THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION
100 CHURCH STREET, 20TH FLOOR
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10007

**DECISION OF THE COMMISSION DENYING THE EXEMPTION APPLICATION OF HARMAN CONTRACTING INC. FOR A REGISTRATION TO OPERATE AS A TRADE WASTE BUSINESS**

Harman Contracting Inc. ("Harman" or the "Applicant") has applied to the New York City Business Integrity Commission ("Commission"), formerly known as the New York City Trade Waste Commission, for an exemption from licensing requirements and a registration to operate a trade waste business pursuant to Local Law 42 of 1996. See Title 16-A of the New York City Administrative Code ("Admin. Code"), § 16-505(a). Local Law 42, which created the Commission to regulate the trade waste removal industry in New York City, was enacted to address pervasive organized crime and other corruption in the commercial carting industry, to protect businesses using private carting services, and to increase competition in the industry and thereby reduce prices.

On May 14, 2008, Harman applied to the Commission for an exemption from licensing requirements and for a registration enabling it to operate a trade waste business "solely engaged in the removal of waste materials resulting from building demolition, construction, alteration or excavation" – a type of waste commonly known as construction and demolition debris, or "c & d." Admin. Code § 16-505(a). Local Law 42 authorizes the Commission to review and determine such applications for exemptions. See id. If, upon review and investigation of the exemption application, the Commission grants the applicant an exemption from licensing requirements applicable to businesses that remove other types of waste, the applicant will be issued a registration. See id.

In determining whether to grant an exemption from licensing requirements and a registration to operate a construction and demolition debris removal business, the Commission considers the same types of factors that are pertinent to the Commission's determination whether to issue a license to a business seeking to remove other types of waste. See, e.g., Admin Code § 16-504(a) (empowering Commission to issue and establish standards for issuance, suspension, and revocation of licenses and registrations); compare Title 17, Rules of the City of New York ("RCNY") §§ 1-06 & 2-02 (specifying information required to be submitted by license applicant) with id. §§ 1-06 & 2-03(b) (specifying information required to be submitted by registration applicant); see also Admin. Code §16-513(a)(i) (authorizing suspension or revocation of license or registration for violation of Local Law 42 or any rule promulgated pursuant thereto). Central to the Commission's investigation and determination of an exemption application is whether the applicant has business integrity. See 17 RCNY § 1-09 (prohibiting

numerous types of conduct reflecting lack of business integrity, including violations of law, knowing association with organized crime figures, false or misleading statements to the Commission, and deceptive trade practices); Admin. Code § 16-509(a) (authorizing Commission to refuse to issue licenses to applicants lacking "good character, honesty and integrity").

Based upon the record as to the Applicant, the Commission denies its exemption/registration application on the ground that this Applicant lacks good character, honesty and integrity for the following independently sufficient reasons:

- The Applicant Failed to Demonstrate Eligibility for a Trade Waste Registration Because the Applicant's President and Sole Owner is the Subject of a Pending Indictment Charging Him with the Crime of Bribery in the Third Degree

- The Applicant Knowingly Failed to Provide Information Required by the Commission by Failing to Disclose a Past Principal of the Applicant in its Exemption Application

- The Applicant Knowingly Failed to Provide Information Required by the Commission

## I. REGULATORY BACKGROUND

### A. The New York City Carting Industry

Virtually all of the more than 200,000 commercial business establishments in New York City contract with private carting companies to remove and dispose of their refuse. Historically, those services have been provided by several hundred companies. For the past four decades, and until only a few years ago, the private carting industry in the City was operated as an organized crime-controlled cartel engaging in a pervasive pattern of racketeering and anticompetitive practices. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has described that cartel as "a 'black hole' in New York City's economic life." Sanitation & Recycling Industry, Inc. v. City of New York, 107 F.3d 985, 989 (2d Cir. 1997) ("SRI").

