

Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Shuvo

OATH Index No. 1620/23 (Jan. 5, 2023), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Jan. 9, 2023), **appended**

Petitioner suspended respondent's TLC Driver License following his arrest for an off-duty incident. At a post-suspension hearing, petitioner failed to prove that respondent's continuing licensure poses a continuing "direct and substantial threat" to the public's health or safety. Lifting of suspension recommended.

NEW YORK CITY OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

In the Matter of
TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION
Petitioner
- against -
ABDUS SHUVO
Respondent

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

FAYE LEWIS, *Administrative Law Judge*

Petitioner, the Taxi and Limousine Commission ("TLC"), brought this summary suspension proceeding against respondent, Abdus Shuvo, holder of a TLC Driver License. Admin. Code § 19-512.1 (Lexis 2022); 35 RCNY § 68-15(d) (Lexis 2022). On November 18, 2022, petitioner suspended respondent's TLC Driver License after receiving notice of his arrest the day before (Pet. Ex. 3).

The initial arrest and complaint reports indicate that respondent was arrested for assault in the third degree (intentionally causing physical injury), criminal mischief in the fourth degree (intentionally removing or disabling a phone to prevent an emergency call), and harassment (Pet. Ex. 5). The criminal court complaint, signed on November 17, 2022, by the arresting officer, charged respondent with harassment, criminal mischief in the fourth degree, attempted assault, criminal obstruction of breathing, and endangering the welfare of a child (Resp. Ex. A). The WebCrims summary indicates that respondent was arraigned on November 18, 2022, on charges of criminal mischief in the fourth degree, harassment, attempted assault in the third degree, and criminal obstruction of breathing. At arraignment, respondent was released on his own

recognizance and a temporary order of protection was issued. Respondent's criminal case is pending. His next court date is February 22, 2023 (Pet. Ex. 4).

Petitioner contends that the child endangerment charge should be considered, because it is included in the criminal complaint. However, the record fails to establish that the child endangerment charge against respondent is still pending, or even that respondent was arraigned on that charge. The criminal court complaint was signed the day before arraignment. There was an additional Criminal Court appearance on December 12, 2022. The WebCrims summary is dated December 14, 2022, after the December 12th appearance (Pet. Ex. 4). Given the ambiguity in the record, the inclusion of the child endangerment charge in the criminal complaint is not a basis for continued suspension.

While disagreeing about the pendency of the child endangerment charge, the parties agree that of the charges listed in the WebCrims, only criminal obstruction of breathing, an A misdemeanor, merits summary suspension (Tr. 65). *See* 35 RCNY §§ 68-15(d)(1)(ii)(C), 68-15(d)(1)(ii)(K). The assault charge on which respondent was initially arrested also does not permit continued suspension, as it is no longer pending. *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Bhuyan*, OATH Index No. 969/22 at 3 (Dec. 22, 2021), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Dec. 29, 2021) (although respondent was arrested for the felony of second-degree strangulation, respondent was ultimately not charged with the felony and thus it "cannot support the continued suspension of respondent's license").

Petitioner contends that respondent's suspension should be continued pending the outcome of his criminal case because permitting him to drive as a TLC licensee would pose a direct and substantial threat to public health and safety (Pet. Ex. 1). Respondent opposes continued suspension of his license and asserts that he does not pose a direct and substantial danger to the public.

At a post-suspension hearing held by videoconference on December 20, 2022, petitioner relied solely on documentary evidence. Respondent testified in his own behalf, called a character witness, Kamil Sumon, and produced documentary evidence. An interpreter provided translation for respondent and Mr. Sumon. For the reasons below, I find that petitioner failed to prove that respondent poses a continuing direct and substantial threat to public health or safety. I recommend that respondent's suspension be lifted.

