowledge, Uber does not possess any operating authority, broker license, or certification from the Commission as a motor carrier. In addition, I & E presented I & E Exhibit 1, a certification from the Secretary of the Public Utility Commission dated June 24, 2014 certifying that Uber Technologies, Inc., has not been issued a certificate of public convenience to operate as a motor carrier of passengers between points within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for compensation and has not been issued a license to broker transportation in the Commonwealth. Officer Bowser testified that only a few individuals in the region possess certificates for call and demand service and that none of the drivers contacted through the Uber app were on his list of certificate holders.

I & E also introduced I & E Exhibit 2, a twenty-nine (29) page document, individually marked as pages 1 through 29, consisting of email communications and receipts for payment between Uber and Officer Bowser. Pages 1 and 2 of I & E Exhibit 2 are essentially an email welcoming the rider to the service. The email references Officer Bowser’s “first Uber ride” and identifies a Pittsburgh Community Manager to assist Officer Bowser as he “Uber(s) around Pittsburgh.” The email provides the name Uber Technologies, Inc. and provides a San Francisco, California address. No other entities or providers are identified on these pages. I & E Exhibit 2, at pages 3-5, regarding a transport on March 31, 2014, provides a receipt for a fare of $7.00 and provides a fare breakdown, in pertinent part, as follows:

Fare Breakdown

Base Fare $2.00

Distance $2.17

Time $3.07

Subtotal $7.24

Rounding Down -0.24

Charged $7.00

The Exhibit is referenced as an “Uber Receipt, utilizes an email address of [receipts.pittsburgh@uber.com](mailto:receipts.pittsburgh@uber.com), identifies the first name of the driver and identifies the car used as “UberX.” The document further thanks the user “for choosing Uber.”

Officer Bowser testified that he received individual emails from Uber at the conclusion of each ride and that the charge that he paid was based upon mileage, time and distance as set forth on the Uber invoices.

Officer Bowser testified that Uber arranged the transportation for driving passengers, through the Uber app, and as such, was required to possess a broker license.

The Standard for Emergency Relief

The issue the Commission must resolve in this emergency proceeding is whether I & E has established the requisite need to order Uber to immediately cease and desist from utilizing its digital platform to facilitate transportation for compensation to passengers using non-certificated drivers in their personal vehicles within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. We conclude that I & E has sufficiently established the need to grant the emergency relief requested, pending further proceedings as provided by the Commission rules and regulations.

The purpose of an interim emergency order is to grant or deny injunctive relief during the pendency of a proceeding. 52 Pa.Code § 3.1. The purpose of granting injunctive relief has been described as “to maintain things as they are until the rights of the parties can be considered and determined after a full hearing.” *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n v. Israel*, 52 A.2d 317; 321 (Pa. 1947). In *Israel*, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court also said:

The rule is ‘that the status quo which will be preserved by preliminary injunction is the last actual, peaceable [and, we may add, lawful] noncontested status which preceded the pending controversy’.

A preliminary injunction is to put and keep matters in the position in which they were before the improper conduct of the defendants commenced and to prevent them from gaining any advantage by their own wrongful acts.

*Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n v. Israel*, 52 A.2d 317, 321-322 (Pa.1947) (citations omitted).

Emergency relief is governed by 52 Pa.Code §§ 3.1-3.12. The provision at 52 Pa.Code § 3.1 defines an emergency as follows:

A situation which presents a clear and present danger to life or property or which is uncontested and requires action prior to the next scheduled public meeting.

52 Pa. Code § 3.1.

To be granted an interim emergency order, the party seeking relief must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the facts and circumstances meet all four of the requirements set forth in 52 Pa.Code § 3.6(b). If the party seeking relief fails to prove any one of the four requirements, the Commission will deny the relief requested. *Crums Mill Assoc. v. Dauphin Consolidated Water Supply Co.,* 1993 PA PUC LEXIS 90 (1993). As set forth above, the party seeking relief must demonstrate the following:

1. The petitioner's right to relief is clear.

2. The need for relief is immediate.

3. The injury would be irreparable if relief is not granted.

4. The relief requested is not injurious to the public interest.

52 Pa.Code § 3.6(b).

1. The Right to Relief is Clear

I & E has averred that its right to relief is clear. In support of this argument, I & E argued that 66 Pa. C.S. § 2505(a), prohibits any person or corporation from engaging in the business of a broker within the Commonwealth without a brokerage license issued by the Commission. I & E avers that Uber is a broker, as defined by 66 Pa.C.S. § 2501(b), as it arranges transportation service for third-party passengers. I & E further asserts that Uber engages non-professional drivers, who are not certificated motor carriers, using their personal vehicles for commercial transportation in violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 2505(a).

