

STATE OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF CANNABIS MANAGEMENT
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

OFFICE OF CANNABIS MANAGEMENT,

Petitioner,

-against-

DECISION
Inspection No. 114202601290033

KUSH BLOOMS LLC

Respondent.

Respondent requested an emergency hearing to adjudicate the Order to Seal, Notice of Violation, and Order to Cease Unlicensed Activity (hereinafter “OTS” and “NOV”) issued by the Office of Cannabis Management (hereinafter “OCM”).

Respondent’s request occurred on January 30, 2026, and was made within seven (7) calendar days of the date of the inspection which occurred on January 29, 2026. A hearing was scheduled for February 4, 2026. On February 2, 2026, Respondent requested a brief adjournment and access to the premises.¹ I granted the adjournment with the understanding that Respondent would be waiving his right to an emergency hearing. A conference was scheduled for February 6, 2026, and held on that day. A hearing was scheduled for March 4, 2026, and conducted on March 4 and March 5, 2026.

The Office of Cannabis Management was represented by Abir Ahmed, Esq.

Supervising Investigator Eva Chumsky (hereinafter “Chumsky”) appeared as a witness for OCM.

The Respondent, Anwar Ahmed, Owner of Kush Blooms LLC., appeared as a legal representative for the business.

Administrative Law Judge Laurie Cartwright, Esq. (Presiding Judge).

¹ A separate detailed ruling was made concerning Respondent’s access to the premises.

I. ISSUE

The allegations set forth in the NOV indicate that the Respondent was offering cannabis products, as defined by Cannabis Law Article 3, for sale without an appropriate registration, license, or permit. This allegation was based upon observations made during a regulatory inspection which was conducted at 3270 Lake Shore Rd., Blasdell, NY 14219.

The scope of the hearing involved a determination of whether OCM, by a preponderance of the evidence, met the requirements articulated in the padlocking provisions of Cannabis Law Article 6 § 138-b, if it was justified in issuing to Respondent the NOV, and what penalty, if any, under Article 6 § 132 is justified. OCM requested the maximum fine of \$10,000 per day from the date of the last Order to Cease Unlicensed Activity on August 8, 2024 and the date of inspection, January 29, 2026, which amounts to 540 days and \$5.4 million.

II. APPLICABLE LAW

Cannabis Law Article 6 §125(1) states that “[n]o person shall cultivate, process, distribute for sale or sell at wholesale or retail or deliver to consumers any cannabis, cannabis product, medical cannabis or cannabinoid hemp or hemp extract product, or any product marketed or labeled as such, within the state without obtaining the appropriate registration, license, or permit therefor required....”

Cannabis Law Article 6 §138-A provides that “The board or the Office of Cannabis Management shall, in accordance with the authority otherwise conferred in this chapter, have the authority to: 1. order any person who is unlawfully cultivating, processing, distributing or selling cannabis, cannabis product, cannabinoid hemp or hemp extract product, or any product marketed or labeled as such in this state without obtaining the appropriate registration, license, or permit therefor, or engaging in an indirect retail sale to cease such prohibited conduct. 2. seize any cannabis, cannabis product, cannabinoid hemp or hemp extract product, or any product marketed or labeled as such, found in the possession of a person engaged in the conduct described in subdivision one of this section.”

Cannabis Law Article 6 §132(1)(a) provides that “Any person who cultivates for sale, offers to sell, or sells cannabis, cannabis products, medical cannabis, or any product marketed or labeled as such, without having an appropriate registration, license or permit therefor, including a person whose registration, license, or permit has been revoked, surrendered or cancelled, where such person is engaging in activity for which a license would be required under this chapter, maybe subject to a civil penalty of not more than ten thousand dollars for each day during which such violation continues...”

Cannabis Law Article 6 §132 (1)(c) requires that any civil penalties assessed “shall take into consideration the nature of such violation and shall assess a penalty that is proportionate to the violation....”

Cannabis Law Article 6 § 138-B(1) provides that orders to seal: In addition to any other authority conferred in this chapter, pursuant to the provisions of this section, the board or the office

shall have the authority to issue an order to seal the building or premises of any business engaged in unlicensed activity, when such activity is conducted, maintained, or permitted in such building or premises, occupied as a place of business as described in subdivision eight of section ten of this chapter, in violation of subdivision one or one-a of section one hundred twenty-five or subdivision one or eight or section one hundred thirty-two of this article.

