



**The City of New York**  
**BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION**  
100 Church Street · 20th Floor  
New York · New York 10007  
Tel. (212) 437-0500

**DECISION OF THE BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION TO DENY THE  
CLASS 2 REGISTRATION APPLICATION OF CLEAN FLEET, CORP.  
TO OPERATE AS A TRADE WASTE BUSINESS**

***Introduction***

On May 17, 2018, Clean Fleet, Corp. (the “Applicant”) (BIC #497898) applied to the New York City Business Integrity Commission (the “Commission”) for an exemption from the licensing requirements and a registration to operate a trade waste business “solely engaged in the removal of waste materials resulting from building demolition, construction, alteration or excavation” (the “Application”).<sup>1</sup> Local Law 42 of 1996 authorizes the Commission to review and make determinations on such exemption applications. *See* Title 16-A, New York City Administrative Code (“Administrative Code” or “Admin. Code”) § 16-505(a).

On October 10, 2020, the Commission’s staff issued and served the Applicant with the Commission staff’s Notice to the Applicant of the Grounds to Deny the Class 2 Registration Application of Clean Fleet, Corp. to Operate as a Trade Waste Business (the “Notice”). The Applicant was given 10 business days to respond, until October 22, 2020. *See* 17 Rules of the City of New York (“RCNY”) § 2-08(a). The Applicant did not submit a response, leaving all of the grounds for denial uncontested.

The Commission has completed its review of the Applicant’s application, having considered both the Notice and the Applicant’s lack of response. Based on the record as to the Applicant, the Commission denies the Application because the Applicant lacks good character, honesty, and integrity based on the following two independently sufficient grounds:

- 1. The Applicant provided false, incomplete and misleading information in its Application and in sworn testimony; and**
- 2. The Applicant’s undisclosed principal has been convicted of manslaughter.**

---

<sup>1</sup> “Trade waste” or “waste” is defined at Admin. Code § 16-501(f)(1) and includes “construction and demolition debris.”

## ***Background and Statutory Framework***

Every commercial business establishment in New York City must contract with a private carting company to remove and dispose of the waste it generates, known as trade waste. Historically, the private carting industry in the City was operated as a cartel controlled by organized crime. As evidenced by numerous criminal prosecutions, the industry was plagued by pervasive racketeering, anticompetitive practices and other corruption. *See, e.g., United States v. Int'l Brotherhood of Teamsters (Adelstein)*, 998 F.2d 120 (2d Cir. 1993); *People v. Ass'n of Trade Waste Removers of Greater New York Inc.*, Indictment No. 5614/95 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Co.); *United States v. Mario Gigante*, No. 96 Cr. 466 (S.D.N.Y.); *People v. Ass'n of Trade Waste Removers of Greater New York*, 701 N.Y.S.2d 12 (1st Dep't 1999). The construction and demolition debris removal sector of the City's carting industry specifically has also been the subject of significant successful racketeering prosecutions. *See United States v. Paccione*, 949 F.2d 1183, 1186-88 (2d Cir. 1991), *cert. denied*, 505 U.S. 1220 (1992); *United States v. Cafra*, No. 94 Cr. 380 (S.D.N.Y.); *United States v. Barbieri*, No. 94 Cr. 518 (S.D.N.Y.).

The Commission is charged with, among other things, combating the influence of organized crime and preventing its return to the City's private carting industry, including the construction and demolition debris removal industry. Instrumental to this core mission is the licensing scheme set forth in Local Law 42, which created the Commission and granted it the power and duty to license and regulate the trade waste removal industry in New York City. Admin. Code § 16-505(a). This regulatory framework continues to be the primary means of ensuring that an industry once overrun by corruption remains free from organized crime and other criminality, and that commercial businesses that use private carters can be ensured of a fair, competitive market.

