

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO**

PROCEEDING NO. 23C-0513-INS

---

IN THE MATTER OF COMMISSION ACTION AGAINST THE CERTIFICATE(S) AND PERMIT(S) OF MOTOR CARRIERS CONCERNING FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY PURSUANT TO § 40-10.1-112, C.R.S., AND RULE 4 CCR 723-6-6008 OF THE RULES REGULATING TRANSPORTATION BY MOTOR VEHICLE.

---

**RECOMMENDED DECISION OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE  
ALENKA HAN  
REVOKING AUTHORITIES AND PERMITS**

---

Mailed Date: November 20, 2023

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. STATEMENT AND SUMMARY .....	2
II. BACKGROUND, FINDINGS, LAW, ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSIONS .....	2
A. Background.....	2
B. Factual Findings .....	4
C. Applicable Law. ....	9
1. Financial Responsibility Requirements and the Commission’s Authority to Revoke Permits and Authorities.....	9
2. Notice and Service Requirements .....	11
3. Burden of Proof.....	12
D. Findings, Analysis, and Conclusions.....	13
III. ORDER.....	18
A. The Commission Orders That: .....	18

**I. STATEMENT AND SUMMARY**

1. Except as noted, this Recommended Decision grants the relief sought in the Public Utilities Commission Staff’s (Commission Staff or Staff) Complaints against the

motor-carrier Respondents listed in Appendix A to this Recommended Decision, revoking Respondents' authorities and permits based on their failure to keep currently effective proof of financial responsibility on file with the Public Utilities Commission (Commission or PUC). This Recommended Decision provides avenues for Respondents listed in Appendix A to avoid revocation by taking action before this Recommended Decision becomes effective.

## II. BACKGROUND, FINDINGS, LAW, ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSIONS

### A. Background

2. Commission Staff instituted the cases in this proceeding by "Order of Summary Suspension and Complaint and Notice of Hearing" (Complaints) against the motor carrier Respondents<sup>1</sup> in this proceeding on October 20, 2023.<sup>2</sup>

3. The Complaints against each of the Respondents allege that the Commission received notice from the Respondents' insurance or surety carriers that the Respondents' insurance or surety coverage will be cancelled, as specifically identified in each Complaint.<sup>3</sup> The Complaints further notify Respondents that their authorities or permits have been, or will be, summarily suspended on the date specified in each Complaint and inform Respondents that a hearing will be held by video-conference on November 8, 2023, at 12:00 p.m. to determine whether their authorities or permits should be permanently revoked for failing to maintain proper evidence of insurance or surety coverage with the Commission.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This proceeding involves numerous Respondents against whom the Commission initiated Complaints by sending them each an "Order of Summary Suspension and Complaint and Notice of Hearing," Hearing Exhibit 2. Each of those Complaints is assigned a unique "Case No." specifying the grounds unique to each Respondent. Each of those case numbers are part of this single proceeding.

<sup>2</sup> Hearing Exhibit 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> Hearing Exhibits 2-3.

4. On November 7, 2023, Staff made a filing stating that Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were served on Respondents by e-mail that same day. Staff also filed those exhibits on November 7, 2023..<sup>5</sup>

5. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) held the hearing as noticed in the Complaints, on November 8, 2023, at approximately 12:00 p.m. Staff appeared with counsel. Seven respondents appeared:

- Sujit Basnet appeared on behalf of Royal Transport, LLC (Royal Transport), PUC No. LL-04110, Case No. 13793-INS;
- Ahmed Warsame appeared on behalf of Widle, LLC (Widle), PUC No. LL-04085, Case No. 13805-INS;
- Lalit Rai appeared on behalf of LR Limo, LLC (LR Limo), PUC No. LL-04043, Case No. 13822-INS;
- Eric Skjerseth appeared on behalf of Biodiesel for Bands, doing business as Planetary Transport Company (Planetary Transport), PUC No. 55907, Case No. 13809-INS;
- Mahad Haji Ali appeared on behalf of Quincy Limo, LLC (Quincy Limo), PUC No. LL-04098, Case No. 13880-INS;
- Govinda Kc appeared on behalf of Rapti, LLC (Rapti), PUC No. LL-04077, Case No. 13833-INS; and,
- Daniel Brhanykun appeared on behalf of Uphill Limousine Services (Uphill Limousine), PUC No. LL-03932, Case No. 13874-INS.

