

November 13, 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. 25-873

JAYPAL SINGH
For-Hire Driver Enforcement Appeal

For Hire no.:

Appellant: **Jaypal Singh**

[REDACTED]
Kent, WA 98032

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. Singh's appeal.

Procedural Background

2. On October 21, 2025, Licensing issued a Notice of License Action - Application Denial with Summary Suspension to Jaypal Singh. Ex. D6. Mr. Singh filed a timely appeal on October 23, 2025. Ex. D7.

3. We went to hearing on November 10, 2025. Participating in the hearing were: Tyson Taylor representing Licensing, and appellant Jaypal Singh. Mr. Singh's wife and daughter were present but did not participate in the hearing. A Punjabi interpreter was provided for Mr. Singh.

Appeal Issues

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

4. In Mr. Singh's October 23, 2025, appeal statement, he argues that the denial and suspension of his for-hire license are based on a pending criminal lawsuit and, unless there is a final determination of guilt in that matter, these licensing actions are premature.
5. The issue on appeal is therefore whether the department can establish that its denial of Mr. Singh's for-hire license renewal and summary suspension 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:

6. Mr. Taylor introduced the department's Notice of License Action and the basis for the application denial and summary suspension. In processing a license renewal application, the department conducts a background check for driving records and any criminal conduct. Testimony of Mr. Taylor.
7. Mr. Singh's criminal record revealed a pending felony case for Rape of a Child in the 1st Degree. Licensing's exhibits point to the severity of the allegations against Mr. Singh. Ex. D2, D3.
8. Mr. Taylor emphasized the Conditions of Release for Mr. Singh, which specifically preclude contact with any minors except for his biological daughter, until the conclusion of the trial. Ex. D4, D5.
9. Mr. Taylor pointed out that the court clearly found the charges serious and concerning enough that even Mr. Singh's contact with his daughter is limited to supervised visits with a responsible adult who has knowledge of the charges and the orders in the criminal case. Testimony of Mr. Taylor.
10. Mr. Taylor noted that the King County and Seattle regulations for taxi drivers are in place to protect the travelling public. Testimony of Mr. Taylor. The department's position is that allowing Mr. Singh to operate as a taxi driver puts the public at risk and its denial of his license was necessary under the applicable regulations. Testimony of Mr. Taylor; Ex. D1.

11. Specifically, Mr. Taylor explained that because of Mr. Singh's prohibition on contact with minors, allowing a family travelling with children into his taxicab would be a violation of his court order, and to refuse service to a passenger because they are travelling with minor children would be a violation of KCC 6.65.170 and SMC 6.311.170. Testimony of Mr. Taylor; Ex. D1.
12. Mr. Singh's testimony focused on his position that the charges against him were untrue, based on an apparent property dispute. Testimony of Mr. Singh. Mr. Singh also emphasized his financial need for his taxi driver employment as he is the sole source of income for their family. Testimony of Mr. Singh. He felt confident that he would be successful at trial. Testimony of Mr. Singh.
13. Mr. Singh submitted a letter from his criminal defense attorney, arguing that Mr. Singh is not guilty and the pending criminal matter should not “terminate his employment.” Ex. A1.
14. Mr. Singh submitted his driving record, showing that he has no restrictions on his license and no record of accidents. Ex. A2.
15. Mr. Singh submitted a letter from his temple showing he participates in community service by helping clean the common areas and prepare and serve meals at Gurdwara Sahib. Ex. A3.
16. Mr. Singh submitted signatures of character references affirming that he is hardworking and that they have not observed any behavior that would questions his integrity or fitness to hold a for-hire driver permit. Ex. A4.
17. Mr. Singh acknowledged that, since the order prohibiting contact with minors was put in place, he has given taxi rides to families with children. Testimony of Mr. Singh. The testimony was as follows:

Mr. Taylor: "Since the date these charges were filed in August of 2024, have you had any families travelling with children approach you for a ride at the airport?"

Mr. Singh: "Yes. A lot of families with kids."

Mr. Taylor: "And did you take them to their destination?"

Mr. Singh: "Yes, from the airport I dropped them wherever they needed to be dropped off."

