OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

Hearings Division

DECISION

Phoebe Dossett, Esq. - Nacmias Law Firm, PLLC 592 Pacific Street 1st Floor Brooklyn,NY 11217	**Summons No: 0213680235 et al. (1 Summons)** **DEPT OF BUILDINGS,** **-against-** **CORE DESIGN & BUILD INC.** **Hearing Date: 10/01/2026** **Hearing Location: Remote** **Type of Hearing: By Telephone**

Total Penalty Amount:**$0.00**

Community Service(Hr): **Not Applicable**

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
0213680235	Dismissed	07/18/2024	475 West Broadway Manhattan

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	A191	MISC. CHAP.4 OF TITLE 28	Dismissed	$0.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Petitioner appeared by DOB representative, Cassie Rene Esq. and issuing officer, Insp. John Juliano, Badge # 3670. Respondent, CORE DESIGN & BUILD INC., appeared by its attorney, Phoebe Dossett Esq. and Respondent's witness (owner), John Kim, to answer a charge of Respondent facilitating unlicensed plumbing work at the cited premises. The first hearing date was September 26, 2024.

Ms. Rene relied on the allegations in the summons as well as supporting evidence which included Investigation Information sheet (see Pet. Exhs. A & B). Ms. Rene also questioned Insp. Juliano who reiterated the allegations in the summons.

Ms. Dossett moved to dismiss the summons on the grounds of improper/defective service of the summons. First, Ms. Dossett stated that Respondent is not an individual but a corporation and that Insp. Juliano checked the wrong box of inquiry and inquired from the person encountered, Jihoon Choi, the Site Supervisor, if Respondent was present. Ms. Dossett stated that such inquiry did not satisfy a reasonable attempt to serve the summons and that since Respondent is a corparation the proper line of inquiry was to find out who Jihoon Choi was and to ask if Jihoon Choi was authorized to accept service on behalf of Respondent. Ms. Dossett concluded by stating that Jihoon Choi was in fact authorized to accept service on behalf of Respondent but was never asked if he was authorized to ddo so. Mr. Kim stated Jhoon Choi is the Site Supervisor and is auythorized to accept service of the summons, that he had spoken to Mr. Choi and that Mr. Choi had stated that he was never asked by Insp. Juliano if he would accept service on behalf of Respondent before posting summons to the door.

Ms. Rene questioned Insp. Juliano who stated that he had asked Mr. Choi if he was authorized to accept service on behalf of Respondent and that Mr. Choi has stated that he cannot accept service of the summons, which is why he resorted to affixing the summons to the door

I do not credit Insp. Juliano's testimony that he inquired from Jihoon Choi if he was authorized to accept service of the summons on behalf of Respondent before affixing such summons to the door. I therefore find that Petitioner has failed to make a reasonable attempt to serve Respondent with the summons prior to affixing such summons to the door. I find service of the summons to be defective and grant Ms. Dossett's motion to dismiss the summons on the grounds of defective/improper service of the summons. Accordingly, the summons is DISMISSED.



10/18/2026

10/18/2026

Akinwale Akinrefon, Judicial Hearing Officer | Date