

**BEFORE THE
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission	:	
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement	:	
	:	
v.	:	C-2017-2634219
	:	
Jetway Transport Inc. t/a	:	
Main Line Taxi	:	

INITIAL DECISION

Before
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge

INTRODUCTION

This Initial Decision sustains the Complaint filed by the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement and imposes a \$4,431.45 penalty against Jetway Transportation Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi for failing to satisfy its 2016-2017 fiscal year assessment. Jetway Transportation Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi is ordered to pay this penalty amount as well as \$29,543.00 to settle its assessment balance for the fiscal year 2016-2017 within thirty days of the entry date of the Commission's final order in this matter.

HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING

On November 17, 2017, the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (I&E or Complainant) of the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Commission) filed a formal Complaint (Complaint) against Jetway Transportation Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi (Jetway or Respondent) alleging that Respondent violated Section 510(c) of the Public Utility Code (the Code), 66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c), by failing to pay its 2016-2017 Fiscal Year Assessment.

As relief, the Complainant asks that the Respondent pay the outstanding assessment in addition to a civil penalty in the amount of \$7,386. I&E also requests that, if payment of the assessment and civil penalty is not made, the Commission cancel Respondent's Certificate of Public Convenience, refer the matter to the Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General for further action, and certify Respondent's automobile registrations to the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for suspension or revocation.

On December 7, 2017, Respondent requested an extension to file an answer to I&E's Complaint by December 19, 2017. On December 13, 2017, the Commission granted Respondent's request for an extension of time to file an answer.

On December 19, 2017, Respondent filed Preliminary Objections arguing that I&E failed to adhere to the Commission's requirements set forth in 52 Pa.Code § 5.22(a)(7) by failing to attach to its Complaint the following documents: 1) the assessment invoice for the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year; 2) the notice of assessment for the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year; and 3) the certified mailing receipt. According to the Respondent, I&E's failure to attach those documents to the Complaint amounted to insufficient specificity of a pleading and formed the basis for a preliminary objection pursuant to 52 Pa.Code § 5.101(a)(3).

Through the filing of the Preliminary Objections, Susan Halpern, Esq. and Richard M. Meltzer, Esq. entered their appearance on behalf of the Respondent.

On December 28, 2017, I&E filed an Amended Complaint attaching the assessment invoice for the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year, the notice of assessment for the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year, and the certified mailing receipt as exhibits.

On January 17, 2018, the Respondent filed an Answer with New Matter.

A Hearing Notice dated January 14, 2019, notified the parties that an initial call-in telephone hearing was scheduled in this matter for Friday, February 22, 2019, at 10:00 a.m.

A Prehearing Order was issued on February 6, 2019, advising the parties of the date and time of the scheduled hearing, informing them of the procedures applicable to the proceeding, and directing the submission of documents prior to the hearing.

On February 15, 2019, Respondent's counsel filed a Motion requesting a continuance of the scheduled hearing in this matter.

The Complainant did not object to the request for a continuance of the scheduled hearing.

On February 19, 2019, I issued an Order denying the Respondent's Preliminary Objections and granting its request for a continuance of the scheduled hearing. The parties engaged in settlement discussions which were not successful. Tr. 54.

A Hearing Notice dated March 4, 2019, notified the parties that an initial call-in telephonic hearing was scheduled in this matter for Monday, April 1, 2019, at 10:00 a.m.

By e-mail dated March 27, 2019, Richard M. Meltzer, Esq., informed me that his client, Jetway Transport, Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, had notified him that it did not desire to participate in the scheduled hearing and had further advised Mr. Meltzer not to represent it at the hearing.

The initial hearing convened as scheduled on April 1, 2019. Kourtney Myers, Esq., represented the Complainant, and presented the testimony of Yvonne Hess, who is Chief of Finance and Assessment in the Commission's Bureau of Administration. The Complainant sponsored 17 exhibits (I&E Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, 9A, 9B, 10A, and 10B) which were admitted into the record. Neither the Respondent nor a counsel for the Respondent appeared at the hearing.¹

¹ The hearing reconvened at approximately 10:26 a.m. in order to allow the Respondent additional time to join the hearing.

