

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

_____	)	
In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Luula Hagos	)	License Number: 81596
t/a Quality Convenience Store	)	Case Number: 09-CMP-00737
	)	ORDER NUMBER: 2010-355
Holder of a Retailer's Class B License	)	
at premises	)	
2922 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, S.E.	)	
Washington, D.C. 20032	)	
_____	)	

BEFORE: Charles Brodsky, Chairperson  
Nick Alberti, Member  
Donald Brooks, Member  
Herman Jones, Member

**ORDER DENYING RESPONDENT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

On January 28, 2010, the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board (Board) served a Notice of Status Hearing and Show Cause Hearing (Notice), dated January 20, 2010, on Luula Hagos t/a Quality Convenience Store (Respondent), at premises 2922 Martin Luther King Jr. Avenue, S.E., Washington, D.C. The Show Cause Hearing in this matter was held on April 7, 2010.

On May 12, 2010, the Board found that the Respondent violated D.C. Code § 25-711(a)(1), among other violations, and ordered the Respondent to pay a total fine in the amount of \$2,500.00, payable no later than thirty (30) days from the date of the Order. Additionally, the Board ordered that the Respondent's license be suspended for a total of six days; three days of the suspension to be served on May 17, 2010, through May 19, 2010 and three days to be stayed for one year, provided that the Respondent does not commit any violations.


On May 26, 2010, the Respondent filed a Motion for Reconsideration asking the Board to reconsider the fine with respect to Charge III, a violation under D.C. Code § 25-711(a)(1), which obligates the Respondent to post its license in a conspicuous place. The Respondent argued that she should not be penalized for posting the wrong license since the posted license was issued to her by ABRA.


As indicated in Board Order 2010-338, the Board finds that the Government proved that the Respondent violated D.C. Code § 25-711(a)(1) by failing to post the correct license in a conspicuous place. The Respondent, in her testimony, admitted that she never had the correct license in her possession. Therefore, the Board held that the Government had proven Charge III.


**ORDER**

Upon consideration of the Respondent's Motion for Reconsideration and the entire record of this case, the Board, on this 9<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2010, hereby **DENIES** the Respondent's Motion for Reconsideration.

District of Columbia  
Alcoholic Beverage Control Board

  
Charles Brodsky, Chairperson

  
Nick Alberti, Member

  
Donald Brooks, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Herman Jones, Member

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 the service of this Order, with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, 500 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20001.

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, 500 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001. However, the timely filing of a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to 23 DCMR § 1719.1 (April 2004) 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).