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CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: The next case on our calendar is Case Number 22-251-00009, Twelve After Twelve, License Number 117238. Mr. Orellana, can you please elevate the rights of the parties in this case, please?

MR. ORELLANO: Andrew, your access has been elevated. Borzou Biabani, your access has been elevated. Donnell Butler, your access has been elevated. Anthony Cello, your access has been elevated. That is all, Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you.
MR. CELO: Good morning.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good morning. Hold on. All right. Good morning. Let me have everyone introduce themself for the record. Let's start with the Government.

MR. CELO: Assistant Attorney Anthony Cello on behalf of the District. Good morning, Your Honor.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Please, Mr. Celo, just as you -- just please spell your name for the record.

MR. CELO: I apologize.

A-N-T-H-O-N-Y, C-E-L-O
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And one of the reasons I always ask the parties to spell their name for the record is because it's been -- we have a transcript with a court reporter, so I want to make sure that the court reporter properly captures the spelling of everyone's name. That's why I always ask for that.

All right. Mr. Kline, please spell and state your name for the record, please.

MR. KLINE: Yes. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Board. Andrew Kline on behalf of the licenesee, A-N-D-R-E-W, last name K-L-I-N-E. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And Mr. Kline, is your client here with you, sir?

MR. KLINE: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And who is that, sir?

MR. KLINE: Borzou Biabani, principle of the licensee.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Biabani, can you please spell and state your name for the record, please?

MR. BIABANI: The spelling is
$B-O-R-Z-O-U$, and the last name is $B-I-A-B-A-N-I$. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: What's your relationship to this establishment, sir?

MR. BIABANI: Owner.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you. MR. BIABANI: Yes, sir. Thank you. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I believe I'm looking at someone's computer screen so -- all right. Mr. Celo, are there any preliminary matters in this case?

MR. CELO: I do believe that there is some factual agreement. I will let Attorney Kline address that but otherwise, no other procedural matters that I'm aware of.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Yes. We're --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, Mr. Kline. What -- yes.

MR. KLINE: -- we're prepared to stipulate to facts that were in the investigative report.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Could someone -- I -- well, I -- what I will ask is that someone put the facts that are being stipulated though on, and so are we then going to have just arguments on if whether or not the licensee is --
has committed -- okay, so what are we -- what is it the Board has been asked to do?

MR. CELO: The Government would propose that the Board accept the investigative report as written as factually accurate. The Government does intend to present limited testimony just to flush out some details in the investigative report, but it would be very abbreviated. Obviously, the respondent can present any case they have, and then we would present argument at that time.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I guess I would also ask, at least for clarity of the record, is that if there are facts, then $I$ need someone to put these facts in the record. I know that we will -- I know the investigative report -- the case report, by matter of law, is a part of the record, but if someone's going to read the transcript, well, no one's going to know what -so we can refer back to the facts. So I would at least like to have some facts -- the facts that are being stipulated, that they are provided -that they are read in the record. Or is it -- I can look up the case report. Is it a long report? Or you tell me.

MR. CELO: Mr. Chair, it's a three-page report with attachments. I, at this point, think probably the quickest way to deal with this is just to present testimony and understanding that I'll keep it slightly abbreviated and then the relevant facts can be put on the record through verbal testimony.

INSPECTOR KLINE: That's fine. We'll withdraw the offer of the stipulation.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
That's fine. All right. This is a show cause hearing and so the procedures for a show cause hearing is that the Government will make an opening statement. Once the Government makes an opening statement, the licensee can also make an opening statement or elect to waive their opening statement until the presentation of their case.

The Government will call its witnesses. The witnesses will testify. Once the witness has testified, the licensee will have an opportunity to cross-examine the witness. Once the licensee has had an opportunity to cross-examine the witness, then the Board would have an opportunity to cross, to ask questions of the witness. Once the Board has asked questions
of a witness, then the Government will have -I'm sorry -- then the licensee will have another opportunity to ask questions of the witness based on the questions that were asked by the Board, and then the Government, since it's the Government's witness, the Government will have an opportunity to redirect its witness.

Once they have presented witnesses, then we will have -- the Government has presented its case, then the licensee will have an opportunity to present its case, and we'll follow the same procedure.

Once the licensee has presented its case, we'll have closing. The parties will be asked whether or not they will do proposed findings of facts and conclusion of law. And then I'll close the case. Any questions before we move forward?

MR. CELO: No, Mr. Chair.
MR. KLINE: No, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
Thank you. Does the Government wish to have a -provide an opening statement?

MR. CELO: Yes, Mr. Chair. May it
please the Board. We are here today, ladies and gentlemen of the Board, to deal with a single account of allowing the establishment to be used for an unlawful or disorderly purpose. The undisputed facts of the case are this: On February 19, 2022, a patron was found carrying a pistol inside of Twelve After Twelve. They brought the pistol into this nightclub. They engaged in an altercation with another patron. They drew the gun on that patron. Fortunately, the incident was resolved without gunfire, and that patron was arrested and subsequently charged appropriately.

What we are here today to discuss is how the establishment, Twelve After Twelve, operated in such a manner as to be conducive to the disorderly or unlawful conduct, specifically in this case, allowing a gun to be brought into the establishment by a patron in violation of D.C. law. What you will hear from Investigator Butler is that the security of this establishment conducted no pat-downs, no wanding, and no searching of the patrons as they entered. Security officers did not have any marked clothing or uniforms to identify them as such.

They received no training from the establishment. The cameras in the establishment were insufficient to cover the interior and to capture what actually occurred in this altercation. And despite being required to do so as a nightclub to obtain their license, this establishment does not have a security plan on file with ABRA. Because of these factors, the establishment did operate in a method conducive to the unlawful conduct, and the charges are appropriate.

After the case has been presented, I will ask for an appropriate sanction from this Board. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thanks, Mr. Celo. Mr. Kline, do you wish to make an opening statement?

INSPECTOR KLINE: Good morning members of the Board. This case does involve a handgun on premises, but it's a situation this licensee as well as any reasonable person would be concerned about. But the issue here is was there a method of operation or was there a course of conduct that allowed this to happen. It appears that Mr. Celo intends to throw everything against the wall, but the issue is one of causation as to
how did this gun get there, were things that were -- that should have been done that usually were not done that would have had an impact on this, is that why this happened? Or is this an isolated incident and a situation where a felon, according to the report of the club, brought a gun into the premises.

We obviously have serious problems with handguns in our society, but this establishment is not at fault. Perhaps there are things they could have done better, but I caution the Board against engaging in --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. --
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- Monday morning quarterbacking and looking back and deciding after the fact what should have been done. The evidence in this case will show that the licensee acted quickly and responsibly to deal with this situation, and that is the evidence that we will hear. And at the completion of the case, we will ask that there be no (audio interference) --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right, thanks. Mr. Kline, I'm not sure if it's my equipment, but I'm having some problems hearing you. Is it just me or are other parties having
problems hearing --
MR. CELO: Yes, a little bit at the end.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. So Mr. Kline, just -- yes, it's not just me so make sure that your microphone is clear and that we can hear you. All right.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Is this better?
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
Thanks. All right. Does the Government have a witness that you wish to -- that they wish to call?

MR. CELO: Yes. The Government calls Donnell Butler, ABRA investigator.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Butler, do you swear or affirm to tell the truth and nothing but the truth?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Your witness, sir. DIRECT EXAMINATION

MR. CELO: Please state and spell your name for the record?

MR. BUTLER: First name, Donnell, D-O-N-N-E-L-L, Butler, B-U-T-L-E-R.

MR. CELO: And what is your
occupation?
MR. BUTLER: Investigator for the Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration.

MR. CELO: How long have you been an investigator with them?

MR. BUTLER: I've been employed for total of 24 years.

MR. CELO: And we are here to discuss a February 19th incident at the establishment Twelve After Twelve. Is it fair to say that you were the investigator on that incident?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, I was, and accompanied by my supervisor, Bob Brashears.

MR. CELO: And just to keep it brief, what happened before ABRA was involved in the incident, what happened to trigger your investigation?

