

REASONS FOR DECISION OF THE TORONTO LICENSING TRIBUNAL

Date of

Hearing: June 11, 2015

Panel: Lionel Miskin, Chair; Ken Chan and (Hedy) Anna Walsh, Members

Re: Harjap Singh Dehar
Holder of Taxicab Owner's Licence No. V02-3604145 for Plate No. 3210

AND

Yadwinder Singh Pannu
Holder of Taxicab Owner's Licence No. V02-3484245 for Plate No. 410
Agent for Plate Nos. 623, 1403 and 3210

Counsel for Municipal Licensing and Standards: Mr. Matthew Cornett
Counsel for Licencees: Mr. Robert Stewart

INTRODUCTION

Yadwinder Singh Pannu is holder of Taxicab Owner's Licence No. V02-3484254 and Harjap Singh Dehar is holder of Taxicab Owner's Licence No. V02-3604145. Both licencees were instructed to attend a hearing before the Toronto Licensing Tribunal (TLT) to determine whether their licences should be suspended, revoked, or have conditions placed on them, in accordance with Chapter 545 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code (the Code).

Mr. Dehar had been first licensed as a taxicab owner with City of Toronto taxicab plate #3210 on January 27, 2006. Mr. Pannu had been first licensed as a taxicab owner with City of Toronto taxicab plate #410 on September 29, 2004. He had previously been licensed as taxicab driver on April 20, 1989. At the time of this hearing he was also a registered agent for Toronto taxicab plate #623, #1403, and #3210.

Mr. Pannu and Mr. Dehar are brothers-in-law and live two doors apart on the same street.

The City alleged that a 2007 Chevrolet motor vehicle (2007 Chev) decommissioned as a taxi, owned by Mr. Dehar, and for which Mr. Pannu was the registered agent, was continuing to operate as an unlicensed taxi. It further alleged that Mr. Pannu participated in the operation of the illegal taxi, and did not carry on his business with honesty and integrity as required by Chapter 545 of the Code.

At the outset of the hearing, it was agreed by all parties that both cases would be heard together. At the conclusion of the evidence, TLT called for argument to be submitted in writing. Both counsel agreed. The City delivered its argument, but the licencees did not.

CITY'S EVIDENCE

The City called only one witness, Mr. Jarrett Tamaki. Mr. Tamaki identified himself as a business licence enforcement officer for the City's licensing division known as Municipal

June 11, 2015

Licensing and Standards (MLS). Some portions of his testimony are beyond dispute, and they are as follows.

On September 14, 2012, while on patrol, he spotted a vehicle which appeared to be a taxi discharging an elderly female passenger near the intersection of Overlea Boulevard and Don Mills Road in Toronto. His attention was drawn to the car because the weather was inclement, and he thought it was rude that the taxi driver was not assisting the passenger. The vehicle was a grey 2007 Chevrolet Impala with provincial licence plates (plp – plps in plural) bearing the number BPJH923. He also noticed that the Toronto taxicab plate with number 3306 (which during the course of the hearing came to be known as the “fake plate”) seemed strange in the fact that the numbers were not spaced as they normally are on a valid Toronto taxicab plate. In addition the word “Toronto” and the city logo were affixed by stickers rather than painted. He followed the car for a while and then pulled it over. He was in full uniform and identified himself as a business licence enforcement officer for MLS. He found a functioning, dispatch radio on the inside as well as an installed taxi camera and an installed computer. He did not test either the camera or the computer to determine whether they were functioning. The car lacked a tariff card and Bill of Rights, both of which are required by the Code to be in a licensed taxi. The driver identified himself as Israr Bhatti. He did not have a taxi driver’s licence. He denied that he had been transporting a fare, and told Mr. Tamaki that he was merely taking the car to his brother.