The Public Utility Code defines a common carrier as one “who or which holds out or undertakes the transportation of passengers . . . by motor vehicle for compensation . . . .”[[1]](#footnote-1) Such a common carrier providing transportation services must hold a certificate of public convenience.[[2]](#footnote-2)

The Code further defines a broker as “Any person or corporation not included in the term “motor carrier” . . . who or which, as principal or agent, sells or offers for sale any transportation by a motor carrier . . . or procuring of facilities therefor, or negotiates for, or holds out by solicitation, advertisement, or otherwise, as one who sells, provides, furnishes, contracts, or arranges for such transportation . . . .[[3]](#footnote-3) A broker must be licensed by the Commission and is precluded from arranging transportation with motor carriers who do not hold a certificate of public convenience or permit. [[4]](#footnote-4)

I & E has established that its right to relief is clear. That is, the Petition raises a substantial legal question and I & E adduced sufficient evidence to conclude that it has a reasonable expectation of success on the merits of a proceeding on the underlying complaint.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The evidence presented at the hearing established that neither Uber nor the drivers who provided rides to Officer Bowser when he initiated a service request using the Uber app hold authority from the Commission to provide transportation services. Officer Bowser paid for each trip that he took.

In its answer to the Petition, Uber contends that it is not a broker, but instead, is a software company that licenses a smartphone application. Uber asserts, in Pennsylvania, it licensed its smartphone application to companies, including Gegen LLC. In its answer, Respondent avers that Gegen is a licensed broker in Pennsylvania and uses Uber software to arrange transportation. Answer ¶ 3. Uber further avers in its answer that its wholly-owned subsidiary, Gegen, applied for a statewide brokerage license to arrange for transportation of persons between points in Pennsylvania on August 2, 2012, which was granted by the Commission. Answer ¶ 9.

No evidence was offered in support of this contention that Gegen LLC offered any of the transportation used by Officer Bowser. The facts presented at the hearing clearly suggest otherwise. Officer Bowser testified that he downloaded the Uber app on his smart phone and was required by Uber to register his credit card information with Uber and to provide an email address in order to complete the download of the Uber app. Officer Bowser testified that he then requested service, which was provided on approximately eleven occasions. After the service was provided, Officer Bowser was advised of the charge and made payment with the credit card information previously provided. He testified the invoices indicated the charge was made by Uber.

2. The Need for Relief is Immediate

I & E next asserts that the need for relief is immediate and ongoing. I & E avers it has attempted, on numerous occasions, to stop Uber from unlawfully brokering transportation service using non-certificated drivers, without success, and that Uber continues to broker transportation using uncertificated motor carriers. I & E asserts Uber’s unlicensed operation poses substantial threats to public safety and should not be permitted to continue during the pendency of I & E’s complaint proceedings.

The evidence presented at the hearing indicates that since I & E filed its complaint on June 5, 2014, Uber has not suspended its operation. Evidence at the hearing also establishes that Uber has continued to offer this service as recently as June 24, 2014, despite not having Commission authority. Officer Bowser testified in great detail about his concerns for public safety because of the lack of information concerning the safety and integrity of drivers and vehicles used by Uber in its operation, as well as the lack of information regarding appropriate insurance coverage. He testified that in his view as an enforcement officer, the public is at risk if Uber continues to operate under the current circumstances. Accordingly, I & E has successfully demonstrated that the need for relief in the form of an order for injunctive relief is immediate.

We therefore conclude that I & E has established by a preponderance of the evidence that its need for relief is immediate.

3. The Harm is Irreparable

I & E also avers the injury would be irreparable if relief is not granted. I & E asserts that brokering transportation without a license and using non-certificated drivers to transport passengers is a violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 2505(a). Additionally, I & E asserts that “in regulating motor carrier passenger transportation service, the Commission has a fundamental duty to ensure driver integrity and vehicle safety for the service provided by each carrier.” *Application of Yellow Cab Company of Pittsburgh, Inc., t/a Yellow X, for the right to begin to transport, by motor vehicle, persons in the experimental service of Transportation Network Service for passenger trips originating or terminating within Allegheny County, Pennsylvania*, Docket No. A-2014-2410269 (May 22, 2014), p. 7.

