



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: 039143890M et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- GANGESHWAR, LLC Hearing Date: 06/15/2026 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	---

Total Penalty Amount: \$1,200.00
Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039143890M	Sustained	04/03/2025	235 MEEKER AVENUE Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B1D3	EC 110.25	Sustained	\$1,200.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Phoebe Dosett appeared as the authorized representative of the Respondent. Petitioner appeared by Richard Mayer. IO A. Lowe Badge No. 3673 appeared.

Respondent is charged with a Class 1 violation of BC 3303.4.6 & 27-1018 for failing to comply with the cited code requirements, as described in the summons.

Petitioner relied on the summons.

Ms. Dosett submitted a Deed and stated that the summons was issued to an improper party. Ms. Dosett stated that Respondent is the owner of the place of occurrence, and the summons was issued for safeguards for construction; however, there was no active construction at the time of summons issuance. Ms. Dosett stated that the summons should have been issued to a general contractor. Ms. Dosett further stated that the summons was charged under Chapter 33 which is improper because the summons named the owner with no active work being done.

Petitioner submitted photographs and stated that the issuing officer was given access to the boiler room and egress.

IO Lowe stated that the photographs show tables, chairs, and mini fridge in an electrical room which is combustible because it can catch on fire.

Petitioner moved to amend the Class 1 violation of BC 3303.4.6 & 27-1018 to a Class 1 violation of EC 110.25.

Ms. Dosett stated that Respondent does not object to the amended charge but challenges class because the cited room is not cluttered and has a window.

Petitioner stated that the summons is a Class 1 violation because the violating conditions are in the main electrical room for the whole building, and if one switch was hit it would be an electrical shock which is an immediate danger.

Petitioner's motion to amend the Class 1 violation of BC 3303.4.6 & 27-1018 to a Class 1 violation of EC 110.25 is granted.

I credit Petitioner's evidence, and the issuing officer's testimony. I find that Respondent did not establish a valid defense or credibly rebut the violation. The \$1200 penalty is imposed.

Sustained.

Myeisha Rouff

07/21/2026

07/21/2026

Myeisha Rouff, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date