

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

	)		
In the Matter of:	)		
	)		
Yolo DC, Inc.	)	Case No.:	25-PRO-00128
t/a Yolo Restaurant & Lounge	)	License No.:	ABRA-126819
	)	Order No.:	2026-613
Application to Renew a	)		
Retailer's Class CT License	)		
	)		
at premises	)		
2005 14 th Street, NW	)		
Washington, D.C. 20009	)		
	)		

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

PARTIES: Yolo DC, Inc., t/a Yolo Restaurant & Lounge, Applicant

Cameron Mixon, Counsel, on behalf of Applicant

Matt Fay, Commissioner, Advisory Neighborhood
Commission (ANC) 1B, Protestant

Kerry Verdi, Counsel, on behalf of ANC 1B

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW,
AND ORDER**

INTRODUCTION

The Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Board (Board) approves the Application for a Renewal of a Retailer's Class CT License filed by Yolo DC, Inc. t/a Yolo Restaurant & Lounge, (hereinafter "Applicant" or "Yolo") with conditions. The Board imposes conditions based on credible evidence presented by the Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC) 1B (Protestants) regarding Yolo's sales and service of alcohol after legal hours and the documented disorderly

conduct in and around the establishment. Accordingly, the Board reduces Yolo's operating hours to 2:00 a.m. Sunday through Thursday and 3:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.

Procedural Background

The Notice of Public Hearing advertising the Application was posted on October 10, 2025, and informed the public that objections to the Application could be filed on or before December 1, 2025. *ABCA Protest File No. 25-PRO-00128*, Notice of Public Hearing [*Notice of Public Hearing*]. The records of the Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Administration (ABCA) indicate that Advisory Neighborhood (ANC) 1B has filed a protest against the Application. *ABCA Protest File No. 25-PRO-00128*, Roll Call Hearing Results.

The parties came before the Board's Agent for a Roll Call Hearing on December 22, 2025, where the above-mentioned objector was granted standing to protest the Application. Finally, the Protest Hearing in this matter occurred on April 8, 2026.

The Board recognizes that an ANC's properly adopted written recommendations are entitled to great weight from the Board. D.C. Code §§ 1-309.10(d), 25-609; *Foggy Bottom Ass'n v. District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 445 A.2d 643, 646 (D.C. 1982). Accordingly, the Board "must elaborate, with precision, its response to the ANC['s] issues and concerns." *Foggy Bottom Ass'n*, 445 A.2d at 646. The Board notes that it received a properly adopted written recommendation from ANC 1B, which indicated that its protest is based on concerns regarding the Applicant's impact on peace, order, and quiet. The ANC's issues and concerns shall be addressed by the Board in its Conclusions of Law below.

Based on the issues raised by the Protestants, the Board may only grant the Application if the request will not have an adverse impact on the peace, order, and quiet of the area located within 1,200 feet of the establishment. D.C. Code § 25-313(b); 23 DCMR §§ 1607.2; 1607.7(b) (West Supp. 20 26). At the beginning of the hearing, the parties agreed that the license should be renewed and that the protest should be limited to whether the conditions proposed by the ANC should be adopted. *Transcript (Tr.)*, April 8, 2026, at 7-8. The requested conditions include having the licensee's hours of operation end at 2:00 a.m. Sunday through Thursday and 3:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. *Id.*

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. The Applicant has submitted an Application to Renew a Retailer's Class CT License at 2005 14th Street, NW, Washington, DC. *Notice of Public Hearing*.

