

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**NOTICE OF PENALTIES INCURRED AND DUE  
FOR VIOLATIONS OF LAWS AND RULES**

PENALTY ASSESSMENT: TV-250530

PENALTY AMOUNT: \$600

John Frank LLC  
12553 4<sup>th</sup> Ave NW  
Seattle, WA 98177  
[jfmcseattle@gmail.com](mailto:jfmcseattle@gmail.com)

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission (Commission) believes John Frank LLC (John Frank or Company) violated Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 480-15-555, Criminal Background Checks for Prospective Employees; and WAC 480-15-560, Vehicle and Driver Safety Requirements, which adopts Title 49 Code of Federal Regulations (49 C.F.R.) Part 390 – General Safety Regulations, Part 391 – Qualifications of Drivers, Part 395 – Hours of Service of Drivers, and Part 396 – Inspection, Repair and Maintenance.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 81.04.405 allows penalties of \$100 for each violation. In the case of an ongoing violation, every day's continuance is considered a separate and distinct violation.

On July 1, 2025, Commission Motor Carrier Safety Investigator Tracy Coble completed a follow-up safety investigation of John Frank and documented the following violations:

- **Two violations of WAC 480-15-555(1) - Failure to complete a national criminal background check for every person the carrier intends to hire.** The Company failed to acquire criminal background checks prior to hiring employees Roman Pavlovych and Aliaksandr Kanapatski.
- **One violation of 49 C.F.R. § 390.19(b)(2) - Failing to file the appropriate form under 390.19(a) (MCS-150, 150B, or 150C) each 24 months according to schedule.** John Frank failed to update its MCS-150. The form is missing the co-owner information, and the signature line needs to be corrected to show the name of the carrier official.
- **One violation of 49 C.F.R. § 391.21(a) – Using a driver who has not completed and furnished an employment application.** The Company used drivers who had not completed and furnished an employment application.
- **One violation of 49 C.F.R. § 396.9(d)(3) – Failing to maintain completed inspection form for 12 months from the date of inspection at the carrier's principal place of business or where the vehicle is housed.** John Frank failed to maintain completed roadside inspection forms for 12 months from the date of inspection.
- **Two violations of 49 C.F.R. § 396.21 – Failing to retain periodic inspection report for 14 months from date of inspection.** The Company failed to retain periodic

inspection reports for 14 months from the date of inspection on two commercial motor vehicles.

The Commission considered the following factors in determining the appropriate penalties for these violations:

1. **How serious or harmful the violations are to the public.** The violations noted are serious and potentially harmful to the public. Household goods moving companies that: (1) fail to complete national criminal background checks for employees, (2) fail to file complete and accurate regulatory forms, (3) use drivers who have not completed employment applications, (4) fail to maintain completed inspection forms according to schedule, and (5) fail to maintain periodic inspection reports put their customers, their customers' belongings, and the traveling public at risk. These violations present significant safety concerns.
2. **Whether the violations were intentional.** Considerations include:
  - Whether the Company ignored Commission staff's (Staff) previous technical assistance; and
  - Whether there is clear evidence through documentation or other means that shows the Company knew of and failed to correct the violations.

On February 17, 2023, the Commission received the Company's application for household goods moving authority. In the application, Anton Korovchenko, owner, acknowledged the Company's responsibility to understand and comply with applicable motor carrier safety laws and regulations.

On March 22, 2023, Anton Korovchenko completed online household goods training and acknowledged receiving training pertaining to motor carrier safety regulations.

On September 3, 2024, Staff completed a routine safety investigation of John Frank and identified violations of WAC 480-15-555(1) and 49 C.F.R. § 390.19(b)(2), 391.21(a), 396.9(d)(3), and 396.21(b).

The Company knew or should have known about these requirements.

3. **Whether the Company self-reported the violations.** John Frank did not self-report these violations.
4. **Whether the Company was cooperative and responsive.** The Company was cooperative throughout the safety investigation and expressed a desire to come into compliance.
5. **Whether the Company promptly corrected the violations and remedied the impacts.** John Frank has not provided Staff with evidence that they corrected some of the violations.

6. **The number of violations.** Staff identified 15 violation types with a total of 23 occurrences during the follow-up safety investigation. Of those violations, Staff identified five violation types with 11 individual occurrences that warrant a penalty in accordance with the Commission's Enforcement Policy.
7. **The number of customers affected.** John Frank reported 63,231 miles on their investigation questionnaire for 2024. These safety violations present a public safety risk.
8. **The likelihood of recurrence.** The Company incurred repeat violations despite prior technical assistance and suspended penalties. Absent a significant commitment to prioritize safe operations, the violations are likely to reoccur.
9. **The Company's past performance regarding compliance, violations, and penalties.** On September 20, 2024, the Company was penalized \$12,900 in Docket TV-240672 for safety violations of WAC 480-15-555 and WAC 480-15-560.  
  
On December 24, 2024, the Commission entered Order 01 in Docket TV-240672, which assessed a reduced penalty to \$6,450, and suspended a \$3,200 portion of the reduced penalty for a period of two years, subject to conditions. The Company paid the \$3,250 non-suspended portion of the penalty in full.
10. **The Company's existing compliance program.** Anton Korovchenko is responsible for the Company's safety compliance program.
11. **The size of the Company.** The Company currently employs seven drivers and operates five commercial motor vehicles. The Company reported \$ 711,506.00 gross revenue in 2024.