MR. BUTLER: That particular day I got a phone call from my supervisor and had to respond to Twelve Twelve -- Twelve After Twelve for an incident. When I arrived -- excuse me -when I arrived there -- excuse me, give me a
second -- when I arrived on the scene, I was greeted by my supervisor and the -- the manager and also an MPD officer who stated that there was an incident inside of the establishment involving an altercation and possibly a handgun that was recovered.

MR. CELO: And -- well, give us the background on what happened with the altercation, how did it develop, to the best of your knowledge, and how was it resolved?

MR. BUTLER: Well, when I got there -when I arrived on the scene, pretty much the situation was over and from what I could understand, there was an altercation between two individuals and during the scuffles, somebody in the crowd hollered he got a gun, he has a gun. Security officers proceeded to apprehend the individual and escort him outside of the building. Once outside, from my understanding, he appeared to have dropped something on the ground, and along that same timeframe, MPD officers was on the scene. And when the individual bent down to grab something, the officer apprehended him and felt a handgun on his person.

MR. CELO: And just to be clear, is it legal to carry a handgun into a nightclub in the District of Columbia?

MR. BUTLER: No, it's not.
MR. CELO: Did you investigate security of the security personnel of Twelve After Twelve as part of your investigation?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. I asked the manager how many security and to also talk to the head of security who said they had six personnel, six security officers on the scene.

MR. CELO: Do the security officers have uniforms or identifying outfits?

MR. BUTLER: As I can recall, no. There was no uniform to distinguish from the patrons.

MR. CELO: Do the security personnel conduct any pat-down or wanding of patrons entering the establishment?

MR. BUTLER: What I understand from the head of security, they do not conduct pat-downs or use the wand.

MR. CELO: And they conduct no other searching of patrons, correct?

MR. BUTLER: No. That's correct.

MR. CELO: And they do not train their security personnel but instead rely on industry experience, correct?

MR. BUTLER: I'm not understanding that question. Say it again?

MR. CELO: When you -- well, the head of security was a Boris Todorovic, is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct.
MR. CELO: And you interviewed him specifically?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MR. CELO: Did you ask him about what training security officers received?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. He stated that they were totally trained and was well aware of what their duties were as far as dealing with patrons.

MR. CELO: Did he tell you that they had industry experience as their training or that Twelve After Twelve trained them specifically?

MR. BUTLER: No. He stated that they had industry experience.

MR. CELO: So the establishment didn't actually training them, they just relied on whatever knowledge they had when they were hired,
correct?
MR. BUTLER: Correct. From my understanding, yes.

MR. CELO: Were you able to see the altercation on the security cameras from the establishment?

MR. BUTLER: No, not at that time. I received a copy of the video from one of their associates, and when I reviewed the camera, I could only see the scuffle. I wasn't able to see clarity as to who started the altercation.

MR. CELO: And the cameras did not have sufficient coverage of the establishment to actually see the entire fight, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: Now from a layout, a floorplan viewpoint, this establishment has different rooms, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: And the fight took place in what was called a "green room?"

MR. BUTLER: Yes. It's a green room that's set off to the, I believe, the left of the establishment. It's a different room.

MR. CELO: How many rooms -- sorry --
how many rooms do they have?
MR. BUTLER: They could have multiple rooms. I think it's more than three rooms. I'm not really certain on that.

MR. CELO: And the camera footage you showed, did it -- was it sufficient to cover every room?

MR. BUTLER: No, it wasn't.
MR. CELO: So we have no way of seeing what actually happened with the actual fight in this establishment at this time, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: Okay. Does Twelve After Twelve, at least at the time of this incident, did they have a security plan on file with ABRA?

MR. BUTLER: No. Not at the time, no. Not at the time of the incident.

MR. CELO: And they are a nightclub --
MR. BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: -- they're registered as a nightclub?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: And nightclubs are required to have security plans?

MR. BUTLER: That's right.

MR. CELO: Okay. And recognizing that that is not one of the charges in this case, 1 do just want to note that for the record.

Do you believe that the lack of searching of patrons as they enter the establishment enabled the patron to bring a gun into the establishment?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct, yes.
MR. CELO: And do you believe that it would have been easier to resolve and investigate the altercation if security personnel had been identifiable and if the cameras had full coverage of the establishment?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MR. CELO: Okay. Nothing further at this time.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Kline. CROSS-EXAMINATION

INSPECTOR KLINE: Hello, Investigator Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Good morning, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: In terms of training, there's no standard training course with respect to security guards who work in licensed establishments in the District of

Columbia, is there?
MR. BUTLER: No, not that I'm aware of.

INSPECTOR KLINE: And isn't it true that one of the best ways for individuals employed in the establishments is to work in the industry and work with others that have had others that have had experience in industry?

MR. BUTLER: Possibly yes, correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: So you're not troubled by the fact that these individuals gathered their knowledge as to how to perform by working in the industry, are you?

MR. BUTLER: No, I'm not.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Is there anything that you think that they -- that the establishment did wrong in reacting to the presence of the handgun on the premises?

MR. BUTLER: No. From what I believe, once the altercation was recognized, security was right on -- right on top of it and subdued the individual.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Do you believe if security had been wearing uniforms, that that would have prevented the handgun from getting
onto the premises?
MR. BUTLER: No -- no, not really.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Do you believe if there was complete coverage -- video coverage of the establishment by way of security cameras, that that would have prevented the handgun from getting on the premises?

MR. BUTLER: No, it wouldn't -- no.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Is there any requirement that you're aware of that every ABC-licensed establishment search persons entering the establishment?

MR. BUTLER: Well, it's certainly recommended that some type of visual or a pat-down or -- to prevent any weapons entering the establishment be conducted, yes.

INSPECTOR KLINE: So if someone goes into The La Diplomate, they should be searched before they go into the establishment, is that --

MR. BUTLER: Some type of visual or some type of means of if they have any weapons or whatever on their person.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Do you believe it's the responsibility of every ABC-licensed establishment to do some sort of search of
patrons entering the establishment to assure the patrons do not have any weapons, is that your testimony?

MR. BUTLER: Well, you said everybody.
You're just talking specifically about nightclubs, not restaurants?

INSPECTOR KLINE: I said -- I went with every person. We'll get to nightclubs --

MR. BUTLER: No.
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- in a minute.
MR. BUTLER: Not every.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Is it your position that every licensed -- every establishment licensed as a nightclub is required to conduct searches of persons entering the premises to ascertain whether they have weapons?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. Some type of visual or some type of pat-down or some type of device that will trigger a weapons or some type of device.

INSPECTOR KLINE: And that's in the ABC regulations somewhere?

MR. BUTLER: It's not in the regulations that I'm aware of, no.

INSPECTOR KLINE: So where do we get
this --where does this requirement come from?
MR. BUTLER: Well, from my
understanding based on today's times, I mean there's violence everywhere so if you have a nightclub and you have a party, to prevent anything, I think it's up to the -responsibility of the establishment to make sure that no weapons are entered into the establishment.

INSPECTOR KLINE: But that -- doesn't that normally involve a determination by the establishment as to what is reasonable for its particular type of business?

MR. BUTLER: It could be.
INSPECTOR KLINE: So I mean we talked about types of licenses. We've talked about you wanted -- you narrowed it to nightclub licenses but indeed there are some restaurants, based upon the type of operation and the clientele, you would think that's a good idea, right?

MR. BUTLER: If he mainly talk about nightclub, you're talking about restaurants where you have adults and, you know, kids going into different establishments, restaurants to eat, there' a visual if they presume that it's going
to be some type of violence or to prevent any type of violence as precaution.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Is there evidence that this establishment didn't conduct a visual observation of patrons entering this establishment?

MR. BUTLER: Not that I'm aware of. I mean I -- when I arrived on the scene, pretty much everything was over. So to verify that they did a visual or any type of search is beyond me. From what I understand, what I was told, there was no pat-downs and no wanding of any individual going into the nightclub.

INSPECTOR KLINE: But you suggested that under certain circumstances, a visual appraisal of the person is sufficient, right?

MR. BUTLER: Well, I'm certain that it's up to the individual establishments to secure their individual establishments if they want to safeguard their patrons given today's times. There's a lot of violence out here, so if I had -- myself, if I had a establishment, I would take some type of precaution to make sure that no weapons of any sort would enter into my establishment. And it's been going on for years.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Wouldn't that be dependent upon what type of establishment you have and who might be the clientele?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. It probably would be.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Probably would, right?