2. ABCA Investigator Jovan Miller investigated the Application and prepared the Protest Report submitted to the Board. *ABCA Protest File No. 25-PRO-00128, Protest Report* (Mar. 2026) [*Protest Report*].
3. The establishment is in an Arts-4 zone. *Id.* at 3. The premises appear well-maintained. *Id.* at Exhibit Nos. 5-15.
4. The establishment's hours of operation are as follows: 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m., seven days a week. *Id.* at 8. Yolo may serve alcohol from Sunday from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m. on Sunday; Monday and Thursday from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m.; and Friday and Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. *Id.* The summer garden sales, service, and consumptions hours are Sunday 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., Monday through Thursday 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 a.m., and Friday and Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 a.m. *Id.* Live entertainment is permitted from 6:00 p.m. until 2:00 a.m. on most weekdays and between 6:00 p.m. to 3:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. *Id.*
5. The Applicant's investigative history indicates a warning was issued for failing to file a security plan; and a \$1,000 fine was issued for operating after the approved hours, which is a primary tier violation. *Id.* at 10.
6. Between March 1, 2025, and March 1, 2026, there were 20 calls for service to Yolo's address, with Yolo specifically named in eight of those calls. *Id. citing Protest Report* Exhibit No. 17.
7. The ABCA Enforcement Division monitored the operations of the business. ABCA investigators visited the establishment on eight occasions between February 2026 and March 27, 2026, and did not observe any peace, order, or quiet issues and did not identify any concerns with the establishment's compliance with the District's alcohol laws. *Id.* at 9.
8. Meron Endalamaw is the general manager of Yolo. *Tr.* at 65. Ms. Endalamaw has been the manager for the past two years. *Id.* She is responsible for training employees, including training in the service of alcohol and how to comply with ABCA regulations. *Id.* at 66. Yolo sells some nonalcoholic mocktails and food after 2:00 a.m. *Id.* at 67-68.
9. Ronald Scott is the head of security at Yolo. *Id.* at 80-81. He has worked there for nearly a year and has over 20 years of experience working in security. *Id.* He is responsible for safety protocols, ID checks, handling intoxicated patrons, breaking up fights and hiring and training security personnel. *Id.* at 81.
10. Dwayne Fails is a retired MPD police officer and current owner of a security company. *Id.* at 99. ANC IB hired Mr. Fails to investigate this case. *Id.* He visited the establishment on March 28, 2026, at approximately 3:40 a.m. and estimated approximately 50-75 people inside. *Id.* at 100. He observed that no one was served food or eating, that a DJ was playing music and people dancing. *Id.* at 101. Mr. Fails asked the bartender if they were still serving, which she said yes, and he ordered a shot of tequila. *Id.* The bartender left the bar to obtain the drink from the backroom and came out with a white plastic cup. *Id.* at 102. After receiving the drink, he took a sip and confirmed the drink as tequila. *Id.* He also observed the bartender continuing to illegally serve

alcoholic beverages to patrons after hours. *Id.* at 103. Mr. Fails left the establishment at 4:15 a.m. and never saw anyone eating food or food being served. *Id.*

11. Mr. Fails also visited Yolo on February 14, 2026, after 3:00 a.m. *Id.* at 113. He ordered a shot of tequila from a bartender who told another employee the order and retrieved the drink from the backroom. *Id.* at 115. There were no differences between the way Yolo was selling alcohol after hours on February 14 versus March 28. *Id.* Mr. Fails asked the bartender for a food menu and the bartender indicated that they were not selling food. *Id.* at 116.

12. Matt Fay is the single member District Commissioner for 1B01, the Secretary for Commission 1B and the Chair of the Economic Development Committee for IB. *Id.* at 128. The ANC, in its protest, is asking the Board to reduce the hours of operation at Yolo from 6:00 a.m. daily to close at 2:00 a.m. Sundays through Thursday, and close at 3:00 a.m. on Fridays and Saturdays, consistent “with the majority of the ABC licensed establishments in the corridor.” *Id.* at 129. The ANC is concerned that Yolo is serving alcohol after hours, there are multiple ABCA violations and MPD reports. *Id.*

13. ANC 1B adopted Resolution 25-29 regarding late night operations and amplified sound of ABCA licensed establishments in ANC 1B. *Id.* at 131. The ANC passed the resolution to take a formal and consistent position regarding the renewal of applications and new applications for establishments with after-hour operations to combat concerns about public safety in the area. *Id.* at 132-133.

14. MPD provided the ANC with 16 incident reports that were specifically related to Yolo involving several incidents of simple assault, an incident of overcrowding, assault on a police officer, disorderly conduct and several offenses involving unlawful possessions of a firearm. *Id.* at 144- 171. Most of the incidents happened between 3:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. *Id.* at 158 *citing Exhibit Nos.* 6-12, 15-16.