Pursuant to Local Law 42, a company "solely engaged in the removal of waste materials resulting from building demolition, construction, alteration or excavation," also known as construction and demolition (or "C & D") debris, must apply to the Commission for an exemption from the licensing requirement. Admin. Code § 16-505(a). If, upon review of an application, the Commission grants an exemption from the licensing requirement, it issues the applicant a Class 2 registration. *Id.* at § 16-505(a)-(b). Before issuing a registration, the Commission must evaluate the "good character, honesty and integrity of the applicant." *Id.* at § 16-508(b); *see also id.* at § 16-504(a). An "applicant" for a license or registration means both the business entity and each principal of the business. *Id.* at § 16-501(a).

The Administrative Code provides an illustrative list of relevant factors for the Commission to consider in determining whether to grant an application for a license or registration:

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; and

11. failure to comply with any city, state or federal law, rule or regulation relating to traffic safety or the collection, removal, transportation or disposal of trade waste in a safe manner.

*Id.* at § 16-509(a)(i)-(xi); *see also id.* at § 16-504(a).

The Commission also may refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant who has “knowingly failed to provide information or documentation required by the Commission . . . or who has otherwise failed to demonstrate eligibility for a license.” *Id.* at § 16-509(b); *see also id.* at § 16-509(a)(i) (failure to provide truthful information in connection with application as a consideration for denial); *Elite Demolition Contracting Corp. v. The City of New York*, 4 N.Y.S.3d 196, 125 A.D.3d 576 (1st Dep’t 2015); *Breeze Carting Corp. v. The City of New York*, 52 A.D.3d 424 (1st Dep’t 2008); *Attonito v. Maldonado*, 3 A.D.3d 415 (1st Dep’t) (Commission may deny an application for an exemption “where the applicant fails to provide the necessary information, or knowingly provides false information”), *leave denied* 2 N.Y.3d 705 (N.Y. 2004). In addition, the Commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to an applicant that “has been determined to have committed any of the acts which would be a basis for the suspension or revocation of a license.” *Id.* at § 16-509(c); *see also id.* at § 16-504(a). Finally, the Commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant when the applicant or its principals have previously had a license or registration revoked. *Id.* at § 16-509(d); *see also id.* at § 16-504(a).

An applicant for a private carting license (including a registration for hauling C & D debris) has no entitlement to, and no property interest in a license or registration; the Commission is vested with broad discretion to grant or deny a license or registration application. *Sanitation & Recycling Indus., Inc. v. City of New York*, 107 F.3d 985, 995 (2d Cir. 1997); *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).

### ***Statement of Facts***

#### *The Application and Communications Between the Applicant and the Commission*

On or about May 17, 2018, the Applicant applied for an exemption from the licensing requirement for the removal of C & D. *See* Application. Anastasios Detsikas (“Detsikas”) was disclosed as the only principal of the Applicant. *See* Application at 13. Detsikas certified that all of the information provided on the Application was complete and truthful. *See id.* at 20.

On the Application, the Applicant disclosed that its main office and garage address is “448 Tiffany Street, Bronx, New York 10474.” *Id.* at 1. Although the Applicant answered “No” to the question on the application asking whether the Applicant “shares office space, staff or equipment (including, but not limited to telephone lines) with any other business or organization,” 448 Tiffany Street, Bronx, New York is also utilized by Durable Diesel Inc. (“Durable Diesel”). *See* Durable Diesel website <https://durableddiesel.com/contact-us/>; *see also* Application at 2. In addition to

using the same address, Durable Diesel and the Applicant share the same telephone and fax numbers. *See* Detsikas Transcript at 64-69, 83.

The Applicant disclosed its email address as ras@cleanfleetsny.com. *See* Application at 1. When the Commission’s staff sent an inquiry to ras@cleanfleetsny.com, a person named Saviriti Persaud (“Persaud”) responded. *See* July 26, 2018 email from Persaud to Commission staff. Persaud’s name does not appear anywhere on the Application. *See* Application. Although she responded to the Commission staff’s inquiries to the Applicant, Persaud acknowledged that she was employed by Durable Diesel. *See* August 3, 2018 email from Persaud to Commission staff. Persaud was later disclosed to the Commission as an “account manager” for the Applicant. *See* July 31, 2018 email from Persaud to Commission staff. In an email that Persaud sent to the Commission’s staff, she attached another email from an individual named Richard Anthony Santoro. Emails forwarded by Persaud to the Commission establish that Richard Anthony Santoro was directing Persaud as to how to respond to the Commission’s inquiries. *See* July 24, 2018 email from Richard Anthony Santoro to Persaud. Richard Anthony Santoro’s name does not appear anywhere on the Application. *See* Application. The Applicant did not dispute any of these facts.

