

Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Fazal

OATH Index No. 431/26 (Oct. 15, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Oct. 20, 2025), **appended**

Petitioner suspended respondent’s TLC driver license following his arrest for an off-duty incident. 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 recommended.

NEW YORK CITY OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

In the Matter of
TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION
Petitioner
- against -
NAEEM FAZAL
Respondent

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

SEON JEONG LEE, *Administrative Law Judge*

Petitioner, the Taxi and Limousine Commission (“TLC”), commenced this proceeding against respondent, Naeem Fazal, holder of a TLC driver license. Admin. Code §§ 19-505(l), 19-512.1(a) (Lexis 2025); 35 RCNY § 68-15(d) (Lexis 2025). Petitioner suspended respondent’s TLC driver license after receiving notice of his arrest on August 27, 2025, for acting in a manner injurious to a child less than 17 years old, a class A misdemeanor (Pet. Ex. 3). 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(1); Penal Law § 260.10(1) (Lexis 2025).

Upon respondent’s request, a post-suspension hearing was scheduled for September 11, 2025 (Pet. Ex. 1). Before the hearing date, respondent sought an adjournment, which was granted to September 25, 2025. A remote hearing commenced on September 25, 2025, and concluded on October 1, 2025.¹ At the hearing, both petitioner and respondent relied solely on documentary evidence.

¹ At the start of the hearing, respondent moved to preclude one of petitioner’s exhibits and consented to adjourning the hearing until after my decision on the motion. The parties agreed to continue the hearing on October 1, 2025 (Tr. 5-6).

Petitioner contends that respondent poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety and seeks to continue the suspension while the criminal charges are pending. Respondent maintains that he is not a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety and opposes the continued suspension.

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

PRELIMINARY MATTER

Petitioner sought to introduce a five-page exhibit, detailing respondent's TLC license suspension history maintained in the TLC's internal database. The first page lists nine suspensions, including the five suspensions at issue here. The list details the suspension start date and end date, if available, and the reason for each suspension, categorized by action types, for example, "legal," "accounts receivable," or "enforcement," among others. The following four pages contain additional information, including the date of arrest and the alleged criminal conduct or charge, for four of the suspensions at issue.

Respondent moved to preclude this evidence under section 296(16) of the New York State Human Rights Law, New York State Executive Law §§ 290 *et seq.* (Tr. 5; ALJ Ex. 1). Section 296(16) provides, in relevant parts, that:

It shall be an unlawful discriminatory practice, unless specifically required or permitted by statute, for any person, agency, bureau, . . . to make any inquiry about, . . . or to act upon adversely to the individual involved, any arrest or criminal accusation of such individual not then pending against that individual which was followed by a termination of that criminal action or proceeding in favor of such individual, as defined in subdivision two of section 160.50 of the criminal procedure law, . . . in connection with the licensing . . . to such individual . . .

Exec. Law § 296(16) (Lexis 2025). The legislative history of the 1976 amendment to section 296(16) that was passed with the enactment of Criminal Procedural Law ("CPL") section 160.50, states: "This legislation is consistent with the presumption of innocence, which simply means that no individual should suffer adverse consequences merely on the basis of an accusation, unless the charges were ultimately sustained in a court of law" (ALJ Ex. 1, Attachment at 57). Governor's

Bill Jacket, L 1976, ch 877 at 56. The “Memorandum for the Governor,” issued by the then Attorney General, further states, “The bill provides that the legal effect of a favorable termination of an action is to restore an accused to the status he occupied before arrest and prosecution” (ALJ Ex. 1, Attachment at 25). Section 160.50(1) of the CPL provides that records of a dismissed criminal action are generally sealed. *See* Crim. Proc. Law § 160.50(1) (Lexis 2025) (“Upon the termination of a criminal action or proceeding against a person in favor of such person, . . . the record of such action or proceeding shall be sealed.”).

Section 296(16) applies to licensing agencies such as TLC, which regulates the licensing of TLC drivers. *See* Charter § 2303(b)(5) (Lexis 2025) (granting the TLC, *inter alia*, the power to issue, revoke, and suspend licenses). And this post-suspension hearing relates to the licensing of drivers. *See* Admin. Code § 19-505(l) (“The commission may, after a hearing, suspend or revoke any driver's license for failure to comply with any provision of this chapter applicable to licensed drivers or for failure to comply with the commission's rules and regulations.”).

