



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION  
COMMONWEALTH KEYSTONE BUILDING  
400 NORTH STREET, HARRISBURG, PA 17120

BUREAU OF  
INVESTIGATION  
&  
ENFORCEMENT

November 18, 2025

**Via Electronic Filing**

Matthew L. Homsher, Secretary  
Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Re: Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement v. Best Taxi, LLC  
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement v. Good Cab, LLC  
Consolidated Cases  
Docket Nos. C-2022-3029070  
C-2022-3029079

**I&E Answer to Petition for Reconsideration from Staff Action**

Dear Secretary Homsher:

Enclosed for electronic filing please find the Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement's ("I&E") **Answer to Petition for Reconsideration from Staff Action of Best Taxi, LLC and Good Cab, LLC** ("Respondents") that Respondent filed November 8, 2025, in the above-referenced proceeding. Copies have been served on the parties of record in accordance with the Certificate of Service.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'G. Rosul', written over a light blue horizontal line.

Grant Rosul  
Prosecutor  
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement  
PA Attorney ID No. 318204  
(717) 783-5243  
[grosul@pa.gov](mailto:grosul@pa.gov)

GR/nb  
Enclosures

cc: Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Gail M. Chiodo (*via email* – [gchiodo@pa.gov](mailto:gchiodo@pa.gov))  
Office of Special Assistants (*via email* – [ra-OSA@pa.gov](mailto:ra-OSA@pa.gov))  
Per Certificate of Service

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Best Taxi, LLC	:	Docket Nos.    C-2022-3029070
	:	C-2022-3029079
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement	:	
	:	Consolidated Cases
v.	:	
	:	
Good Cab, LLC	:	

**ANSWER TO PETITION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
FROM STAFF ACTION OF BEST TAXI, LLC AND GOOD CAB, LLC**

TO THE HONORABLE PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION:

Pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.61(a), the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission’s (“Commission”) Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement (“I&E”), by its prosecuting attorney, hereby files its Answer to the Petitions for Reconsideration from Staff Action of Best Taxi, LLC and Good Cab, LLC (“Respondents”) which were filed on November 8, 2025, requesting reconsideration of the revocation of the Respondents’ respective certificates of public convenience as well as a stay of the Commission’s Final Order in these consolidated cases.

I&E opposes the Respondents’ Petition. I&E opposes the request for a stay of the Commission’s Final Order in these consolidated cases because Respondents have not demonstrated they are entitled to a stay. Further, in a Petition for Reconsideration from Staff Act, the burden is on the petitioning party to demonstrate that it is entitled to the relief it seeks by a preponderance of evidence, and Respondents have not met that burden here.

## **I. HISTORY OF THE PROCEEDING**

1. On February 9, 2022, I&E filed a Formal Complaint against Best Taxi LLC (“Best Taxi” or “Respondent”) alleging the following two violations:

- a. Allowed one driver to operate a taxicab who is disqualified due to being convicted of a felony or misdemeanor relating to the suitability of the driver to provide safe and legal service in violation of 52 Pa. Code § 29.505(b)(1); and
- b. Failed to require the driver to maintain log sheets for all trips, in violation of 52 Pa. Code § 29.313(c).

For the first offense, I&E sought a fine of \$1,000; and for the second offense, a fine of \$50.

These proposed fines total \$1,050. The prosecution against Best Taxi is docketed at No. C-2022-3029070 (“Best Taxi”).

2. On February 14, 2022, I&E filed a Formal Complaint against Good Cab, LLC (“Good Cab” or “Respondent”) alleging the following three violations:

- a. Failed to obtain and review the criminal histories of three employee drivers prior to allowing the employees to operate the company’s vehicles, in violation of 52 Pa. Code § 29.505(b)(1);
- b. Allowed one employee driver to operate who was disqualified due to being convicted of a felony or misdemeanor relating to the suitability of the driver to provide safe and legal service, in violation of 52 Pa. Code § 29.505(b)(1); and
- c. Failed to require the employee drivers to maintain log sheets for all trips, in violation of 52 Pa. Code § 29.313(c).

For the first offense, I&E sought a fine of \$250 per violation for each of the three employees totaling \$750; for the second offense, a fine of \$1,000; and for the third offense, a fine of \$50.

These proposed fines total \$1,800. The prosecution against Good Cab was docketed at No. C-2022-3029079 (“Good Cab”).

3. On September 23, 2022, an Order was entered consolidating Docket Nos. C-2022-3029070 and C-2022-3029079 for litigation and resolution pursuant to 52 Pa. Code § 5.81.