MR. BUTLER: If he -- yes. If you had an adult party, sophisticated party, grown adults and you had -- versus young adults, you know, you make the necessary adjustments.

INSPECTOR KLINE: I believe your report reflects that the establishment on the night in question had an over 21 policy in place; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Okay. So certainly, younger adults were not present on the premises, correct?

MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry. Say that again. You --

INSPECTOR KLINE: Younger adults --
MR. BUTLER: Oh, young adults.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. BUTLER: Yes. They shouldn't have
been present, no.
INSPECTOR KLINE: And you didn't find anyone under 21 on the premises?

MR. BUTLER: Well, no. I wasn't specifically looking for any young adults. I was there mainly to assess the situation.

INSPECTOR KLINE: And this is a relatively new establishment, isn't it?

MR. BUTLER: New ownership, yes, I do believe.

INSPECTOR KLINE: New ownership? It's a new license, isn't it? Do you know when the license was issued?

MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry. I can hardly hear you, Mr. Kline.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Do you know when the license was issued for this establishment? Isn't it a new license?

MR. BUTLER: From what I understand, it's a new license. I'm not certain of the timeframe that they acquired that license. Less than a year I do believe maybe.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Less than a year. So one of the ways that one makes a determination as to what is adequate for security is by
continuing experience, correct?
MR. BUTLER: Correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: So let's go back to La Diplomate. I seem to be picking on them. So if La Diplomate discovered, through their experience, that people were coming in with weapons, then at that point, it might make sense for them to look at their policy and change it, right?

MR. CELO: Objection.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: What's the basis -- Mr. Kline?

MR. CELO: Objection.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Go ahead, sir.
MR. CELO: Objection based on both relevance and speculation. At this point, we are not discussing the incident. We are talking about -- there is no experience sliding scale on the requirements of the $A B C$ license. We are not here to talk about the required procedures. We are here to talk about whether or not they conducted their business in a manner conducive to the unlawful conduct. So what we're talking about with Le Diplomate or what we're talking about how much experience somebody has or whether
they're a new license or an old license -- you know, I let this go for a bit, but we are beyond relevance as to the charges that are before the Board at this time.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Mr. Chairman, I vehemently disagreement. In the absence of a regulation that requires every licensee to conduct pat-down searches or some other requirement, then what we are looking at is the operation of the establishment and the judgment of the operator, and all of the cases deal with that. Lavelle deals with that, Bliss deals with that, Rumors deals with that. The issue is, is the establishment acting responsibly given a number of factors, and one of those factors is their own experiences and who their clientele is. That's exactly what this case is about.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm going sustain the objection, Mr. Kline. I mean we're not talking about every -- we're talking about a nightclub. I think that's one of the -- your -the best -- at least to the best of my knowledge, Le Diplomate isn't a nightclub, and you're asking there, and you are aware that depending on the license class, that there are different kind of
regulations that they need to comply --
INSPECTOR KLINE: With all due respect, there is no different regulation for nightclubs other than the filing of a security plan in terms of what -- of searches. There's no different requirement and indeed, the investigator has already admitted that there are ABC establishments that are licensed as restaurants that would merit heightened scrutiny of patrons entering based upon their clientele and based upon the way they conduct their operation.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay, listen. I'm sustaining your objection, Mr. Kline. Let's move on.

MR. KLINE: Okay. Investigator Butler?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: There are certain facts that are established by the report. One is that a fight broke out in the establishment, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: Second is that security went to separate the combatants in the
fight, correct?
MR. BUTLER: Correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: One of the
combatants had a gun, correct?
MR. BUTLER: Correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: He was restrained by security, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
INSPECTOR KLINE: MPD was flagged down by security, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
MR. KLINE: He was taken outside and based on the video, attempted to come back in but was restrained by or prevented by security from coming back in, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MR. KLINE: In-house security personnel effectively communicated by way of two-way radios and flashlights, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct. Yes, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: The ABC manager, in fact, was notified by security by way of a two-way radio of the incident, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Yes -- yes, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: So what is it, in
your mind, that you believe that this establishment did wrong here?

MR. BUTLER: Where I believe they're wrong?

INSPECTOR KLINE: Yes. What did they do wrong? I mean didn't they react textbook -MR. BUTLER: They --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- the situation they were presented?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. I think the issue is how did he get a gun inside the establishment. Sure, they reacted to the altercation which they were supposed to do. But I think the main issue is, well, how did he get in with the gun, you know.

INSPECTOR KLINE: So your position is they violated a rule that a nightclub must search every patron that comes in for weapons; is that your position?

MR. CELO: That is a gross mischaracterization of what the testimony was.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Cross-examination, I think it's exactly what the testimony was.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm going to
overrule the objection. He can answer the question if he can.

MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that again then?

INSPECTOR KLINE: Yes. So your contention as to what this establishment did wrong is it violated an unwritten rule that every nightclub is required to conduct searches of those entering their premises for weapons.

MR. BUTLER: Well, I think --
INSPECTOR KLINE: Is that correct?
MR. BUTLER: No. I think that it's in their best interest when they have a nightclub with certain individuals entering the nightclub to either do a visual or a pat-down or some type of search.

INSPECTOR KLINE: I'm going to move to strike that --

MR. BUTLER: And this --
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- Mr. Chair,
because -- Mr. Chair --
MR. BUTLER: I can hardly hear you, Mr. Kline.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Okay. I'm going to

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Butler, it might be your equipment. I can clearly hear Mr. Kline.

MR. BUTLER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Maybe there's something going with your equipment. I'm sorry. Go ahead, Mr. Kline. What is --

INSPECTOR KLINE: Yes. I'm going to move to strike that because the chair has ruled that there is no sliding scale and, you know, the best interest or the best thoughts are not what's relevant here. I tried to develop that testimony and there was an objection, and I was not allowed to pursue that. So I would ask that the question -- that the answer be stricken and the question that I've asked be answered.

MR. CELO: He did answer the question, Mr. Chair. He answered it "no," and he explained his answer. Mr. Kline is seeking to strike an answer that he did not like, but he asked the question so the answer's out there.

INSPECTOR KLINE: The answer relates to issues that the Board ruled by an evidentiary ruling are not relevant. I mean it is or it isn't. It's either relevant to look at the facts
and circumstances of each licensee when we do not have a hard and fast rule in effect or it's not. It can't be both ways.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Do you have something to say, Mr. Celo?

MR. CELO: Yes, Mr. Chair. As I understood the past evidentiary ruling, the objection that I made at that time and the ruling was discussing all establishments of all types and all circumstances. Mr. Kline just asked what did this establishment do wrong, and he asked if it was violating an unwritten rule. Mr. Butler clearly testified that it is not a violation of the unwritten rule, and then he went on to answer the question and say what he felt they did wrong. It was perfectly responsive. It was within the bounds of what this Board has previously permitted as testimony. There's no reason to strike. There's no evidentiary problem with the answer that was provided.

MR. KLINE: I'll move on.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Let's move on.
MR. KLINE: So Mr. Butler, let's go at this a different way. Is there something that they did wrong other than not search?

MR. BUTLER: Well, I'm not certain what they did wrong in the beginning because as I stated, I got there after the incident was over. So to observe what they did wrong in the very first, I'm not certain what they did wrong. I only going by what I was told, that there was no pat-downs and no wanding of individuals. And how did they guy get in there with a gun, I'm not certain.

INSPECTOR KLINE: So it's your position that if a nightclub is not doing pat-downs and wandings, even though there's no indication, rule, or regulation to that effect, that they are somehow in violation of something; is that what I'm understanding?

MR. BUTLER: No. The violation came in when there was altercation inside the night club but however, I do believe that each nightclub, if they have a certain type of clientele or certain crowd that enters their establishment, they should take some type of reasonable steps to ensure that their patrons are safe.

INSPECTOR KLINE: So it is dependent upon the clientele, isn't it?

MR. BUTLER: Could be.
INSPECTOR KLINE: And it's dependent upon the character of the establishment, correct?

MR. BUTLER: That's another factor.
INSPECTOR KLINE: All right. And that character can change over time, can't it; establishments change all the time, don't they?

