



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS
Hearings Division

DECISION

NORA BROWN - NACMIAS LAW FIRM PPLC 592 PACIFIC STREET NEW YORK,NY 11217	Summons No: 014187293L et al. (1 Summons) NEW YORK CITY FIRE DEPARTMENT, -against- EXCELLENT AUTO BODY, INC. Hearing Date: 11/18/2025 Hearing Location: Remote Type of Hearing: By Telephone
--	---

Total Penalty Amount:\$575.00
Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
014187293L	Sustained	05/20/2025	344 Maujer St. Brooklyn

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	BF19	VC19 .	Sustained	\$575.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

The NYC Fire Department was represented by supervisor Kofi Speed at a telephone hearing on November 18, 2025. Registered representative Nora Brown appeared on behalf of EXCELLENT AUTO BODY, INC. Respondent's representative waived the use of an interpreter, the assistance of counsel and the presence of the Issuing Officer.

Respondent's representative requested an adjournment for further evidence. Petitioner objected since this was Respondent's second request and failed to provide a reason as to Respondent's failure to send their representative their evidence. Respondent does not deem this hearing important enough to provide their evidence so they should not be given another opportunity to postpone the hearing.

A hearing officer can grant an adjournment so long as the hearing officer considers relevant factors and reaches a reasonable determination of "good cause" based on the entirety of the record. *TLC v. Abdelaziz Djeri*, Appeal No, 10047040C, (Jan. 27, 2016).

I do not find good cause to grant Respondent's request. Respondent failed to present any reason for their failure to provide their evidence to their own representative. Respondent's adjournment request is denied.

Respondent was charged with violation category (VC) 19. Date of occurrence was 05/20/25 and first hearing was scheduled on 07/08/25.

Petitioner relied on the sworn statement of the issuing officer and recommended the standard penalty.

Respondent's representative denied the allegations and offered no rebuttal. No additional evidence was submitted.

I credit the sworn statement of the issuing officer and find that Petitioner established the violation. Respondent failed to rebut the allegations and present a valid legal defense.

Therefore, the summons is sustained, and the standard penalty is imposed.

Raul Quezada

11/21/2025

11/21/2025

Raul Quezada, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date