

TAXI MANAGEMENT, LLC
YELLOW, CHECKER, STAR & NEWCAB

FEB 12 '25 FILED

5225 W. Post Road
Las Vegas, NV 89118

February 12, 2025

Mr. Dan R. Reaser

NEVADA TAXICAB AUTHORITY

2090 E. Flamingo Rd., Suite 200

Las Vegas, NV 89119

Re: TA Meeting February 19, 2025 Agenda Item 8

Dear Chairman Reaser & Members of the Board:

As you know, pursuant to NRS 706, the TA is charged with the protection of the riding public. I am writing with regard to agenda item eight (8) which is set for public hearing at the TA Board meeting on February 19, 2025 ("Desert Application"). The Desert Application proposes that a 50 cent per trip fee be imposed on every taxi ride as a pass-through software license fee ("Proposed Fee"). The Proposed Fee is part of a "negotiated license agreement" with IVSC to compensate IVSC for use of IVSC's purported patents.

Taxi Management opposes the Proposed Fee. In no event should the Proposed Fee be perpetual as patents are subject to expiration. This matter requires complete transparency. The proposed agreement between Kaptyn, IVSC, Desert and any other party must be disclosed in advance to the TA and all interested parties.

Taxi Management and our brands known as Yellow, Checker, Star and Newcab ("TM") provide almost 50% of all taxi trips in the Las Vegas market and hold a CPCN. TM strongly believes that the matter of a Proposed Fee by IVSC suggested in the Desert Application should be thoroughly reviewed by experienced patent counsel at the Nevada Attorney General's Office ("AG"). TM believes that the AG's office needs to review the effectiveness and enforceability of any and all patents held by IVSC prior to the Proposed Fee being imposed. TM believes that the AG's office must analyze whether the TA has the authority to impose a fee on every taxi trip by a third-party company that does not hold a CPCN (IVSC). As part of its review, patent counsel at the AG's office must consider patent defenses including but not limited to prior art, non-infringement, patent invalidity, and patent misuse. The AG's office must determine whether new legislation is required to impose the Proposed Fee.

After the foregoing analysis and possible legislation, should the AG's office and or the Nevada Legislature confirm that a fee to compensate IVSC is necessary, TM strongly believes that a thorough analysis of the amount of the Proposed Fee be conducted. Approving the Proposed Fee at this point does not appear to be in compliance with the safety of the riding public before careful consideration and analysis is performed. TM thanks the Board and the TA staff for its careful consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours:

TAXI MANAGEMENT BOARD OF DIRECTORS