Cannabis Law Article 6 §138-B(6) provides that an order to seal may be issued by the office or the board pursuant to subdivision three of this section only if:

- (a) no part of the premises to be sealed is used in part as a residence and pursuant to local law or ordinance is zoned and lawfully occupied as a residence; and
- (b) the unlicensed activity as described in this section is more than a de minimis part of the business activity on the premises or in the building to be sealed pursuant to this subdivision, the office shall issue a notice of violation and order to cease the unlicensed conduct, which shall constitute notice that such activity must cease immediately. (See Regulations at 9 NYCRR 133.25(f)(2-3)).

Cannabis Law Article 6 §138-B(7) provides that in assessing whether unlicensed activity within a building is more than de minimis, the office or board, as relevant, shall consider factors such as any one or more of the following:

- (a) the presence of signs or symbols, indoors or out, advertising the sale of cannabis or otherwise indicating that cannabis is sold on the premises;
- (b) information shared in any advertisements or other marketing content in connection with the unlicensed business activity and any direct or indirect sales of cannabis or other conduct in violation of this chapter;
- (c) the volume of illicit cannabis products on site; and
- (d) the variety of illicit cannabis products on site. (See Regulations at 9 NYCRR 133.25(f)(3)(i-iv)).

Cannabis Law Article 6 §138-B(3) provides that the office may issue an order to seal with an immediate effective date if such order is based upon a finding by the office of an imminent threat to the public health, safety and welfare. (See Regulations at 9 NYCRR 133.25(f)(1)).

Cannabis Law Article 6 §138-B(4) sets forth the factors that determine an imminent threat to public health, safety, and welfare shall be limited to:

- (a) documented sales to minors;
- (b) unlicensed processing of cannabis products at the building or premises;
- (c) orders issued following an inspection wherein the person engaged in the unlicensed activity engaged in violent, tumultuous, or other behaviors indicating expressed intent to

- not comply with the office's order to cease the unlicensed activity;
- (d) documented presence of unlawful firearms at the building or premises;
 - (e) proximity of the building or premises to schools, houses of worship, or public youth facilities;
 - (f) presence of products deemed unsafe based on reports of illness or hospitalization; or
 - (g) sales of, or offers to sell, cannabis products not tested or labeled lawfully in accordance with this chapter. (See Regulations at 9 NYCRR 133.25(f)(1)(i-vii).

III. FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Investigator Chumsky testified that she is an Investigative Specialist 1 with OCM. Her duties involve short-term and long-term investigations into unlicensed smoke shops. She explained that her training consisted of in the field and in-office training on what can and cannot be seized and in identifying cannabis. She stated then when identifying cannabis, she looked for anything labeled as cannabis, as well as flower that smells, looks and is marketed as cannabis. She also identifies products by logos, cannabis symbols, and out-of-state cannabis labels. Investigator Chumsky identifies cannabis stores by advertising on the walls, such as images of cannabis leaves, as well as by menus and price tags.
2. Investigator Chumsky explained that prior to her regulatory search of Kush Blooms, there was an attempted undercover purchase of cannabis products by an OCM employee from the premises via the same salesclerk that was working during the January 29th inspection. A recording of that attempted undercover buy was entered into evidence as Exhibit K. The employee in the recording scrolls on a menu that appears similar to, or the same as, the menu observed on the inspection date.
3. Investigator Chumsky testified that OCM conducted its January 29, 2026, inspection in accordance with the access order it received on January 23, 2026, which allowed investigators to search non-retail sections of the premises. (Exhibit B).
4. Investigator Chumsky testified extensively to her observations of the premises upon entry and during her walkthrough of the premises. (Exhibit C).
5. There were multiple rooms branching off the hallway at the rear of the store. One was a storage room containing what appeared to be drinks, Funions, and other non-cannabis items. Branching off from this storage room was a bathroom with a toilet, and a separate bathroom with a disconnected bathtub, a urinal, and a sink. There were numerous empty boxes in the bathroom.
6. Down the hall was a room with a passcode-entry door handle featuring a futon, coffee table, a few items that appeared to be blankets or clothing, two-way glass, television with accessories, weights, sandals, and security camera system.