...

Mr. Taylor: "When you travelled with those families did you advise them of your court order?"

...

Mr. Singh: "No. No one asked me nor did I tell them."

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. Licensing Services determined, based on a review of Mr. Singh's criminal record and background, that immediate license suspension and denial of his license renewal application was warranted. The information supporting the department's decision is related to Mr. Singh's pending criminal charge for Rape of a Child and the conditions of his release pending trial.
21. There is no conviction or "final adverse finding" that would warrant license suspension or denial under KCC 6.65.090.H. There are, however, other regulations that support Licensing Services' decision in this matter.
22. Under KCC 6.65.170, a driver cannot refuse to transport any person except under specific circumstances. Mr. Singh's conditions of release prohibit him from having contact with "any minors" (except his biological daughter). Ex. D1, D4, D5. As Mr. Taylor pointed out, this puts Mr. Singh in an impossible position of either violating the for-hire driver regulations or his court restrictions on contact with minors. He cannot legally comply with both.
23. KCC 6.65.160 requires drivers to comply with their regional dispatch agency policies. Regional dispatch agencies are required to have policies in place "that prohibits ...drivers, from discriminating against passengers or potential passengers on the basis of ... age. KCC 6.65.340. Declining passengers based on age to comply with his conditions of release would violate this regulation and the regional dispatch agency policy. As above, he cannot legally comply with the for-hire driver regulations and the court order prohibiting contact with minors.
24. Additionally, under KCC 6.65.090.K, the department may look at an applicant's "ability and skill" to be licensed as a regional for-hire taxi driver. Mr. Singh does not have the "ability" to be a regional for-hire taxi driver because he is unable to be in a car with minors and families will regularly be the customers seeking rides from Mr. Singh at the airport. It is simply not possible for Mr. Singh to comply with the court order and the for-hire regulations.
25. KCC 6.65.090.K also enables the department to consider "honesty and integrity" in their licensing decisions. Both parties provided evidence that spoke to Mr. Singh's character. The signatures of Mr. Singh's co-workers attesting to his character are appreciated, as is the letter from his temple regarding his community service.

26. Mr. Singh's submissions do not carry the weight, however, of a court order prohibiting contact with minors based on the seriousness of the criminal charges against Mr. Singh. Mr. Taylor specifically highlighted that the court found Mr. Singh's case serious enough that there were restrictions on visitations with his 3-year-old daughter.
27. Mr. Singh's admission during the hearing that he has been accepting fares from families with minors, which violates his conditions for release, now gives additional support to the department's decision under KCC 6.65.090.K. His violation of the court order objectively diminishes his honesty and integrity.
28. Based on a preponderance of the evidence, KCC 6.65.090.K, -.160, and -.170 each provide independent regulatory bases for summary suspension of Mr. Singh's license and denial of his renewal application.

DECISION:

Mr. Singh's appeal is DENIED.

ORDERED November 13, 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 10, 2025, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF
JAYPAL SINGH, KING COUNTY FOR-HIRE LICENSING FILE NO. 25-873**

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	Information – Case #24-1-04569-1 KNT
Exhibit no. D3	Motion, Finding of Probable Cause and Order Directing Issuance of Summons or Warrant and Fixing Bail
Exhibit no. D4	Conditions of Release for Defendant
Exhibit no. D5	Order Prohibiting Contact
Exhibit no. D6	Notice of License Action – Application Denial with Summary Suspension
Exhibit no. D7	Appeal, submitted October 23, 2025

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

Exhibit no. A1	Letter from Attorney Zachary Wagnild, dated November 3, 2025
Exhibit no. A2	Driving Record, as of November 4, 2025
Exhibit no. A3	Letter from Gurudwara Singh Sabha of Washington, dated November 3, 2025
Exhibit no. A4	Character reference letter and signatures

November 13, 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. **25-873**

Jaypal SINGH

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 November 13, 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

Newhouse, Cregan

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Singh, Jaypal

Hardcopy

Stenson, Elizabeth

King County For-Hire Licensing

Taylor, Tyson

King County For-Hire Licensing