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CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Our next case is a Protest Hearing (Status) Case No. 19-PRO-00036, Trump International Hotel Washington
D.C., License No. 100648.

Will the parties, please, move forward and identify yourself for the record, please?

MR. O'BRIEN: Stephen O'Brien for the license applicant, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good morning, Mr. O'Brien.

MR. LEVY: Good morning. Joshua Levy for the group.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Good morning, Mr. Levy.

All right. All right. This is Case No. 19-PRO-00036, application to renew Retailer's Class CH License, Trump International Hotel, Trump Hotel located at 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

> We are here today to hear oral
argument on the applicant's Motion to Dismiss filed September 3, 2019. Specifically, the Trump Hotel seeks to dismiss the protest of a Group of 5 or More individuals due to a lack of standing. The protestants filed an opposition to the Motion to Dismiss supported by four exhibits. A reply to the opposition followed on September 13, 2019 and then just yesterday the protestant filed a sur-reply.

The issue before the Board today is whether the members that make up the Group of 5 or More individuals, the protestants, have standing to protest the renewal of the alcoholic beverage license held by the hotel pursuant to D.C. Code § 25-601.

Mr. O'Brien, it's your position that they do not and it's your motion, so let's hear from you first.

We will then hear from Mr. Levy as to why the Board should affirm the protestant's standing. We have set an hour for this hearing and I'm hopeful we won't need more than that, if
that. So please mind the clock.
So, Mr. O'Brien, it's your motion and please let us know.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. After the Roll Call in this case, we filed a Motion to Dismiss on different grounds. The Board overruled that motion, but in its order, I think it is dated June 20th, the Board ruled or granted, I would say, summary judgment to the applicant on the appropriateness grounds.

So the only thing moving forward in this case, with respect to this motion then, is the composition of the Group of 5 .

The -- we have established after finally getting the addresses that four of the purported eight members are not residents of the District of Columbia.

Now, the statute requires that a Group of 5 be comprised of five individuals who are either residents of the District of Columbia or property owners in the District of Columbia. And we can -- you can mix and match. You can have
three residents perhaps and maybe two property owners.

In this case, we have demonstrated that four of the members of the group of eight and that is Kennedy, Boddie, Moline, and Jennifer Butler are not residents of the District of Columbia and were not, at the time of filing of this protest.

I don't understand from the opposition or the sur-reply any challenge of those -- of that factual assertion.

Rather, we are faced in what I would deem a desperate effort to keep this ball in the air with the contention that Moline is a property owner in D.C. and the foundation for that, as I understand it, is that Moline, not in his own name, but in the name of his employer, signed a license agreement to rent three offices and a work station in a shared office suite, sort of like a WeWork type arrangement and that that makes him a property owner in the District of Columbia.

I think it's a silly argument. And with that, I'll rest. Well, I should point out, I think what we all know though, that once the Board determines that the Group of 5 is less than five, then the protest must be dismissed. That's established by the Board's own precedence. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Just a question I want to ask you, Mr. O'Brien.

MR. O'BRIEN: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Because you
said that you have stated how the protestant stated that Moline is a property owner. So what is a property owner? Who is a property owner under the statute?

MR. O'BRIEN: One who owns property.
Moline does not own any property.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, the
statute is clear that the person has to -- that a property owner is one who owns property in the District.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And it's your contention that based on the information that was provided, is that Mr. Moline does not own property in the District of Columbia?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And it's also your contention then that out of the eight, that there is no contention that $I$ think Foer, Boddie and Butler are not D.C. residents?

MR. O'BRIEN: Or property owners.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Or property owners. And so out of the eight, so that leaves five? I'm just saying out of the eight originals, that only -- that left five individuals who could have qualified. Is that correct?

MR. O'BRIEN: (No audible answer.)
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, you
initially stated that there were eight folks who signed off in the group. Is that correct?

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes. And represented that they were residents --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Right. MR. O'BRIEN: -- of Washington, D.C. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Right. And out of the eight, three people Foer, Boddie and Butler that the protestants have agreed, and I'm asking, that they agreed that they are not residents of the District of Columbia or property owners of the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

MR. O'BRIEN: I don't recall in their pleadings a specific concession of that, but they haven't challenged the representation.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Haven't. So the challenge right now is, at least from your perspective, regarding the Moline. The Moline, that's the one that it has been that this person is being presented as a property owner in the District?

