



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 DENYING THE  
LICENSE APPLICATION OF MONARCH WASTE SOLUTIONS INC.  
TO OPERATE AS A TRADE WASTE BUSINESS**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Monarch Waste Solutions Inc. (“Monarch” or the “Applicant”) applied to the New York City Business Integrity Commission (the “Commission”) for a license to operate as a trade waste business (the “Application”). Local Law 42 of 1996 authorizes the Commission to review and make determinations on such applications. *See* Title 16-A of the New York City Administrative Code (“Admin. Code”) § 16-505(a).

The Commission’s review of a license application focuses on determining whether the applicant possesses business integrity, i.e., good character, honesty and integrity. *See* Title 17, Rules of the City of New York (“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 § 16-504(a) (empowering the Commission to issue and establish standards for issuance, suspension, and revocation of licenses and registrations); Admin. Code § 16-509(a) (authorizing the Commission to refuse to issue licenses or registrations to applicants lacking “good character, honesty and integrity”).

On January 12, 2026, the Commission staff issued and served on the Applicant an 11-page Notice to the Applicant of the Grounds to Deny the Application of Monarch Waste Solutions Inc for a Trade Waste Removal License (the “Notice of Denial”). The Applicant was given 10 business days to respond. *See* 17 RCNY § 2-08(a). On January 19, 2026, the Applicant’s attorney requested the transcript of the sworn interview of Sara Dabbarh. The Applicant’s attorney also requested an extension of time to submit a response to the Notice of Denial. *See* email from M. Daniel Bach to the Commission’s staff. On January 21, 2026, the Commission’s staff provided the requested documents and granted an extension of time to respond to February 6, 2026. *See* email from the Commission’s staff to M. Daniel Bach. On February 6, 2026, the Applicant submitted a response (the “Response”), consisting of a six-page letter from its attorney, the resume of principal Sara Dabbarh, and a business plan. *See* Response dated February 5, 2026. Notably, the Response contained no affidavit or other factual assertion under oath by anyone on behalf of the Applicant.

The Commission has completed its review of the license application, having carefully considered both the Notice of Denial and the Response. Based on the record herein, the Commission denies Monarch's Application because the Applicant lacks good character, honesty, and integrity based upon the following two independently sufficient grounds:

1. **The Applicant and its only disclosed principal provided the Commission with false and misleading information; and**
2. **The Commission previously found that undisclosed principal Satwant "Nick" Singh lacks good character, honesty and integrity.**

## II. 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. 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. International Brotherhood of Teamsters (Adelstein)*, 998 F.2d 120 (2d Cir. 1993); *People v. Ass'n of Trade Waste Removers of Greater New York Inc. et al.*, Indictment No. 5614/95 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty.); *United States v. Mario Gigante et al.*, No. 96 Cr. 466 (S.D.N.Y.); *People v. GNYTW*, 701 N.Y.S.2d 12 (1<sup>st</sup> Dep't 1999).

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. *See 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, "[i]t shall be unlawful for any person to operate a business for the purpose of the collection of trade waste . . . without having first obtained a license therefor from the [C]ommission." *Id.* Before issuing such license, the Commission must evaluate the "good character, honesty and integrity of the applicant." *Id.* at § 16-508(b). An "applicant" for a license or registration means both the business entity and each principal thereof. *Id.* at § 16-501(a).

The New York City Administrative Code provides an illustrative list of relevant factors for the Commission to consider in making a licensing decision:

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).

Additionally, the Commission 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). The Commission may refuse to issue a license or registration to an applicant when such applicant was previously issued a license which was revoked or not renewed, or where the applicant "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) and (d).

An applicant for a trade waste license or registration has no entitlement to and no property interest in a license or registration and the Commission is vested with broad discretion to grant or deny a license or registration application. *Sanitation & Recycling Industry, Inc.*, 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).