7. In that room there was a large black filing cabinet containing multiple containers of cannabis products in an assortment of product types, flavors, and strains. (Exhibit C19 and Exhibit D). In the cabinet were the following products:

- a. There was a Snyder's of Hanover Mini pretzel box containing pre-portioned cannabis flower. Investigator Chumsky testified that all the packages depicted cartoons, bubble letters and images that may be attractive to children. Investigator Chumsky also stated that each packaged contained cannabis, had a label that said it contained cannabis, and many if not all, had clear bottoms through which cannabis could be seen. At least one was also opened, allowing for a closer inspection of the contents. Approximately 57 cannabis packages could be seen in the open box. (Exhibit D2-10).
- b. The gray drawer seen in the large black cabinet contained approximately 9 packages of Naked Worm Assorted Flavor Gummies- 1000mg Total THC- 20 Pieces at 50mg each. The labels indicate the products contain cannabis. (Exhibit D14).
- c. 7- 1g Cannabis oil vape cartridges in a variety of strains and flavors such as: Point Green Sativa, La Confidential Indica, Cocoa Dulce Indica, and Zushi Indica. (Exhibit D15).
- d. 12 small containers of cannabis butter/batter in an assortment of flavors such as: Neon Lights, Vercetti Velvet, and LV Lemon. (Exhibit D16).
- e. Multiple packs of Crazy Worms- 2000mg THC- 20ct. 100mg/gummy (Exhibit D19).
- f. Luigi's Live Resin- Liquid Diamond vape and pre-roll in Cucu Melon, Super Sangria, OG Blue Kiwi, and Lavash Breath (Exhibit D21 and Exhibit D24).
- g. Bunker Buster pre-roll in Rainbow Runtz-Indica (Exhibit D30).
- h. There were also two drawers containing numerous tubes of clear cannabis pre-rolls.
- i. Cannabis concentrate vape- Smoothie Bar Blend- Liquid Live Diamonds, 2.0g tank all-in-one in Pink Velvet Indica x Bubblegum Indica, Biscotti Indica x Gumbo Indica, Strawberries N Cream Sativa x Cresendo Sativa, Candy Cane Indica x Biskante Sativa, Hindu Kush (Indica) x Pez (Indica).
- j. Assorted other cannabis products such as pre-rolls and concentrate.

8. Investigator Chumsky also testified to finding a box during the inspection that contained, a grinder, empty rolling papers, and what appeared to be loose cannabis flower. The rolling papers matched the brand of rolling paper used in the pre-rolls recovered from a drawer in the black cabinet at the location.

9. The cabinet shelf was labeled personal cannabis, but it far exceeded the volume that could be reasonably interpreted as personal use.

10. In total, the following cannabis products were seized from the premises:

- a. 24- 1000mg gummies
- b. 2- 2000mg gummies
- c. 12 cannabis concentrates
- d. 15- 2.0g Smoothie Bar cannabis vapes
- e. 10- 2.0g Luigi cannabis vapes
- f. 30-1.0g vape cartridges
- g. 88- 3.5g packages of cannabis flower
- h. 68 pre-rolls

11. There was also a large storage room containing multiple shelves filled with nicotine vapes and products.

12. Upon entry, Investigator Chumsky observed a menu for cannabis products on an iPad at the location with products and their corresponding prices. It contained products recovered from the rear of the store such as: Naked Worm Gummies, Smoothie Bar Blend, as well as pre-rolls, cannabis flower, cannabis oil vape cartridges, cannabis concentrate jars, and the Luigi vape/pre-roll combo.

13. The Respondent was apparently detained by police officers during the search of the premises. Investigator Chumsky testified that the Respondent was refusing to cooperate, became aggressive during the inspection and was handcuffed. Investigator Chumsky added that Respondent had a “history” of not cooperating with OCM and local law enforcement. I will not consider his past conduct, as it is unsubstantiated hearsay, of an unknown origin, and more prejudicial than it is probative.

14. Investigator Chumsky also testified that Respondent had a licensed firearm on his person at the time of inspection. (Exhibit C31). I will not factor this into my decision.

15. Petitioner introduced a picture of Respondent’s vehicle, as well as a copy of his vehicle registration, which had the same address as one of the certificates of authority for Kush Blooms observed at the location. The Respondent did not deny that the address listed was his address.