Extensive testimonial and documentary evidence adduced during lengthy City Council hearings addressing the corruption that historically has plagued this industry revealed the nature of the cartel: an entrenched anti-competitive conspiracy carried out through customer-allocation agreements among carters, who sold to one another the exclusive right to service customers, and enforced by organized crime-connected racketeers, who mediated disputes among carters. See generally Peter Reuter, Racketeering in Legitimate Industries: A Study in the Economics of Intimidation (RAND Corp. 1987). After hearing the evidence, the City Council made numerous factual findings concerning organized crime's longstanding and corrupting influence over the City's carting industry and its effects, including the anticompetitive cartel, exorbitant

carting rates, and rampant customer overcharging. More generally, the Council found "that unscrupulous businesses in the industry have taken advantage of the absence of an effective regulatory scheme to engage in fraudulent conduct." Local Law 42, § 1.

The City Council's findings of extensive corruption in the commercial carting industry have been validated by the successful prosecution of many of the leading figures and companies in the industry. In 1995 and 1996, the Manhattan District Attorney obtained racketeering indictments against more than sixty individuals and firms connected to the City's waste removal industry, including powerful mob figures such as Genovese organized crime family capo Alphonse Malangone and Gambino soldier Joseph Francolino. Simply put, the industry's entire modus operandi, the cartel, was indicted as a criminal enterprise. Since then, all of the defendants have either pleaded guilty or been found guilty of felonies; many have been sentenced to lengthy prison terms, and many millions of dollars in fines and forfeitures have been imposed.

The Commission's regulatory and law-enforcement investigations have confirmed that organized crime has long infiltrated the construction and demolition debris removal sector of the carting industry as well as the garbage hauling sector that was the focus of the Manhattan District Attorney's prosecution. In light of the close nexus between the c & d sector of the carting industry and the construction industry, mob influence in the former should come as no surprise. The construction industry in New York City has been corrupted by organized crime for decades. See, e.g., James B. Jacobs, Gotham Unbound: How New York City Was Liberated from the Grip of Organized Crime 96-115 (1999) (detailing La Cosa Nostra's influence and criminal activity in the concrete, masonry, drywall, carpentry, painting, trucking, and other sectors of the City's construction industry).

Moreover, the c & d sector of the carting industry has been a subject of significant federal prosecutions over the past decade. In 1990, Anthony Vulpis, an associate of both the Gambino and the Genovese organized crime families, Angelo Paccione, and six waste hauling companies owned or controlled by them were convicted of multiple counts of racketeering and mail fraud in connection with their operation of a massive illegal landfill on Staten Island. See United States v. Paccione, 949 F.2d 1183, 1186-88 (2d Cir. 1991), cert. denied, 505 U.S. 1220 (1992). Many c & d haulers dumped their loads at this illegal landfill, which accumulated 550,000 cubic yards of refuse over a mere four-month period in 1988; during that period, "the City experienced a sharp decline in the tonnage of construction waste deposited" at its Fresh Kills landfill, as well as "a concomitant decline in revenue" from the fees that would have been charged for dumping at a legal landfill. 949 F.2d at 1188. The trial judge described this scheme as "one of the largest and most serious frauds involving environmental crimes ever prosecuted in the United States." United States v. Paccione, 751 F. Supp. 368, 371 (S.D.N.Y. 1990).

Another illegal waste disposal scheme also prominently featured haulers of construction and demolition debris. This scheme involved certain "cover" programs instituted by the City of New York at Fresh Kills, under which the City obtained materials needed to cover the garbage and other waste dumped at the landfill. Under the "free cover" program, transfer stations and carting companies could dispose of "clean fill" (i.e., soil uncontaminated by debris) at Fresh Kills free of charge. Under the "paid

cover" program, the City contracted with and paid carting companies to bring clean fill to Fresh Kills. Numerous transfer stations and carters, however, abetted by corrupt City sanitation workers, dumped non-qualifying materials (including c & d) at Fresh Kills under the guise of clean fill. This was done by "cocktailing" the refuse: Refuse was placed beneath, and hidden by, a layer of dirt on top of a truckload. When the trucks arrived at Fresh Kills, they appeared to contain nothing but clean fill, which could be dumped free of charge.

