

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS**

Marion S. Barry Jr. Building
441 Fourth Street NW, Suite 450 North
Washington, DC 20001-2714
TEL: (202) 442-9094 · EMAIL: oah.filing@dc.gov
eFiling: <https://ecourt.oah.dc.gov/public-portal>

ARON YABES, PSN,
Petitioner,

v.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Respondent.

Case No.: 2026-DOH-00015

FINAL ORDER

I. Introduction and Procedural History

This matter is before the court pursuant to a request for hearing filed by Petitioner Aron Yabes, a polysomnographic technologist (PSN). On August 29, 2026, Respondent District of Columbia Department of Health (DOH) summarily suspended Mr. Yabes' PSN license pursuant to D.C. Official Code 3-1205.15(a)(1)(D). The summary suspension is based on the alleged facts that the Petitioner (1) did not disclose all the charges pending against him in his license for renewal, (2) the nature of the seven charges, and (3) the nature of Petitioner's work. Respondent claims that when taken together, the evidence shows Petitioner is an imminent danger to the health and safety of the public.¹

Petitioner requested a hearing on August 31, 2026, and the hearing was set for September 4, 2026 at 1:00 p.m. Respondent requested a one-week continuance to allow for the availability of a key DOH witness who was unavailable on September 4, 2026. The Petitioner consented to the continuance, and the court granted the request, setting the date for evidentiary hearing on September 11, 2026, at 11:00 a.m. At the hearing, Petitioner was present and represented himself pro se. Respondent was present and represented by Assistant Attorney General Sophia Mietus. Respondent called two witnesses:

¹ D.C. Official Code 3-1205.15(a)(1)(D).

- 1) Whitney Moore – Interim Executive Director, D.C. Board of Medicine, Office of Health Professional Licensing Boards Health Systems and Preparedness Administration DOH; and
- 2) Emilia Moran – Investigator for Office of Health Professional Licensing Boards Health Systems and Preparedness Administration DOH.

Respondent's Exhibits (RX) 200-206 were admitted into evidence. The Petitioner testified on his behalf. The record was left open until the close of business on Monday, September 14, 2026, for Petitioner to submit additional evidence on his behalf. Petitioner submitted a letter from his attorney for the criminal charges against him on September 18, 2026, outside of the window the record was left open. This letter was not considered by this administrative court. Under D.C. Official Code 3-1205.15(c), the Final Order is typically issued within 72 hours after the hearing.² Based upon the testimony of the witnesses, my assessment of their credibility, and the entire record of these proceedings, I make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

II. Findings of Fact

Petitioner has been a PSN for 15 years at a Kaiser Permanente location in Virginia. He estimates that 90% of his job is remote work in which he interprets patient's sleep study data from studies conducted at their homes. He communicates with patients primarily through email or telephone correspondence. When he does have patient contact, he is with an attending physician. Petitioner's job requires that he be licensed in D.C., Maryland, and Virginia. Petitioner is licensed in the District of Columbia by DOH with license number PSN 20000037. Petitioner is also licensed in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland. He has not had to renew his licenses in those states since his criminal charges. He is still employed by Kaiser Permanente, but on administrative leave due to his license suspension in D.C.

² Regulations on summary suspension provide for a hearing within seventy-two hours of DOH's receipt of a hearing request and for issuance of a decision within seventy-two hours of the hearing. 17 DCMR 4118.2 (f) and 4118.8. Under precedent in this jurisdiction, a time limit such as this is presumed to be directory rather than mandatory if a statute does not specify the consequence of failing to meet the time limit. *Holzager v DC Alcoholic Beverage Control Board*, 979 A.2d 52 (D.C. 2009). While the Office of Administrative Hearings endeavors to afford an opportunity for a hearing expeditiously after receipt of a hearing request from DOH in a summary suspension case, it is sometimes not feasible to schedule a hearing and issue a decision within seventy-two hours when judge is also addressing previously scheduled matters in the same time frame.