Exhibit #22 is a copy of an Able Atlantic Taxi (AAT) document headed “List of Orders” which, in effect, is a record of dispatches. It shows that Toronto taxicab plate #3306 was dispatched to pick up a fare at Scarborough Grace Hospital for transport to Don Mills and Overlea, where Mr. Tamaki first noticed the vehicle. The dispatch time shows as 1:57 p.m., which is consistent with the time that Mr. Tamaki spotted the vehicle and the time that the police constables arrived on the scene.

When Mr. Tamaki ran a search on the vehicle’s plps, he discovered that the plps were registered to another car, namely a black 2010 Chevrolet Impala registered to Mr. Dehar. He then called police who attended the scene in the persons of Police Constables Jonathan Sham and Katerina Witt. Their notes were entered into evidence together as exhibit #35. The police arranged to have the car towed to a pound by A-Towing.

IB was charged with five violations of the Code, failed to attend at his trial and was convicted on all five. The fines remain unpaid.

Examination of the MLS records by Mr. Tamaki and his supervisor, Mr. Kugelman, disclosed the following information.

At all material times, there was a duly licensed taxi, a 2011 Toyota Camry, registered with the City under Toronto taxicab plate #3306, and operating under the brokerage of Beck Taxi (Beck). This is corroborated by exhibit #29, a letter from Beck, and exhibit #24 which shows the owner to be one Ramanbir Sandhu. Baljit Sikand was the designated agent for that car.

June 11, 2015

Mr. Pannu was registered as an owner of Toronto taxicab plate #410 and as designated agent of Toronto taxicab plate #'s 623, 1403, and 3210. Mr. Dehar was the owner of Toronto taxicab plate #3210 from 2006 to 2013.

Exhibit #6 is a history of Toronto taxicab plate #3210 and shows Mr. Dehar is plate owner, Mr. Pannu is designated agent and AAT is the broker. The Toronto taxicab plate was issued for a vehicle with plp #BPJH923.

Exhibits #13 and #14 show, as of September 19, 2012, and as of October 10, 2012, that plp #AXYX595, was issued for a grey 2007 Chevrolet Impala registered to Mr. Dehar.

Although Mr. Pannu, in his testimony, denied having any involvement with Toronto taxicab plate #3306 (the fake plate) in 2012, he did acknowledge having had that plate in his fleet for a while and that he introduced that plate, purportedly owned by Arshad Mohammad Bhatti, brother of Israr Bhatti, to the brokerage of AAT. Exhibit #19, a letter from AAT dated October 29, 2012, indicates that Toronto taxicab plate #3306, presumably the fake plate, was under its brokerage from September 2011 to September 2012, and that Mr. Pannu was the "contact person". Exhibit #20 shows that Toronto taxicab plate #3306 was on AAT's plate list as at December 9, 2011, and as at October 10, 2012. Exhibit #21 consisting of two sheets is an AAT "duelist" dated August 24, 2012, showing funds due to AAT from Mr. Pannu for September 2012, in relation to Toronto taxicab plate #'s 643, 410, 623, 3210, and 3306. Mr. Pannu also acknowledged that he was a fleet operator, and that Toronto taxicab plate #3306, operated by Arshad Mohammad Bhatti, formed part of his fleet from the beginning of 2012 to September 14, 2012. A fleet operator performs a different function than an agent and is not required to be licensed or registered with the City.

According to his evidence, on being notified by Mr. Dehar that the unlicensed taxi had been impounded, Mr. Pannu attended at the pound with plp #AXYX595 to retrieve plp #BPJH923. Exhibit #17 is a copy of the A-Towing invoice for the tow as well as a photocopy of Mr. Pannu's driver's licence. Objection was made to the admissibility of this document on the basis that it was hearsay. The Tribunal decided that the document should be admitted for three reasons. Firstly, the Tribunal is not bound by the rules of evidence in the same manner as the courts. Secondly there was no suggestion that the contents of the document were not truly representative of the original items. Thirdly, it would be only common prudence for the pound to insist on proper identification from the person who was seeking release of any vehicle. Furthermore evidence from two of the licencees' witnesses corroborated Mr. Pannu's attendance with the aforementioned plps and the fact that he met Israr Bhatti at the pound.