I & E argues that by using uncertificated drivers to transport the public, Uber has unilaterally deprived the Commission of its obligation to ensure driver integrity, vehicle safety and the maintenance of sufficient insurance coverage. I & E further asserts that since Uber drivers are not certificated motor carriers, the Commission cannot be certain that its regulations pertaining to driver safety, 52 Pa.Code §§ 29.501-08, are being met.

It is well settled that aviolation of law constitutes irreparable harm per se. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n v. Israel*, 52 A.2d 347 (1947).

The evidence presented at the hearing establishes thatcurrently there is no Commission oversight of Uber operators and no inspection of the private vehicles providing transportation services. Furthermore, the Commission has no knowledge whether the Uber vehicles are insured, how often they are inspected, and has no information regarding driver histories, policies regarding drivers, criminal records and driving records.

Under the circumstances, the Commission cannot currently determine that the vehicles arranged by Uber comply with its vehicle safety requirements nor that the drivers possess the requisite qualifications to maintain the public safety. The occurrence of a fatal or injurious motor vehicle accident, which could be avoided with appropriate Commission oversight, could be catastrophic.

The Commission cannot accurately determine the existence of adequate insurance coverage for riders using the Uber service in order to ensure the public safety. The occurrence of a fatal or injurious motor vehicle accident, without adequate insurance coverage, could also be catastrophic.

We conclude that I & E has established by a preponderance of the evidence that the harm would be irreparable if the relief requested is not granted.

4. The requested relief is not injurious to the public interest.

The final criterion that I & E must satisfy to obtain interim emergency relief is to prove that the relief requested is not injurious to the public interest. 52 Pa.Code § 3.6(b)(4). We conclude that I & E has established that the relief requested is not injurious to the public interest.

I & E asserts the relief is not injurious to the public interest. I & E argues Uber has no lawful right to broker transportation for compensation between points within the Commonwealth. I & E avers, until Uber becomes licensed and its drivers are certificated, the Commission is unable to guarantee that Uber is brokering transportation using drivers who adhere to the Commission’s safety and insurance regulations, all of which were designed to safeguard the public.

In its answer to the Petition, Uber asserts that by granting the requested relief, the Commission would be ordering a software company to stop operating, without a comprehensive review of whether any activities violate the Code. Such relief, Uber avers, would be injurious to the public interest by depriving the public access to an innovative, economic and reliable service that is not available from traditional transportation providers. Answer ¶ 24.

It is not in the public interest for the Commission to ignore its statutory mandate to oversee brokers and motor carriers through the enforcement of its rules and regulations in order to safeguard the public and to protect against preventable accidents and injuries to the public. It is therefore not in the public interest to permit Uber to continue to provide the contested service, pending a full and complete hearing and providing all parties with a full and fair opportunity to be heard. We therefore conclude that I & E has established by a preponderance of the evidence that the relief requested is not injurious to the public interest.

In conclusion, I & E has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that it is entitled to interim emergency relief, pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 3.6(b). Accordingly, we will grant its request for interim emergency relief.

Pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 3.10(b), the question of granting or denying relief by an interim emergency order shall be certified to the Commission as a material question to be processed in accordance with 52 Pa.Code § 5.305. This order granting interim emergency relief will be certified to the Commission. The Commission will conduct further proceedings on the issues raised by the other pleadings after the Commission has ruled on this order denying interim emergency relief pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.305.

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1.That the Petition for interim emergency relief, filed on June 16, 2014 by

the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement, is granted.

2. That Uber Technologies, Inc., shall immediately cease and desist from utilizing its digital platform to facilitate transportation to passengers utilizing non-certificated drivers in their personal vehicles until such time as it secures appropriate authority from the Commission.

3. That the grant of relief by interim emergency order in the proceedings at Docket Number P-2014-2426846 is hereby certified to the Commission as a material question requiring interlocutory review.

Date: July 1, 2014 **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Mary D. Long

Administrative Law Judge

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Jeffrey A. Watson

Administrative Law Judge
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