Petitioner's D.C. PSN license was set to expire on June 30, 2026, so he submitted a renewal application on June 25, 2026.³ When a license expires but a person has applied for renewal and is awaiting renewal authorization, the D.C. Board of Medicine puts the license into 'renewal pending authorized to work' status, which allows a 60-day extension of their license until a decision has been made. When the Petitioner's license expired, because he had applied for renewal before expiration, his license was extended for 60 days, through August 31, 2026.

The Petitioner's license was expiring on June 30, 2026, and he applied for renewal on June 25, 2026.⁴ On his renewal application the Petitioner was asked:

"Since your last application, have you been arrested, charged, convicted, pled guilty to, or pled no contest to the violation of any criminal law of any jurisdiction whether misdemeanor or felony, including driving under the influence or while impaired, but excluding minor traffic violations? Please note that a charge or conviction does not necessarily mean a barrier to licensure."⁵

Petitioner responded "No."⁶ But under the next question (2):

"Since your last application, have you been a defendant or respondent to a claim for healthcare damages or a malpractice action? If you answer "Yes", please complete the Malpractice Claims Form and submit it along with all relevant court documents (e.g., Complaint, Answer, and Final Order/Decision). A separate Malpractice Claims Form must be completed for each malpractice case."⁷

Petitioner responded "Yes, Charged with Assault. Not convicted. Court case pending."⁸ Additionally, the Petitioner attached a printout of the docket for case no. GC25011669-00, a charge of assault and battery.

Petitioner filled out the form for recertification on his cell phone and said that is why he said 'no' to question (1), which asked about legal arrests and charges and 'yes' to question (2) which asked about healthcare malpractice. Petitioner said that he did not know he needed to list

³ RX 200.

⁴ RX 205.

⁵ RX 200.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.*

all criminal charges against him in that section. Part of the application process for renewal of a PSN licensure is a background check which Petitioner paid \$50 for.⁹

DOH ran a background check on the Petitioner as a part of his license renewal process.¹⁰ This background check showed that Petitioner had been arrested with three misdemeanors for assault and battery.¹¹ There are no specific dates for the first two allegations but a range of dates these alleged incidents occurred on, sometime between May 1st-31st of 2025, sometime between July 1st-31st of 2025, and the third occurrence on October 1, 2025.¹² Petitioner was charged with one count of felony rape occurring sometime between May 1st-31st of 2025¹³, and one felony count of deprivation of liberty occurring on October 1, 2025.

Whitney Moore, Interim Executive Director, D.C. Board of Medicine, explained that generally, a PSN is responsible for the monitoring and administration of sleep studies under general supervision of a physician, and that a PSN monitors the patient while awake and while sleeping. Ms. Moore referred Petitioner's application for additional action by DOH when his background check showed criminal charges. His application was subsequently sent to DOH for action via summary suspension, further investigation by DOH, and to the D.C. Board of Medicine for possible action. Investigator Emilia Moran obtained certified arrest records from the Prince William County courthouse. She read into the record various information, including dates, charges, and statements made by the alleged victim directly from the arrest records.

DOH summarily suspended the Petitioner's PSN license on August 29, 2026. The Petitioner's license expired on August 31, 2026. Petitioner denied all criminal charges against him. He maintained that the charges were made by his former girlfriend of seven years after they broke up when he refused to marry her after her divorce became finalized in October of 2025.

Petitioner was later indicted by a grand jury in Prince William County on July 6, 2026, for two counts of felony strangulation for incidents allegedly occurring on or about May 1, 2025 and on or about October 1, 2025, but was not served notice of those two offenses until after the renewal application.¹⁴

⁹ RX 205.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ RX 201.

¹² *Id.*

¹³ RX 202.

¹⁴ RX 204.

