

December 2, 2025

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**
Telephone (206) 477-0860
hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov
www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner

REPORT AND DECISION

SUBJECT: King County For-Hire Licensing file no. 25679

ABDIFITAAH MUUSSE
For-Hire Driver Enforcement Appeal

For Hire no.: 9465

Appellant: **Abditifaah Muusse**

[REDACTED]
Seattle, WA 98118

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

King County: King County For-Hire Licensing
represented by Tyson Taylor
King County For-Hire Licensing
201 S. Jackson Street Suite 206
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: (206) 263-1373
Email: ttaylor@kingcounty.gov

Overview

1. After hearing the witnesses' testimony and observing their demeanor, studying the exhibits admitted into evidence, and considering the parties' arguments and the relevant law, we deny Mr. Muusse's appeal.

Procedural Background

2. On September 10, 2025, For-Hire Licensing Services (Licensing Services) issued a “Notice of License Action – Denial” to Abditifaah Muusse. Ex. D10. Abditifaah Muusse filed a timely appeal on September 15, 2025. Ex. D11.
3. We went to hearing on November 20, 2025. Participating in the hearing were: Tyson Taylor representing Licensing, and appellant Abditifaah Muusse.

Appeal Issues

Per the Notice of Hearing, the issues identified for consideration on appeal are as follows:

4. Mr. Muusse appeals the September 10, 2025, denial of his application to renew his regional for-hire driver’s license. The denial decision references and relies, in part, on an ongoing criminal case for driving under the influence.
5. We held a prehearing conference on November 3, 2025. At this conference both parties expressed their interest in proceeding with the hearing despite the absence of any final decision on Mr. Muusse’s pending criminal charge.
6. The issue on appeal is whether Licensing Services’ denial of Mr. Muusse’s permit application under either KCC 6.65.090.H or -.090.J is supported by a preponderance of the evidence and appropriate under the facts of this case.

Factual Findings

Weighing all the evidence, the hearing examiner finds the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

7. Mr. Muusse submitted a for-hire driver's license renewal application to Licensing Services on August 19, 2025. As part of its standard application review process, Licensing conducted a criminal background and driving record check. It is significant that these are independent processes and the driving record check triggered the department's concerns with renewing Mr. Muusse's license application.
8. Mr. Muusse's driving record revealed a December 18, 2022, collision. Ex. D2. Mr. Muusse does not dispute that he was the driver involved in the collision and that he was driving his Uber/Lyft vehicle. Testimony of Mr. Muusse; Ex. D6-003. Mr. Muusse denies being at-fault in the collision. Testimony of Mr. Muusse.
9. The other driver and a witness reported that Mr. Muusse was speeding and caused the collision. Ex. D1, D2. Per the police officer’s report, "Muusse was deemed the at-fault driver for Operating Single Lane SMC 11.53.100." Ex. D6-003.