MR. O'BRIEN: That is correct.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay. All
right. All right. Mr. Levy, how do you respond to the motion, sir?

MR. LEVY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Board. Appreciate the opportunity to respond and be before you today.

With regard to the papers before you, the issue is not as narrow as the applicant makes it. The issues before you are not limited to the question of whether these five people have standing to go forward with the protest. The issue I will address in a second.

I also want to make sure that the Board is reminded of the papers that discuss the origins of this matter and how this group has not waived its right to a Show Cause Hearing or another hearing that would be required under the law.

Let me first address the protest standing issue that applicant raises orally with you and the questions, Mr. Chairman, that you had.

It is uncontested in this case that-yes?

MEMBER CROCKETT: Can you, please,
bring the mike towards you?
MR. LEVY: Sure.
MEMBER CROCKETT: Thank you.
MR. LEVY: This microphone?
MEMBER CROCKETT: Yes. Thank you.
MR. LEVY: Is that better?
MEMBER CROCKETT: Yes.
MR. LEVY: Thank you. With regard to standing, applicant does not dispute that four of the members of the group are D.C. residents. Goldfrank is one, Mr. Foer, who is behind me who did not appear at the Roll Call Hearing and is here for the Status Hearing, is another, Rabbi Aaron Poteck is the third and the fourth is Reverend William Lamar.

The applicant does not dispute that they are residents. We are talking about do we have five? There is nothing in the law that precludes additional people from joining in a protest, but to get standing for a protest, we understand that it has to be five people who are either residents of the District or property
owners.
So four are not in dispute. We are talking about one additional person. Rabbi Moline is a property owner in the District. And, Mr. Chairman, you asked the applicant how is property owner defined under the relevant statute, which is 25-601.

And applicant gave you a tautological answer. He said the property owner is the owner of property. That doesn't tell you very much.

The property owner in 25-601 does not distinguish the landlord from a tenant, does not distinguish the lessor from the lessee. Other D.C. statutes do.

The City Council knows how to distinguish different kinds of property owners from each other, different kinds of people with stakes in real property in the District when it wants to legislate. It did not do that here in 25-601 in the title that governs all things related to the licenses of alcohol in the District of Columbia.

And indeed, in applicant's papers, it refers the Board to another statute where the City Council understood how to make that distinction in the Snow Shoveling Statute.

And in that statute, it distinguishes a property owner from a tenant. The City Council is silent in 25-601 on what a property owner is. And the case law from the D.C. Superior Court looking at past Agency decisions and indeed Alcohol Beverage Control Board decisions says clearly to you all you should interpret the term property owner broadly in terms of generally broadly to encourage participation in processes like this, so that you aren't lobbied by people on the sidelines.

Let's use the front door. Let's have the lights on. Let's do this transparently. Let's have people from the community come in. And then on the merits, you can make the decision you need to make, but let's at least allow participation.

Applicant does not want this to --
there to be a hearing. He has tried everything imaginable to try to move to dismiss this proceeding from going forward.

We have been transparent with the Board. Applicant knows that three of these members aren't D.C. residents because we informed the Board of that. We did not mislead the Board. And we did not mislead applicant. And so with all that, we maintain that the five members have standing.

If in the event the Board disagrees with that position, we want to make clear that this group, as you recall, initially filed a complaint under a different provision of Title 25 last summer. Filed a complaint under 25-447 and asked for an Order to Show Cause.

And as the Board knows, under that provision anybody can come forward with a complaint. There is no requirement for residency in the District. There is no requirement for property ownership in the District. Anybody can come before this Board and file a complaint at
any time. And that's what the complainants did. We supplied the Board with evidence this high giving you a reasonable belief that applicant has violated a provision of the title, specifically the statutory good character requirement under 25-301(a)(1).

The Board has yet to reach a decision on whether it has a reasonable belief of such evidence. It didn't reach that in September when it wrote counsel. Instead, the Board said to counsel, in a letter on September 2018, that is an issue that we can take up when the license is being applied for or when it is being -- when the licensee is applying for a transfer or the licensee is applying for renewal.

So immediately after it became public that there was a renewal, we asked the Board to turn to that issue. ABRA came back to us an said we can look at this as a protest, but nobody waived their right to a Show Cause Hearing.

And so we maintain that a hearing should go forward in question of good character.

And the question of whether the applicant is in compliance with that statutory provision, whether through a Protest Hearing, whether through a Show Cause Hearing or whether there should be an Administrative Procedure Act Hearing under 1-1509 because now we have got the ANC weighing in.

