

January 26, 2026

**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. 25601

SHALINE RANJIT
For-Hire Driver Enforcement Appeal

For Hire no.: 118892

Appellant: Shaline Ranjit
represented by **Joseph Reimer**
JGR Law Offices
[REDACTED]
Mercer Island, WA 98040
Telephone: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]

King County: King County For-Hire Licensing
represented by **Mari Isaacson**
Prosecuting Attorney's Office
701 5th Avenue, Suite 600
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: (206) 477-1961
Email: mari.isaacson@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, the Examiner denies the appeal.

Procedural Background

2. On September 5, 2025, King County For-Hire Licensing (Licensing) issued a Notice and Order For-Hire Permit Revocation to Shaline Ranjit. Ex. D2-003-007. The Port of Seattle citation (Case #2025-0356) which, together with several prior citations and infractions, culminated in the Notice and Order alleged soliciting, failing to provide the driver's for-hire permit, lack of TNC endorsement decal, not being logged into a TNC dispatch system, and not obeying the instruction of Ground Transportation and personnel. Exs. D2-003, D8. The Notice and Order also summarized previous observations by Port of Seattle Ground Transportation and City of Seattle and King County Inspectors of soliciting and unsafe driving ranging from June 2023 to July 2025. Ex. D2-004-005.
3. Joseph Riemer, representing Shaline Ranjit, filed a timely appeal on September 25, 2025, Ex. D14, and an amended appeal on November 3, 2025, Ex. D15. The amended appeal did not deny the allegations in the Notice and Order. Rather the amended appeal contended that the Notice and Order was based on unsubstantiated and conflicting evidence, lacked procedural fairness, and misapplied relevant regulations. Ex. D15.
4. This matter was originally assigned to Hearing Examiner Devon Shannon and the parties went to hearing on December 10, 2025. During introductions at the start of the hearing, the Examiner disclosed a prior working relationship with counsel for Licensing and asked if there were any objections. Mr. Reimer objected to Examiner Shannon hearing the case based on an asserted conflict of interest. The Examiner agreed to reassign the hearing to avoid any perception of bias.
5. We went to hearing on January 8, 2026. Participating in the hearing were: Mari Isaacson representing Licensing, witnesses Kim Ludviksen and Dexter Ulloa, and Joseph Reimer representing Ms. Ranjit. We reconvened the hearing on January 15, 2026. Participating in that continued hearing were: Mari Isaacson representing Licensing, witnesses Elizabeth Stenson and Steve Brown, Joseph Riemer representing Ms. Ranjit, and appellant Shaline Ranjit.
6. Mr. Reimer moved to exclude the testimony of all of Licensing's witnesses on the basis that he was not provided a witness list in advance of the hearing. However, Ms. Isaacson advised that Licensing had provided the names of potential witnesses to Mr. Reimer on November 11, 2025. Further, the witnesses were identified in the Staff Report at Ex. D1-003. The Staff Report also included a summary of their reports. Ex. D1-003. The Examiner denied the motion.
7. Mr. Reimer then moved to exclude the testimony of Dexter Ulloa contending that Examiner Shannon granted a continuance over his objection to allow Licensing to call him as a witness. The recording of the December 10, 2025 hearing demonstrates that his

contention is patently false.¹ To summarize, at the outset of the December 10 hearing, before witnesses were sworn in and testimony taken, Ms. Isaacson asked Examiner Shannon to hold the record open to allow testimony of Mr. Ulloa, whom she had learned the previous day was on medical leave. Mr. Reimer asked Examiner Shannon to either continue the hearing or deny Licensing’s request to hold the hearing open. Examiner Shannon deferred her ruling on Licensing’s request until the end of the hearing. As explained in Finding 4, before the hearing proceeded, Examiner Shannon terminated the hearing and reassigned the case. In reassigning the case, Examiner Shannon effectively granted Mr. Reimer’s request for a continuance. In addition, Mr. Reimer cross-examined Mr. Ulloa on January 8, 2026.

Appeal Issues

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

8. The issues on appeal are whether the violations of KCC 6.64.620, -.665.B, as identified in Licensing’s September 5, 2025, Notice and Order of Revocation, are supported by a preponderance of the evidence and appropriate under the facts of this case.