6. During the hearing, Ms. Marquita Riley, Mr. Skjerseth, Mr. Warsame, and Mr. Brhanykun testified. Staff Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were admitted into evidence without objection. Mr. Skjerseth offered Respondent Hearing Exhibits 100, 101, and 102 on behalf of Planetary Transport. Mr. Warsame offered Respondent Hearing Exhibit 200 on behalf of Widle. And Mr. Brhanykun offered Respondent Hearing Exhibit 300 on behalf of Uphill

---

<sup>5</sup> See Notice Concerning the Service of Exhibits 1 through 5 for the November 8, 2023 Show Cause Hearing on Respondents (Notice), filed on November 7, 2023.

Limousine. Respondent Hearing Exhibits 100, 101, 102, 200, and 300 were all admitted into evidence without objection.

**B. Factual Findings**

7. Ms. Riley is responsible for reviewing Commission records and coordinating with other Commission Staff to commence proceedings against motor carriers to suspend and revoke their permits and authorities when they do not have currently effective proof of insurance or surety coverage on file with the Commission. Ms. Riley assisted with initiating this proceeding against Respondents because the Commission received notice from each of the Respondents' insurance or surety carriers of the imminent cancellation of their insurance or surety coverage.<sup>6</sup>

8. Ms. Riley explained that the Commission served the Complaints and Attachment A to the Complaints upon the Respondents by United States mail on October 20, 2023, at the addresses, and upon the persons identified as designated agents for the Respondents, as provided in the Commission's files.<sup>7</sup>

9. Respondents provided the Commission the addresses and identities of their designated agents that were used to serve the Complaints in this proceeding. The Certificate of Service for the Complaints demonstrates that the Commission served the Respondents by mailing the Complaints addressed as indicated in the "Hearing Cycle Listing."<sup>8</sup> The referenced Hearing Cycle Listing is Hearing Exhibit 1.<sup>9</sup> Hearing Exhibit 1 includes those carriers listed in Hearing Exhibit 5, their designated agents and addresses on file with the Commission as of

---

<sup>6</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1-3.

<sup>7</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1-4.

<sup>8</sup> Hearing Exhibit 4.

<sup>9</sup> See Hearing Exhibits 1 and 4.

October 20, 2023, and whose insurance or surety faced imminent termination as of that same date.<sup>10</sup>

10. Ms. Riley testified that the Complaints against Colorado Jeep & Off Road Tours, Inc. (Colorado Jeep), PUC Nos. 55976 and ORC-00216 (Case Nos. 13807-INS and 13785-INS), and Mile High Luxury Transportation, LLC (Mile High Luxury), PUC No. LL-03914 (Case No. 13831-INS) were initially returned as undeliverable. The undelivered mail was of no consequence, though, because both Colorado Jeep and Mile High Luxury had come into compliance prior to the hearing and the Complaints against them have been dismissed. Likewise, a Complaint against RDDT, doing business as West Vail Shell (West Vail Shell), PUC No. T-03491 (Case No. 13794-INS) was returned as undeliverable. However, Ms. Riley testified that she found an alternative address for West Vail Shell and mailed the Complaint along with Attachment A to West Vail Shell at the alternative address; and did not receive back the Complaint mailed to the alternative address as undeliverable. However, a Complaint against SITA Transportation, LLC (SITA), PUC No. LL-03795 (Case No. 13830-INS), which was also returned as undeliverable, could not be remailed because, Ms. Riley testified, no alternative address could be found for SITA.

11. On November 7, 2023, Ms. Riley searched Commission records to determine whether any Respondents took other action rendering it unnecessary to revoke their permits, such as coming into compliance with their financial responsibility obligations, cancelling their permits, or initiating a Commission proceeding which may impact this one (*e.g.*, application seeking to suspend a permit). She identified Respondents who came into compliance with their financial responsibility obligations or took other action rendering it unnecessary to revoke their

---

<sup>10</sup> See also Hearing Exhibit 2.

permits after the Complaints were mailed. She created an updated list of Respondents who remained out of compliance with the Commission's financial responsibility requirements as of November 7, 2023. That list is Hearing Exhibit 5.<sup>11</sup>

12. Ms. Riley testified that on November 7, 2023, Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5 were served on Respondents who remained out of compliance as of that date at their e-mail addresses on file with the Commission.<sup>12</sup> She also explained that the Respondents provided those e-mail addresses to the Commission.