### **III. Statement of Facts**

#### *The Registration Application*

On or about March 12, 2021, the Applicant applied to the Commission for a license to remove trade waste. *See* License Application (the "Application"). The Applicant disclosed Sara Dabbarh ("Dabbarh") as the only principal of the business, and did not disclose any beneficial interest holders, employees or vehicle operators. *See* Application at pp. 21, 27, 30-31. Dabbarh certified that all of the information contained in the Application was "full, complete and truthful." *See* Application at p. 34. Satwant "Nick" Singh's ("Singh") name did not appear anywhere in the Application. *See* Application. In connection with the background investigation in relation to the Application, on December

14, 2022, Dabbarh provided sworn testimony to the Commission's staff. *See* Transcript of Sworn Interview of Sara Dabbarh, dated December 14, 2022 ("Dabbarh Tr.").

During the background investigation, the Applicant has failed in testimony and in written submissions to provide clear information about who is and who is not a principal of the Applicant business and what role Singh plays in the business. The Applicant has sought to deny or, where it does not deny, to minimize the role of Singh in the Applicant business. It is therefore necessary at the outset to briefly describe what the weight of the available evidence establishes on these basic and seemingly simple questions. In the course of doing so, it will also become clear that the operations and ownership of the Applicant are intertwined with Singh.

Part of the subterfuge were the different explanations regarding the relationship between Dabbarh and Singh. During her sworn interview, Dabbarh sometimes testified that Singh was her boyfriend. *See* Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 138-139. At other times she testified that he was her landlord's son.<sup>1</sup> *See* Dabbarh Tr. at p. 225. Whatever their personal relationship is, a review of all of the available evidence establishes that Singh participates directly in the control of the Applicant business.

*Topline Construction & Management Inc. and Satwant "Nick" Singh*

Singh had previously been disclosed to the Commission as the principal of NYC Topline Construction & Management Inc. ("Topline"). On or about August 30, 2016, Topline applied to the Commission for a trade waste registration. *See* Application of Topline for a Class 2 Registration ("Topline Application"). After a lengthy background investigation, on June 27, 2017, the Commission voted unanimously to deny the registration application of Topline based on two independently sufficient grounds: (1) [Topline's] sole principal [Singh] was convicted of falsifying business records in the second degree; and (2) [Topline] provided false information to the Commission in the registration application. *See* Decision of the Business Integrity Commission Denying the Registration Application of Topline ("Topline Denial"). The Response did not dispute any of these facts. *See* Response.

While the Topline Application was undergoing the Commission's background investigation, Topline was observed hauling trade waste in Queens County without a Commission issued license or registration. On or about November 18, 2016, Commission investigators observed a Top Line vehicle hauling trade waste without a license or registration. Consequently, on or about December 9, 2016, Notice of Violation Number TWC- 214367 was issued against Topline. *See* Notice of Violation Number TWC-214367. Topline agreed to settle this administrative violation and paid a \$2,500.00 fine. In relation to this administrative violation, Commission records indicate that on or about November 28, 2016, Singh had a telephone conversation with a member of the Commission's staff. During this telephone conversation, Singh stated, "[I] will just shut down this company and

---

<sup>1</sup> She also testified that she and Singh reside at the same address, albeit on different floors of the house. *See* Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 232-233.

reopen in another name.” *See* Note of Member of Commission’s Staff. The Response did not address any of these facts. *See* Response.

### *Singh’s Conviction*

On or about August 9, 2011, Singh was arrested in Queens County, New York, and charged with offering a false instrument for filing in the first degree, in violation of Penal Law § 175.35 (a class E felony); falsifying business records in the second degree, in violation of Penal Law § 175.05 (a class A misdemeanor); and offering a false instrument for filing in the second degree, in violation of Penal Law § 175.30 (a class A misdemeanor). *See* Criminal Complaint, Docket No. 2011QN043617 (the “Criminal Complaint”). Singh’s arrest came as part of a larger criminal case involving commercial vehicle operators fraudulently obtaining multiple driver’s licenses using aliases. State and federal law enforcement agencies, including U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s Homeland Security Investigations, conducted the investigation. *See* Press Release from Office of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, “*HSI participates in the arrest of commercial drivers for fraudulently obtaining licenses in New York*,” August 18, 2011; *See also*, John Valenti, “*Guv: 10 LI drivers had multiple licenses*,” *Newsday*, August 19, 2011, Garth Johnston, “*DMV catches 51 People with Amazing Fake Names*,” *Gothamist*, August 18, 2011.