MR. BUTLER: They do.
INSPECTOR KLINE: An operator, typically that are newly licensed, learn things about their establishments and as a result of that, implement new procedures, don't they?

MR. BUTLER: Correct.
INSPECTOR KLINE: So someone might have then and not think that they needed to search persons entering their establishments, but then when they have an incident with a gun, they change their mind and say we need to do this, right?

MR. BUTLER: It would be for their betterment to take some type of precautions but here again --

INSPECTOR KLINE: And does --
(Simultaneous speaking.)

MR. BUTLER: -- we're -- here again, we're still talking about --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- direction?
MR. BUTLER: I'm sorry.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Kline, can you give the witness an opportunity to answer the question, sir?

INSPECTOR KLINE: and doesn't that happen all the time with or without the Board's direction where an establishment learns based upon things that happen in its establishment --

MR. BUTLER: You ask --
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- according to your procedures?

MR. BUTLER: Based on situations and based on incidents, yes, they modify or change the procedures, yes.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Okay. And the fact that they didn't have those procedures in place in the first place isn't necessarily a violation, is it?

MR. CELO: Objection.
MR. BUTLER: Thank you.
MR. CELO: Phrasing and a very
ambiguous question. I'm not quite sure what that question was referring to.

MR. KLINE: Pretty clear to me but I'm happy to rephrase it --

MR. CELO: There were a lot of pronouns there and I'm not entirely sure what that question was.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Please rephrase the question, Mr. Kline.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Mr. Butler, so --
MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: -- the fact that an establishment that's been open, in this case, for a brief time learns things from its operation and then makes changes, that doesn't mean that what they were doing before was somehow violative of ABC law or regulations, does it?

MR. BUTLER: Not necessarily, no.
INSPECTOR KLINE: And that's
particularly true when there's no specific regulation requiring them to do what it is that they've change and are now doing, right?

MR. BUTLER: If I'm understanding you, you're saying that if they doesn't -- if they don't perform pat downs or searches in the
beginning, they pretty much not in violation of anything? It's only until something happens that they're in violation. Is that what I'm understanding you to say?

INSPECTOR KLINE: No. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying to you is in order -- do you agree that in order that an establishment should conduct searches, pat downs, what have you, if it knows or has reason to know that the nature of its establishments is such that it will attract people that want to bring in guns?

MR. BUTLER: Well, I think that given the history of violence of certain nightclubs and even though this one hasn't only been open for a few, I think that it's to their -- I think it's best that they take some type of precaution dealing with different crowds of people and different events that they have to ensure that their patrons are safe in any way given the history of violence in this city. I had a nightclub, I wouldn't want anybody to come in with a weapon. And also, I would take some type of precaution, either a visual or a pat down or a wand. So in this case, the issues are how this guy get in night club with a gun, you know,
whether they did a pat down or not. So I think that, you know --

INSPECTOR KLINE: And in this case, there's no evidence that there was a lack of visual inspection when people entered the establishment, correct? This --

MR. BUTLER: Well, as I say, you know, I -- I'm not certain happened prior to that. When I got there, you know, everything was pretty much over so I'm not certain if they did a visual. I know some particular nightclubs, when individuals are -- females are going into the club, they do do a visual, look inside their purses and, you know, and they at least go around the waistband of guys and see if they have any weapons of sorts. You know, it's not uncommon. But in this particular case, I think that even though they only been open for a certain amount of time and they had some type of training, they should have known to -- far as the violence and stuff in the city, they should have known to either do a visual or a -- at least a scan or a feel to see if anybody had anything on them. INSPECTOR KLINE: A couple more questions. So that would be true of one licensed
as a restaurant or a tavern that had entertainment, live entertainment as well, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Well, if you was talking about what type of entertainment. As you very well know, there are certain types of entertainment that attract certain crowds of individuals, you know, and you want to -- if you want to safeguard your patrons, then I'll suggest -- I would suppose that you would take the necessary steps to do that. You know, at least do a visual if not a pat down or a wand certain crowds or individuals that's going into a nightclub with certain type of entertainment. Not all entertainment is, you know, probably not required but certainly some type of visual to be on guard. I mean this is -- come on now, this is D.C. and this day and age, there's a lot of violence going on. And I'm certain if they have industrial training, security training, that they will either do a visual going inside the club or even attempt to pat down somebody, you know.

INSPECTOR KLINE: I don't have any further questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Butler,
it's correct that this establishment is a nightclub; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And is it correct that all nightclubs are required to have a security plan?

MR. BUTLER: Security plan, yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Do you know whether or not at the time of the incident if this establishment had a security plan?

MR. BUTLER: No. As -- no, they didn't at the time.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Now as part of having a security plan, would one of the -- I'm sorry. Within the security plan, are there provisions for pat downs or -- on the entrance of - -

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: -- of clientele to enter the establishment; is that a part of a typical security plan, are you aware?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. That would be part of a typical security plan, yes.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Mr. Short, do you have any questions you want to ask?

You're on mute. I can't hear you, Mr. Short.
MEMBER SHORT: Good morning, still -CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Turn your volume up, Mr. Short. I can hear you but you're just -- turn your volume up, sir.

MEMBER SHORT: That better?
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Up some more. MEMBER SHORT: Trying to do that, Mr. Chair. I'm having a problem.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: You're -- I can hear you, Mr. Short. I can hear you now.

MR. BUTLER: Yes. But I can barely hear you, Mr. Short.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I know, Mr. Butler. Just --

MR. BUTLER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: -- we are --
okay, so try your number.
MEMBER SHORT: Mr. Butler, now that it has been established by the question that was given to you by our Chairman, Chairman Anderson that all nightclubs are required to have security plans; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: Why is that nightclubs
have to have a security plan and not a restaurant or tavern as a requirement of their license?

MR. BUTLER: Restaurants -- here we talk about different clientele. Where you talk about a restaurant, you talk about families with little kids coming in to eat, maybe some background music at the most. When you're talking about a --

MEMBER SHORT: That's straight up. I'm not going to belabor that point. We've established that nightclubs are required by their license to have a security plan.

MR. BUTLER: Some type of --
MEMBER SHORT: So now I'd like to ask you what do security plans provide in the way of protections against people bringing in weapons of any type?

MR. BUTLER: Well, a security will indicate to their security staff what they are and what they are not supposed to do, you know. So if they had a security plan, I'm certain that it would be marked in the plan that upon entrance to this particular establishment, there's a pat down or a search of pocketbooks or a want.

MEMBER SHORT: So at the particular
time that this incident occurred and you investigated the gun incident, is it correct to say this particular establishment, Twelve After Twelve, did not have the required security plan; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: Did you check with someone and find out why they did not have a security plan that's required by law.

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir. When I came back -- when I come back to the office and did a search of the records, they -- it produced no type of security plan at that particular time.

MEMBER SHORT: And it was also stated that training by industry; is that the standard for people with a security plan --

MR. BUTLER: I --
MEMBER SHORT: -- in your knowledge?
MR. BUTLER: -- in my knowledge, so I'm not certain if that's the standard or not, because I do believe that different security companies have their own way of -- in training their people, whether they come from police department or some other type of entity.

MEMBER SHORT: Okay. Let me ask you
this question. Does this establishment, Twelve After Twelve, have any, or could you find, or did you find out from anyone that Twelve After Twelve, if any training was provided by any outside security companies?

MR. BUTLER: No, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: Now the testimony also was that the security persons were not identified. They were dressed just like everybody else in the nightclub; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: From my understanding, yes.

MEMBER SHORT: And is your understanding that the security persons wrestled down the perpetrator with a gun and escorted him out of the establishment, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: Was that after someone had hollered "gun" in the club and before he was taken out of the club that someone said this person having the problem has a gun?

MR. BUTLER: I'm not certain which came first, but I believe during the struggle, from what I understand, during the struggle, somebody may have noticed that he had a gun, a
weapon on his person.
MEMBER SHORT: Did the security persons ever check him for a gun before they let him out of the club, out of the nightclub?

MR. BUTLER: No. Not that I'm aware of, no. It wasn't until, from my understanding, he was looking for something that had -- that he had dropped, and the police officer went to stabilize him and felt that on his person.