13. On the day of the hearing, November 8, 2023, Ms. Riley again reviewed Commission records to determine if any Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 took action to eliminate the need to revoke their permits. She discovered that Aspire Tours, LLC (Aspire Tours), PUC No. 55865 (Case No. 13786-INS) and Kush & Canvases, LLC, doing business as The Cannabis Experience (The Cannabis Experience), PUC No. 55971 (Case No. 13797-INS) had come into compliance and that proof of each of their financial responsibility had been filed with the Commission. Based on this, Ms. Riley requested that the Complaints against Aspire Tours and The Cannabis Experience be dismissed.

14. Prior to the hearing, Ms. Riley also researched Commission records to determine whether any Respondent has a pending application or proceeding before the Commission that may affect the instant Proceeding (*e.g.*, an application seeking to transfer, to suspend, or to abandon a certificate or permit). Ms. Riley discovered that Planetary Transport had filed an application to suspend its letter of authority the morning of November 8, 2023. However,

---

<sup>11</sup> In contrast, Hearing Exhibit 1 is the list of carriers who were non-compliant when the Commission issued the Complaints on October 20, 2023. As the difference in the number of carriers listed in Hearing Exhibits 1 and 5 makes evident, many carriers came into compliance since the Commission issued the Complaints. All the carriers listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 are listed in Hearing Exhibit 1.

<sup>12</sup> See Notice.

Ms. Riley testified, because Planetary Transport is seeking to suspend its Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN), its suspension application must be considered by the Commission before it can be granted. Planetary Transport's suspension application therefore did not affect its status at the November 8, 2023 hearing.

15. Except as noted above, Ms. Riley asked that the permits and authorities of the remaining Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 be revoked for failing to meet their financial responsibility obligations.

**1. Royal Transport**

16. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), 4 *Code of Colorado Regulations* (CCR) 723-1, of the Commission's Rules of Practice, Royal Transport is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Basnet. Mr. Basnet, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to appear on Royal Transport's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Basnet appearing on Royal Transport's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Basnet (a non-attorney) may represent Royal Transport in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Basnet to do so.

17. Royal Transport owns PUC No. LL-04110. The Complaint against Royal Transport alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance (Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Mr. Basnet offered no testimony or evidence countering or disputing the allegations of the Complaint. The undersigned ALJ therefore finds that, as of the date of the hearing, Royal Transport has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

## 2. Widle

18. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), Widle is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Warsame. Mr. Warsame, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to appear on Widle's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Warsame appearing on Widle's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Warsame (a non-attorney) may represent Widle in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Warsame to do so.

19. Widle owns PUC No. LL-04085. The Complaint against Widle alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance (Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Mr. Warsame cross-examined Ms. Riley about the process for updating his address with the Commission. He testified that he is experiencing difficulty obtaining insurance for Widle and for his limousine drivers. Mr. Warsame testified that Widle was insured by State Farm, but that State Farm had suspended coverage, creating confusion. He stated that he has not yet been able to obtain alternative coverage.

20. Hearing Exhibit 200 was admitted into evidence in support of Widle's position. Hearing Exhibit 200 is a copy of the proof of insurance card issued to Mr. Warsame for a 2019 Lincoln MKT Reserve SUV, effective November 4, 2023, through May 4, 2024. While this shows Mr. Warsame has been able to obtain some insurance, it is unclear whether this policy pertains to the vehicle he drives for Widle, nor does it establish that proof of financial responsibility has been filed on Widle's behalf with the Commission.

21. Mr. Warsame indicated that his immediate plan is to suspend Widle's PUC authority until June because business has been slow. He inquired about the process and was

advised by the undersigned ALJ and by Ms. Riley that forms for suspending a permit can be found on the PUC's website.

22. Despite Mr. Warsame's efforts, the undersigned ALJ nevertheless finds that, as of the date of the hearing, Widle has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

### **3. LR Limo**

23. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), LR Limo is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Rai. Mr. Rai, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to appear on LR Limo's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Rai appearing on LR Limo's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Rai (a non-attorney) may represent LR Limo in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Rai to do so.

24. LR Limo owns PUC No. LL-04043. The Complaint against LR Limo alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance (Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Although Mr. Rai questioned Ms. Riley about the timeframe within which he must obtain proper insurance coverage for LR Limo and file proof of insurance with the Commission, Mr. Rai offered no testimony or evidence countering or disputing the allegations of the Complaint. The undersigned ALJ therefore finds that, as of the date of the hearing, LR Limo has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

### **4. Planetary Transport**

25. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), Planetary Transport is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Skjerseth. Mr. Skjerseth, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to

appear on Planetary Transport's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Skjerseth appearing on Planetary Transport's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Skjerseth (a non-attorney) may represent Planetary Transport in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Skjerseth to do so.

