

LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

ORDER NUMBER T-37579

LOUISIANA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION VERSUS TIGER AIRPORT SHUTTLE, LLC

Docket No. T-37579, In re: Alleged violation of 1) Order T-37409 and 2) Revised Statutes 45:161 through 180.1 and General Order dated April 25, 2012 by engaging in activities related to transporting passengers intrastate without LPSC authority on or about May 12, 2025.

(Decided at the October 23, 2025 Business and Executive Session.)

ORDER

Overview

In this proceeding, the Louisiana Public Service Commission (“LPSC” or “Commission”) Staff seeks a finding that Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC (“Tiger Airport Shuttle” or the “Carrier”), a passenger carrier company, is guilty of: 1) violating Commission *Order No. T-37409*¹ accepting the *Affidavit and Stipulation* (“Stipulation”) executed by Tiger Airport Shuttle and agreed to by Commission Staff; and 2) La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 and the Commission’s *General Order* dated April 25, 2012² (“Passenger Carrier Order”) by engaging in activities related to transporting passengers intrastate without authority. Commission Staff issued a citation dated May 15, 2025, directing Tiger Airport Shuttle to appear at a hearing on July 10, 2025. The citation was docketed as the instant proceeding, and notice of this proceeding was published in the Commission’s *Official Bulletin* dated May 23, 2025. When the hearing was convened on July 10, 2025, Commission Staff appeared through counsel and presented testimonial and documentary evidence in support of its allegations. Tiger Airport Shuttle did not appear. For the reasons stated herein, we find Tiger Airport Shuttle guilty as alleged.

The *Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge* (“Recommendation”) was issued in the form of a *Draft Order* on September 9, 2025. The Recommendation was considered at the Commission’s October 23, 2025 Business and Executive Session. On motion of Vice Chairman Skrmetta, seconded by Chairman Francis, with Commissioners Campbell and Lewis concurring and Commissioner Coussan temporarily absent, the Commission voted to accept the Recommendation issued on September 9, 2025.

¹ *Order No. T-37409* dated April 22, 2025, Louisiana Public Service Commission v. Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC (*Docket No. T-37409, In re: Alleged violation of La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 and General Order dated April 25, 2012 by engaging in activities related to transporting passengers intrastate without LPSC authority.* (“Order No. T-37409”).

² *General Order* dated April 25, 2012 (Docket No. R-32141 - Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte.)

Applicable Law

The Commission's jurisdiction over common carriers is established by Article 4, Section 21 of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, which provides in pertinent part:

The commission shall regulate all common carriers and public utilities and have such other regulatory authority as provided by law. It shall adopt and enforce reasonable rules, regulations, and procedures necessary for the discharge of its duties, and shall have other powers and perform other duties as provided by law.

Louisiana statutes more specifically describe the powers of the Commission over motor carriers operating intrastate, including passenger carriers. La. R.S. 45:161 declares that the business of operating motor vehicles for hire as a common carrier of persons is a "business affected with a public interest." La. R.S. 45:162(5)(a) defines "[c]ommon carrier by motor vehicle" as any person . . . , the essential nature of whose business comprises engaging in, soliciting, or accepting . . . passengers, . . . for intrastate transportation for hire, charge or compensation as an employment or holding himself out as so available to the public generally and indiscriminately for such business," La. R.S. 45:162(13) defines "passenger carrying vehicle" or "passenger service" as charter passenger service for no more than 15 passengers. La. R.S. 45:163 provides that "[t]he Commission has the power and authority necessary to supervise, govern, regulate, and control motor carriers . . . which transport household goods, passengers," La. R.S. 45:164(C) refers to passenger carriers applying for a common carrier certificate or contract carrier permit without the necessity of a fitness hearing.

La. R.S. 45:171(A) provides that no person shall violate any orders of the Commission promulgated under Title 45, Chapter 4 (Motor Carriers). La. R.S. 45:171(C) states that violators "shall be fined by the [C]ommission at open hearing not less than one hundred dollars nor more than ten thousand dollars for each violation."