4. On June 18, 2025, Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Chiodo (“DCALJ Chiodo”) issued an Initial Decision sustaining the Formal Complaints against Best Taxi, LLC, Docket No. C-2022- 3029070, and Good Cab, LLC, Docket No. C-2022- 3029079, and assessing civil penalties of \$1,050 and \$1,800, respectively.

5. The Secretary’s Initial Decision Letter, dated June 18, 2025, properly contained details clearly advising that Exceptions must be filed within twenty (20) days of the date of the Secretary’s Letter.

6. The twenty (20) day period of time in which to file Exceptions expired on Tuesday, July 8, 2025.

7. On July 18, 2025, Respondents filed untimely Exceptions.

8. On July 28, 2025, I&E filed its Reply Exceptions and Motion to Strike Untimely Filed Exceptions.

9. On September 25, 2025, the Commission issued an Opinion and Order in these consolidated cases, adopting the Initial Decision of Deputy Chief Administrative Law Judge Chiodo and sustaining I&E’s complaint, and striking Respondents’ untimely filed exceptions.

10. Additionally, the Commission’s September 25, 2025, Opinion and Order provided the following:

- a. That if payments totaling \$1,050 pursuant to Ordering Paragraph No. 6 above are not received by the Commission within thirty (30) days after entry of this Opinion and Order, the Commission’s Bureau of Technical Utility Services shall suspend or revoke Best Taxi LLC’s Certificate of Public Convenience at Docket No. A-2016-2529890.

- b. That if payments totaling \$1,800 pursuant to Ordering Paragraph No. 7 above are not received by the Commission within thirty (30) days after entry of this Opinion and Order, the Commission's Bureau of Technical Utility Services shall suspend or revoke Good Cab LLC's Certificate of Public Convenience at Docket No. A-0012086.

*Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement v. Best Taxi LLC and Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement v. Good Cab LLC*, Docket Nos. C-2022-3029070 and C-2022-3029079 (consolidated cases), September 25, 2025, Ordering ¶¶8-9, p. 26.

11. Neither Respondent paid the civil penalty imposed by the September 25, 2025, Order within the timeframe specified by the Commission.

12. Neither Respondent requested a stay of the Commission's September 25, 2025, Order prior to the revocation of their operating authorities.

13. On October 7, 2025, Respondents filed a notice of appeal.

14. On October 28, 2025, Best Taxi's certificate of public convenience at A-2016-2529890 was cancelled for non-compliance with the Commission's September 25, 2025, Order.

15. On October 28, 2025, Good Cab's certificate of public convenience at A-00120846 was cancelled for non-compliance with the Commission's September 25, 2025, Order.

16. On November 8, 2025, both Respondents filed separate Petitions for Reconsideration from Staff Action, requesting that each Respondent's respective certificate of public convenience be reinstated and that the Commission grant a stay of its September 25, 2025, Order *nunc pro tunc*.

**II. RESPONDENTS DO NOT MEET THE STANDARD FOR THE GRANTING OF A STAY, AND THEIR REQUEST FOR A STAY SHOULD BE DENIED**

17. A party is entitled to stay if:

- a. The petitioner makes a strong showing that he is likely to prevail on the merits;
- b. The petitioner has shown that without the requested relief, he will suffer irreparable injury;
- c. The issuance of a stay will not substantially harm other interested parties in the proceedings; and
- d. The issuance of a stay will not adversely affect the public interest.

18. For a stay pending appellate review, such as the case at bar, Commission and Pennsylvania Supreme Court precedent require that “the petitioner must make a ‘strong showing’ under these criteria to justify the issuance of a stay.” *Michael and Sharon Hartman v. PPL Electric Utilities Corporation*, Docket No. C-2019-3008272 (Order and Opinion entered March 27, 2025) (citing *Pa. Pub. Util. Comm’n. v. Process Gas Consumers Group*, 467 A.2d 805 (Pa. 1983)).

19. In their Petitions, the Respondents provide an outline of their argument, which has already been addressed by the Commission’s September 25 Order, that the Commission’s regulations violate the Pennsylvania constitution.

20. This is not a “strong showing,” and for the reasons put forth by DCALJ Chiodo and the Commission, the Respondents are unlikely to prevail on the merits of their case before the Commonwealth Court.

21. Further, the Respondents claim that they will suffer irreparable injury if the Commission’s September 25, 2025, Order is not stayed.

22. While it may be true that Respondents will suffer an irreparable injury stemming from the loss of their certificates of public convenience, that is a consequence of their own failure to adhere to the Commission's September 25, 2025, Order.

23. Respondents provided no explanation of how the continued enforcement of the Commission's regulations regarding driver criminal history restrictions will cause them to suffer irreparable injury.