The Criminal Complaint alleged that on February 25, 2009, Singh applied for a New York State driver’s license by filing an application with the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles. *See* Criminal Complaint. This application contained a different name (“Nick Singh”), date of birth, and social security number than Singh previously used to obtain another New York State driver’s license. *Id.*

On January 3, 2012, Singh pleaded guilty in New York City Criminal Court, Queens County, to falsifying business records in the second degree, a class A misdemeanor. *See* Certificate of Disposition, Docket No. 2011QN043617 (“Certificate of Disposition”). In pleading guilty, Singh admitted that, on or about February 25, 2009, he applied for a driver’s license at the New York State Department of Motor Vehicles and indicated in the application that he had not previously obtained a driver’s license; nor had he ever had his driver’s license suspended. *See* Transcript of Plea, Docket No. 2011QN043617 (“Plea Transcript”), at p. 3. Those representations were false. Singh had a previous driver’s license – obtained under a different name – and that license had been suspended. *Id.* Singh was sentenced to a conditional discharge and ordered to pay a fine of \$500. *See* Certificate of Disposition.

Question 26 of the Registration Application filed by Topline and certified as “full, complete and truthful” by Singh asked, “Has the applicant business, any current principal of the applicant business, or any past principal of the applicant business ever been convicted of any criminal offense in any jurisdiction?” Topline responded, “No.” *See* Topline Application at p. 5. This response was false. As established above, Singh was

convicted of a crime in 2012.<sup>2</sup> The Response did not dispute any of these facts. *See Response.*

*JBS Builder Inc. and JBS Containers Inc.*

In addition to being a principal of Topline, Singh also appeared to be the principal of JBS Builder Inc. (“JBS Builder”) and JBS Containers Inc. (“JBS Containers”). Despite never being licensed or registered by the Commission to operate in New York City, both companies were found to be transporting trade waste in New York City several times since 2015.

On at least three occasions, Commission Investigators found JBS Containers illegally operating in Queens County. On May 13, 2015, Commission Investigators observed a 2007 white Kenworth dump truck transporting trade waste. The truck was observed with the address “91-01 120 St Richmond Hill NY 11418” marked on its doors. On January 4, 2016, Commission Investigators observed a white 1989 Peterbilt dump truck transporting trade waste. Again, on April 11, 2016, Commission Investigators observed the same white 1989 Peterbilt dump truck transporting trade waste. The truck was registered to JBS Containers and had the company name stenciled on the side of the truck. On the first two instances, Singh came to the scene of the vehicle stop and took over driving of the dump truck from the driver, who was unable to provide investigators with a driver’s license. On the third instance, Singh was the driver of the truck at the time of the vehicle stop. Three administrative violations for unlicensed or unregistered trade waste removal activity were issued against JBS Containers. *See JBS Containers violations TWC-213400, TWC-212886, & TWC-211816.*

On at least two occasions, Commission investigators found JBS Builder illegally operating in Kings County. On May 15, 2021 and on February 16, 2022, Commission investigators observed a white Kenworth dump truck transporting trade waste. *See JBS Builder violations TWC-223375 and TWC-221716.* On both dates, Singh was operating the vehicle. Singh admitted to investigators that he was the owner of JBS. *See Id.* The vehicle was registered to JBS Builder. *See Id.* The company’s name was stamped on the passenger side door of the vehicle cab. *See JBS Builder violations TWC-223375 and TWC-221716 Photographs.* Two administrative violations for unlicensed or unregistered trade waste removal activity were issued against JBS Builder. *See JBS Builder violations TWC-223375 and TWC-221716.* The Response did not address these facts. *See Response.*

Dabbarh testified that she believed JBS Builder was owned by Satwant “Nick” Singh or his father. *See Dabbarh Tr. at p. 261.* Regarding her relationship with JBS Builder, Dabbarh testified that JBS Builder paid her for “invoicing” and “website creation.” *See Dabbarh Tr. at p. 220.* She testified that she deposited these funds into her personal bank accounts. *See Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 238-240.* Dabbarh denied that any funds from JBS Builder were ever deposited into Monarch’s business accounts. *Id.* She also testified that she paid

