OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

Hearings Division

DECISION

Michael Anthony Sargo, Esq. 592 Pacific Street Brooklyn,NY 11217	**Summons No: 039154575X et al. (1 Summons)** **DEPT OF BUILDINGS,** **-against-** **FENTY DESIREE** **Hearing Date: 09/08/2026** **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
039154575X	Dismissed	07/22/2025	79 EAST 91 STREET Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B201	28-105.1	Dismissed	$0.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Petitioner NEW YORK CITY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDINGS (DOB) was represented by DOB attorney CARL KANEV, ESQ.

Respondent FENTY DESIREE was represented by attorney MICHAEL ANTHONY SARGO, ESQ.

The Respondent is charged with a Class 2 violation of § 28-105.1, found in Title 28 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York (Code), for work without a permit.

In support, petitioner submitted into evidence 2 color photographs taken contemporaneously by the Issuing Officer, and the

affirmation of service.

I find the Issuing Officer's sworn-to summons narrative and the submitted documentary evidence to be credible as to their observations.

Respondent denied the violation, arguing that the cited violating condition pre-existed the respondent's purchase of the property.

In support, respondent submitted into evidence (1) 1980 NYC Municipal Archives Tax Map information including a photograph of the cited premises from 1983-1988 showing the garage area already bricked up; (2) a notarized letter from long-time neighborhood resident ANITA LINTON, dated September 30, 2025, stating that the garage area was already bricked up before the respondent's purchase of the property; (3) a notarized letter from long-time neighborhood resident ANCILMA BULLOCK, dated October 1, 2025, stating that the garage area was already bricked up before the respondent's purchase of the property; (4) a notarized letter from long-time neighborhood resident CURTIS SAMUEL, dated September 30, 2025, stating that the garage area was already bricked up before the respondent's purchase of the property; (5) a notarized letter from long-time neighborhood resident LUDWIG JONES, dated September 30, 2025, stating that the garage area was already bricked up before the respondent's purchase of the property; and (6) a Deed showing the respondent's purchase of the cited premises on April 8, 1980.

I find the respondent's submitted documentary evidence to be credible and persuasive.

Petitioner made no recommendation.

I find that the cited violating conditions pre-existed the respondent's purchase of the cited property. The summons is DISMISSED.



09/10/2026

09/10/2026

Mark Goichman, Judicial Hearing Officer | Date