

Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Memeh

OATH Index No. 1480/26 (Mar. 23, 2026), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Mar. 26, 2026), **appended**

At a post-suspension hearing, the evidence did not establish that respondent's continued licensure poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety. Lifting of suspension is recommended.

NEW YORK CITY OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

In the Matter of
TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION
Petitioner
- against -
JUDE MEMEH
Respondent

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

SEON JEONG LEE, *Administrative Law Judge*

Petitioner, the Taxi and Limousine Commission ("TLC"), commenced this proceeding against respondent, Jude Memeh, holder of a TLC driver license (Pet. Ex. 1). Admin. Code §§ 19-505(l), 19-512.1(a) (Lexis 2026); 35 RCNY § 68-15(d) (Lexis 2026). On February 20, 2026, petitioner suspended respondent's TLC driver license after he was arrested and charged with assault in the third degree, a misdemeanor (Pet. Ex. 3). 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(1); Penal Law § 120.00(1) (Lexis 2026). Petitioner contends that respondent poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety and seeks to continue the suspension pending the criminal charge. Respondent opposes the continued suspension and asserts that he does not pose a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

At a post-suspension hearing held by videoconference on March 9, 2026, petitioner relied solely on documentary evidence. Respondent appeared without counsel. I advised respondent of his right to representation, his Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination, and the nature of the proceeding and procedures. Respondent elected to proceed to trial self-represented. He testified on his own behalf and offered video evidence (Tr. 4-7).

For the following reasons, I find that the evidence did not establish that respondent's continued licensure during the pendency of the criminal charge poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety. I recommend lifting the suspension.

ANALYSIS

Petitioner may suspend a TLC driver license before a hearing "if the Chairperson believes that continued licensure would constitute a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety." 35 RCNY § 68-15(a)(1); *see also* Admin. Code § 19-505(l). If the suspension is based solely on an arrest, the licensee may challenge the suspension at a post-suspension hearing where TLC "must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the charges pending against the Respondent, if true, demonstrate that the continuation of the Respondent's License during the pendency of criminal charges would pose a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety." 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(5). Factors relevant to this inquiry include: the particular facts and circumstances underlying the criminal charges; any nexus between the respondent's duties and responsibilities as a licensee and the alleged offense; the respondent's driving record; any previous criminal record, or the lack thereof; and the respondent's character and standing in the community. *Id.*

The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has held that due process affords a driver "an opportunity to show that his or her particular licensure does not cause a threat to public safety." *Nnebe v. Daus*, 931 F.3d 66, 83 (2d Cir. 2019). A continued suspension of the license could be warranted if petitioner demonstrates that the threat posed to the public is both "direct" and "substantial"; the threat may be less direct "the further removed the crime is from the driver's job," and less substantial "[d]epending on the surrounding circumstances and the driver's history." *Id.* at 82. Other relevant considerations include whether the charged crime is "a sole infraction in an otherwise spotless record," or the underlying conduct, while it establishes 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.* The necessary inquiry into whether "the driver's continued licensure would pose a threat to the safety of the public" must consider both the "conduct underlying the arrest and the overall record and character of the driver." *Id.* at 82-83.

On February 19, 2026, respondent was arrested by a police officer and charged with Penal Law section 120.00(1), assault in the third degree (Pet. Ex. 4 at 3-4). He received a Desk

Appearance Ticket to appear in Queens Criminal Court on March 11, 2026 (Pet. Ex. 4 at 4; Pet. Ex. 5). The criminal complaint, signed and dated on February 25, 2026, by the arresting officer, charged respondent with assault in the third degree and harassment in the second degree (Pet. Ex. 4 at 3).¹ Penal Law § 240.26(1) (Lexis 2026). The incident alleged in the criminal complaint occurred approximately 11 months earlier. The complaint alleged that the incident occurred on or about March 21, 2025, between 1:15 p.m. and 2:15 p.m., in front of 68-37 Yellowstone Boulevard in Queens, New York (Pet. Ex. 4 at 3). According to the hearsay statement, a complainant informed that respondent “slammed the car door on her ankle, causing substantial pain as well as annoyance and alarm” (*Id.*). Petitioner did not provide a police report or any medical records showing the nature and extent of complainant’s injury.