According to respondent, the prior arrests and criminal charges against him were dismissed in his favor without an adverse finding and have been sealed under CPL section 160.50 (ALJ Ex. 1). In support, respondent offered his New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services rap sheet, dated August 27, 2025, documenting only the present arrest and charge and no other history of past arrests, criminal charges, or convictions (Resp. Ex. C). Respondent argued that the protections contained in section 296(16) prohibit petitioner from relying on evidence of past suspensions that reference “legal” or “enforcement” as the underlying reason, which respondent states refer to arrests (ALJ Ex. 1 at 1, fn. 1). Petitioner did not dispute that these categories pertain to suspensions based on an arrest (ALJ Ex. 2 at 1). Respondent argued that petitioner should be prohibited from “relying on” such suspensions arising from “past arrests that were subsequently sealed and are no longer publicly available” (ALJ Ex. 1 at 1).

Petitioner opposed the preclusion motion and contended that the TLC suspension history, including information about prior arrests, should be permitted as relevant “support[ing]” evidence for consideration under *Nnebe v. Daus*, 931 F.3d 66, 82 (2d Cir. 2019), and TLC rule section 68-15(d)(5) (ALJ Ex. 2; Tr. 5-6). Petitioner also noted that this tribunal had previously admitted

TLC suspension histories in other matters, including those related to prior arrests (ALJ Ex. 2).² But there is no indication that those cases involved sealed records. Petitioner argued that “for the purposes of Summary Suspension hearings in general, the arrest charges are taken as true,” that “TLC suspension records are not subject to CPL 160.50,” and without the suspension history record, “Respondent’s TLC record as a driver will be incomplete and proper determination under *Nnebe* cannot be made” (*Id.*).

Petitioner’s arguments are unavailing. Under *Nnebe*, the “pending” criminal charges are taken as true at a summary suspension hearing. See 931 F.3d at 90. But it is up to the criminal court to decide the disposition of the criminal charge. *Id.* (“[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. We leave that to be resolved in the criminal courts, with the burden on the prosecution to prove guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.”). Respondent’s suspension history includes a record of prior suspensions that were based on arrests and criminal charges that are no longer pending and have been dismissed. Generally, the dismissal of a pending criminal charge upon which a suspension was based leads to a lifting of the suspension. See *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Bajwa*, OATH Index No. 1603/20 at 5 (Mar. 27, 2020), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Apr. 15, 2020) (lifting suspension because arrest charge upon which the TLC based its license suspension is no longer pending against respondent).

The purpose of section 296(16) of the Executive Law is to protect an individual against the discriminatory effects of arrests and criminal accusations that are terminated in favor of the accused. The plain language of section 296(16) does not permit TLC to “act upon adversely to” respondent for “any arrest or criminal accusation” that were resolved in respondent’s favor and sealed under CPL section 160.50. Exec. Law § 296(16); see *Nostrom v. A.W. Chesterton Co.*, 15 N.Y.3d 502, 507 (2010) (“[T]he text of a provision is the clearest indicator of the enactors’ intent, ‘and courts should construe unambiguous language to give effect to its plain meaning’”) (citation

² Petitioner cites to *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Muindjanov*, OATH Index No. 295/26 at 5-6 (Sept. 2, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Sept. 2, 2025) (referencing “suspension history” showing two-week “administrative suspensions” in 2018 and 2020); *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Ouaziz*, OATH Index No. 0071/26 at 3, 8 (Aug. 15, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Sept. 3, 2025) (referencing prior TLC license suspension for “‘enforcement’ related to a[n] ... arrest for ‘assault’” but noting that no further details were provided about the prior arrest and TLC had lifted the suspension); and *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Arias-Perez*, OATH Index No. 139/26 at 3 (Aug. 1, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Aug. 18, 2025) (referencing prior suspension for failing to comply with TLC’s drug test regulations) (ALJ Ex. 2 at 1).

omitted). To act “adversely” means to act “in a way that is bad or harmful.” See Merriam-Webster, Adversely, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/adversely> (last visited October 8, 2025).

Petitioner is permitted under TLC’s rules to offer evidence of respondent’s “history of . . . license suspension under these Rules” as evidence to demonstrate the risk of continuing respondent’s licensure. See 35 RCNY § 68-15(d)(5). However, prior suspensions stemming from arrests and criminal charges that have been terminated in respondent’s favor, and now sealed, should not factor into the risk analysis.³ See *Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Ismail*, OATH Index No. 2532/25 at 3, 5 (July 29, 2025), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Aug. 1, 2025) (finding that prosecution’s voluntary dismissal of charges “raises questions as to the veracity of that allegation”).