The Passenger Carrier Order provides Commission rules specifically for common and contract carriers of passengers and dispatch taxicab carriers. The Passenger Carrier Order requires

that those carriers apply for and obtain LPSC authority to operate, and specifies the ongoing requirements once authority is obtained.

The Commission's General Order dated June 7, 2006³ ("2006 General Order") authorizes the imposition of a \$25 citation fee when a citation is issued to a Commission-jurisdictional motor carrier.

Order No. T-37409, dated April 22, 2025, orders that the "Affidavit and Stipulation executed on February 26, 2025,⁴ for fines and fees totaling \$525.00 is accepted."⁵ Section III., *Stipulation*, states as follows:

In response to the citation, Kristy Wade, owner of Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC, who is domiciled at the following address, 209 Creepline Dr. Madison, MS 39110, signed an Affidavit and Stipulation on February 26, 2025⁶ admitting to the violations and agreeing to a fine of \$1,000.00 fine and a citation fee of \$25.00, with \$500.00 of the fine suspended conditioned upon the following:

1. The imposition of a \$25.00 citation fee and a \$1000.00 fine with \$500.00 of the fine being suspended contingent on Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC not being found guilty, entering a plea of guilty, or entering a plea of no contest to any of the rules and regulations of the Commission for a period of one (1) year from the date of this executed Affidavit and Stipulation. All fines and fees must be paid in certified funds and are due to be paid no later than **March 3, 2025**.
2. Agrees to cease conducting LPSC[-]regulated passenger carrier services intrastate, outside the domiciled address listed above, and cease engaging in activities related to the LPSC-regulated transportation of passengers intrastate, outside the domiciled address listed above, including but not limited to removing all advertising on any websites, social media account or written advertisements until such time as a Common Carrier Certificate is issued to Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC [.]
3. Understands that passenger carrier services intrastate or advertising for intrastate services, outside the domiciled address listed above, would be a violation of this executed Affidavit and Stipulation[.]
4. And further understand[s] that failure to comply with any of the above requirements will result in the \$500.00 suspended portion of the fine becoming due immediately. The fine of \$500.00 along with the citation fee of \$25.00 paid by certified funds is attached to this executed stipulated agreement. Further, I waive an appearance at a hearing on the citation.

³ *General Order* dated June 7, 2006, *In re: Revisions to the Transportation Bond Schedule and Transportation Fee Schedule*.

⁴ The Stipulation was executed by Kristy Wade on February 25, 2025, and received by the Commission on February 26, 2025. Order No. T-37409 states in error that the Stipulation was executed on February 26, 2025.

⁵ Order No. T-37409 at ordering paragraph 1. The fines and fees in the Stipulation actually total \$1025 - a \$1000 fine (with \$500 of the fine suspended which becomes due if the Carrier fails to comply with requirements) and a \$25.00 citation fee.

⁶ See footnote No. 5.

Commission Staff's Case

Commission Staff alleges that Tiger Airport Shuttle is in violation of Order No. T-37409, La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1, and the Passenger Carrier Order. Specifically, Commission Staff alleges that Tiger Airport Shuttle is not registered with the LPSC as a passenger carrier and is advertising for intrastate passenger carrier services, including between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. Commission Staff seeks an order finding Tiger Airport Shuttle guilty and ordering that Tiger Airport Shuttle pay: the \$500 suspended portion of the fine pursuant to Order No. T-37409, a \$1000 fine for violating La. R.S. 45:162(5)(A) and 45:164(C) and the Passenger Carrier Order, and pay a \$25 citation fee pursuant to the 2006 General Order. In support of its allegations, Commission Staff presented the testimonies of Raheejah Flowers and Tammy Burl.

