



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS

Hearings Division

Decision

ILMA BABU - NACMIAS LAW FIRM PLLC
592 PACIFIC STREET
Brooklyn, NY 11217

Summons# : 000969205K et al. (2 summonses)

DEPT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION,

-against-

Y CO INC COOPER FRIEDMAN ELECTRIC SUPPL

Hearing Date : 4/20/2026

Hearing Location : Remote

Type of Hearing : By Telephone

Total Penalty Amount : 1,040.00

Community Service(Hr): Not Applicable

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
000969205K	Sustained	03/21/2025	ON GRAND ST BETWEEN PITT ST AND, Manhattan

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION / RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	BA1E	24 -163	Sustained	440.00

Total Penalty for Summons: 440.00

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
000969206M	Sustained	05/29/2025	INTERSECTION OF WATER St. AND JOHN

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION / RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	BA1F	24 -163	Sustained	600.00

Total Penalty for Summons: 600.00

Findings of Facts & Conclusions of Law

The respondent Cooper Friedman Electric Supply Co. Inc. was issued two summonses.

Summons # 000969205K was issued for a violation of section 24-163; Idling of a motor vehicle engine for more than three minutes, or when at a terminal point, for any period of the, 2nd offense.

Summons # 000969206M was issued for a violation of section 24-163; Idling of a motor vehicle engine for more than three minutes, or when at a terminal point, for any period of the, 3rd offense.

Attorney Ilma Babu appeared for the respondent.


Michael Grosso appeared by email for the Petitioner, DEP and waived his appearance.

The respondent did not contest the 2nd offense charge for summons # 205K or the 3rd offense charge for summons # 206M

The respondent denied the charges and did not offer a rebuttal.

The summonses are credited.

Since the respondent denied the charges and did not offer a rebuttal, a second offense penalty in the amount of \$ 440.00 is imposed for summons # 205K and a third offense penalty in the amount of \$600.00 is imposed for summons # 206M.

 04/20/2026	04/20/2026
Michelle Mason, Hearing Officer	Date



OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRIALS AND HEARINGS
Hearings Division

DECISION

Frank Tamberino, Esq.
592 Pacific Street
1st Floor
Brooklyn, NY 11217

Summons No: 25Q00799

DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AND
WORKER PROTECTION,

-against-

AMERICAN MULTISERVICE GROUP CORP

Hearing Date: 04/13/2026

Hearing Location: Remote

Type of Hearing: By Telephone

Total Penalty Amount: \$7,500.00

Restitution: \$0.00

Suspension/Revocation/Sealing:

SUMMONS #	SUMMARY DISPOSITION	DATE OF OCCURRENCE	PLACE OF OCCURRENCE
25Q00799	Sustained	03/25/2025	3806 JUNCTION BLVD Queens

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	OCCURRENCE	NO. OF COUNTS	RESULT	PENALTY	SUSPENSION/ REVOCATION/SEALING
1	NA	NYC Admin Code § 20-777.1(a)	1	1	Dismissed	\$0.00	
2	NA	6 RCNY § 5-264(a)	1	1	Sustained	\$3,750.00	
3	NA	NYC Admin Code § 20-777	1	1	Sustained	\$3,750.00	

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

This hearing had been adjourned on 2/24/26 regarding a potential settlement over Petitioner DCWP's objection. The ca

proceeded on 4/13/26.

Frank Tamberino, Esq. appeared for Respondent American Multiservice Group Corp. IO Wiechels #777 appeared for Petitioner DCWP.

The summons alleges that on 3/25/25 the Respondent was in violation of NYCAC section 20-771.1(a) in that the price list signs were only in English even though there was Spanish language outside at the entrance, 6 RCNY 5-264(a) in that there was a sign posted disclosing the surety maintained by the provider and NYCAC section 20-777 in that the provider failed to provide a written contract in English.

IO rested on the summons and provided photographs taken at the time of inspection in support (See Pet. Ex.).


Mr. Tamberino did not deny the allegations. He argued that the summons should be dismissed in that Petitioner did not offer settlement, and that Respondent had promptly and in good faith corrected all violating conditions and passed the subsequent 11/19/25 inspection. In support Mr. Tamberino provided evidence of compliance and settlement attempt (See Res. Ex.).

Code § 20-771(a) provides, in pertinent part - Every licensed employment agency under the jurisdiction of the commissioner and engaged in the job placement of domestic or household employees shall provide to each applicant for employment as a domestic or household employee and his or her prospective employer, before job placement is arranged, a written statement indicating the rights of such employee and the obligations of his or her employer under city, state and federal law.

The IO alleged that price list signs were only in English even though there was Spanish language outside at the entrance. This has nothing to do with the section of law cited. This is not a requirement under Code § 20-771(a). Since the summons did not allege that Respondent failed to provide an applicant for employment a written statement indicating the rights of such employee and the obligations of his or her employer under city, state and federal law, I find Petitioner did not establish a prima facie case and this charge is dismissed.

Settlement is between Respondent and Petitioner and must be reached prior to the hearing. Compliance after the fact is not a defense, even if compliance is swift.

Regarding the two other violating conditions alleged, Respondent has not rebutted the charges. Accordingly, those charges are sustained.



April 21, 2026

04/21/2026

Lara Bianchi, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date