OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

Hearings Division

DECISION

Michael Anthony Sargo, Esq. 592 Pacific Street Brooklyn,NY 11217	**Summons No:** 039548168K et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- GM 88 DEVELOPMENT CORP **Hearing Date:** 09/08/2026 **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
039548168K	Sustained	12/20/2025	28-08 21 STREET Queens

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B1C3	BC 3303.8	Sustained	$5,000.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

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

Respondent GM 88 DEVELOPMENT CORP was represented by attorney MICHAEL ANTHONY SARGO, ESQ. of Nacmias Law.

The Respondent is charged with a Class 1 violation of § 3303.8 of the Building Code (BC), found in Title 28 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York, for failing to provide standpipe air pressurized alarm for standpipe system.

In the summons, the Issuing Officer affirmed observing on December 20, 2025, at 28-08 21 Street in Queens, "Failure to provide standpipe or air pressurized alarm system for standpipe system during construction or demolition operation. At the time of my inspection of active job site observed standpipe not in readiness for fire-fighting personnel as required-top level-at roof level dial shows no pressure in standpipe - 0 PSI - STOP ALL WORK ABOVE 75 FEET Remedy: Provide standpipe or air pressurized alarm system."

In support, petitioner submitted into evidence (1) the instant summons; (2) 38 pages of color photographs taken contemporaneously by the Issuing Officer detain the violating conditions.

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 without further rebuttal.

The credible evidence, here the sworn-to summons narrative of the Issuing Officer and the submitted evidence, is sufficient to establish, and I find, that respondent was in violation on the date of the offense. The violation is SUSTAINED, and I impose the penalty of $5,000.

Mark Goichman

09/10/2026 **09/10/2026**

Mark Goichman, Judicial Hearing Officer **Date**