#### *Sworn Interview of Anastasios Detsikas*

On October 28, 2019, Detsikas provided sworn testimony to the Commission. *See* Transcript of Sworn Testimony of Detsikas (“Detsikas Transcript”). When asked about two individuals – Richard and Stacy DiTommaso – Detsikas initially testified that they had no involvement in the Applicant business. *See* Detsikas Transcript at 13. Eventually, after being presented with evidence that contradicted this testimony, Detsikas admitted that Richard and Stacy DiTommaso are actually principals of the Applicant business. *Id.* at 84. Their names appear nowhere on the Application. *See* Application.

When asked about the use of the Applicant’s email address, Detsikas stated that he did not have access to the email account disclosed to the Commission on the Application and did not “understand” how Persaud (an employee of Durable Diesel) could have communicated with the Commission’s staff on behalf of the Applicant. *Id.* at 60; *see also id.* at 58. Detsikas first testified that the “ras” in the email address “ras@cleanfleetsny.com” stood for a secretary who was no longer employed by the Applicant, Rachel Yosida. *Id.* at 59. Eventually, Detsikas changed his testimony by stating that this email address belonged to Richard DiTommaso, who is also known as Richard Anthony Santoro. *Id.* at 60, 62. Detsikas also initially testified that he did not know the identity of the owner of Durable Diesel. *Id.* at 82. Later, he changed his testimony and admitted that he knew that Stacy DiTommaso owns Durable Diesel. *Id.* Detsikas later conceded that that Richard and Stacy DiTommaso have “control over the business.” *Id.* at 85. The Applicant did not dispute any of these facts.

#### *Richard DiTommaso*

With respect to the DiTommasos, Detsikas testified that Richard DiTommaso is married to Stacy DiTommaso. Although not disclosed to the Commission, Richard DiTommaso plays a significant role in directing the operations of the Applicant. As discussed above, Richard DiTommaso directed responses to the Commission’s inquiries. *See* July 24, 2018 email. His name also appears on the bank signature card of the Applicant’s bank account, and he is listed as the

“secretary” of the Applicant. *See* Clean Fleet, Corp. JP Morgan Chase Bank Signature Card dated December 28, 2016. Richard DiTommaso signed this bank signature card on the same day that Detsikas signed his name when the account was opened. The only rational conclusion is that Richard DiTommaso and Detsikas were together when the Applicant’s bank account was opened.

Detsikas confirmed that Richard DiTommaso is also known by the name “Richard Santoro.” *See* Detsikas Transcript at 63; *see also* Verified Complaint, *Cipico Construction Inc. v. DiTommaso, Richard et. al.*, Index # 0712835/15 (alleging that Richard DiTommaso signed a contract using the name “Richard Santoro” in order to conceal Richard DiTommaso’s criminal record). In 2002, Richard DiTommaso was convicted of Manslaughter in the First Degree (a violent, class B felony) and was sentenced to eight years in prison. *See* May 28, 2002 Press Release of the Queens County District Attorney’s Office; *see also* New York State Penal Law (“PL”) §§ 70.00(1)(a) (Sentence of Imprisonment for Felony), 125.20 (Manslaughter in the First Degree).