Testimony of Raheejah Flowers

Agent Flowers testified that she is an Enforcement Agent in the Commission's Transportation Division whose duties include ensuring passenger carriers are in compliance with the Passenger Carrier Order and investigating carriers that may be operating without LPSC authority. Agent Flowers stated that she is familiar with Tiger Airport Shuttle, which does not have LPSC authority. She stated further that she conducted an investigation into Tiger Airport Shuttle at the request of Transportation Administrator Tammy Burl following the Commission's receipt of information from a regulated carrier that Tiger Airport Shuttle was operating without authority.

Agent Flowers testified that part of her investigation was reviewing the website <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> on May 12, 2025, and she identified a printout of the website dated that day. Agent Flowers noted that the printout includes rates for shuttle services between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. Agent Flowers explained that after she conducted her investigation, she prepared a citation for Tiger Airport Shuttle, to which she attached Order No. T-37409 and the May 12, 2025 printout. Agent Flowers stated that she prepared the citation to be mailed to two addresses for the Carrier: 10337 Jefferson Highway, Baton Rouge, LA 70809 ("Baton Rouge address"), and 209 Creekline Drive, Madison, MS 39110⁷ ("Madison, MS address"). Per Agent Flowers, both addresses are in the Commission's database for Tiger Airport

⁷ Ms. Burl testified that the actual zip code for the Madison, MS address is 39110, the citation listed 37110 in error, and the certified mailing was sent to Madison, MS 37110 rather than 39110. (H'ing Tr. at 20:5-7; 38:1-6).

Shuttle, and the Baton Rouge address also appears in the <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> printout. Agent Flowers testified that she prepared the citation for Ms. Burl's signature, and gave the citation to Ms. Burl for signature and mailing. Agent Flowers confirmed that notice of the citation was published in the Commission's *Official Bulletin* dated May 23, 2025.

In connection with her testimony, Agent Flowers identified the following exhibits, which were admitted:

Staff Exhibit 1 Printout from <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> printed May 12, 2025. And,

Staff Exhibit 2, The following:
in globo

- Citation issued to Tiger Airport Shuttle dated May 15, 2025
- Order No. T-37409 issued April 22, 2025
- Printout from <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> printed May 12, 2025 (Staff Exhibit 1).

Testimony of Tammy Burl

Ms. Burl testified that as Transportation Administrator, she supervises the day-to-day operations of the Commission's Transportation Division, including investigations and enforcement of unregistered carriers. Ms. Burl stated that she is familiar with Tiger Airport Shuttle, as it previously held LPSC authority, but its authority was canceled in 2014. Additionally, she was involved with the investigation, citation, and Stipulation in Docket No. T-37409.

Per Ms. Burl, the citation in Docket No. T-37409 was mailed to the Baton Rouge address. After the citation in Docket No. T-37409 was mailed, Ms. Burl received a phone call from Kristy Wade, who informed her that she had purchased Tiger Airport Shuttle and its website. Ms. Wade informed Ms. Burl that the previous owner, Mr. Leon, had received the citation at the Baton Rouge address and forwarded it to her. Ms. Burl testified that Ms. Wade informed her during this conversation that Mr. Leon permitted Ms. Wade to continue using his address - the Baton Rouge address, although Ms. Wade did not conduct any business operations from that address and Mr. Leon was not employed by Tiger Airport Shuttle. Following Ms. Burl's conversation with Ms. Wade, Commission Staff submitted the Stipulation to Ms. Wade, which Ms. Wade executed and returned.

Ms. Burl identified the Stipulation from Docket No. T-37409 executed on February 25, 2025, by Kristy Wade, identifying herself as the owner of Tiger Airport Shuttle and listing 209

Creekline Dr., Madison, MS 39110 as the domicile address. Ms. Burl stated that after receiving the Stipulation back from Ms. Wade, wherein Ms. Wade had provided the Madison, MS address, the Madison, MS address was then added to the LPSC's database for Tiger Airport Shuttle. Ms. Burl also identified printouts of receipts, prepared by Ms. Burl, for payments by Tiger Airport Shuttle submitted with the executed Stipulation: a \$500 fine payment and a \$25 citation fee payment.