In 1994, twenty-eight individuals, including numerous owners of transfer stations and carting and trucking companies, were indicted in connection with this scheme, which deprived the City of approximately $10 million in disposal fees. The indictments charged that from January 1988 through April 1992, the defendants participated in a racketeering conspiracy and engaged in bribery and mail fraud in connection with the operation of the City's "cover" programs. The various hauling companies, from Brooklyn, Queens, and Staten Island, were charged with paying hundreds of thousands of dollars in bribes to Department of Sanitation employees to allow them to dump non-qualifying materials at Fresh Kills without paying the City's tipping fees. See United States v. Cafra, et al., No. 94 Cr. 380 (S.D.N.Y.); United States v. Barbieri, et al., No. 94 Cr. 518 (S.D.N.Y.); see also United States v. Caccio, et al., Nos. 94 Cr. 357,358, 359, 367 (four felony informations). Twenty-seven defendants pleaded guilty in 1994 and 1995, and the remaining defendant was found guilty in 1996 after trial.

In sum, the need to root organized crime and other forms of corruption out of the City's waste removal industry applies with equal force to the garbage hauling and the c & d sectors of the industry. Local Law 42 recognizes this fact in requiring c & d haulers to obtain registrations from the Commission in order to operate in the City.

### B. Local Law 42

Upon the enactment of Local Law 42, the Commission assumed regulatory authority from the Department of Consumer Affairs ("DCA") for the licensing and registration of businesses that remove, collect, or dispose of trade waste. See Admin. Code § 16-503. "Trade waste" is broadly defined and specifically includes "construction and demolition debris." Id. § 16-501(f)(1). The carting industry quickly challenged the new law, but the courts have consistently upheld Local Law 42 against repeated constitutional challenges (both facial and as applied) by New York City carters. See, e.g., Sanitation & Recycling Industry, Inc. v. City of New York, 928 F. Supp. 407 (S.D.N.Y. 1996), aff'd, 107 F.3d 985 (2d Cir. 1997); Universal Sanitation Corp. v. Trade Waste Comm'n, No. 96 Civ. 6581 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 16, 1996); Vigliotti Bros. Carting Co. v. Trade Waste Comm'n, No. 115993/96 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty. Dec. 4, 1996); Fava v. City of New York, No. CV-97-0179 (E.D.N.Y. May 12, 1997); Imperial Sanitation Corp. v. City of New York, No. 97 CV 682 (E.D.N.Y. June 23, 1997); PJC Sanitation Services, Inc. v. City of New York, No. 97-CV-364 (E.D.N.Y. July 7, 1997). The United States Court of Appeals has definitively ruled that an applicant for a trade waste removal license under Local Law 42 has no entitlement to and no property interest in a license, and the Commission is vested with broad discretion to grant or deny a license application. SRI, 107 F.3d at 995; see also Daxor Corp. v. New York Dep't of Health, 90 N.Y.2d 89, 98-100, 681 N.E.2d 356, 659 N.Y.S.2d 189 (1997).

Local Law 42 specifically permits the Commission to refuse to issue a registration to an applicant "who has knowingly failed to provide the information and/or documentation required by the commission pursuant to [Title 16 of the Administrative Code or any rules promulgated thereto]" or "who has otherwise failed to demonstrate eligibility for such license." Admin. Code §16-509(b). Applicants who knowingly fail to provide information required by the Commission (whether they fail to provide the information altogether or they provide false and misleading information) fall under the first prong. In Attonito v. Maldonado, 3 A.D.3d 415 (1st Dept. 2004); *leave denied*, 2 N.Y.3d 705 (2004), the Appellate Division affirmed the authority of the Commission to "review" exemption applications, to fully investigate any matter within its jurisdiction and to deny such applications in those cases "where the applicant fails to provide the necessary information, or knowingly provides false information." It further affirmed the authority of the Commission to investigate the accuracy of the information provided in an application. Id.