15. Sharniece Chase is a bartender at Yolo and was the bartender during the night Mr. Fails visited the establishment on March 28, 2026. *Id.* at 190. She served nonalcoholic mocktails and did not serve or sell alcoholic drinks or food that night after 3:00 a.m. *Id.* at 192.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

16. The Board may approve an Application to Renew a Retailer's Class CR License when the proposed establishment will not have an adverse impact on the neighborhood. D.C. Code §§ 25-104, 25-313(b); 23 DCMR §§ 1607.2; 1607.7(b) (West Supp. 2026). Specifically, the question in this matter is whether the Application will have a negative impact on the peace, order, and quiet of the area located within 1,200 feet of the establishment. D.C. Code § 25-313(b); 23 DCMR §§ 1607.2; 1607.7(b) (West Supp. 2026).

I. The Burden of Proof Lies with the Applicant to Prove its Case Through Substantial Evidence.

17. The burden of proof in this matter is assigned to the Applicant. D.C. Code § 25-311(a).

“ . . . [T]he Applicant in meeting its burden may rely on the record as a whole, which includes information provided in the Protest Report and the Protestant’s case, and not just what the Applicant presents during its case-in-chief.” *In re The New 7307, t/a Premier Lounge*, Case No. 22-PRO-000222, Board Order No. 2022-701, ¶ 1 (D.C.A.B.C.B. Oct. 19, 2022) *citing Esgar Corp. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 744 F.3d 648, 655 (10th Cir. 2014); *see also Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth. v. Dist. of Columbia Dept. of Employment Services*, 992 A.2d 1276, 1283 (D.C. 2010) *citing Dale v. S & S Builders, LLC*, 188 P.3d 554, 561 (Wyo. 2008) (saying in determining whether a party met its burden during an administrative hearing the court will look at the “record as a whole”). The Board further notes that where there is an “absence of evidence on an essential point [this] supports denial rather than granting of an application.” *Conrad v. Dist. of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 21-AA-748, 2023 WL 163964, at *5 (D.C. Jan. 12, 2023).

18. Furthermore, in determining whether the Applicant has met its burden, the Board shall only base its decision on the “substantial evidence” contained in the record. 23 DCMR § 1718.3 (West Supp. 2024). The substantial evidence standard requires the Board to rely on “such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion.” *Clark v. D.C. Dep’t of Employment Servs.*, 772 A.2d 198, 201 (D.C. 2001) *citing Children’s Defense Fund v. District of Columbia Dep’t of Employment Servs.*, 726 A.2d 1242, 1247 (D.C. 1999). It should be noted that “. . . hearsay evidence is admissible in administrative proceedings” and may constitute “substantial evidence.” *Compton v. Dist. of Columbia Bd. of Psychology*, 858 A.2d 470, 476 (D.C. 2004). In that vein, “The weight to be given to any piece of hearsay evidence is a function of its truthfulness, reasonableness, and credibility.” *Id.* at 477. The Board further is aware that hearsay evidence should be analyzed as to “. . . whether the declarant is biased, whether the testimony is corroborated, whether the hearsay statement is contradicted by direct testimony, whether the declarant is available to testify and be cross-examined, and whether the hearsay statements were signed or sworn.” *Id.* at 477 *citing Gropp v. Dist. of Columbia Bd. of Dentistry*, 606 A.2d 1010, 1014 n. 10 (D.C. 1992). The Board notes that when “the declarant is available to testify and be cross-examined, the practice of relying exclusively on hearsay is strongly discouraged and should be heavily weighted against the sponsoring party” unless the disputed “hearsay is proven to be reliable by strong corroboration.” *Id.* at 479. Moreover, “. . . administrative findings and conclusions based exclusively on hearsay [are subject] to exacting scrutiny” and should be rejected if “too unreliable.” *Id.* at 478.