10. The officer's report indicated that Mr. Muusse "would not provide officers with his driver's license or insurance information." Ex. D2. He was "cited for violation of SMC 11.20.340" for failure to provide proof of insurance. Ex. D2.
11. When officers arrived, Mr. Muusse had just been in a physical altercation with another subject on the scene. "Mr. Muusse was the primary aggressor and was punched in the face." Ex. D6-003. Mr. Muusse requested emergency services and was medically examined and cleared at the scene.
12. The officer's report noted the following about Mr. Muusse's behavior and demeanor on the scene: "heavily smelled of alcohol," "urinated in public on the street," "slurred speech," "became angry and refused to cooperate," "had trouble walking," and admitted to consuming alcohol. Ex. D6.
13. Mr. Muusse was taken into custody with probable cause for a DUI. Ex. D6. He was later charged with Driving While Under the Influence and an order was issued suspending his driver's license from December 1, 2024, to August 5, 2025. Exs. D5, D7, D8, D9.
14. Licensing received trip records from the Port of Seattle that identified two occasions where Mr. Muusse's vehicle was used to take for-hire rides during the time his license was suspended. Ex. D10-003. There was no evidence affirming that the driver on those occasions was Mr. Muusse. Testimony of Mr. Taylor. Mr. Muusse denies taking any riders during the time his license was suspended and asserts he was out of the country on one of the two dates reported by the Port of Seattle. Testimony of Mr. Muusse.
15. Although the Motion & Order of Dismissal for Case #4240004201 provided by Mr. Muusse is not a complete record, the parties both acknowledge, and judicial notice is taken, that the criminal case against Mr. Muusse was dismissed with prejudice on November 14, 2025. *See* Ex. A2. Mr. Taylor testified that the dismissal was based on a technicality because the arresting officer did not appear for the hearing. The Motion and Order of Dismissal confirms this statement. Ex. A2.
16. The toxicology report obtained for the criminal charge indicated that Mr. Muusse's blood alcohol content was .22. Ex. D6-007. However, Mr. Muusse provided evidence that the bloodwork was excluded from his criminal proceeding. Ex. A1. Without knowing why that evidence was excluded, it is not reasonable to rely on the toxicology report as evidence in this proceeding. As discussed below, however, it is not relevant to the basis for the ultimate decision in this case.
17. Licensing denied Mr. Muusse's renewal application on September 10, 2025. Ex. D10.

Conclusions of Law

18. The hearing examiner has jurisdiction pursuant to KCC 20.22.040.

19. Licensing bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence both the violation and the appropriateness of the remedy it has imposed. KCC 20.22.080.G; .210.B. We do not grant substantial weight or otherwise accord deference to agency determinations. Exam. R. XV.F.3.
20. The department offers two legal grounds for its license denial: KCC 6.65.090.J and 6.65.090.H.
21. KCC 6.65.090 H. Grant of license.
The director shall issue a regional for-hire driver's license to an applicant who successfully passes a criminal background check, including:
 1. No conviction, bail forfeitures, or other final adverse findings, including in civil suits or administrative hearings, pertaining to any of the following within the past five years: ...
 - d. any alcohol-or drug-related driving crime.
22. KCC 6.65.090 J. Grant of license.
The director shall issue a regional for-hire driver's license to an applicant who successfully passes a check of the applicant's driving record, meaning:
 1. The applicant's driving record has no egregious law violations within the past five years, and
 2. The applicant's driving record leads the director to reasonably conclude that the applicant will operate a vehicle in a safe manner and comply with this chapter.
23. Where an applicant does not pass a driving record check, the appropriate license action is denial of the application. KCC 6.65.430.F.
24. Mr. Muusse's recent criminal case was dismissed and there is no other criminal history that would implicate KCC 6.65.090.H. There is no final adverse finding in Mr. Muusse's criminal background that would support denial of his for-hire driver's license under this regulation.
25. Application of KCC 6.65.090.J, however, warrants a different result. Under KCC 6.65.090.J.1, we ask whether Mr. Muusse had any "egregious law violations" within the past five years. Under KCC 6.65.040, "egregious" means "any moving violation that posed an immediate threat to the safety of the driver, any passengers in the vehicle, or to others." This broad definition encompasses not just incidents that have actual safety impacts, but those that reasonably could have caused immediate harm to someone involved in the incident.
26. The December 18, 2022, accident, for which Mr. Muusse was deemed to be the at fault driver, was an "egregious" moving violation which posed an immediate safety threat to both drivers. This is true independently of whether either driver was actually injured. The circumstances and nature of the accident put the welfare of the parties at risk and, thankfully, that threat was not fully realized.