MEMBER SHORT: So security never found or checked for a gun when they took him out of the club; is that a fair assessment to say?

MR. BUTLER: That's -- yes, sir, it is.

MEMBER SHORT: He was trying to get back into the club after security had taken him out; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct from my understanding, yes, sir.

MEMBER SHORT: Now this question I hope you have the answer to. Security plans normally say that security must have -- be marked differently than the clientele; is that true or not true?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. Some type of
identifying stating that they're security or, you know, to identify from the patrons and security staff.

MEMBER SHORT: Night of your investigation, no one had any identification as to being security persons; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: So would that have been in violation of a security plan?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER SHORT: Thank you very much for your answers, sir. Mr. Chairman, that's all I have at this time.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Any other questions by any other Board members? All right. Go ahead, Mr. Grandis.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Investigator Butler,
I want to thank you for your report and for your testimony today. I am correct -- it is correct that the report that you have been testifying, it's a report you wrote?

MR. BUTLER: Correct, sir.
MEMBER GRANDIS: is that correct?
MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER GRANDIS: Okay. In my reading
of the report, it does not seem to concern that there was a gun until the gentleman was outside and someone patted his jacket; am I understanding that is what is written in your report?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER GRANDIS: So there is no statement that anyone actually saw a gun in the establishment other than someone saying he has a gun?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir -- yes, sir.
MEMBER GRANDIS: And am I correct that I read the report properly or correctly that it was observed that this person threatened to kill somebody?

MR. BUTLER: I'm not certain about that part, sir.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Okay. I can go back.
Okay. But as far as what your report says, the security personnel, as soon as they -- I understand as soon as they were made aware of this altercation, they attempted to remove this gentleman from the club?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER GRANDIS: And it wasn't until they were outside the club that security or any
employee of the establishment actually witnessed the gun?

MR. BUTLER: To my understanding, when the police officer grabbed him or, you know, put him in custody, then that's when he discovered the gun.

MEMBER GRANDIS: that was outside, though?

MR. BUTLER: Outside of the establish -- yes, sir.

MEMBER GRANDIS: I think I heard you testify that this particular licensee was a new nightclub license, or was it a renewed night club license.

MR. BUTLER: I think it was a fairly new establishment from my understanding.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Is it your understanding -- do you -- and this may be outside your work area, but if there was an application for a nightclub license, as part of the application process, the agency is to request a security plan because they're seeking a nightclub license?

MR. BUTLER: That's -- you know,
sometime it can be a norm that if you have a nightclub that you should also provide some type of security plan.

MEMBER GRANDIS: I think regulations state nightclubs shall have security plans?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
MEMBER GRANDIS: So I think that's part of the testimony. But my question is are you aware -- and you may not be because you're an investigator, you're not licensing -- that if it's a new application for a nightclub, isn't part of the application -- is it part of the application process that before it can be approved, there must be a security plan submitted?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. To my understanding from experience, yes, sir.

MEMBER GRANDIS: Okay. I think from your testimony -- it's my impression from your testimony that this establishment, other than having not pat down, and I understand your concern about that on the outside, but you did not state in your testimony that the personnel in the establishment had any violations in how they handled the situation and that it was appropriate
to take the person outside?
MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MEMBER GRANDIS: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Chairman, thank you.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Any other
questions by any other Board members? All right. I have another question $I$ want to ask you or a couple of more questions $I$ want to ask you, Mr . Butler.

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Is it -- the person who allegedly had the gun, were they just a patron or they -- were they an employee of the -- are you if the person had any other relationship with this establishment other than just being a patron?

MR. BUTLER: From what I understand, he was just a patron, not a employee.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Are you aware if -- have you looked at the history of this case -- I'm sorry -- of this licensee? Did you provide -- as part of your report, did you list their history, do you have investigative history?

MR. BUTLER: Yes. I did attempt to bring up a history but there was no history
available under this particular license.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So, therefore, since -- you said -- since you're saying there's no history, the Board doesn't have or the agency doesn't have any knowledge or notice that a previous firearm or weapon was located in this establishment; is that correct?

MR. BUTLER: Correct, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Mr. Kline, any questions?

RECROSS-EXAMINATION
MR. KLINE: Yes, indeed. Mr. Butler.
MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: All you know is that there's no security plan on file, correct

MR. BUTLER: Correct, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: So in terms of what instruction was given to security or anything else, you don't know anything about that, do you? MR. BUTLER: No, sir.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Mr. Chairman, may I be granted privileges to share my screen, please? CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Orellana, can you please allow Mr. Kline to share his screen, please?

MR. ORELLANO: It's been elevated.
MR. KLINE: Mr. Butler, do you -- can you see what I've shared?

MR. BUTLER: Yes, sir.
INSPECTOR KLINE: All right. Do you recognize this?

MR. BUTLER: Not particularly, no, sir.

INSPECTOR KLINE: If I told you that this is what is on ABRA's website as guidelines for security plans --

MR. BUTLER: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes -yes -- yes.

INSPECTOR KLINE: -- have you --
MR. BUTLER: Okay. Yes. Refreshed my memory. Yes.

INSPECTOR KLINE: Okay. Now under minimum requirements, there's nine requirements for a security plan, correct?

MR. BUTLER: Yes.
INSPECTOR KLINE: All right. Can you show me there among those nine where it is that it says the security plan requires that an establishment search those entering the premises

MR. CELO: Objection, relevance. Mr.

Chair --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm sorry. Go ahead, sir.

MR. CELO: -- this document is the general requirements for all establishments. As we have talked about, this is not the -- it is not the question here as to what the regulations are as they relate to all establishments. The question is what method of operation this particular establishment was using.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Kline.
MR. KLINE: So Chair, there were a lot of questions about a security plan and there's no security plan. And somehow in some way that therefore means that this establishment has engaged in a method and manner of operation that allows guns to come into its premises. And there were lots of questions I heard about security plan. So I don't understand why this isn't relevant, and I don't like to object to Board member's question, so I normally don't but it's all come in, so let's talk about them. What are the requirements of the security plan, and how is it that a filing of a security plan consistent with these minimum requirements would have had
any bearing on the situation whatsoever. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm going to overrule the objection, but I know that Mr. Kline, the Board asked about it and I know I'd asked about a security plan because, as you are aware, all nightclubs are required to file security plans, and as part of the security plan, at least one of the regulations, it talks about the procedures for an individual to enter. So, but I am overruling the objection, so the witness can answer the question if he can.

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: As you stated, Mr. Chair, procedures to permitting patrons to enter, you know, I think that the establishment, under those particular terms, should take some type of reasonable steps to ensure that their patrons are safe, you know, providing that the patrons are permitted to enter under certain circumstances.

MR. KLINE: So, you were asked, you know, why is it that nightclubs are required to have security plans, and I believe you answered because of the nature of their activities, but the fact of the matter is there are other establishments that are required to have security
plans as well, aren't there?
INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yeah, there are, in fact, other establishments out there that may be required to have security plans based on their activities and based on the nature of their license.

MR. KLINE: And the Board will impose those requirements when it deems it appropriate, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: I'm sorry, can you say that again?

MR. KLINE: I said the Board will impose a requirement of a security plan --

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes.
MR. KLINE: -- when it deems it appropriate, correct

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yeah, yes, sir.
MR. KLINE: So, if this establishment had a filed security plan, the only way it would have had any bearing on this case is if it had a requirement that those entering the premises had to be searched in some way, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, if that was on their requirements, yes, sir.

MR. KLINE: But that is, searching is
not a specific requirement for a security plan for a nightclub, is it?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: You know, we --
MR. KLINE: By regulation --
INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: You know, we're going around and around. Okay, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Butler, please listen to the question and you are required to answer the question that is --

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: -- being asked.
INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Can you repeat the question again, sir?

MR. KLINE: Yes, the question is that the -- a security plan is not required to include provisions that persons entering the establishment be searched, is that correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yeah, I can barely hear you, but, yeah, I think you -- yeah, I think so. I can barely hear you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Butler, it's your system. I can hear him. If you didn't hear the question, sir, do not answer a question that you can barely hear.