The Commission's Enforcement Policy provides that some Commission requirements are so fundamental to safe operations that the Commission will issue mandatory penalties for each occurrence of a first-time violation.<sup>1</sup> The Commission generally will assess penalties by violation category, rather than per occurrence, for first-time violations of those critical regulations that do not meet the requirements for mandatory penalties. The Commission will assess penalties for any equipment violation meeting the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's "out-of-service" criteria and for repeat violations of critical regulations, including each occurrence of a repeat violation.

The Commission has considered these factors and determined that it should penalize John Frank \$600 (Penalty Assessment), calculated as follows:

- Two violations of WAC 480-15-555(1) - Failure to complete a national criminal background check for every person the carrier intends to hire. The Commission assesses a penalty of \$100 for each occurrence of these repeat critical violations, for a total of \$200.

---

<sup>1</sup> Docket A-120061 – Enforcement Policy of the Washington Utilities & Transportation Commission – Section V.

- One violation of 49 C.F.R. § 390.19(b)(2) - Failing to file the appropriate form under 390.19(a) (MCS-150, 150B, or 150C) each 24 months according to schedule. The Commission assesses a \$100 penalty for this repeat violation.
- Five violations of 49 C.F.R. § 391.21(a) – Using a driver who has not completed and furnished an employment application. The Commission assesses a \$100 “per category” penalty for these repeat violations.
- One violation of 49 C.F.R. § 396.9(d)(3) – Failing to maintain completed inspection form for 12 months from the date of inspection at the carrier’s principal place of business or where the vehicle is housed. The Commission assesses a \$100 penalty for this repeat violation.
- Two violations of 49 C.F.R. § 396.21 – Failing to retain periodic inspection report for 14 months from date of inspection. The Commission assesses a \$100 “per category” penalty for these repeat violations.

This information, if proven at a hearing and not rebutted or explained, is sufficient to support the Penalty Assessment.

Your penalty is due and payable now. If you believe the violation(s) did not occur, you may deny committing the violation(s) and contest the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. Alternatively, if there is a reason for the violation(s) that you believe should excuse you from the penalty, you may ask for mitigation (reduction) of the penalty through evidence presented at a hearing or in writing. The Commission will grant a request for hearing only if material issues of law or fact require consideration of evidence and resolution in a hearing. Any request to contest the violation(s) or for mitigation of the penalty must include a written statement of the reasons supporting that request. Failure to provide such a statement will result in denial of the request. *See* RCW 81.04.405.

If you properly present your request for a hearing and the Commission grants that request, the Commission will review the evidence supporting your dispute of the violation(s) or application for mitigation in a Brief Adjudicative Proceeding before an administrative law judge. The administrative law judge will consider the evidence and will notify you of their decision.

**You must act within 15 days after receiving this notice** to do one of the following:

- Pay the amount due.
- Contest the occurrence of the violation.
- Admit the violation but request mitigation of the penalty amount.

Please indicate your selection on the enclosed form and submit it electronically through the Commission’s web portal at <https://efiling.utc.wa.gov/Form> **within FIFTEEN (15) days** after you receive this Penalty Assessment.<sup>2</sup> If you are unable to use the web portal, you may submit it via email to [records@utc.wa.gov](mailto:records@utc.wa.gov). If you are unable to submit the form electronically, you may

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://efiling.utc.wa.gov/Form>.

send a paper copy to the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission, PO Box 47250, Olympia, Washington 98504-7250.

If you wish to make a payment online, please use this link: Make a Payment Now (wa.gov).<sup>3</sup>

**If you do not act within 15 days,** the Commission may take additional enforcement action, including but not necessarily limited to suspending or revoking your certificate to provide regulated service, assessing additional penalties, or referring this matter to the Office of the Attorney General for collection.

DATED at Lacey, Washington, and effective July 16, 2025.

/s/ Connor Thompson  
CONNOR THOMPSON  
Director, Administrative Law Division

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.utc.wa.gov/documents-and-proceedings/online-payments/make-payment-now>

**WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**PENALTY ASSESSMENT TV-250530**

**PLEASE NOTE:** You must complete and sign this document and send it to the Commission within 15 days after you receive the Penalty Assessment. Use additional paper if needed.

I have read and understand RCW 9A.72.020 (printed below), which states that making false statements under oath is a class B felony. I am over the age of 18, competent to testify to the matters set forth below and I have personal knowledge of those matters. I hereby make, under oath, the following statements.

- ☐ 1. **Payment of penalty.** I admit that the violation(s) occurred.  
☐ Enclose \$600 in payment of the penalty.  
OR ☐ Attest that I have paid the penalty in full through the Commission's payment portal.
- ☐ 2. **Contest the violation(s).** I believe that the alleged violation(s) did not occur for the reasons I describe below **(if you do not include reasons supporting your contest here, your request will be denied):**
- ☐ a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision.
- OR ☐ b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.
- ☐ 3. **Application for mitigation.** I admit the violations, but I believe that the penalty should be reduced for the reasons set out below **(if you do not include reasons supporting your application here, your request will be denied):**
- ☐ a) I ask for a hearing to present evidence on the information I provide above to an administrative law judge for a decision.
- OR ☐ b) I ask for a Commission decision based solely on the information I provide above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing, including information I have presented on any attachments, is true and correct.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_ [month/day/year], at \_\_\_\_\_ [city, state]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Respondent (company) – please print

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Applicant

RCW 9A.72.020 "Perjury in the first degree."

- (1) A person is guilty of perjury in the first degree if in any official proceeding they make a materially false statement which they know to be false under an oath required or authorized by law.
- (2) Knowledge of the materiality of the statement is not an element of this crime, and the actor's mistaken belief that their statement was not material is not a defense to a prosecution under this section.
- (3) Perjury in the first degree is a class B felony.