At the hearing, Ms. Myers requested permission to submit, as a late-filed exhibit, Respondent's Notification of Address Change.

On April 8, 2019, I&E submitted its late-filed Exhibit 11. The Respondent did not submit any objections to I&E's late-filed-Exhibit 11.

The record in this matter closed upon receipt of my copy of the transcript on May 2, 2019.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Complainant is I&E.
2. The Respondent is Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, whose mailing address is 400 E. Dekalb Pike, Suite # 1, King of Prussia, PA 19406. I&E late-filed Exhibit 11.
3. Jetway is a corporation authorized by the Commission to transport persons in taxi service. I&E Exhibit 10A.
4. A 2015 Assessment Report filed by Jetway shows that the Respondent had a gross intrastate operating revenue of \$2,255,012. Tr. 11-13, I&E Exhibit 1.
5. In its 2015 Assessment Report, Jetway initially reported \$203,631 in exempt operating revenue. Tr.13, I&E Exhibit 1.
6. Jetway failed to support its claim of \$203,631 in exempt operating revenue during the 2015 calendar year. Tr.13, I&E Exhibit 1.
7. The Commission's Fiscal Office removed the exempt revenue from Jetway's 2015 Assessment Report and on September 8, 2016 sent to Jetway a General

Assessment Invoice for the fiscal year July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017 in the amount of \$29,543.00. Tr. 13, 16-19, I&E Exhibits 2 and 4.

8. Attached to the Assessment Invoice for fiscal year July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017 was a Notice of Assessment explaining how the Commission had calculated the assessment and explaining how Jetway could challenge the assessment. Tr. 18-21, I&E Exhibit 3.

9. The Commission's Fiscal Office uses certified mail to send the general assessment invoices to the public utilities within its jurisdiction. Tr. 22, 24-25; I&E Exhibits 2 and 4.

10. The Commission's assessment records contain a mail receipt for the assessment invoice for fiscal year July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017, signed and dated September 12, 2016. Tr. 22-24, I&E Exhibit 4.

11. Jetway did not file an objection to the assessment for fiscal year July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017 with the Commission. Tr. 25-26.

12. From the time the documents were received, the Respondent had 30 days to pay the assessment. Tr. 25.

13. As of the date of the hearing, Jetway has not paid the invoice for the July 1, 2016-June 30, 2017 assessment. Tr. 26.

14. As of the date of the hearing, Jetway has not paid the invoice for the July 1, 2017-June 30, 2018 assessment in the amount of \$21,682.00. Tr. 26-27.

15. As of the date of the hearing, Jetway has not paid the invoice for the July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019 assessment in the amount of \$7,078.00. Tr. 27.

16. As of the date of the hearing, the total outstanding assessment balance that Jetway owes the Commission is \$58,303.00. Tr. 26.

17. Respondent has been the subject of one other Commission complaint in the three-year period prior to the date of the filing of Complaint, at Docket No. C-2016-2563131. I&E Exhibit 10A.

18. The Respondent paid timely, and in full, the penalty that the Commission imposed at Docket No. C-2016-2563131. Tr. 29; I&E Exhibit 10B.

DISCUSSION

The Commission has the power, and the duty, to enforce the requirements of the Public Utility Code. 66 Pa.C.S. § 501(a). The Commission previously delegated its authority with regard to enforcement of its motor carrier regulations to the Bureau of Transportation and Safety (BTS) with the Law Bureau acting as attorney for BTS. *Delegation of Prosecutory Authority to Bureaus with Enforcement Responsibilities*, Docket No. M-00940593 (Order entered September 2, 1994). The Commission delegated this authority in response to the decision in *Lyness v State Board of Medicine*, 605 A.2d 1204 (Pa. 1992) which prohibited the comingling of prosecutory and adjudicatory functions by Commonwealth agency decision makers. Subsequently, pursuant to Act 129 of 2008, the Commission was reorganized, and the Commission delegated its authority with regard to enforcement of its motor carrier regulations and assessments to I&E. *Implementation of Act 129 of 2008; Organization of Bureaus and Offices*, Docket No. M-2008-2071852 (Order entered August 11, 2011).

