## THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL BOARD

In the Matter of:		)			
Momentux Hospitality, LLC ) t/a RUSH		/	No.: se No:	23-PRO-00061 ABRA-125250 2023-537	
Application for a New	N	)	100	2023 337	
Retailer's Class CT License		)			
at promises		)			
at premises 1923 9 th Street, N.W	I	)			
Washington, D.C. 20		)			
		Ĵ			
<b>BEFORE:</b>	Donovan Anderson, C James Short, Member Bobby Cato, Member Jeni Hansen, Member Edward S. Grandis, M				
ALSO PRESENT: Momentux Hospitality, LLC, t/a RUSH, Applicant				oplicant	
	Richard Bianco, Counsel, on behalf of the Respondent				
	Zoe Lu, Designated Representative, Group of Five or More Residents and Property Owners, Protestant				
	Martha Jenkins, Gene Alcoholic Beverage R		ninistra	tion	

## **ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR REINSTATEMENT**

The above-mentioned Applicant filed a motion for reinstatement after its application was dismissed for failing to appear at a required Protest Status Hearing on October 4, 2023. The Applicant requests in its motion and reply that the failure to appear in this case should be excused for good cause pursuant to 23 DCMR § 1602.3, over the objection of the Protestant.

In this case, the Applicant avers that the web link to the virtual hearing was sent to the firm's paralegal, who left his firm, and not the Applicant's counsel, who was listed in the Applicant's designation form. *Mot. for Reinstatement*, at 1-2. The Board notes that nowhere in the form is the firm's paralegal selected as an official point of contact. *Id.* at Exhibit A.

The Board finds it reasonable for a party to expect that email communications will be sent to the phone numbers, mailing addresses, and emails provided to the agency. As a matter of due process, when hearing related communications are not sent to the designated locations and recipients, it is not reasonable to presume that appropriate notice has occurred or been completed. Therefore, any absences related to such a failure, whether in whole or in part, should be deemed for good cause and should not lead to dismissal until appropriate notice is achieved.

The Board has further reviewed the arguments presented by the Protestant but finds the arguments unpersuasive where due process and fundamental fairness concerns outweigh the considerations presented by the Protestant. Therefore, the Board grants reinstatement.

## ORDER

Therefore, on this 25th day of October 2023, the Board **APPROVES** the Motion for Reinstatement filed by the Applicant. The parties are advised that the Protest Status Hearing is now scheduled for November 8, 2023 at 10:30 a.m. and the Protest Hearing is scheduled for Thursday, December 14, 2023 at 10:00 a.m.

A copy of this Order shall be provided to the parties.

District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Board

eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
a at i
Donovan (Anderson
Key: ac430b96b99d5f09e4b730093d1dccd8

Donovan Anderson, Chairperson

	ned via Seamles	
~		
()	(	

James Short, Member

L	
-	

Bobby Cato, Member

	eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com
T .	QL, MAL.
Jeni	Hansen, Member

Jeni Hansen, Member

	eSigned via SeamlessDocs.com	
Edwa	rrd Grandis, Member	
Key	r: 5027bda7ff9f0040ec14adeb52541ce5	

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. Official 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; (202-879-1010). 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).