---

<sup>2</sup> Similarly, the Applicant failed to disclose Singh’s conviction on its application. *See the Application at p. 7.*

JBS \$900 to rent 9101 120th Street, Richmond Hill, NY, which serves as both her home and the Applicant's business location. *See Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 241, 243.*

Besides "invoicing" and "website creation", Dabbarh characterized her relationship with JBS as one of "exchanging business." She described these business exchanges as referrals of business from Dabbarh to JBS and from JBS to Dabbarh. *See Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 220, 260.* Yet, despite her testimony that sought to deny or limit business connections between JBS and the Applicant, bank records establish that several other transactions between JBS and the Applicant took place. *See Chase Bank Records.*

In the Response, the Applicant admits to "a few minor banking transactions" between Dabbarh and Singh, but states that these transactions do not prove that a business relationship existed between the two. *See Response at p. 5.* Yet the Response does not include any proof that the transfer of funds was unrelated to the Applicant's business.

#### *The Applicant and Singh*

Throughout her testimony, Dabbarh exhibited little or no knowledge about the trade waste industry and specifically little or no knowledge about the operations of the Applicant business.<sup>3</sup> Although Dabbarh testified that Monarch never operated and had never received payments or performed any services, business records indicate otherwise. *See Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 44-45.* For instance, bank records establish that in April and May of 2021, Monarch deposited checks from "R&A Construction Services Inc." and "June Geary." *See Chase Bank Records.* The check from R&A Construction Services Inc. included the description, "2112 Grand Ave. Bx. NY- 4 Dumpster," and the check from June Geary included the description "driveway" in the memos of the checks. *See Chase Bank Records.* Dabbarh could not provide an explanation for the descriptions written on each of these checks, and her frivolous explanation for the existence of these checks was that the funds came from a "savings committee." *See Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 154-157, 213-216.*

Finally, on April 28, 2021, a check from a construction company was issued to the Applicant. *See Chase Bank Records.* At her sworn interview, Dabbarh testified that this check was from a savings committee. *See Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 154-157.* Yet, on or about February 8, 2023, a Commission Investigator interviewed the owner of the construction company, who stated that he had spoken to Singh and retained JBS Builder for delivery and removal of containers at a construction site. The containers were delivered to and picked up from the construction site by trucks marked "JBS Builder." The owner of the construction company stated that Singh instructed him to make the check for services out to Singh's other company, "Monarch Waste Solutions." At the time of the interview with the Commission Investigator, the owner of the construction company stated that he did not know anyone by the name of Sara(h) Dabbarh. Later the same day, the owner of the construction company called the Commission Investigator and stated that he had spoken to Singh and that Singh told him that Monarch was Singh's company, but the company was

---

<sup>3</sup> In the Response, the Applicant discusses Dabbarh's qualifications to operate a trade waste business. Yet, the grounds for denial of this application are not based on her qualifications.

placed in Sara(h)'s name. *See* BIC February 8, 2023 Investigation Report. The Response does not dispute any of these facts. *See* Response.

#### **IV. GROUNDS FOR DENIAL**

##### **1. The Applicant and its only disclosed principal provided the Commission with false and misleading information.**

###### **a. False and misleading information on the application.**

All applicants must provide truthful and non-misleading information in connection with an application. *See* Admin. Code §16-509(a)(i). A knowing failure to do so is a ground for denial. *See Id.* As discussed above, Singh was not disclosed to the Commission as a principal or employee of the Applicant, even though the evidence establishes that he should have been disclosed.

Question 16 of the License Application directed the Applicant to, “[o]n Schedule A, identify all individuals who are principals of Applicant business and provide the information requested.” *See* the Application at p. 4. The Applicant disclosed only Dabbarh on Schedule A. *See* the Application at p. 21. By not disclosing Singh as a principal, the Applicant provided false and misleading information to the Commission.<sup>4</sup>

Similarly, question 23 of the License Application directed the Applicant to, “[o]n Schedule H, identify the current employees of the Applicant business and provide the requested information.” *See* the Application at p. 5. The Applicant did not list any names on Schedule H. *See* the Application at p. 30. Thus, it is clear that the Applicant deliberately decided to omit Singh's name from anywhere on the application.

