



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

Hearings Division

Decision

Caroline Kane, Esq. - Nacmias Law Firm, PLLC 592 Pacific Street, 1st Floor Brooklyn, NY 11217	Summons# : 039114676Z et al. (4 summonses) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- 11 PULASKI 2018 HOLDINGS 517 L Hearing Date : 6/23/2025 Hearing Location : Remote Type of Hearing : By Telephone
--	---

Total Penalty Amount :	4,375.00	Community Service(Hr):	Not Applicable
-------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039114676Z	Sustained	05/17/2024	1783 BEDFORD AVENUE, Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION / RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B232	28-301.1	Sustained	625.00

Total Penalty for Summons: 625.00

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039114677K	Sustained	05/17/2024	1783 BEDFORD AVENUE, Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION / RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B202	28-301.1	Sustained	625.00

Total Penalty for Summons: 625.00

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039114678M	Sustained	05/17/2024	1783 BEDFORD AVENUE, Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION / RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B101	28-105.1	Sustained	2,500.00

Total Penalty for Summons: 2,500.00

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039114680L	Sustained	05/17/2024	1785 BEDFORD AVENUE, Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION / RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B202	28-301.1	Sustained	625.00

Total Penalty for Summons: 625.00

Findings of Facts & Conclusions of Law

A telephonic hearing was held on June 23, 2025.

Petitioner was represented by Rafeena Khairullah, Esq. and Issuing Officer Miazga #3440 who confirmed the summonses narrative and presented photos that were taken at the time of the occurrence.

Under summons 039114676Z, Respondent was charged with a class 2 violation of Building Code (BC) section 28-301.1 in that 1st floor level exit signs and emergency lights not operative when tested throughout several areas. Posing evacuation hazard in the event of an emergency.

Respondent was represented by Caroline Kane, Esq. who denied the violation without presenting any evidence.

Under summons 039114677K, Respondent was charged with a class 2 violation of BC 28-301.1 for failing to maintain building in code compliant manner. Exp #3 rear façade step cracks throughout several locations and missing/washed out mortar joints at parapet wall level at 1783 Bedford Avenue on 05/17/2024.

Respondent's representative argued that summons ending 77K is duplicative to summons ending 80L.

Petitioner's representative argued that the summonses are for different places of occurrence, so they are not duplicative.

Under summons 039114678M, Respondent was charged with a class 1 violation of BC 28-105.1 for work without a permit: plumbing work in progress with installation of (3) Rheem hot water heater, with red & blue pex piping; electrical work for new main breaker panel & (4) sub panels with meter bypass at 1783 Bedford Avenue on 05/17/2024.

On crossed examination, IO could not confirm whether or not the building had electricity.

Respondent's representative moved to amend to class 2 violation arguing that there was no electricity in the building so there was no immediate hazard.

Petitioner's representative argued that class was established based on work being done without a permit.

Under summons 039114680L, Respondent was charged with a class 2 violation of BC 28-301.1 for failure to maintain building in code complaint manner. Exp #3 rear façade missing bricks above 1st floor rear exit door. Throughout several locations at rear brick façade, several step cracks with missing/washed out mortar joints at parapet level at 1785 Bedford Avenue on 05/17/2024.

Respondent was represented by Caroline Kane, Esq. who denied the violation without presenting any evidence.

Here, I credit the summonses and find that the same are sufficient to establish the charged violations. I find that summonses ending in 77K and 80L are not duplicative because they were from different places of occurrence. I find that credible contrary evidence or a valid legal defense was not presented. Accordingly, the summonses are sustained.



07/18/2025

07/18/2025

Simone Archer, Hearing Officer

Date