The ANC has written you multiple times. Now on its own, I resent the suggestion in the papers that we had some hand in writing the letters, ridiculous. The ANC where the applicant resides wrote this Board and said we support this complaint. We support this protest. Under law, the Board has to give the ANC great weight. And of course if the Board wants to adopt the ANC's position that in fact the applicant is in violation of the statute, applicant is going to want a hearing and applicant should have a hearing. And all we ask is that we take a part in that hearing. But whether you were looking at a Protest Hearing, a Show Cause Hearing or a Due Process Hearing, this Board has had evidence the
> applicant is in violation of the statutory provision now for 15 months and the hearing is warranted.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: The concern I have because this is a Protest Hearing and so for a Protest Hearing, and as you are aware in all hearings, standing can be raised at any point. And as I've been Chair for this Board for the past four years, and I can only give you examples of when we have a condo association decides to protest a liquor license and one of the things that we go by is to look to see, especially when it comes to a condo, whether or not they are owners or renters.

And so at least for a condo, if they are not like an abutting property -- if they are not an owner, then we do not give standing to a renter. So therefore, they have to provide to us that they are an actual owner. And so, at least in my experience, $I$ have known that -- I'm just using that example of when we have had Protest Hearings with tenants in a condo, that we only
grant standing to actual owners and not renters.
So I -- the Board, I'm sorry, might -we -- it's my understanding that we have a significant amount of decisions that defines what a property owner is. And I'm not sure at this juncture, and I don't know whether or not your definition complies with what the Board has done previously.

MR. LEVY: May I respond?
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Sure.
MR. LEVY: Thank you. Surely if the Board had defined what a property owner was to exclude my client, applicant would have raised that ABRA decision with you. Applicant did not. There are none.

> And applicant has filed two papers
with you. There are no citations to any ABRA decisions defining property owners to exclude a tenant or a sub-tenant. The example you gave of a member of a condominium association is a worthy one, of course, and let me just distinguish it from my client who is a sub-tenant of a
commercial property.
A member of a condominium association is in a large organization with -- which is democratically constituted.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, I'm not saying that. I'm just saying I was just giving a condo as a --

MR. LEVY: Sure.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: -- not necessarily as an association.

MR. LEVY: Sure, sure, of course. I just wanted to distinguish that --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay.
MR. LEVY: -- situation from my client, which is the sub-tenant of a commercial building.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. O'Brien?
MR. O'BRIEN: He is not a sub-tenant. The interface alliance itself is not even a subtenant, it's a licensee to occupy a little corner of a full floor executive suite.

Now Rabbi Moline signed on behalf of
his employer, but if the Chair of this Board or Mr. Moosally, for instance the Director of the Alcoholic Beverage Regulation Agency were to sign an agreement that we are going to ask the Board and ABRA can occupy this space in this building, that doesn't make the Chair or Mr. Moosally a tenant, much less a licensee.

But I have to challenge the claim that there has been no misleading here. This case has been fraught with misleading since day one. I would like to go over the chronology.

This all starts back in June of last year when the group represented by Mr. Levy, a Group of 7 at that time, submitted a complaint to the Board. I've got copies if anybody wants to see it here.

The complaint recites at paragraph 5 "The following residents of Washington, D.C. believe the licensee is in violation," and on and on. And on page 27 of that complaint, it is signed by the seven. There were misrepresentations starting then.

Now, in May of this year when the protest window was open, counsel filed a purported protest that was not signed by the individuals. We moved to dismiss on that ground alone because the regulations required the protestants sign, the individuals.

The Board ruled, and I know I'm paraphrasing here, that essentially the signatures from June of 2018 could be deemed to have migrated to the May 2019 file, protest file.

The Board has so ruled that's the law of the case, but at no time did anybody from the protest group say, Board Members, wait a minute, I really don't have a place in the city, I'm not a resident.

In fact, and I've got the chronology here, on May 28th was the Roll Call. Jennifer Butler showed up and put her name into the microphone. Now, I read the transcript. The Board's Agent, Ms. Fletcher, did not ask each person to state an address, but by that time and it is undisputed, Ms. Butler was out in -- lived
in Maryland, but she showed up here pretending to be a protestant.

The Board eventually ordered release of the addresses. The protective order to try to keep them secret was denied, that was in June. In July there was a motion to add another protestant to the protestant team and that seemed strange to us, at least at the time, because if you have five, it doesn't matter if you have 50 or 500, you just need five.