ANALYSIS

Petitioner may suspend a TLC Driver License before a hearing “for good cause shown relating to a direct and substantial threat to the public health or safety.” Admin. Code § 19-512.1. As the Second Circuit has held, to continue a license suspension, TLC must show that the driver poses a continuing threat to the public that is both “direct” and “substantial.” *Nnebe v. Daus*, 931 F.3d 66, 82 (2d Cir. 2019). If a license is suspended based solely on an arrest, the licensee may challenge that at a post-suspension hearing, where petitioner has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that the charges, “if true, demonstrate that the continuation of the License while awaiting a decision on the criminal charges would pose a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.” 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(5). The analysis encompasses “the conduct underlying the arrest and the overall record and character of the driver.” *Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 82. More specifically, relevant considerations include the circumstances underlying the charges, including any nexus between the driver’s duties and the alleged offense; the licensee’s driving record; the licensee’s previous criminal record, or lack of record; and the driver’s “character and standing in the community.” 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(5).

Even if a driver is charged with an act that endangered public health or safety, that may be “insufficient to demonstrate that the driver would *continue* to pose a threat if allowed to retain his or her license.” *Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 82 (emphasis in the original). The Court noted that “in the majority of cases, the further removed the crime is from the driver’s job, the less ‘direct’ the threat,” and that “[d]epending on the surrounding circumstances and the driver’s history, the threat may also be more or less ‘substantial.’” *Id.* Other considerations include whether the charged crime is the “sole infraction in an otherwise spotless record” and whether the underlying conduct, even if it satisfies the elements of a crime, “was technical or mitigated, such that continuation of the driver’s license did not pose the kind of threat conjured by the general nature of the crime charged.” *Id.*

Our cases have applied this standard. *Compare Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Sylla*, OATH Index No. 202/22 (Apr. 22, 2022), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Apr. 26, 2022) (suspension lifted for driver charged with criminal obstruction of breathing where there was no allegation that the complainant, respondent’s wife, suffered an injury or sought medical attention, this was respondent’s first arrest, and the incident appeared to be an isolated and aberrational event); *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Singh*, OATH Index No. 1913/20 at 4-5 (Apr. 24, 2020), *adopted*,

Comm'r Dec. (May, 1, 2020) (suspension lifted for licensee charged with criminal obstruction of breathing where credible testimony of driver and two other witnesses showed that he “reacted to extraordinary provocation” and he presented unrefuted evidence of an unblemished TLC record); *with Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Frimpong-Manson*, OATH Index No. 1841/20 at 5 (May 5, 2020), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (May 26, 2020) (suspension continued for long-term driver charged with assault and attempted criminal obstruction of breathing where the complainant, his wife, alleged injury and was taken to the hospital, and the driver offered no mitigating testimony or explanation); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Jimenez-Revolta*, OATH Index No. 1974/20 (May 19, 2020), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (June 12, 2020) (suspension continued for driver charged with criminal obstruction of breathing who testified that he had never been arrested and had excellent Uber ratings where the police reports alleged that the complainant, his girlfriend, lost consciousness as a result of the choking, and the driver did not testify about the circumstances underlying his arrest).

Respondent was 31 years old when arrested and the complainant is his wife (Pet. Ex. 3; Tr. 43). According to the arrest and complaint reports, he was arrested on November 17, 2022, at 1:20 p.m., and charged with various offenses including assault, but not including criminal obstruction of breathing (Pet. Ex. 5). The reports list the “occurrence date” as “on” or “from” November 15, at 6:00 p.m., and the date and time “reported” as November 17, 2022, at 1:20 p.m. (Pet. Ex. 5). The reports state that the complainant indicated that she and respondent had a dispute because he did not want to have “dinner” (the reports contain a word before “dinner,” but it is redacted). The complainant said that respondent kicked her in the left hip while she was “holding (word redacted), causing pain to side.” The complainant also said that respondent grabbed her cell phone from her hand and refused to give it back when she tried to call the police. Both reports note that the complainant refused medical attention, but the complaint report notes that the complainant was “physically injured” and characterizes the type of injury as “apparent minor injury.” In addition, the word “YES” is typed next to three printed questions on the complaint report asking if the victim was “fearful for their safety/life,” if there was “Escalating violence/abuse by suspect,” and if prior domestic incident reports were prepared for the complainant (Pet. Ex. 5).