16. Investigator Chumsky testified that the premises was not zoned as a residential building. A building inspector from the Town of Hamburg posted a warning sign on the door of the premises during the inspection which stated, “DO NOT ENTER BY ORDER OF THE BUILDING INSPECTOR Not Permitted Use THE PREMISE LOCATED AT: 3270 Lakeshore Rd. The

premise located at 3270 Lake Lakeshore Rd does not allow residential use BY SECTION 280-60 of TOWN OF HAMBURG CODE POSTED: 1/29/2026 MICHAEL VELLA- TOWN OF HAMBURG BUILDING INSPECTOR.” (Exhibit C34). The building inspector placed a separate notice on the premises which stated, “LEGAL NOTICE VIOLATION OF CHAPTER 76 SECTION 7 A (Certificates of occupancy and certificates of compliance) HAS BEEN FOUND ON THESE PREMISES IT IS HEREBY ORDERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ABOVE LAW THAT ALL PERSONS CEASE, DESIST FROM AND STOP OCCUPYING AT ONCE PERTAINING TO THE PREMISES KNOWN AS, KB Smoke Shop 3270 Lakeshore rd. All persons acting contrary to this order or removing or mutilating this notice or using or occupying these premises in whole or in part for any purpose whatever are liable to summary arrest unless such action is authorized by the building inspector.” (Exhibit C33).

17. OCM investigators issued an Order to Seal, Notice of Violation and Order to Cease Unlicensed Activity to Kush Blooms LLC DBA KB Smoke + Vapor. Investigator Chumsky stated that she served a copy of the NOV and OTS in Exhibit A on Respondent, who did not deny receiving a copy of the NOV or OTS.

IV. ANALYSIS & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

I find that cannabis products were being offered for sale at Kush Blooms on January 29, 2026. Investigator Chumsky testified credibly, describing her observations at the store. These observations include an iPad menu (Exhibit E) displaying cannabis products available for purchase, some of which corresponded with specific products recovered from the rear of the store, namely: Naked Worm Assorted Flavor gummies (Exhibit D13), Luigi vape and pre-roll duo (Exhibit D21), Glo Cart vape cartridges (Exhibit D15), Whole Melts concentrate/dab in Mimosa (Exhibit D16), Gelato cannabis flower, Jelly Belly cannabis flower, Lift Off gummies, and Smoothie Bar Blend vapes (Exhibit D33). The presence of a customer facing iPad menu with products and their corresponding prices indicates that the store was offering the products on the iPad for sale. Respondent testified that the iPad menu was a concept menu that was not available to the public, and that the screen was normally on the vaping products. This argument is undercut by the fact that multiple products, advertised on the iPad as being for sale, were recovered from the back of the business. Additionally, I find the sign in Respondent’s rear black cabinet stating, “Personal Cannabis; Not For Sale”, unpersuasive. The sheer quantity of cannabis products, without explanation, indicates, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the products were used for commercial purposes.

I find by a preponderance of the evidence, that the premises was not being used as a residence. Investigator Chumsky testified that the premises didn’t contain a closet with clothing, a bed or a functioning shower or tub. She explained that the bathtub present was not hooked up to a drain, there was only a futon for sleeping, which in her experience is not uncommon in breakrooms at smoke shops. During the course of the hearing, multiple documents were introduced to show whether Respondent’s business was properly zoned as a residence. Respondent introduced the Town of Hamburg 20025 zoning code, outlining the permitted uses and structures in the neighborhood commercial district, which according to Petitioner and Respondent, constitutes the premises’ zoning district. (Respondent’s Exhibit 9). Petitioner introduced a letter from the Town of Hamburg stating Kush Blooms LLC obtained, and the town finalized, a permit for commercial

use. The letter also stated no permit was applied for, or obtained, for residential use on the property. (Exhibit F10). Petitioner also introduced a notice placed on the premises during the inspection, by the Town of Hamburg building inspector, stating that the premises doesn't allow for residential use. (Exhibit C34). Respondent testified that he would sometimes stay at the business 3-4 nights of the week depending on his workload. He also explained that the kitchen and rooms aside from the purple room containing the futon were shared and that only the futon room was for personal use. He stated that the premises was a second residence of sorts. Respondent deciding to sleep at work occasionally, does not constitute Respondent residing at the premises. Petitioner also introduced evidence that Respondent's vehicle was registered to an address, other than the store's address, which was found on a Certificate of Authority for Kush Blooms (Exhibit C23 and Exhibit I). Respondent acknowledged that this was his address. Based on the evidence presented by Petitioner, in combination with Respondent's testimony, I find by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent did not reside at Kush Blooms, nor was it lawfully occupied as a residence pursuant to local law or ordinance.