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So, if you did not hear the question, please, Mister -- I can clearly hear Mr. Kline, but if you did not hear the question, $I$ do not want you to answer, to give an answer to a question that you can barely hear, sir.

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So, do you need Mr. Kline --

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yeah, you need to repeat it. I couldn't hear the question that clearly, sir.

MR. KLINE: Okay, so just, I mean, I think we've covered it, but I just, I want to be clear that the regulations do not require that a security plan require that persons entering a nightclub be searched, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct.
MR. KLINE: So, even if one had been filed, it may or may not have had that in it and it would have been acceptable, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct.
MR. KLINE: Thank you. I have nothing further.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: You can close
your screen, Mr. Kline, please.
MR. KLINE: Yes. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right, and any redirect?

MR. CELO: Yes, Mr. Chair. Mr. Butler, I want to jump off that last point first. When a security plan is filed, ABRA has the ability to either accept or reject a proposed security plan, correct?

MR. KLINE: Objection. I don't know whether he knows that. I mean, that's in the regulations and we know what the regulations require for a security plan and what they don't require, and what they require was summarized in what I just put up on the screen.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Overruling the objection. Let's move on. The witness testified. I'm overruling the objection. Go ahead.

MR. CELO: So, if ABRA determines that the proposed terms of the security plan are insufficient, they can reject it and require different terms, is that fair?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: From what I understand, yes.

MR. CELO: Okay, now if we jump all the way back to the beginning of that cross examination, you were asked if the security officers were wearing uniforms, it wouldn't have stopped the handgun coming into the facility. Do you remember that question?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: In this establishment, they didn't just have stationary. They had stationary and roving officers, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct, sir.
MR. CELO: Okay, in your experience, can the presence of clearly marked, identified security officers help to prevent an altercation from occurring?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: In my experience, yes.

MR. CELO: So, if the security
officers in this establishment were wearing uniforms, might it have impacted whether or not the altercation actually occurred?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: You were also asked if the cameras would have stopped handguns coming in and you said they would not have. Do you remember
that?
INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: However, if this
establishment had had full camera coverage of the interior, would that have helped with the investigation either from ABRA or MPD?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: You spoke -- we talked about you spoke to the chief security officer, I believe it was a Mr. Todorovic, about how security occurred on that day and how the security was prepared, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes.
MR. CELO: Now, if this establishment or any establishment that relies exclusively on industry experience were to hire somebody for their first job as a security officer, would that person have any industry experience?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Possibly, yes.
MR. CELO: If it was it was their
first time being hired?
INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: If it was their
first time being hired without industrial experience, would they have --

MR. CELO: Right.

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: No.
MR. CELO: And they would receive no training either, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: And you asked Mr. Todorovic
what procedures they used to check patrons entering the establishment, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: And he stated to you that the only check they did was to make sure patrons were over the age of 21 on that night?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: So, despite all of the implications that there's no evidence of a lack of visual inspection, he didn't actually tell you they did any visual inspection?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: No, he didn't.
MR. CELO: And he didn't tell you that they wanded and he didn't tell you that they did pat downs?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: So, he only told you that they made sure people were over 21 years old? INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Over 21, yes.
MR. CELO: He didn't tell you that
they checked women's purses or handbags either, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: No, sir.
MR. CELO: Okay, now, and just one other point on that, did Mr. Todorovic tell you that he instructed his security personnel to take any of those steps?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Not that I'm aware of, no, sir.

MR. CELO: All right, so they never asserted that they were telling people to follow what a security plan would say?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: There was also a discussion on cross examination of whether or not establishments can learn and grow from their mistakes and make changes to their procedures. Do you remember that conversation?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: And would you hope that this establishment is now conducting pat downs or using a wand?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Some type of security, yes, sir.

MR. CELO: Okay, now even if this
establishment were to learn and grow from its past mistakes, that doesn't mean that they didn't make those past mistakes, correct?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct.
MR. CELO: And even if they made a determination as to what security was appropriate and reasonable, are they still responsible for the outcomes of their decisions?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes.
MR. CELO: Okay, so you agree and we're all clear that there's no regulation requiring searching of patrons on entering the premises, right?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Yes, sir.
MR. CELO: But because they chose not to search the patrons and because that lack of search led to a gun being brought in, is that why this charge was made in this case?

INVESTIGATOR BUTLER: Correct, sir. MR. CELO: I have no further questions at this time.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Celo, just a quick question. You had mentioned the names of some managers. Can you spell those names for the record, please?

MR. CELO: Yes, thank you. I should have done that. It was head of security Boris, B-0-R-I-S, Todorovic, T-O-D-0-R-0-V-I-C.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you. All right, does the government has another witness? MR. CELO: No, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Does the government rest?

MR. CELO: Yes, Mister -- well, just for the record, I would note that the case report is made part of the record as a matter of law --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right, thank you.

MR. CELO: -- and then we rest.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: So --
MR. KLINE: I disagree with that proposition, but have no --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: What is it that you disagree with, Mr. Kline?

MR. KLINE: That it's part of the record as a matter of law. This is a contested case proceeding. Unless it's introduced in this proceeding, it's not part of the record.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. KLINE: I have no objection to it
being in the record.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Kline, by our rules and regulations as a matter of law, the case report is a part of the Board's records. It does not have to be introduced formally.

Mr. Kline, if you review the regulations -- I know that you're a learned counsel and you have been practicing law in this area for a number of years, but if you review our regulations, our regulation clearly states that the case report is a part of the Board's records, that it doesn't have to be formally moved into evidence, okay?

All right, do you have -- but the government has asked that the document be moved into evidence and you stated that you do not have any objection, so. All right, thank you, sir. All right, do you have a witness you wish to call, sir?

MR. KLINE: I do not.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right.
MR. KLINE: We rest.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay, do the parties wish to make a -- all right, let me ask you a question then. I guess, let me ask a
question. Does the government have a closing, wish to make a closing?

MR. CELO: Yes, Mr. Chair, and perhaps before we get to that, if opposing counsel is willing, I would state that the government is willing to waive any written findings of fact and conclusions of law, and proceed exclusively to verbal closing.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Kline?
MR. KLINE: We're not waiving.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm sorry, you're what?

MR. KLINE: We're not waiving.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right, so with that said, do you still wish to make a closing argument or -- I'm sorry, I just -- hold on. I just did something.

MR. CELO: Yes, then the government --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Hold on. Hold on, please. Hold on, please. Hold on. Hold on. I just did some -- I did -- I touched something, so my screen had disappeared for the moment. All right, so does the government wish to make a closing?

MR. CELO: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Go ahead, sir. MR. CELO: May it please the Board -and I apologize if you can hear the siren outside.

May it please the Board, this case is about a simple fact. The establishment operated its procedures in a way to allow an altercation involving a gun to occur inside its establishment, inside its premises. What happened in this case was totally preventable.

Now, I anticipate that Mr. Kline will argue that there's no requirement that the establishment pat down or wand its patrons on entry, and that is true. However, should they choose not to do so, they own the results of that decision.

In this case, the operations of the establishment were deficient in a number of areas. First, they did not train their security personnel. Second, they did not pat down patrons entering the establishment. Third, they did not conduct any search. They did not wand patrons entering their establishment.

Fourth, they did not have sufficient camera coverage to allow a proper investigation
of the incident after it occurred by MPD or by ABRA, and as we've noted, they also did not have a security plan on file as they were required and which likely would have included the requirements that they take all of those previous steps that I just outlined.

Now, on their own, none of those details are a violation. We're all in agreement on that. However, when they choose not to follow those steps, when they choose not to take reasonable industry standard procedures for nightclubs, they own the consequences when somebody slips through their lack of security and brings a gun into their establishment.

I draw your attention to the most recent relevant case on this point, which we've already talked about, Bliss, formerly Lemma Holdings, LLC v. the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board, 235(a)3d, 802, a case from 2022 on appeal.

That case has some striking
similarities to this case specifically as it relates to the relevant charge of violation of D.C. Code 25-803(a)(1), or (a)(2), I apologize.

25-803(a)(2) holds that the
establishment allowed for its licensed
establishment to be used for any unlawful or disorderly purpose.

Specifically, as per 25-823(b), that occurs even in a single incident when the licensee has engaged in a method of operation that is conducive to be unlawful or disorderly conduct.