Petitioner correctly notes that its rules and *Nnebe* allow for consideration of prior suspensions. But offering evidence of a past suspension premised on an arrest and criminal charges that were dismissed and sealed would violate section 296(16)’s protections against “adverse” agency action. See *Skyline Inn Corp. v. N.Y. State Liquor Auth.*, 44 N.Y.2d 695, 696 (1978) (holding that licensing agency engaged in unlawful discriminatory practice under Executive Law section 296, “to predicate disapproval of the renewal application, albeit in part,” on an arrest and indictment for a criminal charge that was subsequently dismissed). TLC could have offered its own independent evidence besides the arrest and dismissed charge underlying the suspension, but it has not done that here. *Id.* (finding that licensing agency was permitted “to consider the independent evidence of the conduct leading to the criminal charges”); see also *Dep’t of Correction v. Blanc*, OATH Index No. 2571/11, mem. dec. at 7-8 (Sept. 12, 2011) (“permit[ting] petitioner to introduce [agency] records, including those relating to respondent’s arrest, so long as this information was obtained by investigators prior to entry of the sealing order” pursuant to section 160.50 of the CPL). Indeed, TLC did not dispute or offer any evidence to show that the prior suspensions labeled “legal” or “enforcement” were not based solely on arrests and criminal accusations that were later terminated in respondent’s favor and sealed.

In accordance with the protections of section 296(16) of the Executive Law, for the purposes of this risk analysis, I preclude the evidence of prior suspensions based solely on prior arrests that were dismissed and sealed under CPL section 160.50: the five prior suspensions

³ Respondent’s counsel represented that, in each instance, respondent provided to the TLC a Certificate of Disposition showing dismissal of those criminal charges to have his license reinstated (ALJ Ex. 1 at 3).

categorized as “legal” and “enforcement” on the first page “suspensions list,” as well as the following pages with additional information of the arrest and charges. The three prior suspensions on the “suspensions list” that were not premised on arrests are not precluded.⁴

ANALYSIS

The TLC 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). The TLC rule provides examples of evidence the parties could offer at the hearing that are relevant to the determination:

- (a) The particular facts and circumstances underlying the criminal charges, including the connection between the alleged offense and the Respondent’s duties and responsibilities as a driver licensed by the Commission;
- (b) The Respondent’s driving record, including any history of serious violations or license suspension under these Rules or applicable provisions of law relating to traffic or Vehicles licensed by the Commission;
- (c) The Respondent’s previous criminal record, or lack thereof;
- (d) The Respondent’s character and standing in the community[];
and
- (e) Any other evidence relevant to whether continued licensure of the Respondent during the pendency of criminal charges would pose a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

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*, 931 F.3d at 83. 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

⁴ My ruling at the hearing granted and denied respondent’s motion in parts (Tr. 14). My decision here modifies that ruling.

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.

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 Taxi & Limousine Comm’n v. Bah*, OATH Index No. 1045/24 at 7-8 (Oct. 26, 2023), *adopted*, Comm’r Dec. (Oct. 27, 2023) (finding that an individualized assessment of the relevant circumstances is required in cases involving off-duty domestic violence charges). The evidence in this record, including the conduct underlying the arrest, fails to establish that respondent’s continued licensure poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety.

For the circumstances underlying respondent’s present arrest, petitioner relied on a signed Kings County Criminal Court complaint that had been redacted, which alleges that on August 27, 2025, at approximately 2:23 p.m., respondent “pushed . . . the [complainant]’s body towards a door” and caused “the [complainant] to strike [her] back on said door” (Pet. Ex. 4 at 3). The complainant’s three children, one seven-year-old and two eleven-year-olds, were present and witnessed the “physical altercation” (*Id.*). According to the complainant, respondent’s actions caused her “to suffer substantial pain to [her] back, to fear further physical injury and to become alarmed and annoyed” (*Id.*). The incident occurred at respondent’s home, which is described in the complaint as respondent and complainant’s “shared residence” (Pet. Ex. 4 at 3; Pet. Ex. 2). Additional documents from the Kings County District Attorney provided that the alleged victim is someone with whom respondent is in a “present intimate relationship” and shares “three children in common,” and is a “member of his[] family or household” (Pet. Ex. 4 at 5).

