



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: 039149729N et al. (1 Summons) DEPT OF BUILDINGS, -against- MATTHEW KRANSDORF Hearing Date: 03/19/2026 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
039149729N	Dismissed	06/03/2025	23 FILLMORE PLACE Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	B102	28-301.1	Dismissed	\$0.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Phoebe Dossett, Esq. appeared at the hearing by phone for Respondent. Henrietta Baidoo, Esq. appeared by phone for Petitioner. Respondent was charged with a class 1 violation of 28-301.1 for failure to maintain building in code compliant manner. The instant summons was previously adjourned for the IO who was not available. The hearing was conducted in his absence. Petitioner submitted photos in support. Ms. Dossett challenged the class. She noted that there had been a fire at the location which caused the ERT inspection. She submitted a technical report from a professional engineer which was done in response to the violation. She stated that the report showed that there was no hazard to public safety therefore no safety measures were required. Ms. Baidoo stated that the photos showed pieces of stucco coming off at the public walkway as well as broken brick that appeared ready to fall. She said that the IO was not from the façade unit. She stated that

Respondent was not being proactive as the engineer only made the assessment after DOB issued a second summons. She cited Appeal 2400740 in support. Ms. Dossett argued that class is an element of the charge and, if not proven, requires a dismissal. She stated that Appeal 2400740 was different than the instant case because there was no report from a professional engineer. She said that the engineer's report carried more weight than the IO's observations. She stated that there is no correction yet because the exterior of the building is landmarked. She stated the Landmarks approval was just received.

I credit the summons as written and find that it establishes a prima facie violation. I credit Respondent's evidence and further find that it is sufficient to challenge the Class 1 designation. The report by the licensed engineer clearly states that there is no immediate hazard and outweighs the observation of the IO who was not from the façade unit. I do not find the cited conditions to be immediately hazardous.

Accordingly, the summons is dismissed.



04/09/2026

04/09/2026

Daniella Caputo, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date