26. Planetary Transport owns PUC No. 55907. The Complaint against Planetary Transport alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance (Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Mr. Skjerseth cross-examined Ms. Riley about suspending Planetary Transport's letter of authority and informed her that he had filed a suspension application shortly before the hearing. Ms. Riley confirmed that the Commission had received Planetary Transport's suspension application but advised that because Planetary Transport holds a CPCN letter of authority, the suspension would not be immediately effective. Rather, the full Commission would be notified of the suspension request and would take action on the suspension application at a future Commission meeting. A copy of Planetary Transport's suspension application, seeking a suspension of the license from November 5, 2023, through May 31, 2024, was admitted into evidence as Hearing Exhibit 100. In addition, a copy of the PUC's receipt for the suspension application, establishing that Planetary Transport's suspension application was filed November 8, 2023, was admitted into evidence as Hearing Exhibit 102.

27. Mr. Skjerseth testified that he applied to suspend Planetary Transport's authority because most of its business occurs in the summer months. He stated that Planetary Transport's buses are "shut down and parked."

28. As established by Hearing Exhibit 101 — an insurance policy general change endorsement which was also admitted into evidence — Mr. Skjerseth only extended

Planetary Transport's insurance coverage through November, 4, 2023. In the suspension application, Hearing Exhibit 100, Mr. Skjerseth stated that because business had slowed so substantially during the winter months, "paying insurance is unsustainable."

29. Although the ALJ anticipates that Planetary Transport's suspension application will be granted and that the Complaint asserted in this Proceeding against Planetary Transport will consequently be dismissed, the ALJ finds and concludes that as of the date of the hearing, Planetary Transport has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

### **5. Quincy Limo**

30. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), Quincy Limo is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Ali. Mr. Ali, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to appear on Quincy Limo's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Ali appearing on Quincy Limo's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Ali (a non-attorney) may represent Quincy Limo in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Ali to do so.

31. Quincy Limo owns PUC No. LL-04098. The Complaint against Quincy Limo alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance (Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Although Mr. Ali questioned Ms. Riley about the Commission's procedures to avoid revocation of Quincy Limo's permit, Mr. Ali offered no testimony or evidence countering or disputing the allegations of the Complaint. While questioning Ms. Riley, he indicated that he is "shopping around for insurance," further indicating that Quincy Limo does not currently have proof of financial responsibility on file with the Commission. The undersigned ALJ therefore finds that, as of the

date of the hearing, Quincy Limo has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

## **6. Rapti**

32. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), Rapti is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Kc. Mr. Kc, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to appear on Rapti's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Kc appearing on Rapti's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Kc (a non-attorney) may represent Rapti in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Kc to do so.

33. Rapti owns PUC No. LL-04077. The Complaint against Rapti alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance (Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Mr. Kc offered no testimony or evidence countering or disputing the allegations of the Complaint. The undersigned ALJ therefore finds that, as of the date of the hearing, Rapti has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

## **7. Uphill Limousine**

34. Consistent with Rule 1201(b)(II), Uphill Limousine is a closely-held entity solely owned by Mr. Brhanykun. Mr. Brhanykun, a non-attorney, requested that he be permitted to appear on Uphill Limousine's behalf because it is a closely-held entity with which he holds a position of authority. Commission Staff did not object to Mr. Brhanykun appearing on Uphill Limousine's behalf. Therefore, the ALJ determined that Mr. Brhanykun (a non-attorney) may represent Uphill Limousine in this proceeding and allowed Mr. Brhanykun to do so.

35. Uphill Limousine owns PUC No. LL-03932. The Complaint against Uphill Limousine alleges that it failed to ensure that proof of active liability insurance

(Commission Form E) is on file with the Commission in the form and manner required. Mr. Brhanykun questioned Ms. Riley about the process for re-establishing Uphill Limousine's authority in the event it is revoked. Ms. Riley assured Mr. Brhanykun that if Uphill Limousine were to reapply for a permit, it would be issued the same permit number as it currently holds.

36. Mr. Brhanykun also testified that he is "shopping around" for insurance coverage. As proof, Mr. Brhanykun offered into evidence Hearing Exhibit 300, which is a commercial auto insurance quote he received from Progressive Insurance dated November 7, 2023. However, Hearing Exhibit 300 does not establish that Mr. Brhanykun has secured insurance coverage for Uphill Limousine.