Ms. Burl explained that upon issuance of Order No. T-37409 on April 22, 2025, she conducted a compliance review that same day. She testified that the Stipulation includes an agreement by Tiger Airport Shuttle to cease advertising, and the website that had been investigated in connection with the violation in Docket No. T-37409 was <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com>. Therefore, Ms. Burl went to <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com>, and the website displayed a message stating the account had been suspended. Ms. Burl identified a printout of <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> as it appeared on April 22, 2025, containing a message that the account was suspended. Ms. Burl testified further that she conducted a general Google search and did not find Tiger Airport Shuttle on any other websites. Thus, she concluded that the Carrier was in compliance with the Stipulation and requested that Docket No. T-37409 be closed.

Ms. Burl testified that after Docket No. T-37409 was closed, she was contacted by two separate registered carriers who informed her that Tiger Airport Shuttle had been seen at two locations in Louisiana - Baton Rouge airport and on Interstate 10 "headed to New Orleans."⁸ It was at this time that Ms. Burl asked Agent Flowers to investigate by looking online for advertisements for Tiger Airport Shuttle. Agent Flowers discovered that <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> was again operational and advertising passenger services, including between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. This resulted in the issuance of the citation in the current docket.

Ms. Burl stated that she mailed the citation and its attachments as prepared by Agent Flowers. Ms. Burl testified that she mailed the citation by certified mail to both the Baton Rouge address and the Madison, MS address. Ms. Burl testified that she did not receive a return receipt for the certified mail sent to either address. Therefore, on June 25, 2025, she went to the USPS Tracking website to search for the certified mail tracking numbers for the citation mailings. Per

⁸ H'ing Tr. at 25:6.

Ms. Burl, based on the USPS Tracking results, it appeared that the citation mailed to the Baton Rouge address had stalled in the postal system, and the citation mailed to the Madison, MS address was being returned to the Commission as of June 23, 2025, after being unclaimed.

Ms. Burl stated that she then sent the citation via FedEx to the Madison, MS address, and FedEx picked up the package on June 26, 2025. Ms. Burl explained that when preparing the FedEx, she noticed that the zip code printed on the citation for the Madison, MS address was incorrect, and she included the correct zip code, 39110, on the FedEx mailing. Ms. Burl identified FedEx documents for a FedEx tracking number ending in 0595. Per Ms. Burl, FedEx Tracking results showed that the package was refused by the recipient⁹ and FedEx returned the package to the Commission using a different tracking number. Ms. Burl identified the returned FedEx package with tracking number ending in 0650.

Ms. Burl testified that she emailed a copy of the citation in the instant docket to Ms. Wade at the email address Ms. Wade had used to communicate with Ms. Burl during Docket No. T-37409. Ms. Burl stated that she received a phone call from Ms. Wade on July 8, 2025, and that she and Ms. Wade discussed the instant citation; the allegations therein; and the hearing date, time, and place. In discussing Tiger Airport Shuttle's operations, Ms. Burl stated that Ms. Wade informed her that she resided in Mississippi, but her drivers are located in and around Baton Rouge. Ms. Burl testified that she reviewed Louisiana Secretary of State records for Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC. She explained that there is a business record, but it is inactive and still lists Mr. Leon as the member.

Ms. Burl testified that Commission Staff is seeking a finding that Tiger Airport Shuttle is guilty as alleged, that the \$500 suspended portion of the fine from Order No. T-37409 be enforced, and that Tiger Airport Shuttle be fined \$1,000 and assessed a \$25 citation fee.

In connection with her testimony, Ms. Burl identified the following exhibits, which were admitted:

Staff Exhibit 3, The following:
in globo

- Affidavit and Stipulation in Docket No. T-37409, executed by Kristy Wade on behalf of Tiger Airport Shuttle on February 25,

⁹ Ms. Burl noted that the FedEx Tracking results showed Pearl, MS as the location where the delivery was refused. She testified that she contacted FedEx who advised her that Pearl, MS was the location of closest FedEx shipping facility to the Madison, MS address, so that is what was displayed on the results. (H'ing Tr. at 21:21-22:7).