III. Conclusions of Law

This case arises under the District of Columbia Health Occupations Revision Act of 1985, D.C. Official Code 3-1205.01, *et seq.* (the Act). The District of Columbia Office of Administrative Hearings has jurisdiction of this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code 2-1831.03(a). In the District of Columbia, the license of a health professional may be summarily suspended prior to the opportunity for a hearing if it is determined, after an investigation, that continued practice by the health professional poses an imminent danger to the health and safety to the public.¹⁵

A. The Board had the authority to summarily suspend the Petitioner's license even though it has since expired.

Petitioner had applied to renew his District of Columbia PSN license when the Summary Suspension Notice was received by Petitioner. Petitioner license has since expired on August 31, 2026, two days after the summary suspension was served on the Petitioner on August 29, 2026.¹⁶

Although Petitioner did not raise this issue, the Respondent did and this administrative court will address it. In *Davidson v. District of Columbia*, the petitioner challenged the medical board's authority to revoke his medical license for, among other reasons, that the board lacked jurisdiction over petitioner because petitioner's medical license had expired before the board's proposed revocation.¹⁷ Similar to the case at issue, the court in *Davidson* found that the intent of the city council was to strengthen the enforcement of licensing laws and that it would be unreasonable "to deprive the Board of jurisdiction to impose discipline on a person whose license has expired even though the alleged unprofessional conduct occurred while the license was still in effect."¹⁸ The court went further and stated that even in a case where the petitioner voluntarily allows their license to expire, that does not change the Board's ability to impose discipline on the party.¹⁹

Based on the court's finding in *Davidson*, I conclude that Respondent maintained authority to discipline Petitioner even after Petitioner's license provisionally expired on June 30, 2026. Here, the charges occurred over a period spanning May 2025 to October 2025, while the Petitioner was licensed in D.C. Additionally, the Petitioner did apply for a renewal of his license in this case.

¹⁵ D.C. Official Code 3- 1205.15(a)(1)(D).

¹⁶ RX 205.

¹⁷ *Davidson v. District of Columbia*, 562 A.2d 109 (D.C.1989).

¹⁸ *Id.* at 113.

¹⁹ *Id.* at 114.

During the renewal application process, DOH had the authority to suspend the Petitioner's license even though it has since expired. I conclude that the summary suspension of Petitioner's license was in line with *Davidsons* reasoning.

B. Petitioner is not an imminent danger to the health and safety of District residents

The license of a Polysomnographic Technologist or other health professional in the District of Columbia may be summarily suspended before a hearing if it is determined, after an investigation, that the continued practice by the health professional poses an imminent danger.²⁰ The definition of "imminent" is "ready to take place: happening soon."²¹

The government has the "burden of proving by substantial evidence that the summary suspension of a license was necessary to prevent imminent danger to the health or safety of the citizens of the District."²² They must establish that the summary action is supported by "reliable, probative, and substantial evidence."²³ Substantial evidence is evidence that exceeds a mere scintilla of proof; it means "such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion."²⁴

"The agency must make findings on each material issue of fact, the factual findings must be supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole, D.C. Code § 1-1510(a)(3)(E); and the agency's conclusions must flow rationally from those findings and comport with the applicable law."²⁵

Here, DOH is asserting three factors taken together make Petitioner an imminent danger to the health and safety to District residents and warrant the suspension of his license.²⁶ First, the number of the charges, the nature of the offenses charged, and fact that the offenses occurred on multiple dates in the span of six months, indicates a pattern of behavior for the Petitioner.²⁷ Second, DOH asserts that Petitioner's position as a PSN involves monitoring patients during their sleep,

²⁰ D.C. Official Code § 3-1205.15(a)(1)(D).

²¹ See <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/imminent>.

²² 17 DCMR 4118.7.

²³ D.C. Official Code 3- 1205.15(d).

²⁴ *Children's Defense Fund v. District of Columbia Department of Employment Servs.*, 726 A.2d 1242 at 1247 (D.C. 1999) (citing, inter alia, *Consol. Edison Co. v. Nat'l Labor Relations Bd.*, 305 U.S. 197, 229, 83 L. Ed. 126, 59 S. Ct. 206 (1938) (citations omitted)).

²⁵ *Williamson v. District of Columbia Bd. of Dentistry*, 647 A.2d 389, 394 (1994). (citing *Red Star Express v. District of Columbia Dep't of Employment Servs.*, 606 A.2d 161, 163 (D.C. 1992).

