



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS
Hearings Division

DECISION

JOSHUA SANTIS - NACMIAS LAW FIRM PLLC 592 PACIFIC STREET NEW YORK,NY 11217	Summons No: 000849338H et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION, -against- HUGH O KANE ELECTRIC Hearing Date: 07/15/2025 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
---	---

Total Penalty Amount:\$350.00
Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
000849338H	Sustained	03/14/2024	101 8 AVENUE Manhattan

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	BA51	24 -163	Sustained	\$350.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Petitioner New York City Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) was unrepresented.

Respondent HUGH O KANE ELECTRIC was represented by authorized representative JOSHUA SANTIS of the Nacmias Law Firm.

Respondent was charged with a violation of § 24-163 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York (Code) for idling a motor vehicle engine for longer than three minutes.

I find the Issuing Officer's sworn-to summons narrative to be credible and persuasive.

Respondent's representative stated that he had reviewed the evidence packet and the video evidence previously provided to him and denied the violation without further rebuttal.

Code § 24-163(a) prohibits the idling of a motor vehicle engine in excess of three minutes while parked, standing, or stopped. Per § 6-12(b) of Title 48 of the Rules of the City of New York (RCNY), a summons affirmed under penalty of perjury will be admitted as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein. Petitioner is therefore not required to submit a video at the hearing to establish its case. See DEP v. TM & T Service Station Inc., Appeal No. 1901827 (March 19, 2020), though citizen-complainants must supply one to DEP along with their complaint. See DEP v. U-Haul Co. of Arizona Inc., Appeal No. 2001342 (January 14, 2021). Even where a video is presented, the charge does not fail if the video does not clearly show the vehicle vibrating, producing visible emissions, or making audible engine noise. See DEP v. Hub Truck Rental Corp., Appeal No. 2001344 (February 11, 2021). In such cases, once Petitioner has established its prima facie case, the critical inquiry is whether the respondent has sustained its burden to refute Petitioner's evidence or otherwise establish a defense. See 48 RCNY § 6-12(a).

Code § 24-163(a) provides that no one shall permit the idling of a motor vehicle engine for longer than three minutes unless the engine is used to operate a loading, unloading, or processing device.

The credible evidence, here the sworn-to summons narrative of the Issuing Officer, 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 \$350.

Mark Goichman

07/16/2025

07/16/2025

Mark Goichman, Hearing Officer

Date