Factual Findings

The events leading up to Licensing’s revocation of Ms. Ranjit’s for-hire permit are described in the following findings. Weighing all the evidence, the Examiner finds the following facts by a preponderance of the evidence:

9. On June 12, 2023, the Port of Seattle issued Shaline Ranjit an infraction for not obeying instruction of ground transportation personnel, running a stop sign, refusing to show her for-hire license, soliciting, and speeding. Ex. D3. The infraction warned that failure to comply with all applicable laws, including local laws and Port of Seattle Rules and Regulations, may result in suspension and/or revocation of the permit. Ex. D3-002. From the Citation Details, it is apparent that Ms. Ranjit first asked for leniency as this was her only job and she had children and then later asserted that her sister was the driver, an argument she subsequently abandoned. Ex. D3-026, -028. Each of the infractions were upheld in an appeal hearing, although the fees for not obeying the instruction of ground transportation personnel and speeding were waived. Joe Reimer represented Ms. Ranjit in her appeal. Ex. D3-013.

¹ Mr. Reimer had previously filed a Motion to Dismiss “the case in its entirety” alleging that the “discretionary decision” by Examiner Shannon to defer her ruling on Licensing’s request to hold the hearing open violated her due process rights. The Examiner denied his Motion to Dismiss observing that, in his motion, counsel acknowledged that “a complete rehearing before a neutral, conflict-free examiner” would remedy any prejudice to his client. December 22, 2025, Order on Motion to Dismiss.

At the outset of the January 8 hearing the Examiner disclosed that she did not know either counsel and asked if either counsel objected to her this case. There was no objection.

10. On June 2, 2024, the City of Seattle issued Shaline Ranjit a Notice of Violation for refusing to show her for-hire license and soliciting. Ex. D4.
11. On April 15, 2025, the Port of Seattle issued Shaline Ranjit an infraction for not being logged into the dispatch system, not obeying instruction of ground transportation personnel, soliciting, and unauthorized pickup on April 9, 2025. This infraction also warned that failure to comply with all applicable laws, including local laws and Port of Seattle Rules and Regulations, may result in suspension and/or revocation of the permit. Ex. D5-002. Kim Ludviksen, Port of Seattle Ground Transportation Lead Controller, recognized Ms. Ranjit, walked to the driver's side of the car, asked the driver to roll down her window and asked if they could talk. Ms. Ludviksen introduced herself and asked for Ms. Ranjit's for-hire license. Standing in front of the vehicle, Ms. Ludviksen took a photo of the front license plate; then stepped aside as Ms. Ranjit quickly drove off.² Ex. D5; testimony of Kim Ludviksen.
12. On May 16, 2025, Shaline Ranjit solicited Inspector Elizabeth Stenson, who was not on duty at the time, at Pier 91 in the Transportation Network Company (TNC) area. Inspector Stenson's photographs and video document the encounter. Exs. D6-D7; testimony of Elizabeth Stenson.
13. On July 30, 2025, the Port of Seattle issued Shaline Ranjit a citation for not having a for-hire license, not having a TNC decal, not being logged into the dispatch system, not obeying instruction of ground transportation personnel, soliciting, and unauthorized parking/waiting. Ex. D8; testimony of Ground Transportation Controller Dexter Ulloa.
14. The videos in Exs. D10-D11 capture the July 30, 2025, solicitation and interaction with ground transportation personnel. The photograph in Ex. D9-002 shows Ms. Ranjit's vehicle exiting the TNC area. Ms. Ranjit's for-hire driver permit is provided in Ex. D9-003. Stenson testimony.
15. Ms. Ranjit testified that her husband was driving the vehicle for Uber during the July 30, 2025, incident. Her testimony is simply not credible. The photographic and video evidence clearly show Ms. Ranjit. Exs. D9-11.³
16. Port of Seattle Ground Controller Steve Brown was working in the TNC area on the third floor of SeaTac airport on September 4, 2025, at approximately 1 PM when he heard honking at the entrance to the area. He observed a car blocking the entrance while waiting to pull into stall 1. He recognized the car as Ms. Ranjit's from Port of Seattle videos and the license plate and Ms. Ranjit from her license. He obtained a video of her car at the exit. Exs. D12-D13; testimony of Steve Brown.

² Mr. Reimer asked what regulation required Ms. Ranjit to stay in place. A regional for-hire driver must allow the director to inspect the vehicle without prior notice at any reasonable time or place. KCC 6.65.160.E. (This provision is not cited in the Notice and Order).

³ In addition, she did not raise that argument in her amended appeal. KCC 20.22.080.G (the scope of the appeal is limited to matters raised in the appeal statement).

17. Ms. Ranjit requested leniency, explaining that for-hire driving for Uber is her primary source of income and that she has two children. She conceded that she had solicited but testified that if she could keep her for-hire license she would never solicit again. Given the history described in the previous findings and the fact that she made the same arguments in June 2023, her testimony is simply not credible.
18. Ms. Ranjit has not operated on the Lyft platform. Ex. D4-008 (Lyft has no record of a driver with plate CDL7734); Stenson testimony. Ms. Ranjit was authorized to operate on Uber from November 2020 through November 2024. Ex. D4-009 (Accela search showing Ms. Ranjit active on Uber platform with expiration on 11/09/2024); Stenson testimony.
19. The Examiner finds the testimony of Kim Ludviksen, Dexter Ulloa, Elizabeth Stenson, and Steve Brown, including arguable hearsay, credible and reliable.