²⁶ RX 205.

²⁷ *Id.*

when patients are inherently vulnerable.²⁸ Third, not disclosing all of the charges against him on his renewal application indicates that he is not trustworthy.²⁹

First, DOH cites the fact that the Petitioner is charged with seven different violent offenses concerning three separate incidents over six months as a major factor in Petitioner being an imminent danger. DOH had its own investigator testify to how she obtained the arrest records and she read directly from the arrest records in her testimony but added no additional facts into the record. DOH did not have the person who made the allegations testify nor the officer to whom they made the statements to testify to the accusations made in the arrest records. There is no evidence in the record that the investigator spoke to the police officers who took the statements or the alleged victim. DOH's investigator did not discuss the charges with Petitioner, nor did she have any first-hand knowledge of the facts that gave rise to his arrests. Further, DOH has not entered any specific facts being alleged in these charges besides those in the arrest records themselves.

Further, the primary assertion for the summary suspension of the Petitioner's licensure is a pattern of behavior based on the charges against him and the assertions in the arrest records.³⁰ The arrest records and a statement made by the alleged victim were entered into evidence to prove the truth of the matters they asserted, that he is guilty of those crimes, and this constitutes hearsay.³¹ The District of Columbia Court of Appeals (DCCA) stated, "Absent some indicia of reliability, hearsay evidence alone should not be permitted to offset the sworn testimony of a witness and to constitute substantial evidence in support of an agency position."³² Additionally, DCCA has said that "among the factors to consider in evaluating the reliability of hearsay evidence are 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."³³

Here, the person who accused the Petitioner was not brought to testify and no evidence was presented that she was unavailable to testify. As such, there was no opportunity for cross-examination of the accuser. There was no corroborating evidence of the accuser's allegations, and

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ Fed R. Evid R 801.

³² *Jadallah v. District of Columbia Dep't of Employment Services*, 476 A.2d 671, 677 (1984).

³³ *Compton v. D.C. Bd. of Psychology*, 858 A.2d 470, 477 (2004).

the assertions were directly contradicted by the sworn testimony of the Petitioner. The Petitioner held firmly that his ex-girlfriend was biased against him because he would not marry her. DOH has also not presented probative evidence that shows a plausible nexus he is a danger to his patients based on the allegations to support a conclusion he is an imminent danger to the health and safety of D.C. residents. Simply presenting copies of arrest records, which constitute hearsay, do not weigh heavily enough to meet the burden that they are supported by substantial evidence.

Second, Ms. Moore testified from a lay person's opinion about what a PSN does which she described as monitoring patients while they sleep while under the supervision of a physician. Petitioner explained that 90% of his work is done remotely by reading reports of people's sleep studies done at home. His patient communication is by telephone, email, or in-person with a supervising physician. DOH asserted that having the D.C. PSN license does allow him to work in-person, in D.C., with D.C. residents. While I take note that having the PSN license does allow him to do these things by both accounts, the Petitioner would be supervised by a physician during his interactions with patients and would be in a hospital setting. DOH has not provided reliable evidence to show that his charges stemming from alleged actions towards one person outside of his workplace and with someone who was not a patient, would cause him to be an imminent danger to patients in D.C.

Third, DOH contends that not reporting all his charges on his application is proof of a lack of trustworthiness which, taken in conjunction with the charges against him and the nature of his work, means he is an imminent danger to the health and safety of D.C. residents. The Petitioner only put one of his charges against him on his application for renewal, the least serious charge against him as well, a misdemeanor for assault and battery. Petitioner testified he did not know he needed to list all his charges against him on the application and the application did not tell him he needed to. When looking at the application, it does not expressly state to list all charges, it does state to list 'any': "have you been arrested, charged, convicted, pled guilty to, or pled no contest to the violation of any criminal law of any jurisdiction whether misdemeanor or felony."³⁴ Also, the application has a box for a description of the offense and it does seem intuitive that they would want the person to list all the infractions. Although this does appear to be bad judgement on the

³⁴ RX 200.

part of Petitioner to leave out the most serious charges he was arrested for, he did this knowing DOH would run a background check on him as a part of the renewal application.