That suggested that somebody knew at some point that they were short of the requisite five. They tried to get somebody else in, that didn't work. Finally, the Board ordered that the addresses be released whereupon, for the first time, we were able to go out and test the validity of these things.

Now, at no time has any member, any of the four people who are not valid protestants come to the Board and said wait a minute, there may be a misunderstanding here. I'm not really a D.C. resident, never.

The Board on its order of denying the motion to add Susan Flanders enumerates who the protestants are. That order is denied I think July 24th, the motion recites "The group as presently recognized by the Board consists of Foer, Kennedy, Goldfrank, Lamar, Butler, Potek, Boddie and Moline.

At no point does anybody say wait a minute, Board, there has been a mistake made here. Some of these people do not qualify. No. We had after fighting for it, after having to fight for it, get the addresses and then we get to the bottom of it.

I challenge the representation that the Board and the applicant have not been misled. Now, if the Board grants the Motion to Dismiss the Protest on standing grounds, the contested case is over. There is nothing left before the Board to rule on.

The group can file complaints as often as they wish and the Board will do what it deems appropriate with those complaints, but the
contested case, why we are here today, is strictly on the issue of fitness and the protestants' lack standing not withstanding the claim that Moline is a property owner, it's false. Thank you.

MR. LEVY: May I respond?
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, Mr. Levy.
MR. LEVY: I'm really sorry that applicant's counsel has wasted your time with arguments that are totally irrelevant to this proceeding and false.

We are talking about whether Mr. Moline, Rabbi Moline qualifies to have standing as a protestant. He has now taken you through a false chronology alleging fraud on the part of my complaints in May. It's disgusting. It's inappropriate. And after I'm done, you are going to apologize.

As I have included in our papers on Monday, the only reason why applicant knows that three of these members are not District of Columbia residents is because we informed ABRA of
that and ABRA shared that information with Mr. 0'Brien. I have attached it to the filing on Monday.

On July 16, 2019, Jonathan Berman sent the addresses that I had supplied to the Board to Mr. O'Brien. So Mr. O'Brien's protest that we never informed the Board of the current status of the individuals' residences is incorrect. We did. And that is why you know.

Secondly, when we initially filed the complaint where there is no residency requirement, Reverend Boddie and Judge Kennedy had residences in the District. Reverend Butler had a residence in the District at the time we filed the complaint as well. After we filed the protest, I learned she moved.

But to treat this process like this is some sort of fraud or on poor Mr. Trump, it's insanity. We have been straightforward with the Board. We have been straightforward with Mr. O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien is here a lot. He understands that there is a regular process to
investigate whether the individuals forming a protest have standing or not. He is entitled to get information to investigate. He is making much more out of this than is necessary.

The bottom line is that there are four uncontested people who have standing. There is a question about whether Mr. Moline is a property owner. We argue that he is. There is no ABRA decision to the contrary. Applicant doesn't site anything to the contrary. And we have reserved our rights to have other hearings.

MR. O'BRIEN: Mr. Chair?
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes?
MR. O'BRIEN: Counsel just made a representation as to his personal knowledge. And I'm perfectly prepared to believe that when counsel filed this protest in May, that he was unaware that Reverend Butler had moved to Maryland maybe two months before, a month or two before. I'm prepared to believe that. I'm prepared to believe she didn't pick up the phone and call him.

But since he is making representations, may $I$ suggest the Board ask him when he became aware that Kennedy, Boddie and Moline were not residents of the District of Columbia as he represented in his file? That would be the question $I$ would suggest the Board ask.

MR. LEVY: And here is the answer. May I approach?

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Hold on. Has Mr. O'Brien seen the document?

MR. LEVY: It's just crazy. This is an email to you from July 16, 2019, it's from ABRA. It's from Jonathan Berman. Is that you, Mr. Berman, standing up? The -- I sent a list of the addresses to ABRA. ABRA sent them to you, Mr. O'Brien.

MR. O'BRIEN: After, after.
MR. LEVY: That's --
MR. $0^{\prime}$ BRIEN: After representing that they were residents, after not providing the addresses at the time of filing.

MR. LEVY: No, it was at the time of filing, that's when we forwarded it to you.

