

Mai Vang

From: Jas Teekasingh <jteekasingh@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2025 6:18 AM
To: Mitchell Imbertson
Cc: Dan Niziolek; *CI-StPaul_LegislativeHearings; Gus Nicklow; Adrian Neis; Brian Schmidt; SUNITA GSA2 GROUP LLC; *CI-StPaul_Mayor; #CI-StPaul_Ward1; #CI-StPaul_Ward2; #CI-StPaul_Ward3; #CI-StPaul_Ward4; #CI-StPaul_Ward5; #CI-StPaul_Ward6; #CI-StPaul_Ward7
Subject: Re[4]: re-inspection notice
Attachments: img20251123_22341283.pdf; img20251123_20443593.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Good Morning,

The time line you outlined generally aligns with events, but it omits a critical issue: your office appears to be disregarding the impact of the City's system hack and the disruption it caused across multiple departments, including DSI. This directly affected my ability to comply with your requirements.

Because of these failures, I lost a \$7,000 Chamber of Commerce grant. My address was blocked from January 3 to May 13, preventing contractors from obtaining permits. Two separate contractors attempted to apply and were unable to do so. Neither received any explanation from DSI. Only after the second contractor documented the problem did I come in personally to walk the permit through the system.

Despite this, DSI has not acknowledged any responsibility. Instead, the burden and cost have been shifted entirely onto me and my business.

The alleged non-compliance concerns failure to obtain and close permits in a timely manner. The record shows the opposite. DSI blocked permit applications, did not review the orders that governed my situation, and prevented the corrective-action permits from being submitted. Permits were not obtainable until May, the inspection did not occur until August 15, and I was not allowed to purchase my business license until October 15.

I now face a January 27 hearing concerning fees tied directly to delays created by DSI.

In my original letter, I requested answers to item 2, item 3, and item 4. These were not addressed and still require direct responses, not general statements about procedure.

I also asked for clarification on the consequences of decertify the mixing room and how that decision would affect my ability to maintain my body and paint license. This question also remains unanswered.

Since the deadline is fast approaching , I will initiate the formal appeals process, I need clear and complete responses to these outstanding items and an explanation for the inconsistency between the legislative hearing process and DSI's current actions.

Thank you,

Jaswant Teekasingh

----- Original Message -----

From "Mitchell Imbertson" <mitchell.imbertson@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

To "Jaswant A. Teekasingh" <jteekasingh@yahoo.com>; "Brian Schmidt" <brian.schmidt@ci.stpaul.mn.us>

Cc "Adrian Neis" <adrian.neis@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; "*CI-StPaul_LegislativeHearings"

<LegislativeHearings@ci.stpaul.mn.us>; "gsa2groupllc@gmail.com" <gsa2groupllc@gmail.com>;

"Gautam Singh" <jim.g.singh@gmail.com>; "Gus Nicklow" <gnicklow@meshbesh.com>

Date 11/25/2025 10:38:33 AM

Subject RE: Re[2]: re-inspection notice

Good afternoon,

I accompanied Fire Safety Supervisor Brian Schmidt on this inspection and can clarify requirements regarding the two items noted on this report. In regard to your question about the appeal process, the ordinance gives you 10 days to appeal from the date of the letter which is 11/22/25. If you wish to appeal, you are encouraged to do so.

Regarding the inspection of the entire property, I can explain why a full walk-through was made of the building. The Fire Certificate of Occupancy for this property was revoked for non-compliance over a year ago on October 17, 2024. In order to re-instate the Certificate of Occupancy, a full inspection of the property is required. I understand that you appealed this and as part of the appeal result it was approved that you were given under 1/3/25 to have permits finalized in order to have the Certificate reinstated. As copied from the appeal letter: *"This is to confirm that at the Legislative Hearing on November 19, 2024 Legislative Hearing Officer Marcia Moermond recommended that the City Council grant to January 3, 2025 to have permits finalized and the Fire Certificate of Occupancy reinstated."*

Since that deadline was not met, the property was referred to the City's Registered Vacant Building program. This was also appealed with the following result:

"This is to confirm that at the Legislative Hearing on Tuesday, March 4, 2025, Legislative Hearing officer Marcia Moermond recommended that the City Council deny your appeal and waive the Vacant Building fee for 90 days (to May 11, 2025) and allow permits to be pulled. The property remains a Category 2 Vacant Building but the Code Compliance Inspection requirement is waived."

Based on this status, we are again in a situation where a full inspection of the building was required in order to approve and reinstate the Fire Certificate of Occupancy.