Additionally, the Petitioner did this application on his phone and explains that is why he answered ‘no’ to the arrest question but ‘yes’ to the medical malpractice question. Petitioner’s decision to do the application on his phone and to only disclose one of his charges does show a lack of judgement to the seriousness of renewal process. DOH does not connect how the omission on his application directly ties to his dangerousness. Therefore, his omission does not show with sufficient reliability, that combined with his testimony, and the knowledge DOH would be running a background check on him, that significantly increases his chances of being an imminent danger.

Based on the evidence in the record, the arrest records³⁵ and grand jury indictments,³⁶ DOH’s case primarily rests on hearsay allegations. DOH has not shown sufficient evidence that the Petitioner is likely guilty of the crimes he is accused of. Nor have they shown that the arrests alone based on hearsay assertions of one person show a pattern of behavior, while direct testimony denies the accusations made by an ex-girlfriend who could have had a motive to make those charges as Petitioner said. I am not determining whether the allegations are true or false, but only that DOH rests its case primarily on hearsay, which when weighted against sworn testimony, is not enough to constitute sufficiently substantial evidence to support the suspension of the Petitioner’s PSN license.³⁷ Additionally, there has been no evidence to link the arrests to show that he is an immediate danger to the public. Petitioner has been working as a PSN in his current role for 15 years and one to one and a half years since the allegations were made, with no reported incidents outside of the charges in the record. It is not reasonable to assume guilt in these charges and then to expand that assumption to show a pattern of behavior based on hearsay alone without more facts. Also, one cannot reasonably conclude, based on the record, that omission of his other

³⁵ RX 201, RX 202, RX 203.

³⁶ RX 204.

³⁷ The court similarly held that “In the absence of corroboration strong enough to overcome the inference of unreliability flowing from F.M.K.’s availability to testify, petitioner’s direct contradiction of her allegations against him, and the centrality of these hearsay allegations to the agency’s decision, the hearsay deposition in this case did not constitute evidence sufficiently substantial to support the revocation of Dr. Compton’s professional license to practice psychology in the District of Columbia” *Compton v. D.C. Bd. of Psychology*, 858 A.2d 470, 482 (2004).

charges on his renewal application combined with hearsay allegations foreshadows imminent danger to the health and safety of District residents.

IV. Order

Based on the above findings of fact, conclusions of law, and the entire record in this matter, it is:

ORDERED that the **Notice of Summary Action to Suspend License** issued by DOH which summarily suspends the PSN license of Aron Yabes to practice as a polysomnographic technologist in the District of Columbia (License No. PSN20000037) is **VACATED**; and it is further

ORDERED that pursuant to 17 DCMR 4118.12, DOH must notify the District Board of Medicine of this decision for it to determine whether to propose disciplinary action under 17 DCMR 4102; and it is further

ORDERED that the reconsideration and appeal rights of any party aggrieved by this Order are set forth below.

This Final Order is dated when it is served, as certified on the Certificate of Service found at the end of this document.

/s/ Rashee Raj
Rashee Raj [Electronically Signed]
Administrative Law Judge

If you have questions or need help understanding your case or the hearing process, you may contact the OAH Resource Center:

- Call (202) 442-9094 and press '4' from the automated main menu,
- Email oah.help@dc.gov, or
- Visit in person at 441 4th Street NW, Suite 450N, Monday through Friday from 9am to 12pm or 1pm to 5pm and sign in for the Resource Center at the check-in station.

RECONSIDERATION AND APPEAL RIGHTS

Upon entry of this Final Order, you may ask the Administrative Law Judge to change this Final Order with a motion for reconsideration **OR** you may immediately appeal this Final Order to the District of Columbia Court of Appeals with a “Petition for Review”. There are important considerations – including time limitations – for each option as described below.