Applicants who fail to demonstrate good character, honesty and integrity using the criteria by which license applicants are judged fall under the second prong of §16-509(b). While the Appellate Division in Attonito did not directly address the second prong, by affirming the Commission's authority to investigate matters within the trade waste industry, it necessarily follows that the Commission need not ignore the results of its investigation that bear on an applicant's good character, honesty and integrity. Id.; accord Breeze Carting Corp. v. The City of New York, No. 107859/07 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty. April 1, 2008)(Commission denial based on a criminal conviction, identification as an organized crime associate and false and misleading statements not considered arbitrary and capricious). Accordingly, the Commission evaluates whether applicants meet the fitness standard using the same criteria upon which license applicants may be denied, including:

1. failure by such applicant to provide truthful information in connection with the application;
2. a pending indictment or criminal action against such applicant for a crime which under this subdivision would provide a basis for the refusal of such license, or a pending civil or administrative action to which such applicant is a party and which directly relates to the fitness to conduct the business or perform the work for which the license is sought, in which cases the commission may defer consideration of an application until a decision has been reached by the court or administrative tribunal before which such action is pending;
3. conviction of such applicant for a crime which, considering the factors set forth in section seven hundred fifty-three of the correction law, would provide a basis under such law for the refusal of such license;
4. a finding of liability in a civil or administrative action that bears a direct relationship to the fitness of the applicant to conduct the business for which the license is sought;
5. commission of a racketeering activity or knowing association with a person who has been convicted of a racketeering activity, including but not limited to the offenses listed in subdivision one of section nineteen

hundred sixty-one of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations statute (18 U.S.C. § 1961 et seq.) or of an offense listed in subdivision one of section 460.10 of the penal law, as such statutes may be amended from time to time, or the equivalent offense under the laws of any other jurisdiction;

6. association with any member or associate of an organized crime group as identified by a federal, state or city law enforcement or investigative agency when the applicant knew or should have known of the organized crime associations of such person;
7. having been a principal in a predecessor trade waste business as such term is defined in subdivision a of section 16-508 of this chapter where the commission would be authorized to deny a license to such predecessor business pursuant to this subdivision;
8. current membership in a trade association where such membership would be prohibited to a licensee pursuant to subdivision j of section 16-520 of this chapter unless the commission has determined, pursuant to such subdivision, that such association does not operate in a manner inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter;
9. the holding of a position in a trade association where membership or the holding of such position would be prohibited to a licensee pursuant to subdivision j of section 16-520 of this chapter;
10. failure to pay any tax, fine, penalty, or fee related to the applicant's business for which liability has been admitted by the person liable therefor, or for which judgment has been entered by a court or administrative tribunal of competent jurisdiction.

Admin. Code § 16-509(a)(i)-(x). While the presence of one of the above factors in the record of a registration applicant would not necessarily require a denial as a matter of law, the Commission may consider such evidence as a factor in determining overall eligibility.

## II. DISCUSSION

Harman is a construction company who applied for a registration to operate as a construction and demolition removal business. According to Harman's application, the sole principal of Harman is Tarek Ahmed ("Ahmed"). See Harman Exemption Application at 9.

The record before the Commission demonstrates that the sole principal of Harman is the subject of a pending bribery indictment charging racketeering activities, that Harman provided false and misleading information to the Commission and that Harman failed to provide information and documentation required by the Commission.

On December 15, 2008, the staff issued a nine (9) page recommendation that Harman's application be denied, and served a copy on the Applicant through certified mail, requesting a response within 10 business days. As the date of this decision, the applicant has failed to respond. The Commission has carefully considered both the staff's recommendation and the Applicant's failure to respond. For the reasons set forth

below, the Commission denies Harman's exemption application and refuses to issue Harman a trade waste registration.

### A. The Applicant Failed to Demonstrate Eligibility for a Trade Waste Registration Because the Applicant's President and Sole Owner is the Subject of a Pending Indictment Charging Him with the Crime of Bribery in the Third Degree

In determining whether an applicant possesses the good character, honesty and integrity required to operate a trade waste business, the Commission may consider the criminal proceedings pending against the Applicant (or its principal) for crimes that are directly related to the Applicant's fitness for participation in the industry. See Admin. Code §16-509(ii). A conviction is not required. Based upon the pending indictment and the Commission's review of the evidence supporting the indictment, the Commission finds that this Applicant lacks good character honesty and integrity.