The unlicensed activity which warranted an order to seal constituted more than a "de minimis" part of the business activity. The Cannabis Law Article 6 §138-b (7) and OCM Regulations part 133.25(f)(3) enumerate the factors to consider when determining if unlicensed activity occurring within a business is more than de minimis. One of the factors in analyzing if the unlicensed business activity was more than de minimis, includes determining whether a large volume or variety of illicit cannabis products was found on the premises during the inspection. In this case Investigator Chumsky recovered a large volume of cannabis product from the premises, approximately 249 items, specifically: 24-1000mg gummies, 2-2000mg gummies, 12 cannabis concentrates, 15-2.0g Smoothie Bar cannabis vapes, 10- 2.0g Luigi cannabis vapes, 30-1.0g vape cartridges, 88-3.5g bags of cannabis flower, and 68 cannabis pre-rolls. (Exhibit H). There was a variety of products by form, brand, and flavor/strain. The cannabis flower packages seen in Exhibit D2-10 are labeled and marketed with a variety of images, such as the Ben and Jerry Jelly packaging seen in Exhibit D8. Gummy packs by Naked Worm and Krazy Worms were observed at the location. (Exhibit D11-15 and 17-19). Luigi Live Resin Liquid Diamond Vapes came in a few flavors and strains including Cucu Melon (indica), Super Sangria (sativa), OG Blue Kiwi (hybrid), and Lavash Breath (indica). (Exhibit D 21). An assortment of concentrates were also present in multiple flavors, such as, Neon Lights, Vercetti Velvet, LV Lemon, Florida Funk, Sunset Sherbert, and Vice Beach Berry. (Exhibit D25). Respondent's business offered a variety of pre-rolls from prepackaged options such as Fusion Extracts in Candyland Sativa or Bunker Buster in Rainbow Runtz Indica and unbranded pre-rolls that appear to have been processed on-site. (Exhibit D26-32). Multiple flavors of Smoothie Bar Blend vapes were also on offer in different flavors and strain combinations. (Exhibit D33-35). Respondent argues that most of the business activity at his store was legal. He offered pictures of snacks and drinks sold at the location such as in Exhibit 2A-B, apparel such as in 2C-E, as well as cigarettes. Respondent also offered an inventory sheet, Exhibit 1, which compared the volume of non-cannabis retail inventory to cannabis retail inventory. However, the inventory sheet, even if it is assumed to be accurate, does not give a sense of the role cannabis plays in the business activity of the store as measured by profit or items sold, as opposed to items stocked. Furthermore, it is unclear how Respondent counted items in certain categories such as wraps/papers/cones. Cannabis products were prominently featured on the iPad menu along with price at the location, which indicates that the products were not merely an afterthought, but a prominent part of the business. Respondent stated that he sold tobacco vapes, his main business,

for approximately \$30-40 a vape. However, the iPad also shows that cannabis vapes were selling for \$40-45 each and Naked Worm gummies at \$32 a pack, a far greater cost than your ordinary bag of candy. Therefore, I find that the volume and variety of cannabis present, in addition to other factors, indicate that Respondent's unlicensed activity was more than a de minimis part of the business activity at the location.

I find by a preponderance of the evidence that the unlicensed activity occurring at Kush Blooms constituted an imminent threat to public health, safety, and welfare in that there were sales of, or offers to sell, cannabis products that were not tested or labeled lawfully in accordance with Cannabis Law Article 6. The pre-rolls featured in Exhibit D31-32, concentrate in Exhibit D25, Naked Worm gummies, and Krazy worm gummies were unlabeled or contained general cannabis warnings or symbols. The Fusion Extract products, Smoothie Bar Blend vapes, Prestige cartridges, and some of the bags of cannabis flower, contained warnings and symbols indicating that they came from California. The origins and testing status of the cannabis on site was mostly unverified and unknown. There was ample evidence introduced that the products on site were not tested or labeled in accordance with Cannabis Law Art. 6.