24. Similarly, Respondents have not made a strong showing that the relatively small monetary civil penalty imposed in these consolidated cases will cause them to suffer an irreparable injury.

25. Respondent further argues that the public interest will be served by their continued operation.

26. However, I&E believes that the public interest would be better served by common carriers that are compliant with Commission regulations and Commission orders.

27. Given the posture of the case, if the Commission was to stay its September 25, 2025, Order, I&E would no longer be able to enforce the Commission's regulation at 52 Pa. Code § 29.505(b) for the pendency of this litigation.

28. Thus, a stay would adversely affect I&E, and its ability to enforce the Public Utility Code and the Commission's regulations.

### **III. RESPONDENTS HAVE NOT CARRIED THEIR BURDEN TO SHOW THAT THE REQUESTED RELIEF IS IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST**

29. In addition to their request for a stay, Respondents request reconsideration from staff action, namely the revocation of their authority to operate as common carriers of persons within the Commonwealth.

30. Section 332(a) of the Code, 66 Pa. C.S. § 332(a), provides that the party seeking affirmative relief from the Commission has the burden of proof. *Borough of Middletown v. Pa. Pub. Util. Comm'n.*, 301 A.3d 965, 974-975 (Pa. Commw. 2023).

31. Respondents must prove their burden by a preponderance of the evidence. *Application of 610 Hauling, LLC, t/a College Hunks Hauling Junk, for the right to begin to transport, as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, household goods in use, from points in the counties of Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, Philadelphia, and Bucks, to points in Pennsylvania*, Docket Nos. A-2012-2334103 and A-8915269 (Opinion and Order entered November 5, 2015) (citing *Se-Ling Hosiery, Inc. v. Margulies*, 70 A.2d 854 (Pa. 1950)).

32. A “preponderance of the evidence means that one party has presented evidence that is more convincing, by even the slightest degree, than the evidence presented by the opposing party.” *610 Hauling, LLC t/a College Hunks Hauling Junk*, A-2012-2334103 and A-8915269 (Opinion and Order entered November 5, 2015).

33. When evaluating an applicant seeking common carrier authority, the Commission will consider a number of factors, including “[a]n applicant's record, if any, of compliance with 66 Pa.C.S. (relating to Public Utility Code), this title and the Commission's orders.” 52 Pa. Code § 41.14(5).

34. Respondents’ Petitions consist of a re-argument of its earlier claim that the Commission’s regulations at 52 Pa. Code § 29.505 are unconstitutional, which the Commission has already addressed in its September 25, 2025, Opinion and Order.

35. Respondents were served with the Commission’s September 25, 2025, Opinion and Order directing them to remit their respective civil penalties within 30 days of the date of the entry of that order, i.e., by October 25, 2025.

36. Respondents were warned that failure to comply with the Commission's September 25, 2025, Opinion and Order, would result in the suspension or revocation of their respective certificates of public convenience.

37. Notably, Respondents have not paid the outstanding civil penalties imposed by the Commission as of the date of this filing.

38. Respondents have not explained why they have not complied with the Commission's September 25, 2025, Opinion and Order.

39. Therefore, Respondents have not demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence that they are entitled to the relief sought, specifically the return of their authority to operate as a common carrier of persons.

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Petition for Reconsideration from Staff Action filed by Respondent on November 8, 2025, should be DENIED.

Respectfully submitted,



Grant Rosul  
Prosecutor  
PA Attorney ID No. 318204

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
(717) 783-5243  
[grosul@pa.gov](mailto:grosul@pa.gov)

Date: November 18, 2025

**BEFORE THE  
PENNSYLVANIA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION**

Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Best Taxi, LLC	:	Docket Nos. C-2022-3029070
	:	C-2022-3029079
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement	:	
	:	Consolidated Cases
v.	:	
	:	
Good Cab, LLC	:	

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day served a true copy of the foregoing document upon the parties, listed below, in accordance with the requirements of 52 Pa. Code § 1.54 (relating to service by a party).

**Service via Electronic Mail:**

Cory A. Leshner, Esq.  
Mette, Evans & Woodside  
3401 North Front Street  
P.O. Box 5950  
Harrisburg, PA 17110  
[caleshner@mette.com](mailto:caleshner@mette.com)  
*Counsel for Best Taxi, LLC and Good Cab, LLC*



\_\_\_\_\_  
Grant Rosul  
Prosecutor  
PA Attorney ID No. 318204

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission  
Bureau of Investigation and Enforcement  
Commonwealth Keystone Building  
400 North Street  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
(717) 783-5243  
[grosul@pa.gov](mailto:grosul@pa.gov)

Dated: November 18, 2025