TLC’s “FHV electronic trip sheets database” indicated that on March 21, 2025, respondent picked up a passenger in Manhattan at 12:55 p.m. and dropped this passenger off at 1:57 p.m., at 68-37 Yellowstone Boulevard in Queens (Pet. Ex. 6).

Respondent has been a TLC licensee since September 2016 (Pet. Ex. 2). His New York State Department of Motor Vehicles (“DMV”) driving abstract documented a violation in 2023 for operating a motor vehicle while using a portable electronic device, for which a \$50 fine and five points were imposed (Pet. Ex. 7).

Despite the pending criminal charges, respondent elected to testify about the circumstances underlying his arrest. Respondent stated that the complainant was a passenger in his vehicle. He worked as an Access-A-Ride driver. He recalled that in March 2025, at approximately 12:00 p.m., he was assigned to pick up complainant from Manhattan (Tr. 19-20, 34). Complainant wanted to sit in the front passenger seat, which is not customary, but respondent acquiesced and helped her into his car (Tr. 19). Before the start of the trip, he confirmed with complainant her name, the drop-off location in Queens, and her Access-A-Ride ID number, which is something he does with all passengers (Tr. 34-35).

Respondent said he and complainant did not converse much during the trip, that complainant talked mostly to herself or was on her phone (Tr. 35). At approximately 12:45 p.m., they arrived at the drop-off location, which complainant indicated was her residence (Tr. 19, 35). However, she refused to exit the car, stating that they were not at the correct drop-off location (Tr. 20-21). Respondent testified that he has never experienced this with a passenger, and he pleaded

¹ Harassment in the second degree, a violation, is not a basis for this suspension (Pet. Ex. 3).

with her numerous times to exit the car (Tr. 39). He then called the dispatcher, who confirmed the drop-off location and the dispatcher also pleaded with complainant to exit the car, but she continued to refuse (Tr. 20, 35-36). The dispatcher told respondent that he could wait or call the police (Tr. 20). Complainant's refusal to leave the car delayed his trip to pick up his next passenger and respondent was eager to leave (Tr. 19-21). He got out of the car, went over to the passenger's side, and opened the door so that complainant could exit. Complainant continued to refuse to get out of the car and said that she would call the police to report that respondent was assaulting her (Tr. 21). At that point, respondent started to video record his interaction with complainant with his phone (Tr. 21, 31).

Respondent submitted a video with audio that is four minutes and ten seconds long (Resp. Ex. A). The driver-side door is open, and respondent is standing by the wide-open front, passenger-side door as he videos his interaction with the passenger, who is sitting in the front passenger seat with the seatbelt on, a bag on her lap, and phone in her hands. The video begins with her talking over respondent in a loud voice, saying, "I want you off this job. Do not touch me. They can send another car," then she shuts the passenger-side door (*Id.* at 00:00:00-00:00:06). Respondent walks toward the back of the car and around to the driver's side and captures a sign on the scaffold of the building the car is parked in front of with the address "6837 Yellowstone Blvd Queens NY" (*Id.* at 00:00:06-00:00:18).

Respondent sits in the driver's seat, shuts his door, and speaks in an even-tone voice for the recording (it appears) rather than to complainant, while pointing the video camera at her. He says something like, "We are at the location. [Complainant] refused to get out at the location she is going and I'm planning her to leave but she doesn't want to leave. So, I'm headed to pick up my other passenger. We're headed to Manhattan, so she is going with me to Manhattan. I'm doing that now" (*Id.* at 00:00:19-00:00:40). As respondent is talking, complainant has her phone open in her hand and talks over him, stating that she is "waiting" (*Id.* at 00:00:24-00:00:25). She objects to his statement that he is headed to Manhattan, stating, "No he's not," and opens the passenger-side door and props it open by leaning the soles of her feet in sneakers against the door (*Id.* at 00:00:29-00:00:34). She repeatedly tells respondent, "Access-A-Ride is trying to get in touch with you," then states, "The door isn't closed" (*Id.* at 00:00:33-00:00:41). Still pointing the camera at complainant, respondent says in an agitated voice, "That's [complainant], you see that, she opened the door," and "if she scratches my car, I'm gonna sue her" (*Id.* at 00:00:4-00:00:52).