Mr. Pannu further acknowledged that his fleet also included Toronto taxicab plate #330. He said that the plate was owned by Arshad Mohammad Bhatti and that he was the contact person for it for three to four months in 2011. The City's evidence indicated that there were two plates outstanding with that number. One of them was a validly issued plate which appears on exhibit #30, a *Plate Inquiry* from MLS records. It shows Toronto taxicab plate #330 as having been issued to Kathleen Grout Investments Inc. as owner, with Daniel Hisson as custodian, Joginder Bajwa as agent, and Arrow Cab Inc. as broker. The Toronto taxicab plate was registered to plp #BEEL652 on September 17, 2008. The adjacent page on the exhibit shows that the plate was registered again on

June 11, 2015

May 24, 2012 for plp #BNTL617, a different vehicle with the same owner, agent, and custodian and with Beck Taxi Ltd. as broker. Exhibit #27 is a letter from AAT dated October 29, 2012, indicating that Toronto taxicab plate #330 was brokered by it from November 2010 to January 2011, with contact person being Mr. Pannu. Exhibit #28 is an excerpt from an AAT payment spread-sheet which shows Mr. Pannu in connection with Toronto taxicab plate #330. Exhibit #29 is a letter from Beck dated October 29, 2012, indicating that Toronto taxicab plate #330 has been under Beck brokerage since September, 2009, and that Mr. Bajwa was and still is the agent for that plate. The MLS record does not show Mr. Pannu or Mr. Dehar in connection with the history of Toronto taxicab plate #330.

The City uses a system for renewing Toronto taxicab plates similar to that which the Ministry of Transport uses to renew plps. On renewal a sticker, which the City refers to as "validation tag", or "val tag" for short, is issued to the plate owner to be affixed to the metal plate. On the fake #3306, Mr. Tamaki discovered two val tags, the top one of which was damaged and could not be identified. The other was number 74991. He found from MLS records that val tag #74991 had been issued for Toronto taxicab plate #1403, a plate for which Mr. Pannu was the registered agent.

LICENSEES RESPONSE

Both licencees testified. They said that Mr. Dehar had purchased a later model car, namely a 2010 Chevrolet Impala (2010 Chev) because the 2007 Chev was no longer fit for service as a taxi. There was some confusion as to dates on the part of the licencees. The initial testimony was that the 2010 Chev was acquired on or about August 22, 2012. They took it and the 2007 Chev to a service garage where they themselves removed all of the taxi equipment from the 2007 car and installed it in the 2010 car. They stated that Mr. Dehar had sold the 2007 Chev to one Arshad Mohammad Bhatti, or to his brother, Israr Bhatti, on September 12, 2012. In another part of his testimony, Mr. Pannu said that the transfer of taxi equipment between the two cars did not occur until the sale to Israr Bhatti on September 12, 2012. Mr. Dehar said that the transfer occurred on August 20 and that the new car was registered as a taxi on August 22. Neither Mr. Pannu nor Mr. Dehar produced any documentary evidence of these events. In any event, this transfer of equipment did not include the taxi computer or the taxi camera because those items can only be removed or installed by a specialist or expert. They left the 2007 Chev at the garage, but removed its plps and left those plates in the custody of the garage. They also removed the fuse from the computer to disable it and removed the hard drive from the camera. Mr. Pannu called AAT to instruct them to close down the computer. They hoped to sell the car and thought the plates would be necessary in case a prospective buyer wanted to test drive it. For the same reason they maintained the insurance coverage.