The criminal court complaint, introduced by respondent, goes into further detail about the complainant’s allegations. The police officer who took the complaint said that the complainant told him that on November 15, 2022, at about 6:00 p.m., respondent threw a paper towel holder in

her direction. The paper towel roll came off the holder and struck the complainant on her upper body. Respondent also took the complainant's cell phone from her hand when she said that she was calling the police, preventing her from calling. Further, respondent kicked her hip, causing her pain, while she was holding her one-year old son. Then, on November 17, 2022, at about 11:45 a.m., respondent wrapped both of his hands around her neck "and applied pressure," causing pain to her neck as well as "annoyance and alarm." At the time, her son was standing next to her and holding onto her clothing (Resp. Ex. A).¹

Petitioner did not introduce any documentation relating to respondent's licensing history (other than the driver display information), driving record, or prior involvement with the criminal justice system.

Respondent testified that he has been a TLC licensee for four years. He drives for Uber and Lyft, making over 2000 trips per year (Tr. 40, 41). He denied ever assaulting or threatening to assault a passenger, or ever having been accused of doing so. This is his first arrest (Tr. 41, 42). This is also the first time that the TLC has suspended his license. He has never gotten any TLC violations other than traffic violations (Tr. 42). In addition, respondent has no points on his New York State driver's license (Tr. 42). Out of a possible score of 5.0, his Uber rating is 4.99, and his Lyft rating is 5.0 (Tr. 42-43).

According to respondent, he was arrested at his house on November 17, 2022, after he and his wife both called the police. He testified that his wife called the police after her mother told her to call and say that respondent had assaulted her (Tr. 43-44). He called the police because for the prior three days, his wife had been "misbehaving," "assaulting" him and threatening to take his children away from him (Tr. 44). He and his wife had been arguing because she and her parents wanted to do things her way (Tr. 46, 52). She had been threatening him if he did not agree (Tr. 46, 52). When he went out of their home, his wife would call and tell him not to come home and that she would not let him in. When he came home anyway, she would argue with him and if he tried to get close to their children (ages 10 and 20 months), she would take them away from him, push him away, and curse at him. His in-laws were also involved (Tr. 46-48). Although it was

¹ Respondent's counsel provided a redacted version of the criminal court complaint, which I took into evidence. However, the redactions counsel made were unnecessary as they related to the language of the Penal Law sections charged. Other redactions should have been made, relating to the name of the complainant and the name of the minor child. Accordingly, I have taken the criminal court complaint into evidence, redacted only with regard to the name of the complainant and the child.

unclear precisely when, his mother-in-law came to stay at their home towards the beginning of this dispute. One child stayed near his mother-in-law and the other near his wife, and if he tried to get close to his children, they would start calling him names and curse (Tr. 54). His wife also called her father to come over (Tr. 46). At one point she packed all his clothes and put them outside (Tr. 47).

Respondent denied using physical force against his wife when she pushed him; rather, he just moved away (Tr. 47). He never struck, kicked, strangled, pushed, or in any way tried to assault her (Tr. 44-45, 48). He explained that his wife never before accused him of assaulting her (Tr. 48-49). Asked why he called the police on November 17 and not in the previous few days, respondent said that he was trying his best to “have patience” and hoping that his wife would “calm down” (Tr. 52). However, “nothing changed” (Tr. 52). Before this, when he and his wife argued, they would talk about it afterwards and apologize to each other (Tr. 53). But here, she had involved her parents, and “this time they got together, and they tried to push me away from my house,” which is why he called the police (Tr. 53).

Respondent also introduced evidence this was his first arrest for a crime, including the New York State “fingerprint response summary” (Resp. Ex. B), and the pretrial release assessment completed on November 17, 2022 (Resp. Ex. C).

Mr. Sumon, respondent’s character witness, testified that he is a good friend of respondent. He has known respondent for about six years and used to work with him in a restaurant (Tr. 58, 60). Currently, Mr. Sumon drives for Uber (Tr. 58). He has been to respondent’s house for gatherings where respondent’s wife was also present (Tr. 59). He has never seen respondent strike or threaten his wife (Tr. 59). Indeed, he characterized respondent as a “peace-loving person,” and said he had never seen respondent do anything violent or threaten anyone (Tr. 59).