On September 11, 2007, an indictment was filed in the Supreme Court of Queens County charging Ahmed with the crime of Bribery in the Third Degree. See Indictment, People v. Ahmed ("Ahmed Indictment"). Such crime is a racketeering activity under Local Law 42. See Admin. Code §16-509(a)(racketeering activities include all crimes listed in NYS Penal Law §460.10(1)).

The Ahmed Indictment charged Ahmed with paying a $1,000.00 bribe to an undercover New York City Department of Investigation Investigator who was posing as an Inspector from the New York City Department of Parks and Recreation. The motive behind the bribe was to lift a "Stop Payment Order" pending against Ahmed for committing prevailing wage violations. While this "Stop Payment Order" was in place, Ahmed would not be paid for the work completed under the contract that was valued at $873,100.00. See Press Release, dated March 21, 2007.

On or about October 17, 2005 at 13:10 hours, the undercover Investigator, equipped with a recording device, arranged to meet with Ahmed in Flushing Meadow Corona Park, Queens County, New York. During this meeting the undercover Investigator received the $1,000.00 bribe. On the audio recording Ahmed clearly states that he expected the $1,000.00 bribe to clear the "Stop Payment Order" on Ahmed's project. See October 17, 2005 Recorded Conversation Between Undercover and Tarek Ahmed.

On or about January 16, 2009, Ahmed received an Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal pursuant to Criminal Procedure Law §170.55. The Ahmed Indictment will be pending in the Supreme Court of Queens County until June 16, 2009. When a case is resolved with an Adjournment in Contemplation of Dismissal there is no determination on the merits of the case. Id.; Lancaster v. Kindor, 98 A.D.2d 300, 308 (1st Dept. 1984). The Commission has reviewed the credible evidence that supports the Ahmed Indictment, and it demonstrates that Ahmed lacks good character, honesty and integrity.

In determining whether an applicant possesses the good character, honesty and integrity required to operate a trade waste business, the Commission may consider the criminal proceeding pending against the Applicant (or its principal) for crimes that are directly related to the Applicant's fitness for participation in the industry. See Admin. Code §16-509(a)(ii).[1] The pending indictment charges bribery, a racketeering activity, which bears directly on the Applicant's fitness to participate and operate in the carting industry. See Local Law 42; Admin. Code §16-509(a). Further, the Commission after reviewing the credible evidence that supports the indictment has determined that Ahmed lacks good character, honesty and integrity. Accordingly, the Commission denies Harman's application on this independently sufficient ground.

### B. The Applicant Knowingly Failed to Provide Information Required by the Commission by Failing to Disclose a Past Principal of the Applicant in its Exemption Application

All Applicants must provide truthful and non-misleading information to the Commission. A knowing failure to do so is a ground for denial of the application. See Admin. Code §16-509(b); Attonito v. Maldonado, 3 A.D.3d 415 (1st Dept. 2004); *leave denied* 2 N.Y.3d 705 (2004); Breeze Carting Corp. v. The City of New York, No. 107859/07 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty. April 1, 2008). Harman's application is contradicted by its sworn Vendex application. Accordingly, the Commission cannot place any confidence in Harman's application, finds it unreliable and recommends that the Commission deny Harman's application.

Question 13 of the exemption application filed by Harman instructs the applicant to: "On Schedule B, identify all individuals who have been principals of [the] applicant business at any point during the past ten (10) years." See Harman Application at 2. Schedule B disclosed only one principal (the current principal) – Tarek Ahmed, President of Harman – and disclosed no past principals. Id. at 11. Ahmed signed a sworn certification under penalty of perjury that he "read and understood the questions contained in the attached application and its attachments" and "that to the best of [his knowledge the information provided in response to each question and in the attachments is full, complete and truthful." Id. at 16. See NYC Admin. Code §16-501(d)("principal" of a corporation includes "every officer and director and every stockholder holding ten percent or more of the outstanding shares of the corporation").

