



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS
Hearings Division

DECISION

Michael Nacmias, Esq. - Nacmias Law Firm 592 Pacific Street 1st Floor Brooklyn, NY 11217	Summons No: 0214753981 et al. (1 Summons) NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPT, -against- LURI LESELIDZE Hearing Date: 01/26/2026 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
0214753981	Dismissed	03/01/2025	1630 E102 Street Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	AD6B	A.C. 19-136(b)	Dismissed	\$0.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Michael Nacmias appeared as the authorized representative of the named respondent. The summons cites a violation of A.C. 19-136(b)

The respondent argued that the affidavit of service was blank, and that this was the incorrect rule for driving on the sidewalk, especially since the narrative does not state what the respondent was driving..


I find preliminarily that service is defective. The affidavit of service is blank. In Appeal No. 2200921 NYPD v. J. Doe August 30, 2022, it was held that "At the hearing, Respondent's representative challenged the affidavit of service. Here, Petitioner filed

a completely blank "Affidavit (Certificate) of Service," lacking the IO's signature or any description of the manner of service. As Petitioner failed to appear at the hearing to supplement its proof of service with any testimony or other evidence, the Tribunal finds that Petitioner failed to provide sufficient proof of service rendering service defective. See NYPD v. Ajaz B. Kiani, Appeal No. 1801238 (June 18, 2020); NYPD v. J. Doe, Appeal No. 2000002 (June 18, 2020)."

As to the merits, I do find that an incorrect rule was cited. Section 136b states that "It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to use any portion of a sidewalk or courtyard, established by law, between the building line and the curb line for the parking, storage, display or sale of motor vehicles."

Here, the narrative does not describe what it was that the respondent was driving. If it were a bicycle, then this would be a violation of A.C. 176C. If it were in fact a motor vehicle, this rule would not apply to one that is in motion.

For all the foregoing reasons, the summons is dismissed.



01/26/2026

01/26/2026

Amy Jill Baranoff, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date