The issue to be determined is whether, assuming the pending criminal charges against respondent to be true, petitioner has established that respondent’s continued licensure would pose a direct and substantial danger to public health or safety. The analysis focuses on “whether the conduct underlying the arrest and the overall record and character of the driver confirms or disproves the arrest’s relation to public health or safety.” *Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 82. As set forth below, the allegations in the police report and criminal court complaint were troubling and I did not find respondent to be entirely credible in discussing his conduct immediately prior to the arrest. However, there were substantial inconsistencies between the police reports and criminal court

complaint, the complainant refused medical attention and there is no evidence that she sustained significant physical injury, and respondent offered un rebutted evidence that he has never before been arrested or suspended, has not received TLC violations other than traffic violations, has driven thousands of passengers, and has never assaulted or been accused of assaulting a passenger. Taken as a whole, the record does not support a finding that continued suspension is necessary to ensure public safety.

Respondent is charged with criminal obstruction of breathing. This charge is somewhat “removed” from his job as it does not arise from his interactions as a licensee with other TLC drivers or passengers. Rather, the charge stems from a complaint made by respondent’s wife relating to purported conduct by respondent in their home. However, there is a nexus between criminal obstruction of breathing, which is a crime of violence, and the respondent’s obligations as a TLC licensee towards passengers and other drivers. *See, e.g., Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Masum*, OATH Index No. 2012/20 at 6 (June 1, 2020), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (June 12, 2020) (noting that drivers must maintain “self-control and professionalism in their many interactions with passengers, other drivers, and other members of the public”); *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Zulfiqar*, OATH Index No. 1575/20 at 5 (Mar. 16, 2020), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Apr. 13, 2020) (crimes involving domestic violence may demonstrate “a general lack of self-control, concern for the welfare of others, and disregard for the law” (internal citation omitted)). Thus, as in any other summary suspension case, “an individualized assessment” of the relevant circumstances is required, including evidence relating to the incident leading to the arrest and the driver’s overall character and record. *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Kamal*, OATH Index No. 1495/21 (Mar. 16, 2021), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Mar. 18, 2021) (lifting suspension of driver charged with assault stemming from domestic violence incident; even though driver implausibly denied ever striking his wife, he was a TLC licensee for almost 22 years with an unblemished record, the complainant provided the police with shifting accounts of what occurred, and there was no evidence that she suffered injury requiring medical care).

The circumstances underlying respondent’s arrest are unclear. Respondent denied ever putting his hands on his wife’s throat, but that denial has no weight under the TLC rules, which require that the pending criminal charge, criminal obstruction of breathing, be considered “true.” *See Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 90 (“[w]e see no constitutional infirmity in a process that allows for context-specific findings but does not open the question of a driver's factual guilt of the criminal charges”).

There is a difference between offering mitigating evidence about the circumstances underlying an arrest, as *Nnebe* permits, and completely denying any conduct giving rise to the criminal charge, as respondent did here. Compare *Kamal*, OATH 1495/21 at 7 (driver gave credible testimony that the complainant was the initial aggressor in that she threw coffee at him while he was driving); *Singh*, OATH 1913/20 at 4 (driver presented evidence that complainant was the initial aggressor and that he came to the aid of his sister); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Ibrahim*, OATH Index No. 891/20 (Nov. 25, 2019), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Dec. 9, 2019) (driver established that complainant grabbed his license and bit him when he tried to retrieve it), with *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Hamizane*, OATH Index No. 663/21 at 10 (Dec. 11, 2020), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Dec. 30, 2020) (license suspension continued where driver “simply denied committing the assault” rather than offering evidence in mitigation); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Raj*, OATH Index No. 298/21 at 4 (Sept. 23, 2020), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Oct. 6, 2020) (in recommending continued suspension, noting that instead of offering mitigating testimony, driver “simply denied that an assault occurred”).

