

Respondent, a provider of public pay telephone (ppt) services, appeals from a recommended decision and order finding it in violation of Section 6-05(b) of Title 67 of the Rules of the City of New York (RCNY) for failure to provide working ppt services. In the notice of violation (NOV), dated January 13, 2016, the issuing officer (IO) stated that Respondent failed to provide a working ppt and operator services.

At the hearing, Petitioner, the Department of Information Technology and Telecommunications, offered inspection reports stating that: (1) on January 8, 2016 at 8:16 a.m., the cited ppt had no dial tone; (2) on January 12, 2016 at 6:49 a.m., the ppt had a dial tone but the volume was low; and (3) on January 13, 2016 at 9:46 a.m., the ppt had low volume and the IO was unable to hear the operator. In rebuttal, Respondent offered a call detail report (CDR) for January 6, 2016 to January 14, 2016 to show that calls were made from the cited ppt on or between the inspection dates.

The hearing officer found that although the CDR listed several calls made during the inspection period, they were insufficient to refute the IO's observation of low volume.

### **Issue on appeal**

The issue on appeal is whether Respondent refuted that the inoperable condition of the ppt was continuous for two 24-hour periods from the date of first inspection through the date of third inspection.

### **Applicable law**

Section 6-05(b) of 56 RCNY provides, in pertinent part, that a ppt "must enable a call to be completed when the proper payment has been made;" and "shall provide access to operator service without use of a coin or other payment device."

Under 67 RCNY Section 6-05(e)(2), before issuing a violation for 67 RCNY Section 6-05(b), Petitioner must conduct two inspections disclosing that ppt service was unavailable on two occasions, each such occasion lasting for a duration of at least twenty-four hours, within a period of ninety calendar days.

Under 67 RCNY Section 6-05(e)(5), the violation is considered to have continued during the period from the time of first inspection through the time of reinspection if the inspections occur within a week of each other, and a defense to the violation may be established if the owner of the ppt can demonstrate that the condition underlying such violation was corrected within such period.

### **The appeal**

On appeal, Respondent's representative contends that he submitted a CDR showing calls made from the ppt during the inspection period and that this evidence successfully rebutted Petitioner's allegation of inoperability. For the first time on appeal, Respondent's representative claims that the CDR shows test calls made on January 9 and 14, 2016.

Petitioner did not answer the appeal.

### **The Board's determination**

On this record, the Board finds that Respondent refuted that the inoperable condition of the ppt was continuous for two 24-hour periods from the date of first inspection through the date of third inspection. Petitioner's inspections of the cited ppt disclosed that it had no dial tone on January 8, 2016 and low volume on January 12 and 13, 2016. Because the inspections were conducted within a week of each other but more than 24 hours apart, the violating condition is considered to have continued during the period between inspections. A defense to the violation may be established if the owner of the ppt can demonstrate that the condition underlying such violation was corrected within such period. *See* 67 RCNY Section 6-05(e)(5).

Here, the CDR shows that nine local calls ranging from 45 seconds to 2 minutes in duration were made between the IO's first inspection on January 8, 2016 and second inspection on January 12, 2016. The Board finds that these calls demonstrate that the ppt had a dial tone after the IO's first inspection, when allegedly it had none. Therefore, Petitioner did not establish that there were two occasions when inoperability continued for 24 hours during the IO's inspection period, regardless of any intermittent inoperability. Consequently, the Board concludes that Respondent's evidence established a defense.

Accordingly, the Board reverses the hearing officer's recommended decision and order and dismisses the NOV.

---

Additional information from ECB records (not in original decision)

---

Master NOV #

187220294

Name of Respondent's counsel or other  
authorized representative (if any)

ALLEN CHAPMAN