On September 12, 2012, they met Messrs. Israr Bhatti and Arshad Mohammad Bhatti at the garage. Mr. Pannu had recognized them as persons whom he had seen in the course of the taxi industry, and indeed, he had acted as agent for a Toronto taxicab plate purportedly owned by Arshad Mohammad Bhatti, #3306. Arshad Mohammad Bhatti soon left and Isara Bhatti purchased the car from them for \$500.00 cash paid on the spot. Mr. Dehar signed the vehicle transfer form and handed it over to Israr Bhatti. The buyer had no plps for the car and had not arranged to have it towed. Mr. Pannu and Mr. Dehar allowed him to take the car with Mr. Dehar's plps on the promise that he would

June 11, 2015

return the computer and camera and the plps next day. The garage mechanic installed the plps but, according to his testimony and that of the licencees, he mistakenly removed the plps from the 2010 Chev, that is plp #BPJH923, which he put onto the 2007 Chev, and installed plp #AXYX595 onto the 2010 Chev. Although both Mr. Pannu and Mr. Dehar were present throughout, they denied noticing this discrepancy.

When Israr Bhatti failed to return the plps and the other equipment in the 2007 Chev, Mr. Pannu called him the next evening. Israr Bhatti said that he had been unable to work the car that day, but would bring those items tomorrow, that is, on the 14th of September. In fact he did not return those items on the 14th, the day Mr. Tamaki stopped the vehicle.

Upon learning that the 2007 Chev had been impounded, Mr. Dehar called Mr. Pannu and instructed him to immediately go to retrieve the car. Mr. Pannu arranged to meet Israr Bhatti at the pound, and in fact did meet him. Mr. Pannu brought Mr. Dehar's plps #AXYX595 with him. He said that he tried to exchange the plates at the pound, that is to leave the plps #AXYX595 and retrieve the plps #BPJH923. The pound refused, telling him that he must take the car. Israr Bhatti and Mr. Pannu affixed the #BPJH923 plates to the car. Israr Bhatti denied that he had the funds to pay the towing bill, and again prevailed upon Mr. Pannu to allow him to take the car with Mr. Dehar's plps. It was agreed that Mr. Pannu would follow Israr Bhatti to his place of residence where Israr Bhatti would return the plates. It is significant that Mr. Pannu testified that the car had no outward appearance of being a taxi when he retrieved it from the pound. He said it had no side numbers, no roof light, no Toronto taxicab plate. He said that he wanted to retrieve the car from the pound to prevent storage charges from accruing as Mr. Dehar, still the registered owner, would be responsible for them.

Mr. Pannu lost track of Israr Bhatti as he tried to follow him. He went to the building where he knew Israr Bhatti lived, but Israr Bhatti was not there. He tried to telephone him, but got no answer. He contacted Arshad Mohammad Bhatti who said he would try to reach his brother and report back, but Mr. Pannu heard nothing further from him. He did contact Israr Bhatti the next day, and two or three days after that, Israr Bhatti returned the plps along with the computer and camera.

Both licencees denied having any knowledge that the 2007 Chev was being used as a taxi after they had sold it, denied any knowledge that the Toronto taxicab plate on the car was fake, denied any knowledge of how the val tag #74991 got onto the fake plate, denied any knowledge of the valid Toronto taxicab plate #3306, denied having seen the fake Toronto taxicab plate #3306 before this hearing, and denied any knowledge of the fake Toronto taxicab plate #330.

ANALYSIS

It is beyond question that, when officer Mr. Tamaki stopped the 2007 Chev, it was being operated by Israr Bhatti as an unlicensed taxi with an invalid Toronto taxicab plate and a val tag issued for a different plate. This much is clear from the appearance of the vehicle which was fitted out like a taxi and from the correspondence from AAT and from Beck, as well as from AAT's dispatch records. It is also clear that the vehicle had affixed to it a fake or fraudulent Toronto taxicab plate, with a val tag which had originally been issued to Mr. Pannu for a Toronto taxicab plate #1403, for which he was the registered

June 11, 2015

agent. In addition the vehicle was being operated with plps which had been issued for a 2010 Chev owned by Mr. Dehar. It is also clear that a second fraudulent plate using the number 330 had been in Mr. Pannu's fleet. The City's records show that a plate with that number having been validly issued to Kathleen Grout Investments Inc. operating under the brokerage of Beck; yet a second plate with the same number appears in Mr. Pannu's fleet operating under the brokerage of AAT.