As respondent is saying this, he moves the car forward very slowly, for approximately five seconds (*Id.* at 00:00:41-00:00:46). Complainant says, “And you’re driving” (*Id.* at 00:00:45-00:00:46).

Almost a minute into the video, respondent’s voice becomes more assertive, and he begins to point his finger at complainant as he states, “That’s the location. We’re telling her to get out. She says no. I’m going to get out again and close my door and if she refuses, then I’m going to move” (*Id.* at 00:00:53-00:01:02). Complainant’s back is turned toward respondent as she mumbles, “No, no, I’m not doing that. I’m waiting for ARRO” (*Id.*). It appears that she is referring to ARRO, the “taxi app” company for Access-A-Ride passengers.²

Respondent exits and walks around the backside of the car to the front passenger seat and says, “Ma’am” (*Id.* at 00:01:02-00:01:11). Complainant is seated with her two legs propped against the door to keep it wide open and she blocks her face with her phone (*Id.* at 00:01:11). She says to respondent, “Go right ahead,” then screams this to him a second time (*Id.* at 00:01:11-00:01:15). The video camera pointed at complainant does not show respondent, who says, “Can you get up, please?,” and she replies, “No, I can’t” (*Id.*). Complainant says to respondent, “Don’t touch me,” and refuses respondent’s request for her to take off her seatbelt (*Id.* at 00:01:16-00:01:19). Complainant then tells respondent, “They’re getting in touch with your company” (*Id.* at 00:01:20-00:01:23). It appears that complainant’s seatbelt is unbuckled but she is holding on to the belt with her right hand (*Id.* at 00:01:23-00:01:25). Respondent then asks, “Can you allow me to leave? Can I pick up my other passenger?,” to which complainant replies sarcastically, “You’re so dedicated” (*Id.* at 00:01:25-00:01:31). With a dismissive expression, she adds, “I don’t care. They have to wait. ARRO can send someone else” (*Id.* at 00:01:32-00:01:36). Respondent repeats his request for her to exit the car because they have arrived at her destination, but she does not respond (*Id.* at 00:01:37-00:01:42).

Suddenly, complainant says, “Don’t you dare, don’t you dare,” to which respondent states, “Take your leg off. I have to close my door. I can’t leave my door open” (*Id.* at 00:01:48-00:01:54). Complainant asks respondent for ARRO’s phone number, stating “they can’t get in touch with your company” (*Id.* at 00:01:58-00:02:03). Pointing to her feet that are propped up against the armrest of the car door, respondent repeatedly asks complainant to take her shoes off his car so that he can close the door. Complainant refuses and asks for the company phone number again, stating, “I’m not going to change my mind,” that she “doesn’t care,” and she does not want

² See ARRO, ARRO & Access-A-Ride (2026), <https://www.ridearro.com/aar/>.

respondent to “close the door on her” (*Id.* at 00:02:05-00:02:28). She also states that respondent will have to wait and that if she called the police, he would have to wait longer (*Id.* at 00:02:27-00:02:30). Respondent reaches down toward complainant’s pants legs and lightly touches her calf to attempt to move her legs away from the door, and complainant replies, “Do not touch me” (*Id.* at 00:02:31-00:02:33).

At this point, respondent waved down a passerby, who is not shown in the video, and began to explain the situation (*Id.* at 00:02:34-00:02:42). The audio recording for a call on hold could be heard from complainant’s phone (*Id.* at 00:02:42). Complainant interrupts respondent’s conversation with the passerby to explain that she is an Access-A-Ride passenger with a walker (*Id.* at 00:02:42-00:02:53). The passerby asks complainant, “Why don’t you want to get out of the car?” (*Id.* at 00:03:08-00:03:10). Complainant answers, “He (respondent) was verbally abusive, and I want the company to know but they can’t be gotten in touch with,” and “This is Access-A-Ride and he can’t treat disabled people this way” (*Id.* at 00:03:13-00:03:31).