2025, and signed as agreed to by LPSC Staff Attorney Paul Rachal

- Receipt of Payment No. 15485 dated February 28, 2025, for \$25 paid by Tiger Airport Shuttle
- Receipt of Payment No. 15645 dated February 28, 2025, for \$500 paid by Tiger Airport Shuttle

Staff Exhibit 4 Printout dated April 22, 2025 from <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com/cgi-sys/suspendedpage.cgi> with message “This Account has been suspended.”

Staff Exhibit 5, *in globo* The following FedEx documents:

- Shipping label dated June 26, 2025, addressed to Kristy Wade, Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC, 209 Creekline Dr., Madison, MS 39110 with tracking number 882329290595
- Transaction Record for tracking number 882329290595 showing shipping date of June 26, 2025, to Kristy Wade, Tiger Airport Shuttle, LLC, 209 Creekline Dr., Madison, MS 39110
- FedEx tracking results from <https://www.fedex.com> for tracking number 882329290595, displaying events between June 26, 2025 and July 3, 2025, including “Delivery was refused by the recipient” and “Returning package to shipper” with return tracking number 882506060650.

Staff Exhibit 6 Copy of the returned FedEx envelope with multiple overlapping FedEx stickers and labels, including one stating “Returned Shipment”, “Original Tracking Number: 882329290595” and “Return Tracking Number: 882506060650.”

At the conclusion of its testimony and evidence, counsel for Commission Staff reiterated the outcome it is seeking in this matter, identifying the specific violations and corresponding laws it alleges the Carrier has violated. Counsel argued that the Carrier’s advertising for services on <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> listed in the Stipulation was a violation of Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Stipulation accepted in Order No. T-37409.¹⁰ Additionally, counsel argued that the Carrier’s advertising for services between Baton Rouge and New Orleans on <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> violates La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 and the Passenger Carrier Order by holding Tiger Airport Shuttle out as a passenger carrier available for those services without being registered with the Commission.¹¹

Commission Staff is seeking: 1) that the Carrier be found guilty as alleged; 2) that the \$500 suspended portion of the \$1,000 fine accepted in Order No. T-37409 (Stipulation Paragraph 4) be assessed for Tiger Airport Shuttle’s violation of Order No. T-37409; 3) that, pursuant to La. R.S. 45:171, Tiger Airport Shuttle be fined \$1,000 for its violation of La. R.S. 45:162(5)(a) and

¹⁰ H’ing Tr. at 29:6-23; 32:3-8.

¹¹ H’ing Tr. at 30:18-32:13.

45:164(C) and the Passenger Carrier Order; and, 4) that Tiger Airport Shuttle be ordered to pay a \$25 citation fee pursuant to the 2006 General Order.¹²

Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law

Having considered applicable law and the evidence presented in this case, the Commission makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

Findings of Fact

1. Commission Order No. T-37409 issued April 22, 2025, accepts the Stipulation executed on February 25, 2025, by Kristy Wade, identifying herself as the Owner of Tiger Airport Shuttle, domiciled at 209 Creekline Dr., Madison, MS 39110. The Stipulation is also signed by Commission Staff Attorney Paul Rachal, noting that the Stipulation is agreed to by Commission Staff. Order No. T-37409 at Section III, *Stipulation*, includes the Stipulation terms.¹³
2. On May 12, 2025, Tiger Airport Shuttle was advertising for-hire intrastate passenger carrier services, including services between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, at <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com>.
3. Ms. Burl issued a citation to Tiger Airport Shuttle on May 15, 2025, directing it to appear at a hearing on July 10, 2025. Order No. T-37409 and a printout dated May 12, 2025, from <https://www.tigerairportshuttle.com> were attached to the citation.
4. Notice of the citation was published in the Commission's *Official Bulletin* dated May 23, 2025.
5. Ms. Burl sent a copy of the citation with its attachments via FedEx (tracking number 882329290595) on June 26, 2025, to Kristy Wade, Tiger Airport Shuttle, 209 Creekline Dr., Madison, MS 39110.
6. FedEx tracking results for tracking number 882329290595 show that the delivery was refused by the recipient on or about July 2, 2025.
7. FedEx shipped the original envelope back to the Commission on July 3, 2025 (tracking number 882506060650). The Commission received the returned FedEx envelope.
8. Ms. Burl emailed a copy of the citation to Ms. Wade. Ms. Wade contacted Ms. Burl by telephone on July 8, 2025, during which Ms. Burl discussed with Ms. Wade the citation; the allegations therein; and, the date, time and place of the hearing in this matter.
9. Tiger Airport Shuttle was not registered with the LPSC as an intrastate passenger carrier on May 12, 2025, and as of the date of the hearing, had not become registered.
10. Tiger Airport Shuttle did not appear at the hearing.