The Tribunal cannot accept the explanations of the licencees. There are too many inconsistencies and incongruities.

The whole response of the licencees was based on the alleged sale of the 2007 Chev to Israr Bhatti. There was no documentation whatsoever to establish such a sale save for one handwritten document which was marked as exhibit #37, for identification purposes only. The Tribunal reserved a decision as to its admissibility. The document was not produced at the pre-hearing nor at any time prior to the commencement of this hearing, contrary to the procedural rules of the Tribunal. It was tendered as evidence after the City had completed its case and after the licencees had commenced their testimony. The City's counsel objected to its introduction at this point because it had not been produced in a timely manner, he had had no opportunity to consider the document beforehand, nor to investigate its validity. Ultimately the tribunal has decided that its admissibility is irrelevant because, had it been admitted into evidence, the Tribunal would have given it negligible weight, given its view of the evidence adduced by the licencees. It is, at the least, remarkable that a genuine, valid document vital to the licencees' case would not have been produced at or shortly following the pre-hearing. No explanation was forthcoming as to why it was not. Furthermore there was no *Used Vehicle Information Package*, although it is required by law. Mr. Dehar in his testimony acknowledged that he knew this. There was no certificate of fitness, nor a "Drive Clean" certificate, nor any deposit slip for the purchase price.

The licencees proposed to sell the car, and anticipated that a prospective purchaser would want to test drive it. Why then remove the provincial plates from the car? They say they sold the car to someone who was known to them only as the brother of someone in the taxi industry who for a brief period had joined Mr. Pannu's fleet. Why would they allow that person to take the car with Mr. Dehar's plps still attached, without having registered the transfer? Neither Mr. Dehar nor Mr. Pannu were inexperienced in buying and selling cars as both had done so various times in the past. They were aware that the registered owner continues to be responsible for the vehicle until the new owner is registered. They hurried to the pound when they feared that storage charges would mount. Furthermore they allowed the car to leave with a stranger along with the computer and the camera. The computer was a rental from AAT and presumably expensive to replace. A replacement taxi camera would cost approximately \$2,000.00, purchased new. Allowing the car to go in that manner is consistent with an expectation that it will continue to be used as a taxi, from which they might benefit. Mr. Pannu said that he had removed the fuse from the computer, but why could not a new fuse easily be installed? The same question arises in regard to the camera from which he said he had removed the hard drive. He said he called AAT to disable the computer, but received no confirmation that this instruction had been carried out.

The licencees were both experienced business people. Both had been involved in the taxi industry for years, Mr. Dehar first as a taxi driver and then as a licensed plate owner,

June 11, 2015

Mr. Pannu as a plate owner, registered agent for multiple plates, and a fleet operator. How is it that these two persons could not or would not produce some documentation to corroborate their evidence? They failed to produce any confirmation, such as invoices or receipts, for their activities. Monies changed hands between Mr. Dehar and Mr. Pannu his registered agent, between Mr. Pannu and his drivers, and between Mr. Pannu and the broker, AAT. An expert was needed to remove a computer from a vehicle and to install one in a newly acquired vehicle, and a new camera was purchased for \$2,000.00, vehicles were serviced at a service garage; and no paper of any kind was produced to reflect that these transactions actually occurred as testified.

Mr. Pannu stated that when the fake taxi left the pound it did not have any of the appurtenances of a taxi. This is not possible given that it had all of the trappings of a taxi when Mr. Tamaki stopped it and that it was sent directly to the pound from that location.