Usually, as the participant seeking an order of the Commission, I&E would bear the burden of proof, pursuant to the provisions of 66 Pa.C.S. § 332(a). However, in this case, Jetway has the burden of proving that it complied with the Commission's orders and regulations and the Public Utility Code. *McQuaide v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n*, 629 A.2d 272 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1993). Section 315(b) of the Public Utility Code, 66 Pa.C.S. § 315(b), provides that in a case involving an alleged violation of a determination or order of the Commission by a public utility,

the burden of proof shall be upon the public utility to show that it has complied with the determination or order of the Commission.

At the time the alleged violations occurred, the Commission had authorized Jetway to transport persons in taxi service. As a common carrier that holds out or undertakes the transportation of persons within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Jetway was at the time of the alleged violations, a public utility. 66 Pa.C.S. § 102.

The degree of proof that Jetway must meet to establish its case before the Commission is preponderance of the evidence. *Samuel J. Lansberry, Inc. v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n.*, 578 A.2d 600 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1990), *alloc. denied*, 602 A.2d 863 (Pa. 1992). The phrase "preponderance of the evidence" means that one party has presented evidence that is more convincing, by even the smallest amount, than the evidence presented by the other party. *Selling Hosiery v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950). By refusing to participate at the evidentiary hearing, the Respondent has failed to carry the burden of proof.

Section 510(c) of the Public Utility Code (Code) requires public utilities to pay the Commission's assessment invoices within thirty days of having received notice from the Commission of the amounts assessed. It also gives each public utility the opportunity to challenge its assessment within fifteen days after receiving notice of the assessment. Specifically, section 510(c) provides:

(c) Notice, hearing and payment.--The commission shall give notice by registered or certified mail to each public utility of the amount lawfully charged against it under the provisions of this section, which amount shall be paid by the public utility within 30 days of receipt of such notice, unless the commission specifies on the notices sent to all public utilities an installment plan of payment, in which case each public utility shall pay each installment on or before the date specified therefor by the commission. Within 15 days after receipt of such notice, the public utility against which such assessment has been made may file with the commission objections setting out in detail the grounds upon which the objector regards such assessment to be excessive, erroneous, unlawful or invalid. The commission, after

notice to the objector, shall hold a hearing upon such objections. After such hearing, the commission shall record upon its minutes its findings on the objections and shall transmit to the objector, by registered or certified mail, notice of the amount, if any, charged against it in accordance with such findings, which amount or any installment thereof then due, shall be paid by the objector within ten days after receipt of notice of the findings of the commission with respect to such objections. If any payment prescribed by this subsection is not made as aforesaid, the commission may suspend or revoke certificates of public convenience, certify automobile registrations to the Department of Transportation for suspension or revocation or, through the Department of Justice, may institute an appropriate action at law for the amount lawfully assessed, together with any additional cost incurred by the commission or the Department of Justice by virtue of such failure to pay.

66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c).

The testimony and evidence presented by I&E has demonstrated that Respondent has violated 66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c). The Respondent filed a 2015 Assessment Report with the Commission on April 5, 2016. I&E Exhibit 1. The 2015 Assessment Report was then utilized by the Commission to calculate the Respondent's yearly assessment for the 2016-2017 fiscal year. Tr. 13, 16-19, I&E Exhibits 2 and 4. On September 8, 2016, a General Assessment Invoice in the amount of \$29,543.00 was issued to the Respondent for the July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 fiscal year. *Id.*

At that same time, a Notice of Assessment was also sent to the Respondent for the July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 fiscal year. Tr. 18-21, I&E Exhibit 3. These documents were sent to the Respondent by certified mail. Tr. 22, I&E Exhibit 4. The Respondent received the assessment invoice and notice of assessment on September 12, 2016 and signed an electronic signature form acknowledging receipt of these documents. Tr. 22-24, I&E Exhibit 4.