Penalty

Based on the foregoing, I find by a preponderance of the evidence that Kush Blooms LLC was advertising and offering cannabis for sale to customers at its business. Petitioner asserts that this tribunal should find that Respondent, was selling cannabis each day between August 8, 2024, the inspection date associated with Respondent's last hearing against OCM, and the date the store was padlocked again, January 29, 2026. Petitioner argues that we should count each day between August 8, 2024, and January 29, 2026 (540 days), because per the store's posted hours, it was open each day, and as such the maximum penalty against Respondent would be \$5.4 million. However, Petitioner did not subtract any government holidays or determine if Respondent closed the business for any of them. Additionally, Respondent's store was padlocked by Petitioner between August 8, 2024, and at the earliest, October 17, 2024. As such a minimum of, 71 days must be subtracted from the initial 540-day calculation. Petitioner did not submit evidence as to when the padlock was removed from Respondent's store, or when Respondent restocked its shelves with cannabis products, and began offering those products for sale. However, Petitioner did introduce a video during the proceeding, in Exhibit K, showing an offer to sell cannabis to an OCM employee. Petitioner's attorney Mr. Abir Ahmed asked Investigator Chumsky if this video took place in December 2025, and if it was the basis for Petitioner's access order. She confirmed that it did and it was the basis of the order. The access order, supported by a sworn, but undated, affidavit of OCM Investigator Andrew Gerken, asserts that the attempted purchase of cannabis took place on December 5, 2025. Cannabis Law §132 (1)(c) allows for Investigator Gerken's affidavit to support a prima facie case that the conduct was continuing for each business day between the initial inspection and order to cease unlicensed sales, and the last day where the conduct was observed. In this case this would allow for a prima facie case to be established that Respondent was selling cannabis for all 540 days between the issuance of the prior OTS and NOV and the January 2026 inspection. Due to the foregoing, I find that part of that prima facie case is rebutted by the facts namely, the period during which Petitioner had padlocked the premises. As such, I find that the preponderance of the evidence supports a finding that Respondent was continuing the unlicensed conduct between December 5, 2025, and January 29, 2026, inclusive of the start and end date. I

believe that a proportionate and reasonable fine entails crediting Respondent for a closure on New Years Day.

V. DECISION


The Respondent engaged in the sale of illicit cannabis and cannabis products without a license, registration, or permit to do so, at the location, 3270 Lake Shore Rd., Blasdell, NY 14219. In so doing, Respondent violated Cannabis Law Article 6 and is ordered to pay a fine of \$ 1,000 per day for 55 days of continued sales, amounting to \$55,000. While Respondent had a wide volume and variety of product, the store also stocked many other non-cannabis products. A breakdown of Respondent's sales was not introduced into evidence. Therefore, I find that a fine of \$55,000, in addition, the sealing of Respondent's store, is a significant deterrent to future unlicensed sales.

1. The Notice of Violation and Order to Cease Unlicensed Activity is **AFFIRMED**.
2. Respondent is found to have violated Cannabis Law §§125(1), 132(1)(a), and 132(1)(c).
3. The sealing requirements of Cannabis Law §138-b have been met by a preponderance of the evidence, and the Order to Seal is hereby **AFFIRMED**.
4. A civil penalty of \$55,000 is assessed under Cannabis Law § 132(1)(c).

WHEREFORE, PURSUANT TO CANNABIS LAW ARTICLE 6 §138-b (9), THE ORDER TO SEAL, ISSUED ON JANUARY 29, 2026, IS HEREBY EXTENDED FOR ONE YEAR FROM THE DATE OF THIS DECISION, AND PURSUANT TO CANNABIS LAW ARTICLE 6 § 132(1), THE RESPONDENT IS HEREBY ORDERED TO PAY A \$55,000 FINE, AS A PROPORTIONATE PENALTY FOR THE UNLICENSED SALE OF CANNABIS AND CANNABIS MARKETED PRODUCTS ON JANUARY 29, 2026.

This constitutes the final decision of the Office of Administrative Hearings. A copy of this decision shall be served upon the parties.

Dated: May 1, 2026


Laurie J. Cartwright
Administrative Law Judge

PLEASE BE ADVISED: Either party may appeal this decision within 30 calendar days of receipt, according to the specific manner described in Regulations at 9 NYCRR §§ 133.23(g)(5) and 133.25(k).

This decision was sent via email on May 1, 2026, to the following:

Nickolas Perry
Sheila Wagner
Abir Ahmed, Esq.
Anwar Ahmed