There is another inconsistency. When the 2007 Chev left the pound, it still had the original computer and camera. They were returned, along with the plps, a couple of days later, which meant that Israr Bhatti or Arshad Mohammad Bhatti must have paid the cost of removing them. Again, this raises the question of why would they pay that expense for equipment in which they had no interest?

Mr. Sohal was an apprentice mechanic working at the garage when the alleged sale occurred. He testified that he saw Mr. Pannu and Mr. Dehar conferring with Israr Bhatti, saw documents and cash change hands. He did not see how much money was exchanged nor did he see what documents changed hands, nor did he identify exhibit #37. He accepted responsibility for switching the plps between vehicles, but it raises the question of whether it was his error, or whether he was deliberately misdirected by the licencees. In response to a question from the Tribunal he said that the garage did keep dealer plates on hand, which again raises the question of why would you have to restore plates to the car for a road test if dealer plates were available. He did not work on the car, but said he knew it was stripped of taxi paraphernalia within a day or two of its arrival at the garage. He did not see the actual stripping, but saw the debris from it. Precisely what this debris consisted of was not revealed. He did say that when the car left, it looked like a normal car, not like a taxi. His observation would have been from the outside of the car. He also said that the car was on the garage lot for about seven weeks. This time would roughly coincide with the date on which the car was registered in the name of Jamil Nazar. At no time was it registered in the name of either of the Bhatti brothers.

Mr. Dehar stated that his new taxi, the 2010 Chev, was registered on August 22, 2012. He said that he and Mr. Pannu removed the taxi equipment (except the computer and camera, which could only be removed at the radio shop) from the 2007 Chev on August 20, 2012, and installed it on the new taxi on August 22. He owned the camera but did not explain why he would have left the camera in the old car when it cost him \$2,000.00 to buy a new one. He also failed to explain why Mr. Pannu, as his agent, paid the rental fee for the computer for the month of September. Indeed the question arises, why would they not have had the computer and camera removed from the old car before they took it to the garage to park it until sale.

June 11, 2015

After their first bad experience with Israr Bhatti in his failing to return the plps and other taxi equipment when promised, they allowed him to take the vehicle with the plps a second time. Is this realistic? Furthermore they appear not to have notified the Ministry of Transportation (MOT) about the sale even though they knew Mr. Dehar would continue to be responsible for the vehicle until they did. None of their testimony is convincing.

In 2011, the City called in all of the outstanding taxi owner plates, which were blue, to be exchanged for black plates. Although the licencees adduced testimony intended to show that the handling by City staff of the old plates was sloppy, and that someone could have retrieved one and removed the val tag and placed it on another plate, there was absolutely no evidence that this occurred. Similarly while evidence was adduced that val tags were showing up on plates for which they were never issued, there was no evidence presented as to how val tag #74991 came to be affixed to a fake plate with #3306. This val tag was originally issued for a Toronto taxicab plate #1403 for which Mr. Pannu was agent. It ended its existence on a different Toronto taxicab plate (#3306) which at one time was in Mr. Pannu's fleet when it was owned, lawfully or not, by Arshad Mohammad Bhatti. There was some confusion on the part of Mr. Tamaki as to whether the City actually issued val tag #74991, but regardless, such a tag did appear on Toronto taxicab plate #1403, a plate for which Mr. Pannu was the registered agent, and later appeared on the fake plate #3306 which was in Mr. Pannu's fleet.

Exhibit #38 is a *Used Vehicle Information Package* dated October 22, 2014. It showed that the 2007 Chev was registered to one Jamil Nazar on October 12, 2012. Mr. Sohal testified that the 2007 Chev was parked at the garage for approximately seven weeks. This evidence is inconsistent with the testimony that the car was sold to Israr Bhatti and taken by him on September 12, 2012. That seven-week period would signify that the car actually left the garage more or less contemporaneously with its registration to Mr. Nazar.

