



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: 0199500759 et al. (1 Summons) NEW YORK CITY POLICE DEPT, -against- YOUSOUF CONDE Hearing Date: 03/09/2026 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
0199500759	Dismissed	01/16/2026	19-15 Nameoke Ave Queens

LINE ITEM	OATH CODE	CODE SECTION/RULE	RESULT	PENALTY
1	AD6L	AC 19-190(B)	Dismissed	\$0.00

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

Petitioner NYPD did not appear. Attorney Michael Nacmias appeared on behalf of Respondent YOUSOUF CONDE at telephone hearing on March 9, 2026. Respondent's counsel waived the present of the issuing officer, formal reading of the charges and the use of a translator.

Respondent was charged with violating section 19-190(B) of the Administrative Code. Date of occurrence was 01/16/26.

Respondent's counsel made two arguments in support of the dismissal of the summons. First, the summons was defective since it had a blank affidavit of service. Thus, Petitioner failed to provide proper proof of service as per the RCNY. Second, the

summons is facially defective because it is a restatement of the law and does not connect Respondent's conduct to a violation. The summons failed to allege whether the pedestrian had the right of way or whether Respondent was operating a vehicle. No additional evidence was submitted.

The Board has held that service is improper when the Issuing Officer fails to provide any information on the affidavit of service and petitioner offered no testimony or other evidence at the hearing as to how the summons was served. See *NYC v. M & G General Construction*, Appeal No. 1200063 (May 31, 2012); *reaffirmed in NYPD v. Doe*, Appeal No. 1800218 (May 17, 2018). See also *NYPD v. Barrett Cherelle*, Appeal No. 2000420 (June 18, 2020).

In addition, OATH rule 6-08(c)(2) states that a summons must contain "[a] clear and concise statement sufficient to inform the Respondent with reasonable certainty and clarity of the essential facts alleged to constitute the violation or the violations charged, including the date, time where applicable, and place when and where such facts were observed..."

I give credit to the issuing officer's sworn statement but find that it fails to establish a violation. The summons fails to allege Respondent's conduct, if any, that would constitute a violation of the cited rule. Moreover, I find the Affidavit of Service is blank and there was no evidence presented to show that the respondent was properly served with the summons.

Therefore, the summons is dismissed.



03/10/2026

03/10/2026

Raul Quezada, Judicial Hearing Officer

Date