



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: 039535078Y et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- T JAR GROUP CORP Hearing Date: 01/13/2026 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	--

Total Penalty Amount: \$0.00
Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
039535078Y	Dismissed	12/11/2024	1226 DECATUR STREET Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B1J4	BC 3301.11.1 and 2	Dismissed	\$0.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

DANIEL BRICKMAN, ESQ., appeared for the Department of Buildings (DOB), the petitioner here. PHOEBE DOSSETT, ESQ., appeared for the respondent. The summons alleges that at the time of inspection of respondent's new building construction workers were actively working, but a site safety orientation and refresher were not presented. The inspector asserted that the absence of the site safety orientation and refresher created a hazardous condition for workers, the public and the property. Accordingly the inspector issued this summons as a class 1 violation of section 3301.11.1, 2 of the Building Code.

Petitioner rested on the allegations contained within the four corners of the summons. I find that the summons makes an initial showing of the violation.

Respondent's counsel denied the allegations and liability for the summons. Counsel submitted un rebutted documentary evidence establishing that workers indeed received site safety orientation back in May 2024, several months prior to issuance of the summons. In that light, I find that respondent has established a valid defense. I find that the respondent is not in violation.

The summons is dsimissed.



01/16/2026

01/16/2026

Velly Polycarpe, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS
Hearings Division

DECISION

Michael Sargo, Esq. - Nacmias Law Firm 592 Pacific Street 1st Floor Brooklyn, NY 11217	Summons No: 14269-24F0 et al. (1 Summons) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & MENTAL HYGIENE, -against- PARIS BROOKLYN CAFE INC. Hearing Date: 01/13/2026 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	--

Total Penalty Amount: \$2,350.00

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
14269-24F0	Sustained	12/06/2024	5810 8 AVENUE Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	VIOL CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	CONDITION (SEVERITY)	RESULT	PENALTY
1	NA	02B	NYCHC 81.09(a)	4	Sustained	\$400.00
2	NA	04A	NYCHC 81.15(a)	5	Sustained	\$400.00
3	NA	04L	NYCHC 81.23(a)	3	Sustained	\$250.00
4	NA	08A	NYCHC 81.23(a)	3	Sustained	\$200.00
5a	NA	10B	NYCHC 81.20(a)	2	Sustained	\$100.00
5b	NA	10B	NYCHC 81.20(a)	2	Sustained / Bundled with Line 5a	\$0.00
6	NA	18-01	NYCHC 81.05(a)	N	Sustained	\$1,000.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Michael Sargo, Esq., appeared on behalf of the Respondent, Paris Brooklyn Café Inc.

The Petitioner did not appear.

The summons alleges a violation of NYC Health Code 81.09(a), condition 4, time/temperature control for safety hot food not held at or above 140 degrees except during necessary preparation,

The summons alleges four total conditions of NYC Health Code 81.09(a), hot food not held at or above 140 degrees F, five total conditions of NYC Health Code 81.15(a), food protection certificate not held by manager or supervisor of food operations, three total conditions of NYC Health Code 81.23(a), evidence of mouse activity, three total conditions of NYC Health Code 81.23(a) Harborage or conditions conducive to refuge insects or other pests, two total conditions of NYC Health Code 81.20(a), potable water system not protected from back-siphonage or backflow, total condition 0 of NYC Health Code 81.05(a), current valid permit to operate a food service establishment not provided.

Mr. Sargo motioned for an adjournment to discuss a settlement offer with his client.

This case has been adjourned five times previously, three times for the discussion of a settlement offer.

As the Respondent has failed to avail itself of numerous opportunities to settle this matter, I see no reason to delay adjudication further. The adjournment is denied.

With regards to all line items, the Respondent denied the charges but made no rebuttal.

The summons and all line items are sustained.



January 15, 2026

1/15/2026

Sean Gralton, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date