That is what occurred in this case for the reasons outlined earlier. They did not conduct proper searches of patrons coming in. They did not train their security officers appropriately.

They did not have proper camera coverage and they did not have a security plan. They operated in a method that was conducive to a gun being brought in and an altercation occurring.

And although I omitted it before, the lack of marked security also contributed, as we heard, to the altercation actually happening. Visual security presence could have prevented that.

As we look at Bliss, in both cases, the management failed to follow reasonable security procedures to prevent the incident. In
both cases, the establishment failed to ensure that they have security cameras covering the entire nightclub.

In both cases, the security operated in a way that amounted to willful blindness of the issues inside the establishment and that's precisely what we have here. We have willful blindness as to what is coming in.

They don't get off the hook because they decided we're not going to look at anyone, and whatever anyone brings in is fine, and oh, we're just a brand-new establishment. We don't know what industry standard is. We're just a brand-new establishment. We don't know what the rules should be.

They don't train their security guards. They rely on industry experience. They are responsible for what occurs. They acted in a way that demonstrated an unwillingness of the security personnel to properly manage their facility.

## That is also identical to the

 precedent we have. Their choices to not monitor security resulted in what happened today and it resulted in a violation. It is consistent withprecedent.
We believe that the Board should issue an appropriate penalty and should also require that a security plan be filed and approved, and that the security plan provides for pat downs and wanding.

We do not want another incident with a gun coming into this establishment. With that, I rest my close. However, I reserve the right for rebuttal. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Celo. Mr. Kline?

MR. KLINE: -- concerning, and it's why we've spent the time on it today that we have, and the reason that it's concerning is we had a time when the Board, not made up of its current members, Monday morning quarterbacked and after the fact imposed requirements that were not requirements of law.

And that was finally changed when the Rumors case, 1900 M Restaurant Associates v. the ABC Board went to the D.C. Court of Appeals, and after that, the practice stopped. We didn't have the Board coming in.

Instead, what the Board did, to its
credit, was have fact-finding hearings and said hey, let's see what went on here. Let's see how we can do it better, and maybe you should do this and maybe you should do that. Are you willing to consider it?

That's not what we had here. We had a fact-finding hearing, and instead of the constructive approach, we end up in a show cause proceeding with the imposition of requirements that are not law, with arguments that there are these industry standards when there are no experts that have testified as to what those industry standards are, and we have a complete after-the-fact analysis of what went on.

Now, let's look at what did go on, and this is in the report and it was covered on testimony. The unrefuted evidence is a fight broke out. Security stepped in and separated them. One of the combatants had a gun.

He was restrained by security. He was brought outside. MPD was flagged down. He was turned over to MPD to be dealt with and MPD discovered the gun, and at one point, he tried to get back in and was prevented by security from going back in.

Now, how do we get from there to the willful blindness and the hiding of security issues that we find in the Bliss case, where the Bliss case involved the assaulting of a patron by an employee of the establishment? That is not what we have here.

I mean, what we quite simply have is after the fact, an appraisal of what went on and said yeah, you know, you should have done this because then the gun wouldn't have gotten in. I mean, after much testimony, it appears that the failure, such as there was one, was the failure not to search.

Now, if one looks at the requirements for a security plan, none of that is required, nor are the other things that are listed here. There's no minimum requirement for training, and in fact, the investigator testified that hiring people who are experienced in the industry, I'm paraphrasing, but who have had training elsewhere.

What is training? There is no recognize training course. There is no official training course that this Board recognizes. People learn and are trained in different ways.

There is no evidence whatsoever that the security personnel in this case did not have the adequate background to do the job.

In fact, the evidence is to the contrary, they did. When the gun was discovered and the fight broke out, they did exactly what they were supposed to do. They didn't search, again, not a requirement. Look at the security plan regulations, not there.

They didn't have adequate cameras. Again, there is nothing in the requirements for a security plan or nowhere is there a requirement as to what the minimum camera coverage is. The Board and licensees, including many of my clients, have had many discussions about coverage.

And the Board said yeah, we think you should have better coverage. We'll send our investigator out. We'll help you and look at the establishment and make sure that there's proper coverage, and we have just no evidence to support any of this.

What are the procedures that were lacking? I mean, the one procedure that we have is there wasn't wanding, but did this licensee
have reason to believe that weapons were going to be brought into the establishment?

Now, the investigator ultimately testified on cross with some hesitation yeah, it absolutely depends upon who your crowd is, and who is there, and in fact, we got into what seemed to me, for me, a very uncomfortable suggestion of profiling, and said, yeah, we should profile our customers to make determinations.

If these requirements were so important that we are going to punish licensees for failing to follow them, then they should be in the regulations, and if they're not in the regulations, then they're not going to make up a violation.

I mean, this is not Lavelle, which is the leading case of using your premises for unlawful or disorderly purpose. And for those of you that are unfamiliar with it, some of you Board members may be, Lavelle was a club that operated, guess where, on the first floor of the Reeves Center where the ABC Board normally sits for these hearings.

And if you read the opinion, it was
completely out of control. I mean, people were getting shot. People were getting stabbed. There were weapons in the establishment all of the time.

And under those circumstances, yeah, it's pretty clear a record was established that failure to wand, failure to search, and failure to do all of these things certainly created an atmosphere for, if not unlawful, certainly disorderly and probably unlawful, an unlawful, disorderly practices on the premises.

And it is perfectly appropriate under those circumstances to punish a licensee and say hey, you didn't pay attention to anything. People are getting shot. People were killed. That's not what we have here.

What we have here is a licensee who made decisions about its practices, and admittedly, based upon the testimony of the investigator, those decisions were based on your knowledge of who your crowd is, what type of place you have, what type of atmosphere you have, and that may change over time.

And, in fact, this Board has had many licensees before it that were on a fact finding,
not in this situation where we're going to punish you because after the fact, we find out you didn't do what we think you should do.

But the Board, in an instructive setting, in a fact-finding situation has frequently said, you know, will you consider this? Will you consider that? And that is a constructive approach to a situation like this. This is not.

To haul someone in and have a hearing where, well, you didn't comply with this. Where is that in the regulation? Oh, it's not, but you should do it anyway. You didn't comply with that. Where is that in the regulation? Well, it's not, but that's standard practices. You should do that.

This is outrageous, and it's unfair to this licensee and it is unfair to every licensee in the District. I mean, the question is did they have reason to believe that weapons were going to be brought in? There is absolutely no foundation or testimony about that in this case.
It's like the gun came in. It
happened. You should have wanded. Did Comet Pizza know that a madman with a gun was going to
come into their place and shoot it up? Should they have been wanding?

Do we bring them in after the fact and say hey, this guy from South Carolina came in and shot up your place, people could have gotten killed, maybe you should have had procedures in place to prevent that from happening?

When there was a shootout on July 22, 2021 in front of Le Diplomate and people were caught in the crossfire, $I$ mean, it wasn't in Le Diplomate, but does that give reason for Le Diplomate to now pat and wand?

Because it easily could have been in there. Do they need to pat and wand every person that comes into their establishment? Well, if they're a nightclub, I guess they don't need to.

The fact of the matter is there are guns everywhere. There was another incident on The Wharf on July 17, 2022, and two were shot and one of them was killed.

Now, all of the establishments on The Wharf, should they be patting and searching everyone that sits there? Should The Wharf have procedures in place to prevent people from entering The Wharf area before they've been
searched and patted?
Well, maybe, and maybe that's
something that needs to be considered, but to impose it after the fact and say somebody was killed on July 17, 2022. You didn't do enough. You should have known that there were guns going to come in, and Wharf, you're in violation. That's just flawed.

I mean, regrettably, guns are everywhere in our society and there are more than 400 million guns in this country, and the Supreme Court, unfortunately, had restricted all of our ability to do much about it.

I mean, they basically said, you know, in a case that came out of the District, that there's little regulation that could be done, but the Attorney General's Office wants to hold this licensee to a standard that no one else can meet.

None of the things that are complained about here, with the exception of the pat downs, which we talked a lot about, are particularly relevant to preventing this incident.