Moreover, respondent did not clearly explain the circumstances that led to the police being called on November 17, 2022. However, he explained that there had been a prolonged dispute beginning several days before between himself, on the one hand, and his wife and her parents, on the other. According to respondent, the dispute started with an argument, then escalated when his wife called her parents, and continued for several days as his wife, sometimes with the assistance of her parents, pushed him, cursed at him, threw his clothes outside, and kept his children away from him. Despite the continuing dispute, the police were not called until November 17. Asked why, respondent stated that his wife and her parents were trying to force him out of his house. Yet since the family dispute with his wife and her parents began several days earlier, it was unclear what was different on November 17 as opposed to November 15. Although I credited respondent's testimony about the family dispute that began several days earlier, respondent was notably vague about precisely what precipitated his arrest, which undermined his credibility. See *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Zatout*, OATH Index No.186/22 (Aug. 13, 2021), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Aug. 31, 2021) (continuation of license suspension of driver charged with forcible touching and sexual abuse recommended where driver denied any wrongdoing and gave inconsistent and ambiguous testimony relating to circumstances leading up to his arrest on domestic violence charges); *Hamizane*, OATH 663/21 at 9 (noting “certain gaps and inconsistencies in respondent's testimony” that detracted from his credibility); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Abbas*, OATH Index

No. 896/20 (Nov. 25, 2019) (in recommending continued suspension of driver charged with assault for punching his wife in the head, finding driver's testimony "unclear, inconsistent, and uncorroborated").

The arrest and complaint report, as well as the criminal court complaint, contain serious allegations about what occurred. According to the arrest and complaint report, the complainant alleged that respondent kicked her in the left hip at about 6 p.m. on November 15. According to the complaint report, previous domestic incident reports had been prepared, the complainant was fearful for her life, and there had been "escalating violence/abuse by respondent." The criminal court complaint, signed on November 17, 2022, by the arresting officer, added that the complainant had been holding her one-year old son when respondent kicked her on November 15, and that on November 17, shortly before the police were called, respondent had choked her with both hands while her infant son was standing nearby holding onto her clothing. These allegations, particularly the allegations in the criminal court complaint, are disturbing, as they refer to multiple instances of violence occurring over several days and state that there had been prior incidents of domestic violence. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Estrella Rodriguez*, OATH Index No. 1013/23 (Nov. 30, 2022) (recommending continued suspension for driver arrested for criminal obstruction of breathing and assault where respondent did not offer any evidence about the circumstances underlying his arrest, the notations on the report suggested a previous history of domestic violence, and respondent had been previously suspended after an arrest for assault in 2019).

However, without diminishing the serious nature of the allegations, it is notable that the initial police reports from November 17 mention nothing about respondent choking his wife less than two hours before. That allegation appears for the first time in the criminal court complaint, which also adds details about the minor child or children who were allegedly present during both the kick on November 15 and the choking on November 17. The criminal court complaint also drops the charge of assault and substitutes a charge of attempted assault. It is unclear why, since the complaint includes the allegation pertaining to the kick. Although the pending criminal charge must be taken as "true," neither *Nnebe* nor petitioner's rules require that every detail in a police report or criminal court complaint be taken as true. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Perez*, OATH Index No. 2524/22 at 3-4 (July 8, 2022), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (July 11, 2022) (suspension lifted where complainant signed statement several weeks after the arrest indicating

she could not “confirm or deny” anything about what happened before respondent’s arrest, when she was “under the influence of alcohol”).

In this case, the differences between the initial charges, the criminal court charges, and the arraignment charges, including that the initial reports did not allege choking, are not minor, and diminish the reliability and probative value of the details on the police reports and criminal complaint. *See Bhuyan*, OATH 969/22 at 5 (noting that there were “significant inconsistencies between the police arrest report and the criminal court complaint” that were “troubling” and cast doubt” on the specific allegations of physical force in the reports). This includes the affirmative notations on the complaint report relating to the complainant’s fear for her life, history of escalating violence, and prior domestic incident reports. *Perez*, OATH 2524/22 at 6 (the complainant’s signed statement diminished “the reliability of the specific allegations in the police report and criminal court complaint,” including the answers to questions about escalating violence, prior reports, and concern for safety); *cf. Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Encarnacion*, OATH Index No. 2457/22 at 5 (June 17, 2022), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (June 22, 2022) (lifting suspension where complaint report indicated that the complainant gave “shifting accounts” of what transpired before arrest); *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Shakhnovskiy*, OATH Index No. 32/22 (July 23, 2021), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (July 27, 2021) (suspension of taxi driver arrested for assault lifted where complainant testified that respondent accidentally hit him and denied ever stating that he feared for his safety or that there was a history of escalating violence).

