Agenda: Item 7

Consideration of Hearing Officer's Recommendation in <u>Taxi Commission v.</u>

<u>Scott Van Leuven</u>, Permit # 675 [ACTION]

• Consideration of Decision to Lift Summary Suspension Issued for Violations of Rules 4.A.1 and 4.A.3 (allowing unlicensed and suspended driver to operate his taxicab vehicle)

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ADMINSTRATIVE HEARING DECISION

Hearing Officer: Julie Rosenberg, Esq.

Hearing Date: September 19, 2008

#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, SF, CA 94121, Room 408

Case: Scott Van Leuven

Type of Permit: Medallion #675

I. Facts

Medallion Holder #675, Scott Van Leuven, allowed Driss Elassali to drive under Medallion #675.

On 8/22/08 Sergeant Reynolds of the San Francisco Taxi
Detail (the "Detail") suspended Mr. Elassali's A-card (permit #52819) because Mr. Elassali had a suspended or revoked
California driver's license. Apparently Mr. Elassali failed to appear for a moving violation and a notice of the suspension was mailed to him on 6/19/08. Sergeant Reynolds told Mr. Elassali that he was not permitted to operate any vehicle, including a taxicab.

Sergeant Reynolds did not notify any color scheme or medallion holders that Mr. Elassali's A-Card and California driver's license had been suspended.

On 8/31/08, Mr. Elassali drove cab #675 into an SFPD DUI check point, and it was discovered that Mr. Elassali was unlicensed. Consequently, Medallion #675 was seized, Mr. Elassali was cited for driving without a license, and the cab was towed pursuant to the City's S.T.O.P. Program (SF Traffic Offender Program).

¹ It is not clear on which date the driver's license was actually suspended.

II. Summary Suspension of Medallion #675

Pursuant to Municipal Police Code Section 1090(c) the Detail summarily suspended Medallion #675 on 9/2/08. Section 1090(c) states, in part: "The Chief of Police may suspend summarily any permit issued under this Article pending a disciplinary hearing before the Police Commission when in the opinion of said Chief of Police the public health or safety requires such summary suspension."

The Taxi Commission ("Commission") requests suspension of Medallion #675 for the following reasons: (1) Mr. Van Leuven illegally operated a vehicle for hire, (2) he allowed an unlicensed driver to operate his taxicab, which created a danger to public safety, (3) criminal behavior², and (4) he was not in compliance with the Taxicab Rules and Regulations.

Based on a discussion with the Commission staff at the hearing, the hearing officer understands that the Commission's basis for this summary suspension is the fact Mr. Van Leuven allowed an unlicensed driver to drive taxicab #675. The Commission further stated that Mr. Van Leuven allowed Mr. Elassali to broker the medallion and therefore, Mr. Van Leuven had, in effect, given up control of the medallion.

The hearing officer asked the Commission what Mr. Van
Leuven could have done differently so that he would have been
aware of the suspended license. The Commission suggested that
if there had been a written lease (between Van Leuven and

² The Commission did not present any evidence of criminal behavior, and it is unclear why this allegation is in the complaint.

Elassali), which imposed an affirmative obligation on the part of Elassali to report if his license was suspended, then the incident would have been less likely to occur.

The hearing officer disagrees. Mr. Elassáli knowingly drove his cab with a suspended license after being directed not to do so by Sergeant Reynolds. It is highly unlikely a contract provision would compel him to disclose his unlicensed status to Mr. Van Leuven.

Although the Detail does not have an affirmative obligation to notify Color Scheme and Medallion holders if an A-Card or driver's license has been suspended, it would have been a prudent course of action.

It was established at the hearing that Mr. Van Leuven did not have knowledge that Mr. Elassali was unlicensed.

Consequently, he did not knowingly cause a threat to public safety.

If the Commission wants to charge Mr. Van Leuven for non-compliance with the rules pertaining to how he manages the medallion, then those charges should be addressed in a separate complaint.

Finding: The hearing officer finds that the public health and safety is not threatened if Medallion #675 is in operation.

/// -/// ///

///

IV. Hearing Officer's Recommendation

The hearing officer recommends that the summary suspension of Medallion #675 be lifted.

Julie Rosenberg, Esq.

Date

Hearing Officer

Van Leuven Summary Suspension - 4