MR. O'BRIEN: At the time of filing--
MR. LEVY: At the time of filing, $I$ sent the addresses --

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.
MR. LEVY: -- upon request of ABRA.
MR. O'BRIEN: I have not inter rupted and I suggest you not either.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: For the --
MR. LEVY: I'm not the one personally attacking --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: -- since this matter is being transcribed, I would ask both counsel one person speak at a time to make sure that we have a clean record just in case --

MR. LEVY: Sure. Let me respond.
MR. O'BRIEN: I have the floor.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Go ahead, Mr. 0'Brien.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you. So that's my suggestion to the Board. Counsel has chosen to
say well, $I$ didn't know that Butler wasn't a resident when I filed this in May. And I'm prepared to believe that, it's logical that she didn't pick up the phone and call him.

But my suggestion since he wants to make representations about what he knew, my suggestion is the Board ask him when he knew that Kennedy, Moline and Boddie were not, in fact, residents of the District of Columbia as he represented to the Board and as he allowed the Board to continue to believe after the Board recited them as protestants in its June 24 order denying the motion to add yet another protestant.

That to me would be the appropriate question, but it's up to the Board whether it -CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Well, that's not necessarily relevant to me. I mean, as the-we only need five people. And so and to me the argument is whether or not Moline is a resident of the District of Columbia to make this a Group of 5 or More.
And so I'm not -- I don't think it is
that important. And as you know, as attorneys, and I -- we make representations based on information that our client has represented to us. And as you stated, Mr. O'Brien, people make decisions and your client does not necessarily always call you and let you know what is it that they are doing.

And so I'll take your representation and I'll take -- I will leave it as an attorney, because as attorneys we make representations based on the information that is provided to us from our client. And as you stated, if a client moved out of the District of Columbia, the litigations move in and they might not think it was important for them to inform their attorney to say that -- and maybe that person was not even aware that in order for them to protest the matter, they have to be a resident of the District of Columbia.

I'm just leaving it at that. I'm leaving it at that.

MR. O'BRIEN: They signed it back in--
last year --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No, but --
MR. O'BRIEN: -- saying they were residents of the District of Columbia.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: And I don't know if they were at the time, but I'm just saying --

MR. O'BRIEN: They were not, sir.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm not -- I
guess for me, the relevance -- where we are right now, we are only talking about -- it doesn't appear to me that we are trying to make a determination. It appears that there is agreement on four and we are here trying to make a determination on whether or not there is a fifth member. I think that's where we are. I think that's where they are.

MR. O'BRIEN: The four that are still standing were not investigated, once we found out it was below five, we didn't bother with that. We did not make any concessions.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. But
we are not making -- the decision to -- the motion is that they do not have five. And the arguments that are being made today it's on this one person, Moline, is that the information that the protestant provided to the Board to substantiate their D.C. residency, you are saying that based on information that is provided, that person does not qualify as a resident in D.C. Is that correct?

MR. O'BRIEN: A property ownership. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, a property ownership.

MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, they don't claim Moline as a resident.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Right. That the information that is provided to the Board to say that this -- that Moline owns property in the District of Columbia. You are saying that this document does not support that this person is a property owner in the District of Columbia. Is that correct?

MR. O'BRIEN: Under any reasonable or
plausible definition of the term property owner. CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I'm just trying to make sure that I'm clear in my mind. MR. O'BRIEN: That's absolutely correct. And, Mr. Chair? CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes?

MR. O'BRIEN: My -- when you gave me before at the start of this conversation, I was very brief. I just laid it out and said this is what is before you and that is it. I bring this up on a rebuttal only because representations were made during argument.

I would agree with you. It's as
simple as can be. If Moline is not a property owner, they don't claim he is a resident any more, they used to, but they don't any more. If Moline is not a property owner then this case is over.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay. That's your opinion. And that is the crux of this decision for us.

MR. O'BRIEN: That is absolutely
correct.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: That's the crux of this decision that the Board has to make. Mr. Levy?

MR. LEVY: I agree that with regard to the question of standing for a Protest Hearing the question is limited to whether Mr. Moline, whether Rabbi Moline is a property owner. And if applicant could share with you an ABRA decision defining property owner to exclude people like Rabbi Moline, he would have, he has not, because there is not.

The statutory definition of property owner doesn't exist. The definition of property owner in 25-601 is undefined and the case law that talks about participation in ABRA decisions, in ABRA process and in particular a Protest Hearing says to ABRA and to the Board encourage participation. Read these terms to encourage participation, don't read them to exclude participation.