Conclusions of Law

1. The hearing examiner has jurisdiction pursuant to KCC 20.22.040.
2. 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. The Examiner does not grant substantial weight or otherwise accord deference to agency determinations. Exam. R. XV.F.3.
3. KCC 6.64.665.B expressly provides that a transportation network company's driver, when driving an endorsed vehicle, shall only provide rides to fare-paying passengers that are booked through a transportation network company's application dispatch system. Consequently, Ms. Ranjit could not have legally provided rides to fare-paying passengers after November 9, 2024, when her Uber authorization was deactivated.
4. KCC 6.64.610.A.2 provides that a for-hire driver's license shall be immediately suspended and is null and void if the director obtains information after license issuance that the driver fails to meet the qualifications of a for-hire driver. KCC 6.64.610.B.2 provides that the director may suspend or revoke a for-hire driver's license if the director determines that the licensee has failed to comply with the driver standards as set forth in Chapter 6.64 KCC. Thus, the July 30, 2025, event alone would have been a sufficient basis for revocation of Ms. Ranjit's license.
5. Pursuant KCC 6.64.620 the director may consider information concerning the applicant's character, integrity, personal habits, past conduct and general qualifications that shows the applicant's ability and skill as a for-hire driver and the applicant's honesty, integrity and character for the purposes of determining whether the applicant is a suitable person to drive as a for-hire driver. These factors are just as relevant in deciding whether to revoke a license. Therefore, the Examiner overruled Mr. Reimer's repeated objections to

witnesses' testimony regarding Ms. Ranjit's prior solicitation and driving behavior.

6. Exam. R. XII.B provides:

Except as otherwise provided by these Rules, admissibility is not controlled by the Washington Rules of Evidence (ER). Any trustworthy oral or documentary evidence may be received, including reliable hearsay. The agency's case file is normally admitted as an exhibit in its entirety. Any party may object to the admission of specific documents within the case file on any of the grounds in XII.B. Parties are encouraged to offer specific case file documents as separate exhibits when of special importance. Exam. R. XII.C.8

Based on these rules, the Examiner overruled many of Mr. Reimer's repeated ER objections to Licensing's exhibits and testimony.

7. KCC 6.64.660.C provides that a driver shall have in the driver's possession and posted as required in K.C.C. 6.64.595 a valid for-hire driver's license at any time the driver is driving, in control of or operating a vehicle and the license shall be displayed as prescribed by the director.
8. The violations of KCC 6.64.620, -.665.B, as identified in Licensing's September 5, 2025, Notice and Order of Revocation and the appropriateness of the remedy Licensing imposed, are supported by a preponderance of the evidence and appropriate under the facts of this case.

DECISION:

The appeal is DENIED

ORDERED January 26, 2026.



Alison Moss
Hearing Examiner pro tem

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 JANUARY 8, 2026, HEARING IN THE APPEAL OF SHALINE RANJIT, KING COUNTY FOR-HIRE LICENSING FILE NO. 25601

Alison Moss 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	Notice and Order of Revocation (<i>Page D2-002 was excluded</i>)
Exhibit no. D3	Port of Seattle records for June 2023 incident
Exhibit no. D4	City of Seattle records for June 2024 incident
Exhibit no. D5	Port of Seattle records for April 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D6	Photo for May 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D7	Video for May 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D8	Port of Seattle records for July 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D9	Photo for July 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D10	Video for July 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D11	Second video for July 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D12	Port of Seattle records for September 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D13	Video for September 2025 incident
Exhibit no. D14	Appeal, received September 25, 2025
Exhibit no. D15	Amended appeal, received November 3, 2025

January 26, 2026

**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. **25601**

Shaline RANJIT

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 January 26, 2026.



Jessica Oscoy
Administrator

Bailey, Kendall

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Brown, Natalie

Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Brown, Steve

Port of Seattle

Cantu, Eddie

King County For-Hire Licensing

City of Seattle Hearing Examiner

Isaacson, Mari

Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Ludviksen, Kim

Port of Seattle

Megow, John

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Newhouse, Cregan

Finance and Admin Svcs, Consumer Protection Div

Ranjit, Shaline

Hardcopy

Reimer, Joseph

JGR Law Offices

Hardcopy

Stenson, Elizabeth

King County For-Hire Licensing

Taylor, Tyson

King County For-Hire Licensing

Ulloa, Dexter

Port of Seattle