Respondent responds, “She’s got a problem” (*Id.* at 00:03:32-00:03:33). Complainant says, “And this is how he’s been speaking to me” (*Id.* at 00:03:34-00:03:35). The passerby asks, “Do you have any other way to get information?” (*Id.* at 00:03:33-00:03:36). Complainant shows her phone and states that “they” are waiting and that respondent is not giving her the company’s phone number (*Id.* at 00:03:37-00:03:42). Respondent replies that complainant has the information in the “system,” and he has told her to make her complaint when she “is inside,” because he must pick up other people, but she refused to exit the car (*Id.* at 00:03:40-00:03:52). Complainant responds that she wants respondent’s company to hear how respondent is speaking to her (*Id.* at 00:03:49-00:03:52). The passerby says something inaudible (*Id.* at 00:03:53-00:03:57). Respondent agrees with whatever the passerby had said and explains that he wants to pick up other passengers and “when she is ready, then [he] will bring her back” (*Id.* at 00:03:57-00:04:05). Complainant chimes in and says to the passerby, “He was gonna take me to Manhattan” (*Id.* at 00:04:06-00:04:08). By this time, complainant has calmed down. The video ends with respondent telling the passerby about his other pick-up (*Id.* at 00:04:08-00:04:10).

Respondent described the passerby as a “gentleman” and a “good Samaritan” who is “white,” like complainant (Tr. 22, 29). He showed the passerby the drop-off address to confirm that they were at the correct location (Tr. 23). The passerby took time to speak with complainant, who finally agreed to exit the car. However, complainant said she would report respondent to the

police (Tr. 23). Respondent left the location. He said he called the police to report the incident, but the police told him that if both he and the passenger had already left the scene and there was no injury, there is nothing for them to do and he could leave (Tr. 23).

Two days later, respondent received a phone call from a detective who informed him that complainant had reported an incident and alleged that respondent had “hit her” (Tr. 23). Respondent denied the accusation (Tr. 23). The detective instructed him to come to the police precinct for some paperwork (Tr. 23-24). Respondent agreed to report to the precinct the following Wednesday upon his return from a short out-of-state trip (Tr. 24). Shortly before that day, however, respondent said the police called to tell him that he did not have to report to the precinct because “everything has been taken care of” (Tr. 24). The police department did not contact him again about this incident (Tr. 25, 29-30).

On February 19, 2026, 11 months later, the police stopped respondent’s car and arrested him (Tr. 24-25, 33). Respondent did not provide any details of the circumstances of the car stop. Respondent testified that after several hours in detention, the detective who had called him about the incident back in March 2025 met with him and said that he was arrested because he failed to keep his appointment at the precinct (Tr. 25). Respondent explained that he did not show up because somebody, possibly this detective, called him before the appointed time to cancel their meeting (Tr. 25-26). But the detective replied that neither she nor anybody else at the precinct called him to cancel (Tr. 26). Respondent stated that he felt “humiliated . . . [b]eing handcuffed and all of that in the street” during his arrest (Tr. 26).

Respondent denied the allegation in the complaint and testified that he did not harm complainant, who “scratched [his] car on the side” (Tr. 28, 32). He testified without dispute that, aside from one violation for using an electronic device while driving, he has years of driving experience with an unblemished record, which “speak[s] for itself” (Tr. 29). He testified that he encounters passengers who threaten him, but he stays away from crime and “[a]nything that [he] know[s] is illegal” and lives “peacefully and calmly” (Tr. 28). He further explained that most Access-A-Ride passengers are disabled and he “sympathize[s] with them” (Tr. 38). He helps passengers get in and out of the car, walks them to their door if needed, or makes prearrangements with their caretakers for the pickup and drop-off (Tr. 37-38). He also takes extra care to double check that the building number of the arrival location matches the trip log so that these passengers

are not “stranded” at the wrong location (Tr. 39). He mentioned that he is a single father of an 11-year-old daughter, and this suspension has been financially difficult for his family (Tr. 44).

