



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 No: 039123788H et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- SHRI SIDHDHY VANAYAK, INC Hearing Date: 06/30/2025 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	---

Total Penalty Amount: \$800.00
Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039123788H	Sustained	09/03/2024	1119 EAST GUNHILL ROAD Bronx

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B1C9	27-3018(b)	Sustained	\$800.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

On 9/3/24, Respondent SHRI SIDHDHY VANAYAK, INC was issued a summons alleging a class 1 of AC section 27-3018(b) for electrical work without a permit. Specifically, the IO noted the following: " I observed in the basement area the installation of circuit breaker panels, branch circuit wiring, overcurrent devices, feeder wires and conduits. Also noted the installation of lights and outlets in the rear section of the storage areas. No permit in DOB records". The first scheduled hearing date was 11/15/24. On 1/4/25, the hearing was adjourned on the motion of the Petitioner for the testimony of the IO.

On 6/27/25, the hearing was conducted by telephone. Respondent appeared by its attorney Caroline Kane, Esq. Petitioner DOB appeared by its attorney Daniel Brickman, Esq.

Mr. Brickman rested on the summons.

Ms. Kane denied the charge and argued that the violation does not rise to the level of a class 1 immediately hazardous violation. She said Respondent obtained the electrical permit on 11/124, prior to the first scheduled hearing date. Mr. Brickma stood by the class 1 designation.

I credit the allegations contained in the summons and find that Petitioner established a prima facie case for a violation of the cited section of law. I find that the violation is properly designated as a class 1 immediately hazardous given that the nature of the work which is electrical and the extent of it. I do not credit Respondent's denial and find that Respondent failed to submit any evidence in rebuttal. Accordingly, I sustain the summons but impose the mandatory mitigated penalty based on Respondent's timely correction.

Didi Skaff

07/03/2025

07/03/2025

Didi Skaff, Hearing Officer

Date