II. The Establishment is Inappropriate for the Neighborhood with Unrestricted Hours.

19. The Board agrees with the Protestants that conditions limiting the hours of the premises as proposed are necessary to preserve the peace, order, and quiet of the neighborhood. Under the appropriateness test, “the applicant shall bear the burden of proving to the satisfaction of the Board that the establishment for which the license is sought is appropriate for the locality, section, or portion of the District where it is to be located” D.C. Code § 25-311(a). In determining appropriateness, the Board must consider whether the Applicant’s future operations will satisfy the reasonable expectations of residents to be free from disturbances and other nuisances—not just whether the Application complies with the minimum requirements of the law. D.C. Council, Bill 6-504, the “*District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act Reform Amendment Act of 1986*,”

Committee on Consumer and Regulatory Affairs, 38 (Nov. 12, 1986); *see Panutat, LLC v. D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 75 A.3d 269, 277 n. 12 (D.C. 2013) (“However, in mandating consideration of the effect on peace, order, and quiet, § 25-313(b)(2) does not limit the Board's consideration to the types of noises described in § 25-725.”). As part of its analysis, the Board should evaluate each “unique” location “according to the particular circumstances involved” and attempt to determine the “prospective” effect of the establishment on the neighborhood. *Le Jimmy, Inc. v. D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 433 A.2d 1090, 1093 (D.C. 1981). Furthermore, the analysis may also include the Applicant’s efforts to mitigate or alleviate operational concerns, the “character of the neighborhood,” the character of the establishment, and the license holder’s future plans. *Donnelly v. District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Board*, 452 A.2d 364, 369 (D.C. 1982) (saying that the Board could rely on testimony related to the licensee’s “past and future efforts” to control negative impacts of the operation); *Upper Georgia Ave. Planning Comm. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 500 A.2d 987, 992 (D.C. 1985) (saying the Board may consider an applicant’s efforts to “alleviate” operational concerns); *Citizens Ass’n of Georgetown, Inc. v. D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 410 A.2d 197, 200 (D.C. 1979); *Gerber v. D.C. Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 499 A.2d 1193, 1196 (D.C. 1985); *Sophia's Inc. v. Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 268 A.2d 799, 800-801 (D.C. 1970).

a. Renewal of the license without conditions will negatively impact peace, order, and quiet.

20. “In determining the appropriateness of an establishment, the Board shall consider . . . [t]he effect of the establishment on peace, order, and quiet, including the noise and litter provisions set forth in §§ 25-725 and 25-726.” D.C. Code § 25-313(b)(2); *see also* D.C. Code §§ 25-101(35A), 25-314(a)(4). Among other considerations, the Board is instructed to consider “noise, rowdiness, loitering, litter, and criminal activity.” 23 DCMR § 400.1(a) (West Supp. 2026). The alcohol laws further require that a licensee follows the terms of its license, including its licensed hours, as approved by the Board, and abide by the legal hours limits on the sale, service, and consumption of alcohol. D.C. Code §§ 25-823(b)(1)-(2), 25-823(a)(7).

21. Yolo is currently licensed to operate until 6:00 a.m. but cannot sell alcohol past 2:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday, and 3:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. *Supra*, at ¶ 4. Yolo was given the privilege to remain open late so long as it only provides customers with food and non-alcoholic beverages. A private investigator was able to observe alcohol sales and purchase alcohol from Yolo on February 14, 2026 and March 28, 2026 after the end of its legal alcohol sale, service, and consumption hours. *Supra*, at ¶¶ 10, 11. As a result, Yolo has failed to take appropriate steps to end the sale, service, and consumption of alcohol after the end of its legal hours, and under these facts it is reasonable to presume it will continue to do so in the future if permitted to stay open past the end of its legal alcohol sale hours.