This conviction stemmed from the September 30, 1999 murder of Michael Seyfert (“Seyfert”). *Id.* Seyfert was lured to a trainyard and shot three times in the back of the head. *Id.* The apparent motive for this murder was a belief that Seyfert was acting as a police informant. *See Chair-Toss Thug Faces Slay Rap*, NY Post (March 26, 2002). When he pleaded guilty to the crime, Richard DiTommaso admitted that he took part in the killing with co-defendant Michael Antinuche, who also pleaded guilty to Manslaughter in the First Degree and was sentenced to 15 years to life in prison. Although it is not clear when Richard DiTommaso began to use the name “Richard Santoro,” it appears to be after being released from prison in July 2007. *See* New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, Inmate Information (showing Richard DiTommaso’s prison release date of July 16, 2017).

At the time of the Seyfert murder, Michael Antinuche was a member of the “Young Guns” gang. *Id.* Law enforcement identified this gang as being associated with the Gambino organized crime family and with Gambino captain Ronald “Ronnie One Arm” Trucchio (“Trucchio”). *See* May 2004 Indictment, United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida. The indictment asserts that the “Young Guns,” also known as the “Liberty Posse,” were controlled by Trucchio and acted at Trucchio’s direction. *Id.* at 3. The Applicant did not dispute any of these facts.

#### *Stacy DiTommaso*

Detsikas testified that Stacy DiTommaso is his stepdaughter / adopted daughter. *See* Detsikas Testimony at 22. Although her name does not appear anywhere on the Application, Detsikas testified that Stacy DiTommaso controls the “accounts payables and receivable” of the Applicant. *Id.* at 43; *see also id.* at 45. Detsikas also testified that he does not hold the Applicant’s corporate credit card, and that Stacy DiTommaso does. *Id.* at 52. Stacy DiTommaso also has full authority over the Applicant’s corporate bank account. *See* Clean Fleet, Corp. JP Morgan Chase signature card dated January 3, 2017. Lastly, as noted above, Stacy DiTommaso is an owner of Durable Diesel and is married to Richard DiTommaso. *Id.* at 82; *see also id.* at 23. The Applicant did not dispute any of these facts.

## ***Basis for Denial***

### **1. The Applicant provided false, incomplete and misleading information in its Application and in sworn testimony.**

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*, 52 A.D.3d 424, 860 N.Y.S.2d 103 (1st Dept. 2008). In connection with the Application, Detsikas 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.” *See* Application at 20. During his testimony, Detsikas swore to tell the truth. *See* Detsikas Transcript at 7.

#### *False and Misleading Information Provided on the Application*

Question 12 of the Application directs, “On Schedule A, identify all individuals who are principals of applicant business and provide the information requested.” *See* Application at 13. The definition of “principal” (which is included in the instructions for the Application) includes corporate officers and directors, “every stockholder holding ten percent or more of the outstanding shares of the corporation ... [and] *all other persons participating directly or indirectly in the control of such business entity.*” *See* Admin. Code § 16-501(d) (italics added). Schedule A of the Application filed by the Applicant discloses one principal – Anastasios Detsikas. *See* Application at 13. Richard and Stacy DiTommaso’s names do not appear anywhere on the Application. *See* Application.

The Applicant’s response to Question 12 and the information provided in Schedule A is false, as both DiTommasos are principals of the Applicant. During his sworn interview, Detsikas admitted that Richard DiTommaso has the authority to sign checks on behalf of the Applicant; is a signatory on the Applicant’s bank account; is listed as the “secretary” of the Applicant on the bank signature card; hires and fires employees; draws a salary from the Applicant (even though Detsikas does not); and directs employees as to how to respond to Commission requests for information. *See* Detsikas Transcript at 71-72, 82. Detsikas also admitted that Stacy DiTommaso controls the “accounts payables and receivable” of the Applicant; holds the credit card issued to the Applicant; has full authority to control the Applicant’s corporate bank account; and is an owner of Durable Diesel, a company that shares an address, at least one employee, telephone number, facsimile number, and email addresses with the Applicant. *Id.* at 45, 52, 71, 82. It is clear that both Richard and Stacy DiTommaso participate directly in the control of the Applicant.

