

**CITY OF NEW YORK
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS**

-----X
**THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER
AFFAIRS,**

DECISION AND ORDER

Violation No.: PL005310676

Complainant,

- against -

GREAT DEALS CLEANERS INC.,

Respondent's Address:

**291 Ralph Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11233**

Respondent.

-----X

A hearing on the above-captioned matter was held on February 11, 2013.¹

Appearances: For the Department: Inspector M. Bolt. For the Respondent: Joseph Indusi, Esq.; Hugo Sanchez, President.

The Notice of Hearing charged the respondent with violating Section 20-292 of the Administrative Code of the City of New York by engaging in unlicensed laundry jobber activity.

Based on the evidence in this case, I **RECOMMEND** the following:

Findings of Fact:

On January 11, 2013, the respondent was operating a dry cleaning business which sent out its dry cleaning to be done off premises, and did not offer laundry services.

The respondent did not have a laundry jobber license on the day of the inspection.

Opinion

The Department did not establish the violation by a preponderance of the credible evidence.

The inspector testified that she observed a DCA complaint sign on the premises which listed DCA laundry jobber license number 122646 and that an employee told her that the clothing is "sent out." The inspector admitted that she

¹ The record was left open until February 20, 2013 in order to give the respondent an opportunity to submit additional evidence.

did not recall seeing a sign offering laundry services, that the employee did not specify whether clothing is sent out to be dry cleaned or laundered, and that she did not observe signs offering laundry services or a scale at the premises.²

Mr. Sanchez provided detailed and consistent testimony that the respondent only offers dry cleaning services and that clothing brought in by customers is sent off premises to be dry cleaned.³

In regard to the posted sign, he explained that that it was put up by the prior owner, Danny Singh. The respondent submitted a purchase and sale agreement, dated November 11, 2011, between Singh (seller) and Hugo Sanchez (purchaser) for the transfer of Great Deals Cleaners Inc. The respondent also submitted a copy of its 10-year lease agreement, which commenced on November 1, 2011. Mr. Singh's license expired on December 31, 2011. Mr. Sanchez testified that no clothing has been accepted for laundering since the prior owner's license expired.

Based on the above, the charge shall be dismissed.

Order

The respondent is found **not guilty** and the charge is **DISMISSED**.

This constitutes the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge.

David S. Paul
Administrative Law Judge

² See *DCA v One Stop Dry Cleaners Ltd.*, PL001048924 (February 9, 2007) (20-292 violation dismissed where the inspector did not recall seeing a sign for laundry jobbing services and the only evidence presented was 2 boxes of shirts and a receipt that stated "pickup all laundry after 4:00pm").

³ See *DCA v Agcona d/b/a Bushwick Dry Cleaners*, PL001023364 (February 9, 2005) (20-292 violation dismissed where the clothes were sent out for dry cleaning and there was a press on the premises).

DECISION AND ORDER

The recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge is approved.

This constitutes the Decision and Order of the Department.

Date: 7 March 2013

James M. Plotkin
Deputy Director of Adjudication

cc: Joseph Indusi, Esq.
e-mail: jindusi@nyc.rr.com

Hugo Sanchez
e-mail: hugoboss1969@aol.com