Conclusions of Law

1. At the hearing in this matter, the Commission Staff had the burden of proving its allegations against Tiger Airport Shuttle. Because Tiger Airport Shuttle did not appear at the hearing, the Commission Staff also had the burden of demonstrating that Tiger Airport Shuttle was provided fair notice of the hearing and the opportunity to present a defense.¹⁴

¹² H'ing Tr. at 35:20-36:10.

¹³ The Commission's issuance of Order No. T-37409 and the underlying violation(s) to which Tiger Airport Shuttle admitted guilt in that docket are not at issue in this proceeding.

¹⁴ *E.g.*, Order No. T-36678 dated December 12, 2023 at 10, Louisiana Public Service Commission v. Clark Moving Specialists, LLC.

2. Pursuant to its constitutional and statutory authority, the Commission adopted the *Rules of Practice and Procedure*. Commission Rules 7 and 19 provide for notice of non-criminal proceedings through publication in the Commission’s *Official Bulletin*, as well as service “through any means whereby proof of receipt or unclaimed status can be shown” to “the last known place of address of the person entitled to receive such notice”¹⁵
3. The Louisiana Constitution of 1974, Article 4, Section 21(B) mandates that the Commission regulate common carriers; adopt and enforce reasonable rules, regulations, and procedures; and, shall have other powers as provided by law. La. R.S. 45:163 states that the powers of the Commission shall include the power to adopt and enforce reasonable rules. La. R.S. 45:171(A) provides that no person shall violate any orders of the Commission promulgated under Title 45, Chapter 4 (Motor Carriers). Accordingly, the Commission has constitutional and statutory authority to enforce its rules and orders.
4. La. R.S. 45:162(5)(a) defines “[c]ommon carrier by motor vehicle” as any person . . . , the essential nature of whose business comprises engaging in, soliciting, or accepting . . . passengers, . . . for intrastate transportation for hire, charge or compensation as an employment or holding himself out as so available to the public generally and indiscriminately for such business,” La. R.S. 45:162(13) defines “passenger carrying vehicle” or “passenger service” as charter passenger service for no more than 15 passengers. La. R.S. 45:163 authorizes the Commission to regulate motor carriers which transport passengers. La. R.S. 45:164(C) refers to passenger carriers applying for authority without the necessity of a fitness hearing. The Commission’s Passenger Carrier Order requires regulated passenger carriers to apply for LPSC authority to operate.
5. In accordance with Commission Rules 7 and 19, on June 26, 2025, the Commission’s Transportation Division sent the citation with attachments via FedEx to the address provided to the Commission in a notarized affidavit in Docket No. T-37409 executed by Kristy Wade, as Owner of Tiger Airport Shuttle, on February 25, 2025. The FedEx tracking information shows that the FedEx package was refused by the recipient.
6. The Commission Staff demonstrated through testimonial and documentary evidence that the citation sent via FedEx was refused by the Carrier. Interim Rule 7 adopted in *Special Order No. 72-2021* permits service where proof of receipt or unclaimed status can be shown. FedEx tracking results indicating a package was refused by the recipient offered as proof of service appears to be a matter of first impression under Interim Rule 7.