37. The undersigned ALJ therefore finds that, as of the date of the hearing, Uphill Limousine has not established that Form E has been filed on its behalf with the Commission.

### **C. Applicable Law.**

#### **1. Financial Responsibility Requirements and the Commission's Authority to Revoke Permits and Authorities.**

38. Generally, motor carriers holding a Commission permit, authority, or certificate must maintain and file evidence of financial responsibility with the Commission in such sum, for such protection, and in such form as the Commission deems necessary to adequately safeguard the public interest.<sup>13</sup> Motor carriers must ensure their insurance or surety coverage is kept continuously effective during the life of a certificate or permit to operate.<sup>14</sup> Commission Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6 of the Rules Regulating Transportation by Motor Vehicle, identifies the

---

<sup>13</sup> § 40-10.1-107(1), C.R.S.; Rule 6008 of the Rules Regulating Transportation by Motor Vehicle, 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>14</sup> § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S.

amount, type of protection, and form for the insurance or surety coverage that motor carriers must maintain at all times in order to safeguard the public interest.

39. Specifically, motor carriers must obtain and keep motor vehicle liability insurance or surety bond coverage in force at all times.<sup>15</sup> In addition to motor vehicle liability coverage, towing carriers and household goods movers must maintain and keep cargo liability insurance or surety bond coverage in force at all times.<sup>16</sup> Towing carriers must obtain and keep workers' compensation insurance in force at all times; and towing carriers providing storage must obtain and keep garage keeper's liability insurance in force at all times.<sup>17</sup> And, in addition to motor vehicle liability and cargo liability coverage, household goods movers must obtain and keep general liability insurance or surety coverage in force at all times.<sup>18</sup>

Motor carriers are responsible for maintaining and filing evidence of the required financial responsibility coverage with the Commission.<sup>19</sup> They must ensure their insurance or surety coverage is kept continuously effective during the life of a certificate or permit to operate.<sup>20</sup> Insurers and sureties must notify the policy or bond holder *and* the Commission when terminating a policy or bond at least 30 days before the effective date of termination; failing that, termination is not valid.<sup>21</sup> As a result, the Commission regularly receives notice from insurance or surety carriers about imminent policy or bond terminations for motor carriers licensed by the Commission.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Rule 6008(a)(I), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>16</sup> Rule 6008(a)(I) and (III), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>17</sup> Rule 6008(a)(IV) and (V), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>18</sup> Rule 6008(a)(VI), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>19</sup> § 40-10.1-107(1), C.R.S., and Rule 6008(a), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>20</sup> § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S.

<sup>21</sup> § 40-10.1-107(4), C.R.S.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

40. Notice of cancellation from a motor carrier's insurance or surety carrier is evidence that the motor carrier no longer has proof of financial responsibility on file with the Commission.<sup>23</sup> Failure to have proof of current and effective insurance or surety coverage on file with the Commission creates a rebuttable presumption that the carrier is in violation of the financial responsibility requirements.<sup>24</sup>

41. Section 40-10.1-112(1)(a) and (c), C.R.S., provides that a Commission-issued authority or permit may be suspended, revoked, altered, or amended if it is established to the satisfaction of the Commission at a properly-noticed hearing that the holder of that authority or permit has violated Article 10.1, Title 40 of the Colorado Revised Statutes, or any applicable Commission rule. Rules 6009 and 6011, 4 CCR 723-6, also provide the Commission authority to revoke a permit or authority in the circumstances here.

## 2. Notice and Service Requirements

42. The Commission must provide Respondents with notice of the Complaints against them, including sufficient facts to adequately advise Respondents of the relief sought and how they are alleged to have violated the law, as well as the time affixed for a hearing on the Complaints.<sup>25</sup> Such notice must be served upon the Respondents, which may be accomplished by mail.<sup>26</sup>

43. Regulated motor carriers must provide the Commission "its designation of the name, mailing address, and physical address of a Person upon whom service may be made of any

---

<sup>23</sup> Rule 6008(e), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>24</sup> *Id.*

<sup>25</sup> §§ 40-10.1-112(1) and 40-6-108, C.R.S.; Rule 1302(h), 4 CCR 723-1, of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure; *see also* § 24-4-105(2), C.R.S.