In contrast, Detsikas (the sole disclosed principal) admitted that he does not have access to the Applicant’s email account and is confused about who is answering or controlling that email. *Id.* at 60. Additionally, Detsikas admitted that he does not hold the credit card issued to the Applicant; does not draw a salary from the Applicant; and played almost no role in preparing the Application. *Id.* at 52, 83, 87. The Applicant likely did not disclose Richard and Stacy DiTommaso on the Application out of concern that the Commission would deny the Application

based on Richard DiTommaso's criminal record and the facts surrounding the killing of Seyfert, including the connection to gangs and organized crime.

### *False and Misleading Testimony Under Oath*

Detsikas initially testified that he was the "only principal" and the "100 percent owner" of the Applicant. *Id.* at 12-13. Only after being confronted with evidence that establishes that Richard and Stacy DiTommaso are principals of the Applicant did Detsikas change his testimony and admit that Richard and Stacy DiTommaso should have been included on the Application. *Id.* at 84. Detsikas also agreed that Richard and Stacy DiTommaso have "control over the business." *Id.* at 85.

The failure of the Applicant to provide truthful and non-misleading information to the Commission about the identity of the principals of the company demonstrates that the Applicant lacks good character, honesty and integrity. Because Richard and Stacy DiTommaso participate directly in the control of the Applicant, they are principals of the business and were required to be disclosed as such on the Application. Detsikas initially provided the Commission with false and misleading sworn testimony to conceal the DiTommasos' involvement. He only changed his testimony and admitted Richard and Stacy DiTommaso's true roles with the Applicant after being confronted with evidence that establishes their status. The Applicant did not contest this ground. Therefore, the Commission denies the Application on this independently sufficient basis. *See* Admin. Code §§ 16-509(b), 16-509(a)(i).

## **2. The Applicant's undisclosed principal has been convicted of manslaughter.**

Richard DiTommaso – one of two undisclosed principals of the Applicant – has been convicted of Manslaughter in the First Degree. *See* PL § 125.20. The Applicant never disclosed this violent, class B felony conviction to the Commission, just as it failed to disclose Richard and Stacy DiTommaso as principals of the company. *See* Application. By using a different name (Richard Santoro) and by omitting any mention of himself (including his prior criminal conviction), Richard DiTommaso and the Applicant attempted to mislead the Commission and frustrate its oversight and regulatory responsibilities.

The Commission may refuse to issue a registration to an applicant that lacks "good character, honesty and integrity." *See* Admin. Code § 16-509(a) (applying the same fitness standard to registration applicants). In making a determination regarding an applicant's good character, honesty and integrity, the Commission may consider prior convictions of the Applicant (or any of its principals) for crimes which, considering the factors set forth in Section 753 of the Correction Law, would provide a basis for refusing to issue a license or registration. *See* Admin. Code § 16-509(a)(iii); *see also* Admin. Code § 16-501(a). Those factors are:

- (a) The public policy of this state, as expressed in [the Correction Law], to encourage the licensure . . . of persons previously convicted of one or more criminal offenses.

- (b) The specific duties and responsibilities necessarily related to the license . . . sought.
- (c) The bearing, if any, the criminal offense or offenses for which the person was previously convicted will have on his fitness or ability to perform one or more such duties and responsibilities.
- (d) The time which has elapsed since the occurrence of the criminal offense or offenses.
- (e) The age of the person at the time of occurrence of the criminal offense or offenses.
- (f) The seriousness of the offense or offenses.
- (g) Any information produced by the person, or produced on his behalf, in regard to his rehabilitation and good conduct.
- (h) The legitimate interest of the public agency . . . in protecting property, and the safety and welfare of specific individuals or the general public.

N.Y. Correction Law § 753(1).

Despite the State’s public policy to encourage the licensure and employment of persons previously convicted of one or more criminal offenses, *id.* at § 753(1)(a), as demonstrated below, the Correction Law factors weigh heavily in favor of denying the Application based on Richard DiTommaso’s manslaughter conviction. Richard DiTommaso was convicted of Manslaughter in the First Degree, which is a violent felony, punishable by up to 25 years in prison. *See* PL §§ 70.00(2)(b), 125.20. It is also a “racketeering activity,” as that term is defined by the Penal Law. *See* PL §§ 125.20, 460.10(1)(a). Commission of a racketeering activity is particularly serious, given the history of the Commission and the reasons it was formed, *i.e.*, to expel organized crime and other corruption from the trade waste industry. Thus, Manslaughter in the First Degree is clearly an extremely serious offense under the Correction Law. Correction Law § 753(1)(f).