The car remained in Mr. Dehar's name for one month after the alleged sale with no evidence at all that Mr. Dehar attempted to notify the MOT or do anything else to disclaim responsibility for it. In addition, the fake plate #3306 was still listed as one operating under the brokerage of AAT as at October 20, 2012, as indicated by exhibit #20. None of this is consistent with an owner who realizes that he continues to be responsible for the vehicle until a sale is registered.

There were other factors in this hearing relating to credibility. The City tendered evidence that Mr. Pannu had been convicted of fraud for an offence committed in 1997. This information was not tendered as probative of the allegations in the current hearing, nor did the Tribunal accept it as probative. But Mr. Pannu's response to questions about the offence did reflect on his credibility. He explained that the offence consisted of some sort of conspiracy with a customer of the store that he operated at the time, to fake a break-in and claim insurance money. Rather than acknowledging the crime, accepting responsibility for it and expressing any kind of regret or remorse, he attempted to minimize any participation on his part and to slough responsibility for it onto the customer.

At the outset, both licencees stated that they required an interpreter. Tribunal staff arranged an interpreter, but were unable to get the same interpreter for the duration of

June 11, 2015

the hearing, which continued for six days. Both of the licencees, when delivering their testimony, interrupted the interpreter a number of times to correct the translation into English. These interruptions, in English, could be heard by the Tribunal members, and came through very clear, very comprehensible, and well enunciated. In response to a question from a Tribunal member, Mr. Dehar stated that he works as a Toronto Transit bus driver and communicates with the public in English. It was apparent that both licencees understand and can speak English. Their request for interpreters and their apparent ability to converse well in English further detracted from their credibility. This along with the lengthy delays both prior to the start of the hearing and during the hearing, most of which were caused by the licencees or their counsel, prompted the Tribunal to conclude that the request for interpreter, as well as the objections to the quality of the interpreters, were intended as a delaying tactic.

DECISION

The Tribunal has concluded that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the licencees were parties to a scheme to operate one or more unlicensed taxis, and in fact did so. Operation of an unlicensed taxi removes it from the oversight of MLS, the regulatory body, and removes it from the legal necessity of regular mechanical inspections. It allows unlicensed taxi drivers who have not been screened by MLS to transport members of the public without assurance for their safety and without insurance.

The Tribunal is satisfied:

that the conduct of the licencees affords reasonable grounds to believe that they have not conducted their trade or business in accordance with the law and with honesty and integrity [Municipal Code, Chapter 545-4 C. (1) (a)];

that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the carrying on of the trade or business by the licencees has resulted in a breach of Chapter 545 [Municipal Code, Chapter 545-4 C. (1) (b)];

that there are reasonable grounds to believe that the carrying on of the trade or business by the licencees has resulted in a breach of Section 39.1 (b) of the Highway Traffic Act, R.S.O. 1990, as amended;

that the conduct of the licencees affords reasonable grounds to believe that the carrying on of the trade or business by the licencees would endanger the safety of other members of the public [Municipal Code, Chapter 545-4 C. (1) (e)].

Accordingly TLT's order was as follows:

That Mr. Dehar's taxicab owner's licence is immediately suspended;

That Mr. Dehar is prohibited from acting as Designated Agent for any taxicab, effective immediately;

June 11, 2015

That Mr. Dehar is required to sell his taxicab plate within two months of June 11, 2015, failing which his taxicab owner's licence shall be cancelled.

That Mr. Pannu's taxicab owner's licence is immediately suspended;

That Mr. Pannu is prohibited from acting as Designated Agent for any taxicab, effective immediately;

That Mr. Pannu is required to sell his taxicab plate within two months of June 11, 2015, failing which his taxicab owner's licence shall be cancelled.

Originally Signed

Lionel Miskin, Chair
Panel Members, Ken Chan and (Hedy) Anna Walsh concurring

[Reference: Minute No. 83/15]

Date Signed: Sept. 29, 2015