<sup>26</sup> § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.; Rule 1205(a) and (d), 4 CCR 723-1; *see also* § 24-4-104(10), C.R.S.

lawful notice, order, process, or demand.”<sup>27</sup> That person is the motor carrier’s designated agent upon whom the Commission may serve complaints and other notices.<sup>28</sup> And, regulated motor carriers are responsible for updating the Commission on changes to their designated agent, including the agent’s mailing and email addresses, within two days of the change.<sup>29</sup> Service on a motor carrier’s designated agent on file with the Commission is service upon the carrier and is “prima facie evidence” that the carrier received notice.<sup>30</sup> A certificate of service issued by the Commission’s Director is *prima facie* evidence that service has been obtained.<sup>31</sup>

44. In addition, Commission Rule 1205(a), 4 CCR 723-1, requires that a person filing any pleading or other document with the Commission must serve all other parties; the same rule allows parties to serve pleadings and documents by e-mail.

### 3. Burden of Proof

45. Staff carries the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence to demonstrate that the allegations in the Complaints are true and that the Complaints were properly served on each of the Respondents.<sup>32</sup> The preponderance standard requires the fact finder to determine whether the existence of a contested fact is more probable than its non-existence.<sup>33</sup> A party has met this burden of proof when the evidence, on the whole, tips in favor of that party.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Rule 6006(a), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*; Rule 1205(a) and (d), 4 CCR 723-1.

<sup>29</sup> Rule 6006(b), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>30</sup> Rule 6006(c) and (d), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>31</sup> § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.

<sup>32</sup> § 24-4-105(7), C.R.S.; Rule 1500, 4 CCR 723-1.

<sup>33</sup> *Swain v. Colorado Dep’t of Revenue*, 717 P.2d 507, 508 (Colo. App. 1985).

<sup>34</sup> *Schocke v. State Dep’t of Revenue*, 719 P.2d 361, 363 (Colo. App. 1986).

**D. Findings, Analysis, and Conclusions**

46. The ALJ concludes that Staff demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that it properly served the Complaints and Attachment A thereto upon each of the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 by mailing them to the designated agents and addresses on file with the Commission for each of the Respondents.<sup>35</sup>

47. The ALJ finds that the Complaints and Attachment A thereto comply with the relevant notice requirements because they: (a) inform Respondents that the Commission has received insurance or surety cancellation notices for each Respondent and the effective date of such cancellation; (b) advise Respondents that their authorities or permits are summarily suspended as of the coverage cancellation date; (c) notify Respondents that they may not conduct operations under their authorities or permits after the coverage cancellation and summary suspension date; (d) inform Respondents that the Commission has initiated a proceeding to permanently revoke their permits or authorities for failing to maintain and provide proof of effective insurance or surety coverage; (e) notify Respondents of the date, time, and means to attend the remote hearing on the Complaints at which Respondents have an opportunity to present data, views, and arguments; and (f) advise Respondents of the legal authority for the Complaints and relief sought.<sup>36</sup>

48. In addition, the ALJ concludes that on November 7, 2023, Staff served Hearing Exhibits 1 to 5 on Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 at the e-mail addresses which

---

<sup>35</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1 through 5; § 40-6-108(3), C.R.S.; Rules 1205(a) and (d) and 1302(g)(II)(e), 4 CCR 723-1; and Rule 6006(a) and (c), 4 CCR 723-6.

<sup>36</sup> Hearing Exhibits 1, 2, and 4; Rule 6009(e), 4 CCR 723-6; *see* §§ 40-6-108 and 24-4-105(2), C.R.S.

Respondents provided. As such, Respondents had the opportunity to review those exhibits before and during the hearing.<sup>37</sup>

49. The ALJ finds that Staff established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Commission received notice from the insurance or surety providers for the motor carriers identified in Hearing Exhibit 5 that their insurance or surety coverage was or will be cancelled or terminated.<sup>38</sup> This creates the rebuttable presumption that the Respondent carriers listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 are in violation of their respective financial responsibility requirements.<sup>39</sup> Except for Aspire Tours and The Cannabis Experience, no evidence rebutted that presumption.

50. The ALJ finds that the preponderance of the evidence establishes that Aspire Tours, LLC is in compliance with its financial responsibility obligations. As such, the Complaint against it (Case No. 13786-INS) will be dismissed.

51. The ALJ further finds that because Kush & Canvases, LLC, doing business as The Cannabis Experience, is also in compliance with its financial responsibility obligations. As such, the Complaint against it (Case No. 13797-INS) will be dismissed.

