

The hearing was conducted by phone on July 24, 2026. Petitioner appeared through MariaDollas, Esq. Respondent appeared through Phoebe Dossett, Esq.

Respondent received three summonses: 32Y charged a Class 1 violation of AC 28-207.2.2 as a recurring condition (Agg. I); 33X charged a Class 2 violation of AC 28-204.4, and; 34H also charged a Class 2 violation of AC 28-204.4 but as a recurring condition (Agg. I).

Ms. Dollas introduced the Petitioner evidence into the record on each summons. See Pet. Ex. 1.

Ms. Dossett challenged the Agg. I designation on 32Y and introduced a record showing the predicate summons had been dismissed. See Resp. Ex. A. Ms. Dollas acknowledged Petitioner could not substantiate the Agg. I designation and so stood by the standard penalty. Thereafter Ms. Dossett denied the charge with no rebuttal.

She denied the charge in 33X with no rebuttal.

On 34H, issued as an Agg I., she challenged the designation only arguing that only one other failure to comply had been issued to the property and it had been issued contemporaneously so could not be a predicate. She argued the Agg. I could not be substantiated. She submitted a record showing the underlying into the record and stated it reflected the underlying having been dismissed. See Resp. Ex. A.

I credit the IO, establishing the prima facie case for violation on each. On 32Y I credit Ms. Dossett and Respondent's evidence that the predicate summons was dismissed. I find the Agg. I designation cannot be established. I do not credit Respondent's general denial on either of 32Y or 33X. On 34H I credit Ms. Dossett and Respondent's evidence that the alleged predicate was issued concurrent with 34H such that the Agg. I designation cannot be established; I credit same that the underlying was dismissed.

Therefore I dismiss the charge reflected in 34H; I find Respondent in violation on 32Y and 33X and impose the standard penalty on each.



07/27/2026

07/27/2026

Charles Simpkins, Hearing Officer

Date