From the time the documents were received, the Respondent had 30 days to pay the assessment. 66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c); Tr. 25. This means that Respondent's assessment payment was due on or before October 12, 2016. Tr. 25-26. The Respondent never filed an objection to, and has never paid, the 2016-2017 fiscal year assessment. Tr. 25-26. Therefore, the

preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent has violated 66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c).

Having concluded that Respondent has violated the Public Utility Code, I&E's request for a civil penalty must be addressed. Section 3301 of the Public Utility Code provides that if any regulated entity fails to comply with any Commission regulation it shall forfeit and pay to the Commonwealth a sum not exceeding \$ 1,000.00 per day of violation. 66 Pa.C.S. § 3301. To determine the amount of, and whether, a civil penalty should be imposed is governed by the considerations that the Commission first enunciated in *Rosi v. Bell-Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc. and Sprint Communications Company, L.P.*, Docket No. C-00992409 (Order entered March 16, 2000). In *Rosi*, the Commission adopted standards to be applied to determine the amount of the civil penalty in slamming² cases. The Commission also considered these standards when evaluating settlement agreements in slamming cases. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n v. PEPCO Energy Services*, Docket No. M-00001432 (Order entered November 9, 2000). Subsequently, the Commission determined that all violations of the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations would be subject to review under the standards set forth in *Rosi*. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n v. NCIC Operator Serv.*, Docket No. M-00001440 (Order entered Dec. 21, 2000).

The Commission, at 52 Pa.Code § 69.1201, has adopted a policy statement setting forth the standards it will consider in evaluating litigated and settled proceedings involving violations of the Public Utility Code and Commission regulations based in part on the standards in *Rosi*. The standards in 52 Pa.Code § 69.1201(c) provide:

(c) The factors and standards that will be considered by the Commission include the following:

(1) Whether the conduct at issue was of a serious nature. When conduct of a serious nature is involved, such as willful fraud or misrepresentation, the conduct may warrant a higher penalty. When the conduct is less egregious, such as administrative filing or technical errors, it may warrant a lower penalty.

² "Slamming" refers to changing a customer's supply service without authorization. *Rosi*.

(2) Whether the resulting consequences of the conduct at issue were of a serious nature. When consequences of a serious nature are involved, such as personal injury or property damage, the consequences may warrant a higher penalty.

(3) Whether the conduct at issue was deemed intentional or negligent. This factor may only be considered in evaluating litigated cases. When conduct has been deemed intentional, the conduct may result in a higher penalty.

(4) Whether the regulated entity made efforts to modify internal practices and procedures to address the conduct at issue and prevent similar conduct in the future. These modifications may include activities such as training and improving company techniques and supervision. The amount of time it took the utility to correct the conduct once it was discovered and the involvement of top-level management in correcting the conduct may be considered.

(5) The number of customers affected and the duration of the violation.

(6) The compliance history of the regulated entity which committed the violation. An isolated incident from an otherwise compliant utility may result in a lower penalty, whereas frequent, recurrent violations by a utility may result in a higher penalty.

(7) Whether the regulated entity cooperated with the Commission's investigation. Facts establishing bad faith, active concealment of violations, or attempts to interfere with Commission investigations may result in a higher penalty.

(8) The amount of the civil penalty or fine necessary to deter future violations. The size of the utility may be considered to determine an appropriate penalty amount.

(9) Past Commission decisions in similar situations.

(10) Other relevant factors.

52 Pa.Code § 69.1201(c).

Here, I&E provided testimony and evidence regarding the Respondent's

circumstances with the Commission as well as the seriousness of the Respondent's violations. I&E's witness credibly testified that Respondent's continued failure or refusal to pay the 2016-2017 fiscal year assessment was conduct of a serious nature and could have serious consequences given the importance of such assessments to the Commission. The Commission relies solely on assessments for its funding and therefore its continued ability to perform its function as a regulatory agency rests with such payments. Tr. 28. Respondent's failure to pay the 2016-2017 assessment was intentional. In addition to the assessment invoice, the Commission made contact with the Respondent on several occasions to request payment of the assessment. See Tr. 14-16, 54. Despite repeated contact, the Respondent has failed or refused to pay the assessment.