52. The ALJ further finds that although the representatives of the following seven Respondents who appeared at the hearing all indicated, to varying degrees, that they are working to ensure their respective business have the requisite liability insurance coverage in effect, the necessary insurance coverages were not in effect as of the date of the hearing:

- Mr. Basnet for Royal Transport;
- Mr. Warsame for Widle;
- Mr. Rai for LR Limo;

---

<sup>37</sup> See Rule 1205(a), 4 CCR 723-1; see Notice and Exhibit A to Notice; Hearing Exhibit 5. Exhibits were displayed on the video-conference screen during the hearing and were available to download during the hearing.

<sup>38</sup> Hearing Exhibit 2.

<sup>39</sup> Rule 6008(e), 4 CCR 723-6.

- Mr. Skjerseth for Planetary Transport;
- Mr. Ali for Quincy Limo;
- Mr. Kc for Rapti; and,
- Mr. Brhanykun for Uphill Limo.

Moreover, proof of full financial responsibility for any of these seven entities listed below had been filed with the PUC as of the date of the hearing.

- Royal Transport, LLC, PUC No. LL-04110, Case No. 13793-INS;
- Widle, LLC, PUC No. LL-04085, Case No. 13805-INS;
- LR Limo, LLC, PUC No. LL-04043, Case No. 13822-INS;
- Biodiesel for Bands, doing business as Planetary Transport Company, PUC No. 55907, Case No. 13809-INS;
- Quincy Limo, LLC, PUC No. LL-04098, Case No. 13880-INS;
- Rapti, LLC, PUC No. LL-04077, Case No. 13833-INS; and,
- Uphill Limousine Services, PUC No. LL-03932, Case No. 13874-INS.

The ALJ therefore finds that none of these seven entities, all of whom appeared at the hearing, are in compliance with Commission Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6.

53. Except as noted above, the preponderance of the evidence established that the Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 are out of compliance with their respective financial responsibility requirements per § 40-10.1-107(3), C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6 as of the time of the hearing. The ALJ finds that Staff established by a preponderance of the evidence that the Commission's records do not show a currently effective level of financial responsibility in such form and in such manner as required by § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6, as noted in the Complaints against each Respondent listed in Hearing Exhibit 5. Finally, the ALJ concludes that Staff met its burden of proof to show by a preponderance of the

evidence that the allegations in the Complaints against Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5<sup>40</sup> are true.

54. The Commission's only means of performing its important duty to the public to ensure that persons who hold an active motor carrier authority meet their financial responsibility obligations is to require documentation of the carriers' current and effective insurance or surety furnished in a uniform format to the Commission. The holder of the authority is responsible for ensuring that documentation is provided to the Commission. § 40-10.1-107, C.R.S., and Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6. The Respondents listed in Hearing Exhibit 5 have failed to do so. This failure warrants revocation of their permits or authorities.

55. Respondents may take action before the effective date of this Decision to avoid revocation. First, carriers may avoid revocation by: (a) obtaining insurance or surety coverage as required by Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6; and (b) causing proof of that insurance to be filed with the Commission in the form and manner required by Rule 6008, 4 CCR 723-6. The Complaints against carriers who take this action before the effective date of this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked.

56. In addition, limited regulation carriers,<sup>41</sup> luxury limousine carriers, household goods movers, towing carriers, and hazardous materials carriers who submit a form to cancel their permits or authorities before the effective date of this Decision may avoid revocation of their permits. The Complaints against carriers who take this action before the effective date of

---

<sup>40</sup> Hearing Exhibit 5 is attached to this Recommended Decision as Appendix A.

<sup>41</sup> Limited regulation carriers are defined as carriers who provide transportation service by charter bus, children's activity bus, fire crew transport, luxury limousine, Medicaid client transport, or off-road scenic charter. Rule 6001(qq), 4 CCR 723-6.

this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked. Permit cancellation forms are available on the Commission's website at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb\\_duOQ2QWlrMFlvUDJoNjQ/view?,authuser=0](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2QWlrMFlvUDJoNjQ/view?,authuser=0).

57. Fully-regulated intrastate carriers, including common carriers operating a shuttle service, sightseeing service, charter service, taxicab service, and contract carriers who submit an application to suspend their authority under Rule 6205, 4 CCR 723-6, before the effective date of this Recommended Decision, may also avoid revocation of their permits. The Complaints against carriers who take this action before the effective date of this Decision will be dismissed, and their permits will not be revoked. Applications to suspend a common carrier authority are available at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb\\_duOQ2dXZ0UTNIXzBvRIU/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2dXZ0UTNIXzBvRIU/view).