And in reference to the security plan, there's one thing I want to mention. 25-836(b) says no license shall be issued to a nightclub
unless a security plan is filed. So, is the establishment at fault for not filing? Does the Agency bear some responsibility for that? I think Mr. Grandis touched on it. Yeah, absolutely. So, it wasn't filed.

There isn't any evidence that they didn't have procedures in place. Do we think that the way this security team reacted to this situation where they restrained the gunman and they brought him out and turned him over to police demonstrates that they had no plan in place and had no idea how to react to this situation simply because there wasn't a filing with the Agency?

The evidence is to the contrary. The evidence is that yeah, they were trained. They had a plan. They knew exactly what they were supposed to do. The only issue here is the wanding.

So, failure to follow the plan? Your agency shares responsibility for that because the license shouldn't have been issued. Does that excuse the licensee? No, the licensee has responsibility to file it, but the Agency had a responsibility not to issue the license until it
was filed.
So, and that's not the charge here anyway. We spent a lot of time on that. We spent a lot of time on things that would have been in the plan that are not required by law and it's very, very troubling.

As I said before, this is not the Bliss case. This is not Club U. What happened here, as a I said before, there are a lot of guns. One of them made it into 1212. When that happened, security acted promptly, quickly, and responsibly to restrain the man. They took him out and they turned him over to police.

What more can we ask? And if there is more that needs to be done, these are lessons learned and lessons to be applied after the fact and say someone got a gun in. What are we going to do about this?

And that would be a perfectly appropriate conversation to have in a fact finding, not an appropriate conversation to have in a show cause proceeding, but this is just wildly inappropriate.

This case is completely different from Bliss where an employee was involved in an
assault and ownership tried to cover up. It's completely different than -- there's The Cabin case where an employee was involved in an assault.

This is certainly completely different than Lavelle, or Club U, or whatever you want to call it, where things were completely out of hand. This is more like the Rumors case.

We've got one incident, and although one incident as we know under the law can give rise to a showing of allowing the premises to be used for unlawful or disorderly purpose, one of the things is to be considered.

Even as was talked about, I think, in Bliss, is was there a pattern? In other words, if guns were coming in every week, then, yeah, we're here. It's appropriate. We should be here and the Board should be saying look at what you did. Look at this history.

In most cases failure to -- or using the establishment for an unlawful or disorderly purpose should require some sort of pattern. The law says some sort of pattern or a method of operation.

The method of operation here is an
after-the-fact imposed requirement that people entering the establishment be searched, and it's wrong. It won't be sustained on appeal, and we would ask that you find for the licensee and find no liability on the part of the licensee. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Kline. Mr. Celo, do you need --

MR. CELO: Yes, yes, Mr. Chair, I would have rebuttal close.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Go ahead, please.

MR. CELO: Thank you. May it please the Board, I'll start with the legal argument. Attorney Kline cited quite a lot to the Rumors case. However, I would note for the Board that the Rumors case was explicitly superseded by the Bliss case. That's what we have to look for now, the 2020 precedent.

Essentially, what I got from that closing argument is that Attorney Kline would really have preferred that ABRA decide to conduct a fact-finding hearing instead of a show cause hearing in this case.

There was no citation of authority
that says the fact-finding hearing was the only appropriate option. There was no citation of authority that says the show cause wasn't. There was no citation of authority that says that these proceedings are in any way inappropriate.

The determination was made that the show cause was appropriate and that determination was reasonable. It was not arbitrary. It was not capricious. It was not an abuse of discretion and this Board absolutely can impose penalties under a show cause proceeding.

I'd like to draw an analogy under the law here. There's a legal requirement that you have insurance if you drive an automobile, not the same requirement for a motorcycle.

You can choose not to have insurance for a motorcycle. However, if you get into an accident, you are still responsible for that choice. You are responsible to pay the consequences of that decision.

In this case, it is true that they were not required to pat people down entering the establishment or to wand people. We are not filing charges saying that they failed to do that. However, when their choice results in a
crime occurring, they are responsible for making that choice. That is what the reasonableness Attorney Kline kept bringing up refers to.

The issue of changing over time and what more can we ask of this establishment, this licensee, and how on earth do we get to willful blindness that was brought up? We got to willful blindness because the security of the nightclub willingly chose not to look. They willingly chose to let people in without searching anyone.

Attorney Kline says hey, we have no pattern here. It's not as if guns are being brought in on a regular basis. Well, how would the licensee know? They never look. They never search. The only reason we found out in this case is because the person who brought a gun in also started a fight.

The establishment chose not to have sufficient security. They bear the responsibility for that choice. With that, I rest.

However, I would, just for the sake of the record, I didn't want to do this to interrupt opposing counsel's close, but I do object and move to strike the facts not in evidence of

Attorney Kline's close specifically as they relate to the other shootings and incidents, and most especially as they relate to his suggestion of profiling comments. I would move to strike those comments.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'll take that under advisement. We'll take that under advisement in the decision that the Board ultimately makes in this case.

All right, the record is now closed. Do the parties wish to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law or waive their rights to do so?

MR. CELO: It appears we will be filing.

MR. KLINE: Yeah, the licensee wants to file.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right, then if the parties choose to file proposed findings of fact -- since the parties have chosen to file proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, then 90 days from when the Board receives its proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law. So, therefore, the transcripts will be available within the next three weeks and the
proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law are then due to the Board 30 days from the date that you receive the transcript.

The parties are -- if you change your mind, please advise the Board and the other party as soon as possible if you change your mind regarding doing the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, all right?

All right, as Chairperson of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board for the District of Columbia and in accordance with D.C. Code Section 2575 of the Open Meetings Act, I move that the ABC Board hold a closed meeting for the purpose of seeking legal advice from our counsel on case number 22-251-000, I'm sorry, 25-251-00009, Twelve After Twelve, pursuant to D.C. Code Section 2575(b)(4)(a) of the Open Meetings Act and deliberating upon case number 22-251-00009, Twelve After Twelve, for the reasons cited in D.C. Official Code Section 2575 (b)(13) of the Open Meetings Act. Is there a second?

MEMBER SHORT: Mr. Short, I second. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Short and Mr. Grandis have seconded the motion. We'll now
take a roll call vote. Mr. Short?
MEMBER SHORT: Mr. Short, I agree. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Cato? MEMBER CATO: Bobby Cato, I agree. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Ms. Hansen?

Mr. Grandis?
MEMBER GRANDIS: Edward Grandis, I agree.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And Mr. Anderson, I agree. As it appears that the motion has passed, I hereby give notice that the ABC Board will recess this proceeding to hold a closed meeting pursuant to Section 2575 of the Open Meetings Act.

All right, thank you very much for your presentation today and this matter is recessed, all right? Okay, thank you.

MR. KLINE: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, Mr. Kline?
MR. KLINE: I have the afternoon
matter and I just wanted to confirm that the Board will be back at 1:30 in terms of time? CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, the Board, we will -- we are -- I am going to read our -- I know that there was a motion filed and the Board
will make a determination at our -- we will read the results this morning in a couple of minutes, but I believe at current, please plan, unless you hear otherwise, please plan and we'll have a hearing at 1:30 unless you hear otherwise.

MR. KLINE: Yeah, I wasn't asking you about that. I was just asking in terms of timing and the Board's schedule.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, the Board, we have an extensive calendar to do before and the Board is going to go to lunch, and so I believe -- I'll say --

MR. KLINE: I'll see you at 1:30.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: 2:00, Mr. Kline, okay?

MR. KLINE: 2:00, okay.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: 2:00. I will advise legal to advise the other parties that we will, hold on, that we will, our afternoon, that, yeah, that the afternoon session will start at 2:00, okay?

MR. KLINE: Thank you. That lets me eat lunch too. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right, thank you. All right, I'm just asking -- all
right, thank you. That case, your case, our case is completed, the case this morning, so thank you. The Board is now -- all right, we're going to be off the record for -- give me -- it's three minutes. I'll ask all Board members to -- sir, your case is over, so you can log off.

MR. BIABANI: Thank you very much. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: You're welcome. It's 12:24. I just need to take a six-minute break, so we're going to be off the record for six minutes. I'm just asking all Board members just hold tight and we'll come back on the record at 12:30. So, just don't log off, just -- yeah, 12:30.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 12:24 p.m.)
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