



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: 039164697N et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- 547 HUDSON LLC Hearing Date: 08/27/2026 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	--

Total Penalty Amount: \$5,000.00
Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039164697N	Sustained	10/24/2025	547 HUDSON STREET Manhattan

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B102	28-301.1	Sustained	\$5,000.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

The Respondent, 547 HUDSON LLC, appeared by its Attorney-at-Law, PHOEBE DOSSETT, ESQ. The Petitioner appeared by HENRIETTA BAIDOO, ESQ., and by the IO J ANGOTTI, badge #3743. The summons alleges class 1, aggravated 1 violation, for a failure to maintain the building in a compliant code manner. The details state "failure to maintain. At roof level decking is still installed and still is altering the height of the roof leading to roof ladder".

The matter was originally scheduled to be heard on 1/8/2026 and was fully heard on this instant date, 8/27/2026.

Ms. Baidoo relied on the sworn allegations, the IO's testimony, and an image of predicate summons #391142587P as the

basis for the aggravated charge. (PX1). The predicate summons #87P cited the same respondent, at the same premises; and refers to the same provision of law as the instant.

The IO provided testimony to substantiate the class 1 classification of the charge. According to the IO, the roof deck was unpermitted and was made of combustible materials, thereby creating a fire hazard. Further, the roof ladder does not extend to the addition, the roof level; and the deficiency posed a severe safety hazard to people and first responders in case of an emergency.

Ms. Dossett argued that the face of the summons does not support an immediately hazardous violation to justify class 1 and the IO's testimony included additional information that was not included in the summons.

I disagree with Respondent's argument that it is improper for the IO to supplement the classification of the charge with testimony at the hearing. While the IO cannot add facts outside of the details on the summons, they can supplement the details to clarify a violation or to supplement the sworn details. Here, I credit the Petitioner's case, including the IO's testimony, and I find that they support a prima facie case for the violation as alleged.

I find that Petitioner established that the violating condition poses a threat that severely affects the safety of the public and first responders and warranted immediate corrective action. I find the Respondent liable for the violation and the statutory penalty is imposed for a class 1, aggravated 1, violation. The summons is sustained.

Janet Pitter

08/28/2026

08/28/2026

Janet Pitter, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date