However, the Commission's investigation revealed that Harman filed a Vendex application that directly contradicted Harman's sworn exemption application that Harman had no principals during the past 10 years other than its current principal, Tarek Ahmed. According to Harman's Vendex application, filed February 13, 2003, the Vice President and 40% owner of Harman was an individual named Faiz Ahmed. See Vendex Application at 12. The sworn certification attesting to the truth of the Vendex application contents was signed by Tarek Ahmed. Id. at 26. It is hardly a coincidence that the individual omitted from Harman's application before the Commission was also charged

[1] The Commission has the discretion to defer consideration of an application until a decision has been reached on a pending indictment. See Admin. Code §16-509(a)(ii). Given the serious nature of the criminal charges in this case (see *supra* at 8-10) as well as the Applicant's false submission to the Commission (see *infra* at 10-11), the Commission declines to exercise such discretion in this case.

with bribery during the same investigation as Ahmed.[2] See Press Release; Criminal Court Complaint against Faiz Ahmed.

The failure of the Applicant to provide truthful and non-misleading information to the Commission is evidence that the Applicant lacks good character, honesty and integrity. The Commission should deny Harman's application on this independently sufficient ground. See Admin. Code §§16-509(b); 16-509(a)(i).

### C. The Applicant Has Knowingly Failed to Provide Information Required by the Commission

"The commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to an applicant for such license or an applicant for registration who has knowingly failed to provide the information and/or documentation required by the commission pursuant to this chapter or any rules promulgated pursuant hereto." See Admin. Code §16-509(b).

On August 5, 2008, a staff member sent a letter to Harman requiring Ahmed to appear at the Commission to provide sworn testimony on August 21, 2008. See Letter from BIC to Harman, dated August 5, 2008. On the scheduled date, Ahmed appeared, but refused to answer questions and wanted a postponement of the testimony until the conclusion of his pending criminal case. See Transcript of Proceedings at 3-5. Despite being warned that a refusal to answer questions could result in the denial of his application, Ahmed refused to answer questions and provide information. Id. at 4.

Ahmed had full control over the timing of the filing of Harman's application. Despite the pendency of his criminal case, he chose to file his application with the Commission and cannot now complain about the Commission's efforts to investigate his application.

Despite a timely request, the Applicant failed to provide the required information. "[T]he commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to an applicant for such license or an applicant for registration who has knowingly failed to provide the information and/or documentation required by the commission pursuant to this chapter or any rules promulgated pursuant hereto." Admin. Code §16-509(b). By failing to respond to the Commission's request, the Applicant has "knowingly failed to provide the information" required by the Commission and has demonstrated that it lacks good character, honesty and integrity. Based on this independently sufficient ground, the Commission denies the Applicant's exemption/registration application.

## III. CONCLUSION

Harman has not satisfied its burden of demonstrating its eligibility for a trade waste registration. "The commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to an applicant ... who has otherwise failed to demonstrate eligibility for such license under this chapter". See Admin. Code §16-509(b). In addition, Harman "has knowingly failed

[2] Faiz Ahmed pleaded guilty to Giving Unlawful Gratuities (Penal Law §200.30) a class A misdemeanor. He was sentenced to a conditional discharge, a $1,000 fine and forfeiture of any ill-gotten gains.

to provide the information and/or documentation required by the commission" by providing false and misleading information in its application. Id. Based upon the above independently sufficient reasons, the Commission denies Harman's exemption application and refuses to issue Harman a registration.

Dated: April 14, 2009

THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION



Michael J. Mansfield
Chairman



John Doherty, Commissioner
Department of Sanitation

Jonathan Mintz, Commissioner
Department of Consumer Affairs

Deborah Buyer, General Counsel (designee)
Department of Small Business Services

Brian O'Neill, Inspector (designee)
New York City Police Department



Jayme Naberezny, Inspector General (designee)
Department of Investigation