The inquiry is whether petitioner established that respondent’s continued licensure poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety in view of the underlying arrest and respondent’s overall record and character. *See Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 82. The determination is highly fact dependent and requires an “individualized assessment of the circumstances of each case.” *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Encarnacion*, OATH Index No. 2457/22 at 5 (June 17, 2022), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (June 22, 2022); *see* 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(5).

There is a direct nexus between respondent’s license and the alleged crime involving a passenger. However, an arrest stemming from an on-duty incident, even involving a passenger, is not presumptive evidence that the licensee poses a direct and substantial threat to the public. *See, e.g., Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Zagre*, OATH Index No. 1934/21 at 5-7 (May 25, 2021), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (May 25, 2021) (suspension lifted, even though driver charged with assault following a fare dispute with a passenger, who claimed that she was punched in the face, where driver was the person who contacted the police, and evidence suggested that this was an isolated incident); *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Roach*, OATH Index No. 1864/23 at 9-10 (Feb. 3, 2023), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Feb. 8, 2023) (suspension lifted where driver who was facing multiple charges including assault in the second degree involving a passenger, provided compelling character evidence, including other passenger testimony).

I credited respondent’s testimony in general about the incident underlying this arrest as largely corroborated by the video and based on his recollection of the incident that took place approximately 11 months ago. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Singh*, OATH Index No. 705/26 at 7 (Nov. 10, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Nov. 12, 2025) (finding respondent’s testimony generally credible despite some inconsistencies with the video evidence); *see also Dep’t of Sanitation v. Menzies*, OATH Index No. 678/98 at 2 (Feb. 5, 1998), *aff’d*, NYC Civ. Serv. Comm’n Item No. CD 98-101-A (Sept. 9, 1998) (relevant considerations in assessing credibility include demeanor, consistency of testimony, supporting evidence, witness motivation, bias or prejudice, and whether the testimony comports with common sense and human experience). Respondent found himself in a predicament with a disgruntled passenger, and he tried to deal with the situation. He did not recall being trained by the TLC during the Access-A-Ride licensing process on what to do if a passenger is non-cooperative (Tr. 34). With the benefit of hindsight, respondent could have

done some things differently, but he does not appear to pose a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

Aspects of respondent's testimony regarding his interaction with complainant contradict the video evidence and are concerning. For example, he offered inconsistent testimony regarding whether he had "moved" the car while the passenger-side door was open. In the video, before the car moves, respondent states that complainant had opened the passenger-side door, but on cross-examination he denied knowing that the door was opened and further testified that he "did not think that he had moved" the car (Tr. 36). He later explained that his "movement was just to get [the car] out from the . . . road," for safety reasons, because he realized that it might take "another 30, 40 minutes before the passenger gets [out] from the car" (Tr. 37). He moved the car "just [a] tiny" bit to "a little space on the right-hand side" (Tr. 37). Furthermore, on cross-examination, respondent denied touching the complainant even though the video shows that he had touched complainant's leg while attempting to move her leg off the door of his car (Tr. 40-41). When confronted with this discrepancy, respondent argued unpersuasively that the brief touching of the leg "is different" because complainant's shoe was pressed against the side of his car door causing damage to his car (Tr. 41-42).

Despite these inconsistencies, the video does not show respondent slamming the car door on complainant's ankle as alleged in the complaint, nor does it show her physically harmed in any way. I credited respondent's claim that he moved the car slightly to get it closer to the curb on the right side and away from car traffic. It also appears that his contact with complainant's leg was fleeting; it was not intended to and did not cause any harm. Although complainant threatens respondent that she will report to the police that he had assaulted her, when speaking to the passerby, complainant only states that respondent was verbally abusive to her and does not mention an assault. Nevertheless, at this proceeding, the pending criminal charge of third-degree assault is presumed to be true. *See Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 90 (finding "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"). But presuming the criminal charge as true does not require acceptance of every additional detail in the complaint. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Singh*, OATH Index No. 701/20 at 4 (Nov. 1, 2019), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Nov. 19, 2019) (noting that "neither petitioner's rules nor the decision in *Nnebe* support the sweeping proposition that every additional detail in a complaint must be accepted as true" but they "should be weighed against the rest of the