Petitioner did not provide police reports or other documents, including medical records of any injury or treatment, in connection with this incident.

Respondent was charged and arraigned on non-felony charges of assault in the third degree (Penal Law § 120.00); endangering the welfare of a child, in three counts (Penal Law § 260.10 (01)); attempted assault in the third degree (Penal Law §§ 110.00, 120.00); and harassment (Penal Law § 240.26) (Pet. Ex. 5 at 2-3). The criminal court issued a signed temporary order of protection for the complainant but not the children (Resp. Ex. B).⁵ Respondent was released on his own recognizance with the next criminal court appearance scheduled for October 21, 2025 (Pet. Ex. 5 at 3).

The credible evidence established that respondent's arrest stemmed from an alleged off-duty domestic incident. This tribunal has found a nexus between domestic violence and the duties of TLC licensees as it tends to demonstrate "a violent and assaultive personality," and "a general lack of self-control, concern for the welfare of others, and a disregard for the law." *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Baig*, OATH Index No. 179/20 at 6 (Aug. 15, 2019), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Oct. 15, 2019); *see also Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Wynter*, OATH Index No. 295/23 at 7 (Aug. 17, 2022), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Aug. 29, 2022). Nevertheless, an alleged off-duty incident poses a less "direct" threat to the public. *Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 82; *see Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Peralta*, OATH Index No. 3349/24 at 4, 6 (June 18, 2024), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (June 25, 2024) (lifting suspension in consideration of the off-duty nature of the alleged incident involving choking another to obstruct breathing during a verbal dispute).

For purposes of this inquiry, the pending criminal charges must be taken as true. *See Nnebe*, 931 F.3d at 90. The allegation underlying the charges provides that respondent "pushed" complainant's body in the direction of a door, and her back hit the door causing "substantial pain" to her back. There is no indication that complainant suffered any other injuries or required medical attention. Evidence suggests that the injuries complainant suffered were relatively minor. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Parmar*, OATH Index No. 706/25 at 5 (Dec. 18, 2024), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Dec. 18, 2024) (noting that "suspensions have been lifted where there is no evidence of significant injury," in lifting suspension of driver with pending assault and harassment charges).

Furthermore, despite the full order of protection for the complainant, this evidence alone does not support continuing the suspension. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Irshaad*, OATH

⁵ The temporary order of protection submitted by petitioner for both the complainant and the children was unsigned (Pet. Ex. 4 at 8-9). Respondent's attorney represented that the order was modified so that the full order of protection remained in place for the complainant but not the children so that respondent could have contact with the children without supervision (Tr. 28).

Index No. 2533/25 at 5 (July 24, 2025), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (July 25, 2025) (finding that the presence of a full order of protection against respondent is “concerning,” but did not foreclose lifting the suspension); *see also Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Ahmad*, OATH Index No. 932/25 at 7 (Nov. 21, 2024), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Nov. 26, 2024) (rejecting that a full order of protection on behalf of respondent's wife is a “critical factor to support continuing the suspension”).

With respect to the children who were alleged witnesses of the altercation, the complaint did not allege nor provide evidence of any injury to them. *See Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Anonymous*, OATH Index No. 1856/25 at 5-6 (Apr. 8, 2025), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Apr. 11, 2025) (finding that pending charge of endangering the welfare of a child did not support a continued suspension where evidence of injury to child was lacking); *see also Irshaad*, OATH 2533/25 at 5 (finding risk to public not established where evidence concerning “extent of injury” to complainant was lacking and the criminal complaint did not allege any injuries to the child). Notably, no temporary order of protection was issued for the children (Resp. Ex. B).

Turning to respondent's record as a driver, his record as a licensee is not without blemish. Respondent has been a TLC licensee for 20 years (Pet. Ex. 2). An “adjudication list” from TLC's internal database documents mostly traffic law violations entered for respondent (Tr. 24, 26). From May 26, 2009 to August 22, 2016, TLC issued ten summonses to respondent, but three of the summonses are marked “closed withdrawn commission” (CWC), which suggests that TLC had withdrawn these charges. The remaining seven summonses were resolved with either a guilty finding after a hearing (“closed guilty hearing” – CGH), by mail (“closed guilty mail” – CGM), or by settlement (“closed settlement accepted” – CSA) (Tr. 25-26). I find unclear the disposition of two summonses marked as “closed settlement withdrawn” (CSW) (Pet. Exs. 7, 7A), and no further information was provided about them. More recently, respondent was issued two summonses on March 17, 2020, but one was withdrawn (CWC) and the other resolved with a settlement (CSA). Another summons that was issued on August 6, 2024, was settled (CSA) (Pet. Ex. 7). I give no weight to the violations for which the summonses were issued and resolved more than ten years ago. The more recent settled violations that petitioner admitted were “minor moving violations” (Tr. 26), deserve minimal weight.