This Commission has ruled consistent with Louisiana courts that a carrier cannot defeat service by refusing certified mail, finding that “[w]hen a plaintiff sends certified mail to a defendant at the correct address, and the defendant simply refuses to accept the package this is still sufficient service.”¹⁶ This Commission and Louisiana courts have repeatedly held that a litigant may not defeat service by failing to claim a certified mailing.¹⁷ While the delivery method at issue here is FedEx rather than USPS certified mail, the premise of the court rulings previously relied on by the Commission remains applicable, particularly in light of Interim Rule 7. When a defendant receives notice of the mailing, but simply refuses to claim the mailing, it is tantamount to refusal of service.¹⁸ Applying Interim Rule 7, a recipient refusing service of a citation delivered by FedEx is like USPS certified mail being unclaimed due to the recipient’s refusing or ignoring notice of USPS certified mail. Additionally, in this matter, Ms. Burl testified that after emailing a copy of the citation to Ms. Wade, Ms. Wade contacted her by telephone on July 8, 2025, and the two discussed

¹⁵ *Special Order No. 72-2021* dated November 22, 2021, Louisiana Public Service Commission, ex parte, *In re: Possible implementation of Interim Rule 7 of the Commission’s Rules of Practice and Procedure (Service of Process) and possible revision to the Commission’s Rules*.

¹⁶ *Order No. T-35045* dated February 14, 2019 at 5; Louisiana Public Service Commission v. Luxury Limousines of New Orleans, LLC (Metairie, Louisiana) citing *Thomas Organ Co. v. Universal Music Co.*, 261 So.2d 323 (La. App. 1 Cir. 1972).

¹⁷ E.g. *Order No. T-35220* dated August 28, 2019, Louisiana Public Service Commission v. American Integrated Services, Inc. (Robert, LA) citing *Thomas Organ Co. v. Universal Music Co.*, 261 So.2d 323 (La. App. 1 Cir. 1972); *Hardy v. Dowe Company, Inc.*, 674 So.2d 452 (La. App. 4 Cir. 5/8/96).

¹⁸ *Anderson v. Anderson*, 309 So.3d 868 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/23/20) (At footnote 11, the Court notes that the defendant refused to accept delivery of FedEx on two occasions prior to FedEx leaving the package at his door. The Court states service is proper under La. R.S. 13:3204, citing *Wood v. Hackler*, 52, 791 (La. App. 2 Cir. 8/14/19), 276 So.3d 1136, 1140-41, writ denied, 19-1469 (La. 12/10/19), 285, So.3d 490).

the citation and the upcoming hearing, indicating that Ms. Wade had actual notice of the hearing. Thus, we find that the record, taken as a whole, demonstrates that the Commission Staff provided fair notice to the Carrier of the hearing date and that the Carrier was provided a fair opportunity to present a defense at the hearing.

7. The Commission Staff cited Tiger Airport Shuttle for violating Commission Order No. T-37409. The Commission Staff proved through testimonial and documentary evidence that Tiger Airport Shuttle violated Order No. T-37409 by failing to comply with the terms of the Stipulation accepted therein by ceasing to engage in activities related to the LPSC-regulated transportation of passengers, intrastate. Specifically, Tiger Airport Shuttle resumed advertising for intrastate passenger services, including services between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, in violation of Order No. T-37409, Section III, Paragraphs 2 and 3. Accordingly, we find Tiger Airport Shuttle guilty of violating Commission Order No. T-37409 by failing to comply with the terms of Stipulation accepted therein.
8. The Commission Staff requests that the Commission order payment of the \$500 suspended portion of the \$1000 fine agreed to in the Stipulation accepted by Order No. T-37409. Commission Staff has proven through documentary and testimonial evidence that enforcement of the \$500 suspended portion of the fine is warranted pursuant to Order No. T-37409, Section III, Paragraphs 1 and 4.
9. The Commission Staff also cited Tiger Airport Shuttle for a violation of La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 and the Passenger Carrier Order. Specifically, Commission Staff alleged that the Carrier is in violation of La. R.S. 45:162(5)(a), La. R.S. 45:164(C) and the Passenger Carrier Order through its online advertising for LPSC-regulated intrastate passenger services, including between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, without being registered to provide such services.