And not withstanding all of that, we
have reserved our right to a hearing under other parts of the statute that we have asked for and we renew those arguments and renew those requests with the Board.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. Any other argument? I'm sorry, any Board Members have any questions that you wish to ask either party?

MEMBER CROCKETT: No.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: No. So what I'm going to do is that this is your motion, Mr. O'Brien, and I'll give you the final word, but do you want to make any closing arguments?

MR. O'BRIEN: No, I said everything I think is appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Levy, any closing arguments?

MR. LEVY: No, thank you.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: All right. I want to thank both parties for their arguments today. And the Board will take this matter under advisement and since we are going to go in
session, I guess I should read this.
As Chairperson of the Alcoholic
Beverage Control Board for the District of Columbia and in accordance with DC Official Code Section 2-574(b) 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 No. 19-PRO-00036, Trump International Hotel Washington, D.C., pursuant to DC Official Code Section 2-574(b)(4) of the Open Meetings Act and deliberating upon Case No. 19-PRO-00036, Trump International Hotel Washington, D.C., for the reasons cited in DC Official Code Section 2574(b)(13) of the Open Meetings Act.

Is there a second?
MEMBER SHORT: Second.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Short has seconded the motion.

I will now take a roll call vote on the motion before us now that it has been seconded it.

Mr. Short?

MEMBER SHORT: I agree.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Ms. Crockett?
MEMBER CROCKETT: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Cato?
MEMBER CATO: I agree.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Mr. Anderson?

I agree.
As it appears that the motion has passed, $I$ hereby give notice that the ABC Board will recess these proceedings to hold a closed meeting in the ABC Board conference room pursuant to Section 2-574(b) of the Open Meetings Act.

Thank you for your presentation.
MR. LEVY: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: We will issue a written order.

MR. O'BRIEN: A housekeeping matter? $^{\prime}$
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, Mr.
O'Brien?

MR. O'BRIEN: I don't know when the Board is going to make its decision --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: The Board will
issue a decision very shortly. I'm not sure if you know this, Mr. O'Brien, I don't like to have things sitting, because I might forget what the arguments are.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes.
MR. O'BRIEN: The housekeeping matter is this --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, sir.
MR. O'BRIEN: -- there is a Protest
Hearing scheduled --
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: For?
MR. O'BRIEN: -- I think it is the last week in October.

MR. LEVY: October 25th.
MR. O'BRIEN: The 25th.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: 25th.
MR. O'BRIEN: Which is essentially a
month out. I don't know how long -- I understand promptly, very promptly, $I$ got that. But I don't know long it is going to take for an order to issue.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay.
MR. O'BRIEN: And then we are going to have working backwards, the requirement of a PIF.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes.
MR. O'BRIEN: And if this protest should survive today, I will be filing a Motion in Limine as to the scope of evidence to be considered.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Okay.
MR. O'BRIEN: What I'm suggesting is that the Protest Hearing date of the 24th be --

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: I think it's the 23 rd . It would be the 23 rd and we have -- it's not going to occur, Mr. -- I'll say this to you. It's not going to occur on the 23rd because you look at the schedules today, we have a 1:30 Protest Hearing and we have two 4:30 Protest Hearings on our schedule today.

So this is scheduled for a Protest Hearing on the 23rd. I strongly doubt that it would occur.

MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. Then so the
parties don't have to go to needless work. Can the Board order that the 23rd date be taken off the calendar and it will be rescheduled based on developments when the Board issues its order on this motion?

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes, I would agree with that, because as I'm saying I just -I'll schedule matters today and as I said before I have scheduled -- we've scheduled a Protest Hearing on the 23rd at 1:30 and we have scheduled two Protest Hearings for the 23rd at 4:30.

So I don't see how we can have another Protest Hearing on the 23rd.

MR. O'BRIEN: The 23rd is out.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes.
MR. O'BRIEN: And we will see what happens.

CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Yes.
MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON ANDERSON: Right. Thank you very much for being here today.

All right. The Board is in recess
until our 1:30 hearing.
(Whereupon, the Protest (Status)
Hearing was concluded at 11:55 a.m.)
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Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript

In the matter of: Hearing

Before: Alcoholic Beverage Control Board

Date: 09-18-19

Place: Washington, DC
was duly recorded and accurately transcribed under my direction; further, that said transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Hae } R \text { ours } \\
& \text { Court Reporter }
\end{aligned}
$$