Respondent's TLC license suspension history documents previous suspensions. Respondent's license was suspended a total of 27 days for “accounts receivable” in 2014, and 70 days for reasons provided as “revoked” and “ALJ – Temporary Suspen [sic]” from October 20 to

December 29, 2016 (Pet. Ex. 6). TLC offered no other details or evidence regarding these suspensions. These prior suspensions occurred almost ten or more years ago and they are too removed in time to bear on respondent's current ability as a driver.

Despite the pending charges and respondent's less-than-perfect TLC record, the evidence failed to establish that his continued licensure poses a direct and substantial threat to public health or safety. *Compare Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Cuautle*, OATH Index No. 552/25 at 6-8 (Oct. 21, 2024), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Oct. 24, 2024) (lifting suspension despite documented history of past violations and two recent suspensions, in light of other factors including respondent's long tenure as a licensee); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Doss*, OATH Index No. 2502/24 at 7 (Apr. 15, 2024), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (May 2, 2024) (lifting of suspension for driver with a prior TLC license suspension in light of good passenger rating and a six-year record as a licensee with no passenger complaints); *with Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Aghedo*, OATH Index No. 784/23 at 5, 8-10 (Oct. 26, 2022), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (Nov. 9, 2022) (continuing suspension for a driver with a "strikingly poor" DMV driving record for a driver who has been licensed for less than five years, a lack of customer reviews, and a previous guilty plea to a consumer complaint of discourtesy to a passenger demonstrating "lack of self-control on the job"); *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Putera*, OATH Index No. 1323/23 (Dec. 5, 2022), *rejected*, Comm'r Dec. (Dec. 19, 2022) (continuing suspension where licensee, who had been driving for three and a half years, was arrested for repeatedly striking his six-year-old child, and the driving abstract showed two convictions for disobeying a traffic device in 2019 and 2020, three accidents in 2019, and a prior guilty plea to a passenger complaint regarding a TLC rule violation for making a passenger exit his vehicle at a location other than the final destination).

Respondent's Uber Pro star rating of 4.83 based on 10,970 trips in the recent 11 years and four months is notable and reflects his present capability as a licensee (Resp. Ex. A). Furthermore, there is no evidence in this record of any passenger complaint against him. Respondent appears to be a driver who is able to "maintain self-control and professionalism in [his] many interactions with passengers, other drivers, and other members of the public." *Taxi & Limousine Comm'n v. Masum*, OATH Index No. 2012/20 at 6 (June 1, 2020), *adopted*, Comm'r Dec. (June 12, 2020).

Respondent's TLC suspensions and most of the violations occurred, and were resolved, a long time ago and do not reflect his present ability as a driver. The two more recent violations were for minor infractions and deserve little weight. Respondent's rap sheet shows that he has no

prior convictions and this is his only documented arrest and criminal charge (Resp. Ex. C). Weighing these factors, his good passenger ratings, and considering the off-duty nature of this incident that resulted in an apparent minor injury, lead me to conclude that respondent's continued licensure does not pose a direct and substantial threat to public health and safety.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Respondent was arrested and charged with misdemeanor assault in the third degree, endangering the welfare of a child, and related charges.
2. Even assuming that the pending criminal charges are 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 charges.

Seon Jeong Lee
Administrative Law Judge

October 15, 2025

SUBMITTED TO:

DAVID DO
Commissioner/Chair

APPEARANCES:

SHIVAJEET CHAKRABORTY
Representative for Petitioner

BROOKLYN DEFENDER SERVICES
Attorneys for Respondent
BY: ERIC EINGOLD, ESQ.

October 20, 2025

Naeem Fazal
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Re: TLC License No. 5189777

Licensee Fazal:

Pursuant to TLC Rule 68-15, a summary suspension hearing was concluded on October 1, 2025, as a result of your August 27, 2025 arrest for acting in a manner injurious to a child less than 17 years old.

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*
Todd Mordos, *Supervising Attorney, OATH Trials (TLC)*
Eric Eingold, *Attorney for Respondent*