The Commission Staff provided documentary and testimonial evidence proving its allegations in this matter. Commission Staff proved that Tiger Airport Shuttle is a common carrier by motor vehicle pursuant to La. R.S. 45:162(5)(a) and is in violation of La. R.S. 45:164(C) and the Passenger Carrier Order by engaging in LPSC-regulated passenger carrier activities - by holding itself out as an intrastate passenger carrier in online advertisements, including for services between Baton Rouge and New Orleans - without first having obtained authority from the Commission to operate as an intrastate passenger carrier.

Per La. R.S. 45:172(4)(d), a passenger carrier is exempt from La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 if its vehicles are operated within the limits of the parish of its domicile or if the major portion of its operations are conducted within the corporate limits of one municipality. As the online advertisements include rates for services between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, and the Carrier did not appear at the hearing and establish an exemption, we find that Tiger Airport Shuttle is not entitled to an exemption.

This appears to be the first time that a passenger carrier has been adjudicated guilty of violating the Commission's rules and regulations based solely on advertising. Nonetheless, ample precedent exists as this Commission has found other types of motor carriers guilty of engaging in LPSC-regulated activities based solely on advertising.¹⁹

10. Commission Staff requested a \$1,000 fine for Tiger Airport Shuttle's violation of La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 based on it being the Carrier's second violation. In accordance with R.S. 45:171, a carrier that violates the requirements of Title 45, Chapter 4 (Motor Carriers) is subject to a fine of not less than \$100 and not more than \$10,000. Based on the record of this proceeding, we conclude that a \$1,000 fine is reasonable.
11. The Commission Staff requested that Tiger Airport Shuttle be required to pay a \$25 citation fee in accordance with the 2006 General Order. We find the \$25 citation fee is warranted.

¹⁹ *Order No. T-37118* dated July 10, 2024 at 6, *Louisiana Public Service Commission v. Nola Moving, LLC*; *Order No. T-36703* dated February 12, 2024 at 8, *Louisiana Public Service Commission v. Cooyon Duhon's Moving Company*; *Order No. T-36504* dated September 8, 2023 at 9, *Louisiana Public Service Commission v. Adair Movers LLC*.

Conclusion

In accordance with the findings of fact and conclusions of law stated above,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Tiger Airport Shuttle LLC is guilty of violating Order No. T-37409 dated April 22, 2025, for failing to comply with the terms of the Stipulation accepted therein.
2. Tiger Airport Shuttle LLC shall pay the \$500 suspended portion of the fine ordered by Order No. T-37409.
3. Tiger Airport Shuttle LLC is guilty of violating La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 and the Passenger Carrier Order, as specified herein, for engaging in activities related to transporting passengers intrastate without Commission authority.
4. Tiger Airport Shuttle LLC shall pay a \$1,000 fine pursuant to La. R.S. 45:171 for its violation of La. R.S. 45:161 through 180.1 and the Passenger Carrier Order.
5. Tiger Airport Shuttle LLC shall pay a \$25 citation fee pursuant to the 2006 General Order.
6. All fines and fees ordered herein shall be paid to the Commission within 30 days of the date of this order.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA
November 13, 2025



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Brandon M. Frey".

BRANDON M. FREY
SECRETARY

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mike Francis".

DISTRICT IV
CHAIRMAN MIKE FRANCISA handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Eric F. Skrmetta".

DISTRICT I
VICE CHAIRMAN ERIC F. SKRMETTAA handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Foster L. Campbell".

DISTRICT V
COMMISSIONER FOSTER L. CAMPBELLA handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Davante Lewis".

DISTRICT III
COMMISSIONER DAVANTE LEWIS

ABSENT

DISTRICT II
COMMISSIONER JEAN-PAUL P. COUSSAN