The Applicant's Response discusses Dabbarh's qualifications to operate a trade waste business. *See* Response at pp. 1, 5, 6. The Applicant's Response also includes self-serving unsworn statements that Singh “has never been authorized to conduct any business on its behalf and is not an authorized signatory on any bank account.” *See* Response at p. 4. Yet the Applicant's Response does not even attempt to refute any of the evidence of the specific instances when Singh acted as a principal or an employee of the Applicant business. The undisputed evidence of Singh's involvement in the operations of the Applicant coupled with Dabbarh's ignorance about the operations of the Applicant can only lead to one conclusion- that the Applicant provided the Commission with false and misleading information on the Application.

---

<sup>4</sup> Local Law 42 sets forth a broad definition of a principal, which includes all “persons participating directly or indirectly in the control of such business entity.” *See* Admin. Code § 16-501(d). The evidence recounted above establishes that Singh directly or indirectly controls the operations of the Applicant's business.

**b. False and misleading testimony under oath.**

Dabbarh's sworn interview is rife with contradiction throughout and largely refuted by evidence gathered by the Commission. She asserted that she established Monarch alone, without anyone's help. *See* Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 43, 134-137. However, the evidence establishes that she received \$3,500.00 from JBS Builder and Singh. After stating that Singh is her boyfriend and the son of her landlord, she changed course and asserted that theirs was purely a business relationship, one centering on his role as property manager of Monarch's office space and on his hiring her for assistance with his website. *See* Dabbarh Tr. at p. 225.

The frequent bank transactions between JBS Builders and Monarch point to a relationship between these two companies far more elaborate than that described by Dabbarh. *See* Chase Bank Records. Dabbarh alleged that the transactions were for website services and rent, although she had earlier testified that the payments for website services were made to her personal account alone. *See* Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 238-240. Similarly, she had earlier testified that the cost of her rent was \$900, far less than the two transfers totaling \$9,000.00 that were made by Monarch to JBS Builder in the single month of May 2021. *See* Chase Bank Records. The Applicant's Response admits to the banking relationship between Monarch and Singh but characterizes these transfers as "minor." *See* Response at p. 5. Yet the Applicant's Response provides no evidence that the banking relationship was not connected to the formation and operation of the Applicant business.

Furthermore, Dabbarh averred that she alone operates the Applicant business, although her testimony revealed that she has no actual knowledge of the industry. *See* Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 43, 72. She testified also that Monarch has not provided any services to customers or received any payments for services, however, when confronted with checks that directly contradict this assertion, she stated, implausibly, that they were connected to a "savings committee." *See* Dabbarh Tr. at pp. 44-45, 154-157, 213-216. Dabbarh's testimony directly contradicts the information provided by a customer of the Applicant—that the customer dealt with Singh; that the Applicant via Singh provided the customer with trade waste removal services; and that Singh informed the customer that the Applicant was Singh's company and that he put the Applicant business in Dabbarh's name. The Response does not refute any of these facts.

Simply stated, although Dabbarh testified that she is the only principal of the Applicant, a review of all of the evidence, including her own testimony, establishes that Singh is an undisclosed principal of the Applicant.

The Applicant provided false and misleading information to the Commission on its application because the Application makes no mention of Singh. It is likely that the Applicant knew that including Singh's name on the application would result in the denial of the application, as the Commission previously determined that Singh lacks good character, honesty and integrity. Similarly, Dabbarh provided the Commission with false and misleading information when she testified under oath that Singh does not have any involvement in the operations of the Applicant. Again, without providing any proof, the

Response simply contains unsworn, self-serving statement by the Applicant's attorney that Singh has no involvement in the operation of the Applicant business. Contrary to the statements in the Response, the evidence establishes that Singh is involved in the operations of the Applicant business.