22. The Protestants further demonstrated that permitting Yolo to operate past the end of its legal alcohol sale, service, and consumption hours encourages an environment detrimental to the peace, order, and quiet of the neighborhood. Yolo’s later hours encourage noisy and rowdy crowds to gather around the premises after 3:00 a.m. *Supra* at ¶ 14. The crowd poses an ongoing risk of criminal activity and violence as evident from the numerous MPD incident reports and calls-for service. *Id.* The Board may consider MPD incident reports, offense reports, and calls-for-service

as evidence bearing on whether the establishment adversely affects the peace, order, and quiet of the neighborhood, provided there is credible evidence creating a nexus between criminal activity and the licensed establishment. *Conrad*, 287 A.3d at 645. Here, the Board finds the incident reports, testimony and calls-for-service to be reliable and corroborate a pattern of disorderly and illegal behavior involving the establishment after 3:00 a.m. *Supra* at ¶ 14. As a result, continuing to permit the business to operate until 6:00 a.m. will negatively impact the neighborhood and nearby residents based on the establishment's refusal to end alcohol sales at the appropriate time and the disorderly environment around the establishment. For this reason, the Board finds the establishment inappropriate with unrestricted hours.

III. The Board Imposes Conditions on the License Limiting the Hours of the Establishment.

23. In light of the Board's findings regarding appropriateness, the Board finds it necessary to impose conditions on the Applicant's license. *See In re Dos Ventures, LLC, t/a Riverfront at the Ball Park*, Case No. 092040, Board Order No. 2014-512. ¶ 49 (D.C.A.B.C.B. Nov. 13, 2013) (saying "[i]n practice, the Board has imposed conditions when it is shown that there are valid concerns regarding appropriateness that may be fixed through the imposition of specific operational limits and requirements on the license"). Under § 25-104(e), the Board is granted the authority to impose conditions on a license when ". . . the inclusion of conditions will be in the best interest of the [neighborhood]" D.C. Code § 25-104(e).

24. In this case, the Board limits the hours to operate until 2:00 a.m. Sunday through Thursday, and 3:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday. The Board, in its conditions, includes morning hours and bars extended hour privileges for the purpose of clarity as to the effect of these conditions. The Board is further persuaded that these conditions will address the peace, order, and quiet issues demonstrated by the Protestants.

IV. The Establishment's Record of Compliance Merits Renewal.

25. Under § 25-315, "[t]he Board shall consider the licensee's record of compliance with this title and the regulations promulgated under this title and any conditions placed on the license during the period of licensure, including the terms of a settlement agreement." D.C. Code § 25-315(b)(1). The Board notes that the issue of renewal was not challenged by the protestants and the history of violations does not merit revocation of the license at this time.

V. The Application Satisfies All Remaining Requirements Imposed by Title 25.

26. Finally, the Board is only required to produce findings of fact and conclusions of law related to those matters raised by the Protestants in their initial protest. *See Craig v. District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Bd.*, 721 A.2d 584, 590 (D.C. 1998) ("The Board's regulations require findings only on contested issues of fact."); 23 DCMR § 1718.2 (West Supp. 2026). Any errors or omissions in the Application are deemed unintentional, harmless, and de minimis and would not change the Board's decision to approve or issue the license. Accordingly, based on the Board's review of the Application and the record, the Applicant has satisfied all

remaining requirements imposed by Title 25 of the D.C. Official Code and Title 23 of the D.C. Municipal Regulations related to the approval of the Application.

VI. The Board Satisfies the Great Weight Requirement.

27. In this case, in accordance with the “great weight” requirement found at D.C. Official Code § 25-609, the Board addresses the ANC’s submissions as follows:

1. The Protest Letter filed by the ANC indicates that the protest is based on peace, order, and quiet without elaboration. *ANC Protest Letter*, at 1 (Nov. 6 2025). The ANC is directed to this order as its response to the ANC’s issues and concerns.
2. Resolution 25-29 does not appear to be a recommendation or trigger the great weight requirement as a matter of law where the resolution does not identify or reference Yolo, take a position on the renewal of this specific application, or request conditions related to this specific Applicant, which is the “action” or “decision[]” before the Board in this matter. D.C. Code § 1-309.10(a); (d)(1); *ANC 1B, Regarding Late-Night Operations and Amplified Sound of ABCA Licensed Establishments in ANC 1B*, Resolution 25-29, 1-3 (Nov. 6, 2025). Nevertheless, out of comity to the ANC, the Board will respond to the comments contained in the resolution.
3. In Resolution 25-29 and during the Protest Hearing, the ANC discusses the availability of law enforcement resources, such as ABCA investigators and MPD. Nevertheless, this type of evidence is excludable, not relevant, and merits no weight in a protest or licensing action per Board precedent on this issue for the reasons described in the *Unity* matter. *Resolution 25-29*, at 1; *In re FD, LLC, t/a Unity*, Case No. 25-PRO-00075, Board Order No. 2026-422, 6 (May 6, 2026).
4. In Resolution 25-29, “. . . the Commission does not support new ABCA license applications or substantial changes to operating hours that extend beyond the times alcohol beverages are legally allowed to be served.” *ANC 1B, Regarding Late-Night Operations and Amplified Sound of ABCA Licensed Establishments in ANC 1B*, Resolution 25-29 (Nov. 6, 2025). This recommendation is not relevant to the present proceeding where the present application is for renewal, and not a new application or a substantial change application.
5. In Resolution 25-29, “. . . any establishment with extended hours that has a significant investigative history with ABCA will be subject to stricter provisions in an agreement or revocation of the licensed hours in effort to maintain neighborhood livability . . .” *Id.* It is unclear whether this applies to Yolo where Yolo is not referenced. Likewise, the phrase “significant investigative history” is vague and undefined to such an extent that the Board cannot determine its applicability to the present case. Nevertheless, the Board notes that it has adopted the ANC’s protest position in this case based on the evidence and testimony adduced at trial as described above.

6. Anything not discussed above related to Resolution 25-29 does not appear relevant or specific to the present Application or too vague to merit consideration, including the discussion regarding extended hours, outdoor seating, ANC policy or procedures, or ANC desires regarding settlement agreements. *Id.* at 1-2.

ORDER

Therefore, the Board, on this 15th day of July 2026, hereby **APPROVES** the Application to Renew a Retailer's Class CT License at premises 2005 14th Street, NW, filed by Yolo subject to the following **CONDITIONS**:

1. The hours of operation shall be limited to between 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday.
2. The hours of operation shall be limited to between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.
3. The Applicant shall not be eligible for extended hours or one-day substantial changes, extended holiday hours, or other extended-hour privileges that allow the business to operate between the hours of 2:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m., Sunday through Thursday, and 3:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday.
4. Once Yolo's hours of operation have ended, no patrons shall be permitted on the premise, and the consumption of alcohol shall not be permitted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in this Order shall be deemed severable. If any part of this determination is deemed invalid, the Board intends that its ruling remain in effect so long as sufficient facts and authority support the decision. The omission of any testimony or evidence in the Board's Order indicates that such testimony or evidence was contravened by the evidence or testimony credited by the Board, had no or minimal weight on the Board's findings and conclusions, was irrelevant, was not credible, was not truthful, was repetitious, was too speculative, or was otherwise inappropriate for consideration.

The ABCA shall deliver a copy of this order to the Parties.

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

James Turner, Member

Any party adversely affected may file a Motion for Reconsideration of this decision or other motion permitted by law within ten days of service of this Order. If a motion is filed, the opposing party may file a response within seven days. If a response is filed, the movant may file a reply within three days. All filings should be served on all parties to the matter and delivered to the Alcoholic Beverage and Cannabis Administration, 899 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 4200-B, Washington, D.C. 20002, or sent by email to abca.legal@dc.gov. Parties are further advised that the failure to properly serve the other parties or to present all matters of record that have allegedly been erroneously decided in a motion for reconsideration may result in the waiver of those matters being considered by the Board. The Board also reserves the right to summarily deny or not consider multiple and repetitive motions.

In addition to filing a Motion for Reconsideration, pursuant to § 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, a party that is adversely affected may have the right to appeal this Order by filing a petition for review, within 30 days of the date of service of this Order, with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, located at 430 E Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. Parties are advised that the timely filing of a Motion for Reconsideration 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).

Parties are also advised that the Superior Court of the District of Columbia may have jurisdiction to hear appeals in non-contested cases or in matters where that court is specifically provided jurisdiction by law. Finally, advisory neighborhood commissions (ANCs) are advised that their right to appeal or challenge a decision of the Board may be limited by the laws governing ANCs. *See e.g.*, D.C. Code § 1-309.10(g).