evidence”). While the allegation of physical harm is not to be taken lightly, the absence of any evidence of injury or treatment diminishes the reliability of the allegation that respondent had “slammed the car door on [complainant’s] ankle” and suggests that any injuries were minor (Pet. Ex. 4 at 3). *Compare Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Diallo*, OATH Index No. 2511/24 at 5-6 (Apr. 1, 2024), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Apr. 1, 2024) (lifting suspension where alleged victim was “taken to a local hospital, but there [was] no evidence regarding the nature of the treatment”), *and Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Ahmed*, OATH Index No. 2612/23 at 5, 8 (Apr. 13, 2023), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Apr. 20, 2023) (lifting suspension for driver charged with assault after hitting his wife with a wood stick causing “redness and swelling” and “substantial pain,” where there was no evidence of medical treatment for the alleged injury), *with Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Azad*, OATH Index No. 142/20 at 5-6 (Aug. 15, 2019), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Oct. 15, 2019) (continuing suspension where hospital records documented injuries and treatment of driver’s 15-year-old nephew, whom driver was accused of repeatedly hitting with a wooden stick).

There is significant mitigating evidence. It was undisputed that this incident is the only passenger complaint against respondent in his nearly ten-year career as a TLC licensee and this is his first arrest. Notably, respondent continued to drive as a licensee for approximately 11 months after this incident with no indication that respondent had posed a direct and substantial threat to the public during that period. Except for a minor DMV violation in 2023, respondent has had no other traffic violations, and there is no evidence of any TLC violations or prior license suspensions.

Respondent is a long-time licensee who has a virtually spotless driving record. Respondent impressed me as a hard-working and conscientious driver who attends to the special needs of his passengers. Faced with a difficult and unusual situation involving a passenger, respondent tried his best to resolve it. The absence of any serious injury combined with what is seen in the video evidence suggests that this case is the type discussed in *Nnebe*, where the allegation of criminal conduct appears to be “technical or mitigated” and does not indicate that respondent poses a continuing threat to passengers or the public. 931 F.3d at 82. Indeed, this incident seemed out of character for respondent, an aberration in an otherwise law-abiding life that is unlikely to recur and does not affect his ability to act professionally with passengers or the public. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Gray*, OATH Index No. 2550/25 at 8 (July 25, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Aug. 13, 2025) (finding that an incident leading to the arrest and charge was an aberration in an otherwise law abiding life and lifting suspension for driver with an unblemished record who

valued his work); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Polanco*, OATH Index No. 451/25 at 6 (Sept. 5, 2024), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Sept. 9, 2024) (lifting suspension where incident giving rise to respondent's arrest appeared to be a sole infraction in an otherwise clean record); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Bah*, OATH Index No. 1927/20 at 6-7 (June 1, 2020), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (June 9, 2020) (suspension lifted where arrest allegations did not constitute "persuasive proof of an assaultive nature," but rather showed "an isolated circumstance"). Considering all the factors in *Nnebe*, I find that the evidence did not establish that respondent's continued licensure would pose a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Respondent was arrested and charged with misdemeanor assault in the third degree while on duty.
2. Even assuming that the pending criminal charge is true, the evidence did not establish that respondent's continued licensure poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

RECOMMENDATION

Respondent's TLC driver license suspension should be lifted pending the resolution of his criminal charge.

Seon Jeong Lee
Administrative Law Judge

March 23, 2026

SUBMITTED TO:

EVAN HINES

Acting Commissioner/Chair

APPEARANCES:

SHIVAJEET CHAKRABORTY

Representative for Petitioner

JUDE MEMEH

Self-Represented Respondent

March 26, 2026

Jude Memeh
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: TLC License No. 5714053

Licensee Memeh:

Pursuant to TLC Rule 68-15, a summary suspension hearing was concluded on March 9, 2026, as a result of your February 20, 2026 arrest for assault in the third degree.

After hearing the evidence presented, the presiding Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”), Seon Jeong Lee, 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: Seon Jeong Lee, *Administrative Law Judge*
Daniel Williamson, *Supervising Attorney, OATH Trials (TLC)*