I&E also presented testimony regarding Respondent's compliance history with the Commission. It noted that, in addition to the 2016-2017 assessment, the Respondent has also failed to pay the assessment invoices for the fiscal years 2017-2018 and 2018-2019. As of the date of the hearing, the total outstanding assessment balance that Jetway owes the Commission is \$58,303.00. Tr. 26, 29. Furthermore, the Respondent has been the subject of six other Commission complaints for regulatory violations, five of which date back to 2014 with the sixth one filed in 2016. Tr. 31, I&E Exhibits 5A – 10B.³ I&E argued that the Respondent had made no effort to modify its practices or procedures to ensure timely payment of annual assessments, although it admitted that the Respondent had promptly and fully paid all the penalties that the Commission imposed through the six complaints for regulatory violations mentioned above. Tr. 29. I&E requested a civil penalty in the amount of \$7,386.00 which is 25% of the delinquent 2016-2017 assessment amount. Tr. 27.

In *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement v. West Side Services, Inc.*, Docket No. C-2015-2494535 (Order entered August 3, 2017) (*West Side Services*), the Commission addressed the level of a civil penalty imposed upon a respondent utility through a ruling on a motion for judgment on the pleadings. In *West Side Services*, the

³ For the six other complaints, *see*, I&E Exhibits 5A-5C from Docket No. C-2014-2420594; I&E Exhibits 6A-6B from Docket No. C-2014-2420595; I&E Exhibits 7A-7D from Docket No. C-2016-2450701; I&E Exhibits 8A-8B from Docket No. C-2014-2453523; I&E Exhibits 9A-9B from Docket No. C-2014-2470361; and I&E Exhibits 10A-10B from Docket No. C-2016-2563131.

Commission noted that a utility's compliance history and the need to deter future violations were important considerations when weighing the amount of a civil penalty and that it was reasonable to review Commission records for a period of *three years prior to the date of the filing of a complaint* - up to and including the date of Commission action in the matter before it to determine whether a utility has a satisfactory compliance record.

Although the present case does not involve a motion for judgment on the pleadings, I find no reason to extend the period of compliance review beyond the three-year period delineated in *West Side Services*. Consequently, I find that, while the Respondent has failed or refused to pay its annual assessments of the 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019 fiscal years, it has been the subject of only one other Commission complaint in the three-year period prior to the date of the filing of Complaint, at Docket No. C-2016-2563131. I&E Exhibit 10A. The record indicates that the Respondent paid the penalty timely and in full. I&E Exhibit 10B. I find the Respondent's compliance history to be better than the compliance history considered by the Commission in *West Side Services* when it determined that a civil penalty based on 25% of the outstanding assessment amount was appropriate. I also note that the assessment invoices for the fiscal years 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 are indicative of a continuous and steep decline in the Respondent's operating revenue in the calendar years 2016 and 2017 respectively. Tr. 26-27, 16-21.

Based on a review of the testimony and evidence and the standards set forth above, a civil penalty in the amount of \$4,431.45, which is 15% of the delinquent 2016-2017 assessment amount, is appropriate for the violations set forth in the Complaint. This level of penalty better reflects the Respondent's compliance history while providing a sufficient deterrent against future violations by the Respondent. 52 Pa.Code § 69.1201, see also *West Side Services*. Additionally, such an amount is consistent with civil penalties levied in other cases in which a utility has a history of failure to comply with Commission regulations and the Public Utility Code. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n v. Beverly A. Hall and Rich Lengel t/a Lemirage Limousine*, Docket No. C-2012-2315797 (Order entered January 24, 2013) (the Commission directed a limousine carrier to pay its outstanding assessment balance and a civil penalty equal to 15% of

the outstanding assessment balance) and *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n v. Wanish Limousine Service LTD*, Docket No. C-2014-2459320 (Order entered October 25, 2016).