Among the specific duties and responsibilities required of registrants of the Commission is the disclosure of truthful information in connection with an application. *See* Admin. Code § 16-509(a)(i). Aside from the fact that the Applicant failed to meet this duty by hiding Richard DiTommaso’s role in the company, it is clear that Richard DiTommaso – a principal of the Applicant, albeit undisclosed – lacks the ability to meet this obligation of candor as a result, at least in part, of his conviction. *See* Correction Law § 753(1)(b), (c). DiTommaso’s crime involved the luring of a suspected informant to a trainyard where DiTommaso’s codefendant shot the victim in the back of the head. *See* May 28, 2002, Press Release of the Queens County District Attorney’s Office; *Chair-Toss Thug Faces Slay Rap*, NY Post (March 26, 2002). The crime involved not just violence, but deceit.

In addition to the acts taken during the offense, as noted above, Richard DiTommaso's codefendant in the case was a gang member and an organized crime associate. Committing crimes – particularly those as serious as manslaughter – with a gang member and organized crime associate clearly has serious implications for a Commission-issued registration. The trade waste industry has a difficult history, and it would undermine the public's confidence in the integrity of the industry if someone who associated with gang members and organized crime associates were granted a trade waste removal registration. *See* Correction Law § 753(1)(h).

Although Richard DiTommaso's crime occurred in 1999, when he was 20 years old, the crime is so serious that the passage of 21 years has not dissipated the seriousness of the offense. A person was killed in the course of the commission of the crime, lured to his death. *See* Correction Law § 753(1)(d), (e). The ongoing concealment of information regarding Richard DiTommaso's conviction and role within the Applicant's business demonstrates how serious the conviction is, and how cognizant of that fact the Applicant, Detsikas and Richard DiTommaso are. Neither the Applicant nor any of its principals (disclosed or undisclosed) provided Commission's staff with any information regarding Richard DiTommaso's rehabilitation or good conduct; the Applicant has not responded to the Notice at all. *See* Correction Law § 753(1)(g); *see also* 17 RCNY § 2-08(a).

In light of the factors detailed above, and in the exercise of its discretion, the Commission concludes that, based on the manslaughter conviction of its undisclosed principal, the Applicant lacks good character, honesty and integrity. The Applicant did not dispute this point. Therefore, the Commission denies the Application based on this independently sufficient ground.

### ***Conclusion***

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a license or an exemption from the license requirement to any applicant it determines lacks good character, honesty and integrity. The record as detailed herein demonstrates that the Applicant lacks those essential qualities. Accordingly, based on the grounds set forth above, the Commission denies the Application.

The denial of the Application is effective immediately. Clean Fleet, Corp. may not operate in the trade waste industry in the City of New York

Dated: October 30, 2020

THE NEW YORK CITY  
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION

**Approved at October 30, 2020  
Telephonic Commission Meeting**

---

Noah D. Genel  
Commissioner and Chair

**Approved at October 30, 2020  
Telephonic Commission Meeting**

---

Edward Grayson, Acting Commissioner  
Department of Sanitation

**Approved at October 30, 2020  
Telephonic Commission Meeting**

---

Margaret Garnett, Commissioner  
Department of Investigation

**Approved at October 30, 2020  
Telephonic Commission Meeting**

---

Kenny Minaya, Chief of Staff  
(Designee)  
Department of Consumer and Worker Protection

**Approved at October 30, 2020  
Telephonic Commission Meeting**

---

Andrew Schwartz, Deputy Commissioner  
(Designee)  
Department of Small Business Services

**Approved at October 30, 2020  
Telephonic Commission Meeting**

---

Matthew Hyland, Inspector  
(Designee)  
New York City Police Department