27. A preponderance of the evidence supports Licensing’s denial of Mr. Muusse’s license renewal application under KCC 6.65.090.J.1 because the December 18, 2022, accident is reasonably categorized as an egregious law violation on Mr. Muusse’s driving record within the past five years.
28. KCC 6.65.090.J.2 provides discretion for the department to consider other factors in the applicant's driving record to determine whether issuing a license is appropriate. Here, the director's conclusion that Mr. Muusse could not be relied on to operate a vehicle in a safe manner and in compliance with Ch. 6.65 KCC was reasonable in light of other facts in his driving record regarding the December 12, 2022, collision.
29. Specifically, Mr. Muusse refused to provide his license and insurance information and was cited at the scene for this violation. Mr. Muusse admitted to having at least two beers prior to driving and the responding officer noted the smell of alcohol on Mr. Muusse, his slurred speech and his trouble walking. These facts support the department’s conclusion that Mr. Muusse cannot be relied on to operate a vehicle in a safe manner and in compliance with Ch. 6.65 KCC.
30. It is essential to clarify that the criminal charge and dismissal is irrelevant to the decision here. If Mr. Muusse had not been charged with a DUI, but the same facts were a part of Mr. Muusse's driving record, the result would be the same. It is the accident itself and the details in the police report regarding Mr. Muusse's demeanor and actions at the collision scene that justify the department's decision under KCC 6.65.090.J.
31. Nothing in this decision prevents Mr. Muusse from re-applying for a for-hire driver's license in the future. Three years have passed since the collision that was the basis for the department's decision in this case. KCC 6.65.090.J contemplates a five-year window of driving record activity relevant for review of a license application.
32. Taken as a whole, a preponderance of the evidence in this case supports the department's decision to deny renewal of Mr. Muusse's for-hire license.

DECISION:

Mr. Muusse’s appeal is DENIED.

ORDERED December 2, 2025.



Devon Shannon
Hearing Examiner

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

King County Code 20.22.040 directs the Examiner to make the County’s final decision for this type of case. This decision shall be final and conclusive unless appealed to superior court in accordance with Ch. 7.16 RCW. It is the responsibility of the party seeking to appeal the examiner’s decision to determine and meet the legal requirements for filing an appeal.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 20, 2025, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF ABDIFITAAH MUUSSE, KING COUNTY FOR-HIRE LICENSING FILE NO. 25679

Devon Shannon was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the Hearing Examiner’s Office.

The following exhibits were offered by the department and entered into the record:

Exhibit no. D1	King County For-Hire Licensing staff report
Exhibit no. D2	Collision Report ED17824
Exhibit no. D3	Accela Vehicle Record – BPX7588 – FVEH-19-001723
Exhibit no. D4	09/21/2022 Vehicle Inspection Report – BPX7588 – E-Cab #866
Exhibit no. D5	Criminal Complaint – Seattle Municipal Court Case #4240004201
Exhibit no. D6	Seattle Police Report – Case No: 4240004201
Exhibit no. D7	Seattle Municipal Court Minute Order – 10/15/2024
Exhibit no. D8	Declaration of Non-Driving and Order on Criminal Motion
Exhibit no. D9	Seattle Municipal Court Minute Order – 08/05/2025
Exhibit no. D10	Notice of License Action – Citation, issued September 10, 2025
Exhibit no. D11	Appeal, received September 15, 2025

The following exhibits were submitted by the appellant and accepted into the record:

Exhibit no. A1	Seattle Municipal Court Minute Order, Hearing 8-11-2025
Exhibit no. A2	Motion and Order to Dismiss, dated 11-14-2025, submitted 11-15-2025

December 2, 2025

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**
Telephone (206) 477-0860
hearingexaminer@kingcounty.gov
www.kingcounty.gov/independent/hearing-examiner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

SUBJECT: King County For-Hire Licensing file no. **25679**

Abdifitaah MUUSSE

For-Hire Driver Enforcement Appeal

I, Jessica Oscoy, certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that I transmitted the **REPORT AND DECISION** to those listed on the attached page as follows:

- EMAILED to all County staff listed as parties/interested persons and parties with e-mail addresses on record.
- placed with the United States Postal Service, through Quadient-Impress, with sufficient postage, as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to the non-County employee parties/interested persons to addresses on record.

DATED December 2, 2025.



Jessica Oscoy
Administrator

Bailey, Kendall

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Cantu, Eddie

King County For-Hire Licensing

City of Seattle Hearing Examiner

Megow, John

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Muisse, Abditifaah

Hardcopy

Newhouse, Cregan

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Taylor, Tyson

King County For-Hire Licensing