The failure of the Applicant to provide truthful and complete information to the Commission in its application and via its disclosed principal's testimony establishes that the Applicant lacks the requisite good character, honesty, and integrity to operate in the trade waste industry. The Applicant's Response did not provide any compelling arguments and did not offer any evidence on this point except to reiterate some of the statements made by Dabbarh at her sworn interview. For this independently sufficient reason, the Commission denies the license application of Monarch Waste Solutions Inc.

**2. The Commission previously found that undisclosed principal Satwant "Nick" Singh lacks good character, honesty and integrity.**

Local Law 42 of 1996 provides that "Applicant" shall mean the business entity submitting an application for a license or registration and each principal of the applicant. *See Admin Code §16-501(a)*. Singh was previously disclosed to the Commission as a principal of Topline. On June 27, 2017, the Commission unanimously found that Topline lacked good character, honesty and integrity and denied its application. The denial of Topline's application was based on Singh's conviction for falsifying business records and for providing the Commission with false and misleading information in its application. Thus, the Commission has previously found that Singh lacks the requisite good character, honesty and integrity to be involved in the trade waste industry in New York City.

The failure of the Applicant to disclose Singh- who the Commission previously found to lack good character, honesty and integrity- in any capacity is ample reason for the Commission to conclude that the Applicant lacks good character, honesty and integrity. The Applicant's Response did not dispute this point. For this independently sufficient reason, the Commission denies the license application of Monarch Waste Solutions Inc.

[THIS SECTION LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

**V. CONCLUSION**

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant that it determines lacks good character, honesty, and integrity. The record as detailed above demonstrates that the Applicant lacks those qualities. Accordingly, the Commission denies the License Application for the two independently sufficient reasons set forth herein.

The decision is effective immediately. Monarch Waste Solutions Inc may not operate as a trade waste removal business in the City of New York.


Dated: New York, New York  
February 24, 2026

THE NEW YORK CITY  
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION



---

Elizabeth Crotty  
Commissioner and Chair



---

Department of Sanitation

---

Department of Investigation

---

Department of Consumer and Worker Protection

---

Department of Small Business Services



---

New York City Police Department

**V. CONCLUSION**

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant that it determines lacks good character, honesty, and integrity. The record as detailed above demonstrates that the Applicant lacks those qualities. Accordingly, the Commission denies the License Application for the two independently sufficient reasons set forth herein.

The decision is effective immediately. Monarch Waste Solutions Inc may not operate as a trade waste removal business in the City of New York.

Dated: New York, New York  
February 24, 2026

**THE NEW YORK CITY  
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Elizabeth Crotty  
Commissioner and Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department of Sanitation

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department of Investigation

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department of Consumer and Worker Protection

\_\_\_\_\_  
Department of Small Business Services

\_\_\_\_\_  
New York City Police Department

**V. CONCLUSION**

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant that it determines lacks good character, honesty, and integrity. The record as detailed above demonstrates that the Applicant lacks those qualities. Accordingly, the Commission denies the License Application for the two independently sufficient reasons set forth herein.

The decision is effective immediately. Monarch Waste Solutions Inc may not operate as a trade waste removal business in the City of New York.

Dated: New York, New York  
February 24, 2026

THE NEW YORK CITY  
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION

---

Elizabeth Crotty  
Commissioner and Chair

---

Department of Sanitation

---

Department of Investigation

*Samuel Levine*

---

Department of Consumer and Worker Protection

---

Department of Small Business Services

---

New York City Police Department

**V. CONCLUSION**

The Commission is vested with broad discretion to refuse to issue a license or registration to any applicant that it determines lacks good character, honesty, and integrity. The record as detailed above demonstrates that the Applicant lacks those qualities. Accordingly, the Commission denies the License Application for the two independently sufficient reasons set forth herein.

The decision is effective immediately. Monarch Waste Solutions Inc may not operate as a trade waste removal business in the City of New York.

Dated: New York, New York  
February 24, 2026

THE NEW YORK CITY  
BUSINESS INTEGRITY COMMISSION

---

Elizabeth Crotty  
Commissioner and Chair

---

Department of Sanitation

---

Department of Investigation

---

Department of Consumer and Worker Protection

*Leemor Rozen*  

---

Department of Small Business Services

---

New York City Police Department