In considering the circumstances underlying respondent’s arrest, it is also notable that the complainant refused medical attention at the scene and that although the complaint report notes that she was “physically injured” with an “apparent minor injury,” there is no reference as to what the injury was and no evidence that the complainant ever sought treatment for her injuries. *Compare Sylla*, OATH 2020/22 at 8 (lack of evidence that complainant suffered an injury or sought medical attention supported lifting the suspension); *Ibrahim*, OATH 891/20 at 4 (evidence that complainant refused medical attention suggested that injuries were minor and supported lifting of the suspension), *with Frimpong-Manson*, OATH 1841/20 at 4 (suspension continued where un rebutted evidence showed that complainant suffered medical injuries that were so serious that medical personnel took her to a hospital); *Abbas*, OATH 896/20 at 3 (noting that after the arrest, the complainant was transported to a hospital for evaluation and treatment).

Consideration of respondent's overall record and character also supports lifting respondent's suspension. Respondent testified and produced documentary evidence establishing that this is his first arrest. He testified that he has been a TLC driver for four years, has never been suspended by TLC before, has served thousands of passengers and has never assaulted or threatened to assault a passenger, has never gotten any TLC violations other than traffic violations, and has no points on his New York State driver's license. Petitioner did not introduce respondent's licensing history or any other documents to rebut this testimony. Finally, respondent's witness, Mr. Sumon, characterized him as a peace-loving, non-violent person.

As noted, the specific allegations in the police reports and criminal court complaint relating to repeated violence by respondent are troubling, and respondent's testimony about the circumstances leading up to the arrest was not entirely credible. However, there are inconsistencies within the police reports and criminal court complaint which cast doubt upon the specific details in those documents: most notably, the police reports, taken shortly after the alleged choking, do not mention the choking, while the criminal court complaint drops the assault charge in favor of attempted assault. Moreover, this is respondent's first arrest and petitioner did not rebut his testimony that he has never been suspended before, has never been assaultive or threatening to passengers, and has no TLC violations other than traffic violations. On balance, taking the pending criminal charge of criminal obstruction of breathing as "true," petitioner did not meet its burden of proving that respondent's continuing licensure would pose a direct and substantial danger to public health and safety. Respondent's license suspension should be lifted.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Respondent is currently charged with criminal obstruction of breathing.
2. Petitioner did not establish that respondent's continuing licensure during the pendency of his criminal case poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

RECOMMENDATION

I recommend that respondent's license suspension be lifted.

Faye Lewis
Administrative Law Judge

Jan. 5, 2023

SUBMITTED TO:

DAVID DO
Commissioner and Chair

APPEARANCES:

JOHN OKUTANI, ESQ.
Attorney for Petitioner

DANIEL ACKMAN, ESQ.
Attorney for Respondent



David Do
Commissioner/Chair

Ryan Wanttaja
First Deputy Commissioner

Sherryl A. Eluto
General Counsel/
Deputy Commissioner
for Legal Affairs
sherryl.eluto@tlc.nyc.gov

33 Beaver Street
22nd Floor
New York, NY 10004

+1 212 676 1135 tel
+1 212 676 1102 fax

January 9, 2023

Abdus Shuvo



Re: **TLC License No. 5905479**

Licensee Shuvo:

Pursuant to TLC Rule 68-15, a summary suspension hearing was concluded on December 20, 2022, as a result of your November 17, 2022 arrest for criminal obstruction of breathing.

After hearing the evidence presented, the presiding Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”), Faye Lewis, found that your suspension should be lifted.

I accept the ALJ’s Recommendation and lift the suspension of your TLC license.

Sincerely,

/s/ Sherryl A. Eluto

Sherryl A. Eluto
General Counsel

cc: Faye Lewis, *Administrative Law Judge*
Daniel Williamson, *Senior Prosecuting Attorney, OATH Trials (TLC)*
Daniel Ackman, *Attorney for Respondent*