

**THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE AND CANNABIS BOARD**

In the Matter of:

Howsoon Cham
t/a Moi Moi Restaurant

Summary Suspension

at premises
1627 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

)
)
)
) Case No.: N/A
) License No: N/A
) Order No: 2025-662
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

BEFORE: Donovan Anderson, Chairperson
Silas Grant, Jr., Member
Teri Janine Quinn, Member
Ryan Jones, Member
David Meadows, Member

PARTIES: Howsoon Cham, t/a Moi Moi Restaurant, Respondent

Franz Jobson, Counsel, on behalf of the Respondent

ORDER AFFIRMING CEASE AND DESIST

INTRODUCTION

On May 14, 2025, the Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Control Board reviewed compelling evidence that Howsoon Cham, t/a Moi Moi Restaurant (Respondent) illegally engaged in the sale, service, and consumption of alcohol on May 9, 2025. On May 22, 2025, after receiving a request for an expedited hearing, the Board granted a hearing to the Respondent to challenge the cease and desist order. Based on the evidence and testimony adduced at trial, the Board affirms the cease-and-desist order imposed by Board Order No. 2025-642. As such, the cease-and-desist order to immediately cease the sale, service and consumption of alcohol on the premises shall remain in effect.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The following statements represent the Board's findings of fact based on the evidentiary record. In reaching its determination, the Board considered the evidence, the testimony of the

witnesses, the arguments of the parties, and all documents comprising the Board’s official file. The Board credits all testimony and evidence identified or cited below unless otherwise stated.¹

1. Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Administration (ABRA) Supervisory Investigator (SI) Stephanie Redding observed online advertisements from Jadore.dc offering the sale of various alcohol products at an event at 1627 K Street, N.W. *Case Report*, at 1. On May 9, 2025, SI Redding entered 1627 K Street, N.W., in an undercover capacity. *Id.* at 2. At the establishment, she bought a \$26 pineapple martini. *Id.* The location had no alcohol license, because the prior license was revoked in Board Order No. 2024-049, issued on February 6, 2024. Inside, SI Redding observed other indicia of the operation of an illegal alcohol establishment, including a nightclub setup, the presence of bartenders, security, and a menu. *Id.* SI Redding then left the establishment with the purchased drink in her hand and sat on a couch set up outside. *Id.* at 3. While inside the premises, SI Redding identified the presence of Howsoon Cham and heard bartenders identify him as the owner and chef of the premises. *Id.* at 2.

2. The Board did not find the testimony of Mr. Cham credible and is not persuaded by the argument that a caterer oversaw any event at the establishment or that SI Redding’s testimony or report is not credible. First, on the night of SI Redding’s visit, she did not observe a caterer in charge of event, which is evidenced by the lack of any caterer license posted in plain sight, which is required under the law. *See* D.C. Code § 25-711(a). Second, the receipt in evidence lists Moi Moi as the recipient of funds and does not list the caterer as the seller, which is evidence that it was the seller of alcohol and not a caterer. Indeed, where a non-alcohol licensee is collecting money related to the purchase of alcohol, this is sufficient evidence that it is engaged in the act of selling alcohol without a license in violation of D.C. Official Code § 25-102(a).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

3. Title 25 of the District of Columbia (D.C.) Official Code (Title 25) provides the Board with the authority to order any individual or licensee to immediately cease “. . . violating any provision of . . . [Title 25 when] the violation has caused, or may cause, immediate and irreparable harm to the public” D.C. Official Code § 25-829(a).

4. The Board finds that the continued operation of the Respondent’s business in violation of D.C. Official Code §§ 25-102(a) and 25-102(d). Under § 25-102(a), “No person shall sell any alcoholic beverage in the District without having first obtained an appropriate license as required by this title.” D.C. Code § 25-102(a). In this case, SI Redding was able to purchase alcohol at the establishment despite the location not having a liquor license. *Supra*, at ¶¶ 1-2. As such, the Respondent was not authorized to sell, serve, or to permit the consumption of alcoholic beverages on the premises and this activity on the premises violates D.C. Official Code § 25-102.

5. The Board further finds that the illegal sale of alcohol causes irreparable harm to the public by allowing the facilitators to maintain a continuing nuisance that threatens the safety and welfare of the public. All violations of Title 25 are deemed nuisances pursuant to § 25-805. D.C. Official

¹ In light of the time required to issue an opinion under the law, the Board issues this opinion without the benefit of the transcript. The Board notes that is sufficiently well versed in the facts and evidence adduced at trial to issue this Order.

Code § 25-805; *see also Com. ex rel. Preate v. Danny's New Adam & Eve Bookstore*, 625 A.2d 119, 122 (1993) (It is well-settled that even a lawful business may be enjoined from operation if it is shown that, under the particular circumstance, its operation constitutes a public nuisance); *Camp v. Warrington*, 227 Ga. 674, 674, (1971) (“where it is made to appear with reasonable certainty that irreparable harm and damage will occur from the operation of an otherwise lawful business amounting to a continuing nuisance, equity will restrain the construction, maintenance or operation of such lawful business.”). In this case, permitting the business to continue to illegally operate without approval would allow the ownership to maintain and benefit from the operation of a continuing nuisance and to continue to endanger the public.

6. Furthermore, the Board is convinced that the circumvention of the licensing process threatens the health, safety, and welfare of the public. The misuse of alcohol encourages crime, disorder, and other antisocial behavior. The licensing process keeps those who cannot be trusted to superintend a licensed event, such as criminals, individuals with a history of repeated violations of the District’s alcohol laws, and those without sufficient knowledge and training, from obtaining a license. Therefore, the continued operation of the business cannot be allowed until an appropriate alcohol license is obtained.

ORDER

Therefore, the Board, on this 4th day of June 2025, hereby **AFFIRMS** Board Order No. 2025-642 and maintains the cease and desist order imposed by that order. ABRA shall serve notice by certified mail or personal delivery on the Respondent.

District of Columbia
Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Board

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
Donovan Anderson
Key: ac43cb98c9d5f0be4b730093d1dccc8

Donovan Anderson, Chairperson



Silas Grant, Jr., Member

Teri Janine Quinn

Teri Janine Quinn, Member



Ryan Jones, Member



David Meadows, 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 and Cannabis Administration, 899 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 4200-A, Washington, D.C. 20002.

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).