

**THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL BOARD**

In the Matter of:)	
)	
)	
Crujiente, LLC)	Case No.: 22-PRO-00017
t/a Anejo Bar & Grill)	License No.: ABRA-116070
)	Order No.: 2021-154
Application for a Substantial Change to a)	
Retailer's Class CT License)	
)	
at premises)	
3920 14th Street, N.W.)	
Washington, D.C. 20011)	

BEFORE: Donovan Anderson, Chairperson
James Short, Member
Bobby Cato, Member
Rafi Aliya Crockett, Member
Jeni Hansen, Member
Edward S. Grandis, Member

ALSO PRESENT: Crujiente, LLC, t/a Anejo Bar & Grill, Applicant

Daniel E. Alexander, Protestant

Adrienne Morris, Protestant

Steve Donahoe, Protestant

Martha Jenkins, General Counsel
Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

The Application filed by Crujiente, LLC, t/a Anejo Bar & Grill (Applicant), for a Substantial Change to add a dance floor to its Retailer's Class CT License, having been protested, came before the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board (Board) for a Roll Call Hearing on March 28, 2022. On March 28, 2022, the Board dismissed the Protests of Daniel E. Alexander, Adrienne Morris, and Steve Donahoe (Protestants). Specifically, they were dismissed because none of these parties were or are abutting property owners. D.C. Official Code § 25-601(1)(A)).

Subsequently, the Protestants indicated that they filed in error as abutting property owners, and indicated they intended to file as a group of five or more residents and property owners. The Protestants also provided a petition signed on April 7, 2022. Nevertheless, switching one's status as an abutting property owner to another status after the expiration of the protest period is not permitted by D.C. Official Code § 25-602 and 23 DCMR § 1601.8. *In re The Blagden Alley Entertainment, LLC, The American*, Case No. 14-PRO-00019, Board Order No. 2014-238, 2-3 (D.C.A.B.C.B. May 28, 2014) (saying "permitting the abutting property owners to seek standing under a new ground would allow them to evade the protest filing requirements of § 25-602(a)").

CONCLUSION

Therefore, the Board, on this 20th day of April 2022, hereby **DENIES** the motion for reconsideration. The ABRA shall deliver a copy of this order to the Parties.

District of Columbia
Alcoholic Beverage Control Board

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
Donovan Anderson
Key: ac43cb9eb9645f09e4b730093d1dccc8

Donovan Anderson, Chairperson

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
James Short
Key: 547ae3738b20a6eac8d1b532a2d2948ec

James Short, Member

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
Bobby Cato
Key: 2a6d3fad7be146d7f4b75bd7917d20d

Bobby Cato, Member

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
Rafi Aliya Crockett, Member
Key: b560e91845e1f0e4016155e5c12f81cc

Rafi Crockett, Member

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
Jeni Hansen, Member
Key: 82172931f0509447491b56f9c2a41899

Jeni Hansen, Member

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
Edward Grandis, Member
Key: 5027bda7f9f0d040ec14adeb52541ce5

Edward S. Grandis, Member

Pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 25-433(d)(1), any party adversely affected may file a Motion for Reconsideration of this decision within ten (10) days of service of this Order with the Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration, Reeves Center, 2000 14th Street, NW, 400S, Washington, D.C. 20009.

Also, pursuant to section 11 of the District of Columbia Administrative Procedure Act, Pub. L. 90-614, 82 Stat. 1209, D.C. Code § 2-510 (2001), and Rule 15 of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, any party adversely affected has the right to appeal this Order by filing a petition for review, within thirty (30) days of the date of service of this Order, with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, 430 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. However, the timely filing of a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to 23 DCMR § 1719.1 stays the time for filing a petition for review in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals until the Board rules on the motion. See D.C. App. Rule 15(b) (2004).