And applications to suspend a contract carrier authority are available at:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb\\_duOQ2U2JQS2dvek5HWm8/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B3u7jb_duOQ2U2JQS2dvek5HWm8/view).

58. Having a permit revoked, cancelled, or suspended does not always mean that a carrier's business is permanently terminated. Generally, Commission rules allow many types of motor carriers, including luxury limousine, household goods movers, and towing carriers, to obtain new permits without difficulty by filing an application.<sup>42</sup> For the most part, such permits may be obtained by completing an application that can be submitted to the Commission online, providing related supporting information and proof of financial responsibility, and paying a fee.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> While the ALJ does not warrant or otherwise guarantee this outcome, it is her understanding that carriers may request that a prior permit number be reinstated as part of the carrier's application for a permit.

<sup>43</sup> Rule 6302 (luxury limousine application and permit); Rule 6503 (towing carrier application and permit); and Rule 6603 (household goods mover carrier application and permit). Carriers concerned about their ability to comply with application requirements may request that the Commission waive an application requirement, per Rule

59. Applications for luxury limousine, towing, or household goods mover permits are available at the following link: <https://doraapps.state.co.us/puc/TransportationApplications/>. Referenced carrier types who voluntarily cancel their permits or whose permits are revoked may reapply for a permit.

60. As provided below, this Recommended Decision will not become effective for 20 days after the date the Decision is mailed. This allows ample time for Respondents to take action to avoid a final Commission decision revoking their permits or authorities.

61. Pursuant to § 40-6-109, C.R.S., the ALJ transmits the record of this proceeding, this recommended decision containing findings of fact and conclusions thereon, and a recommended order to the Commission.

### **III. ORDER**

#### **A. The Commission Orders That:**

1. Consistent with the above discussion, the Complaint against Aspire Tours, LLC, (PUC No. 55865, Case No. 13786-INS) is dismissed.
2. Likewise and consistent with the above discussion, the Complaint against Kush & Canvases, LLC, doing business as The Cannabis Experience (PUC No. 55971, Case No. 13797-INS) is dismissed.
3. Except as noted above, the authorities and permits listed in Appendix A, attached hereto, are revoked as of the effective date of this Recommended Decision.

---

1003(a), 4 CCR 723-1. That rule allows parties to request a waiver of a Commission rule; in deciding whether to waive a rule, the Commission may consider hardship, equity, or more effective implementation of a rule on an individual basis. 4 CCR 723-1. Such requests are decided on an individual and case-by-case basis and are outside the scope of this proceeding. *See* Rule 1003(a), 4 CCR 723-1.

4. Ordering Paragraph No. 3 will be void and the Complaint dismissed as to any Respondent who takes one of the following actions before the effective date of this Recommended Decision:

- a. files the required Certificate of Insurance or surety with the Commission;
- b. files an Application to Suspend their permit or authority with the Commission, if allowed by Commission rules; or
- c. submits a permit cancellation form to the Commission, if allowed by Commission rules.

5. Proceeding No. 23C-0513-INS is closed.

6. This Recommended Decision shall be effective on the day it becomes the Decision of the Commission, if that is the case, and is entered as of the date above.

7. As provided by § 40-6-109, C.R.S., copies of this Recommended Decision will be served upon the parties, who may file exceptions to it.

- a) If no exceptions are filed within 20 days after service or within any extended period of time authorized, or unless the decision is stayed by the Commission upon its own motion, this Recommended Decision will become the decision of the Commission and subject to the provisions of § 40-6-114, C.R.S.
- b) If a party seeks to amend, modify, annul, or reverse basic findings of fact in its exceptions, that party must request and pay for a transcript to be filed, or the parties may stipulate to portions of the transcript according to the procedure stated in § 40-6-113, C.R.S. If no transcript or stipulation is filed, the Commission is bound by the facts set out by the administrative law judge and the parties cannot challenge these facts. This will limit what the Commission can review if exceptions are filed.

8. If exceptions to this Recommended Decision are filed, they may not exceed 30 pages in length, unless the Commission finds good cause and permits this limit to be exceeded.

(S E A L)



THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

ALENKA HAN

\_\_\_\_\_  
Administrative Law Judge

ATTEST: A TRUE COPY

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rebecca E. White".

Rebecca E. White,  
Director