Respondent will be directed to pay its total outstanding 2016-2017 assessment in the amount of \$29,543.00 and the civil penalty in the amount of \$4,431.45. If Respondent fails to pay the assessment and civil penalty within 30 days of the date of service of this order, its automobile registrations will be certified to the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for suspension or revocation and the matter will be referred to the Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General for appropriate action.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this proceeding. 66 Pa.C.S. §§ 501(b), 701.
2. The Commission has the power, and the duty, to enforce the requirements of the Public Utility Code. 66 Pa.C.S. § 501(a).
3. In a case involving an alleged violation of a determination or order of the Commission by a public utility, the burden of proof shall be upon the public utility to show that it has complied with the determination or order of the Commission. 66 Pa.C.S. § 315(b).
4. As the holder of a Commission-issued certificate of public convenience, Respondent has a duty to comply with Commission orders and regulations. 66 Pa.C.S. § 501(c).
5. A public utility is required to pay the Commission's assessment invoices within thirty days of having received notice from the Commission of the amounts assessed or challenge its assessment within fifteen days after receiving notice of the assessment. 66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c).

6. Respondent's failure to pay the 2016-2017 annual assessment in the amount of \$29,543.00 is a violation of 66 Pa.C.S. § 510(c).

7. If any regulated entity fails to comply with any Commission regulation it shall forfeit and pay to the Commonwealth a sum not exceeding \$ 1,000.00 per day of violation. 66 Pa.C.S. § 3301.

8. Whether a civil penalty should be imposed is governed by the considerations enunciated in *Rosi v. Bell-Atlantic-Pennsylvania, Inc. and Sprint Communications Company, L.P.*, Docket No. C-00992409 (Order entered March 16, 2000).

9. All violations of the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations are subject to review under the standards set forth in *Rosi. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n v. NCIC Operator Serv.*, Docket No. M-00001440 (Order entered Dec. 21, 2000).

10. The standards which will be considered in evaluating proceedings involving violations of the Public Utility Code and Commission regulations are set forth in the Commission's policy statement at 52 Pa.Code § 69.1201.

11. A civil penalty in the amount of \$4,431.45 is reasonable and appropriate. *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n, Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement v. West Side Services, Inc.*, Docket No. C-2015-2494535 (Order entered August 3, 2017).

ORDER

THEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED:

1. That I&E late-filed Exhibit 11 is admitted into the record.

2. That the Complaint filed by the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement against Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi at Docket No. C-2017-2634219 is sustained.

3. That within **thirty (30) days** of the entry date of the Commission's final order in this matter, Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, shall remit \$33,974.45 payable by check, money order, or certified funds, to:

Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission
400 North Street
Harrisburg, PA 17120

4. That, if Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, fails to make the payment required by Ordering Paragraph No. 3 above within thirty days of the entry date of the Commission's final order in this matter:

- a. The Certificate of Public Convenience held by Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, shall be cancelled without further action by this Commission;
- b. The Bureau of Administrative Services, Assessment Section, shall refer this matter to the Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General for appropriate action; and
- c. A copy of this Opinion and Order shall be served upon the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, pursuant to Chapter 13 of the Vehicle Code, 75 Pa.C.S. §§ 1301-1379, and the Commission will request that the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation put an administrative hold on Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi's vehicle registrations. Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, will

not be able to register any new vehicles or renew any existing vehicle registrations until all past due assessments are paid, all past due fines are paid, all insurance filings are up to date, and it holds an active Certificate of Public Convenience issued by this Commission.

5. That, after Jetway Transport Inc. t/a Main Line Taxi, remits \$33,974.45 as required by Ordering Paragraph No. 3, the Secretary's Bureau shall mark this proceeding closed.

Date: July 12, 2019

_____/s/
Eranda Vero
Administrative Law Judge