OPTION 1 - REQUEST THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE TO CHANGE THE FINAL ORDER OR GRANT A NEW HEARING

Motions for Reconsideration or for New Hearing. You may file a written request (a “motion”) with the Office of Administrative Hearings (OAH) asking the Administrative Law Judge to change a final order or schedule a new hearing. These requests are referred to as motions for reconsideration. OAH Rule 2830 explains the circumstances under which such a request may be made. Rule 2830 and other OAH rules are available at <https://oah.dc.gov> and at OAH’s office. Before filing your motion, you must serve the other party with notice regarding your request for reconsideration or new hearing.

How to File a Motion for Reconsideration or New Hearing. You may file a motion for reconsideration or new hearing at OAH using one of the following methods:

- OAH eFiling portal located at: <https://oah.dc.gov/page/oah-efiling-portal>
- Email: oah.filing@dc.gov
- Mail: OAH, 441 Fourth Street, NW, Suite 450 North, Washington, D.C. 20001-2714.

The motion must state when and how copies were served on the other party. Additional information and fill-in-the-blank motion forms can be found at: <https://oah.dc.gov/page/closed-case-forms>

Effect of Filing a Motion for Reconsideration or New Hearing. A motion for reconsideration or new hearing does not release your obligation to comply with the Final Order and to pay any fine or penalty. However, the time it takes you to file your motion may have other effects:

- **Within 10 Days of the Order.** A motion for reconsideration or new hearing that is filed within 10 calendar days of the date the Final Order was issued electronically (or 15 calendar days if OAH mailed the final order to you), will pause the deadline for seeking review with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.
- **Between 10 and 120 Days.** A motion for reconsideration filed after the 10 calendar day deadline (referred to as a “motion for relief” from the Final Order) will *not* pause the deadline for seeking review with the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.
- **After 120 days.** Except under certain limited grounds, a motion for reconsideration or new hearing may not be considered if it is received at OAH more than 120 calendar days after the Final Order was filed (or 125 calendar days if OAH mailed the Final Order to you).

Note for Members of the U.S. Armed Forces. If you are a member of the United States Armed Forces on active duty, you may have certain rights under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, 50 U.S.C.S. Appx. § 501 *et seq.* If you qualify for these rights and you have **LOST** this case because you were not present, you **MAY** be able to have this case reopened. If you think you may qualify under this law, you must notify the Office of Administrative Hearings promptly to ensure that your rights are protected.

OPTION 2 - REQUEST THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS TO CHANGE THE FINAL ORDER

Petition for Review (Appeal). A party suffering a legal wrong or adversely affected or aggrieved by the Final Order may seek judicial review by filing a Petition for Review with the D.C. Court of Appeals. D.C. Appellate Rule 15 explains the circumstances under which a Petition for Review may be made. Please review the Court's rules, available at <https://www.dccourts.gov/court-of-appeals/dccarules> and its forms available at <https://www.dccourts.gov/services/forms>.

- *Note on Challenges to Fine Amounts.* Please note that, pursuant to District law, the D.C. Court of Appeals “may not modify a monetary sanction imposed by an Administrative Law Judge if that sanction is within the limits established by law or regulation.” D.C. Official Code § 2-1831.16(g).

When to File Petition for Review. D.C. Appellate Rule 15 requires that the Petition for Review be received by the Court *within 30 calendar days of the date of the Final Order* (or 35 days if OAH mailed the final order to you).

How to File Petition for Review. As of March 31, 2023, the Court has suspended the requirement for paper copies and the Petition for Review may be delivered or mailed to the address below or emailed to: efilehelp@dcappeals.gov.

Clerk
District of Columbia Court of Appeals
430 E Street, NW, Room 115
Washington, D.C. 20001

Please visit the Court's website at <https://www.dccourts.gov/court-of-appeals> or call the Court's public office at (202) 879-2700 for up-to-date information. There is a \$100 fee for filing a Petition for Review. If you are unable to pay the filing fee, you may alternatively file a motion and affidavit asking to proceed without the payment of the fee when you file the Petition for Review.

Effect of Filing Petition for Review. Filing a Petition for Review does not release your obligation to comply with the final order and to pay any fine or penalty. If you file a Petition for Review with the D.C. Court of Appeals, the OAH Administrative Law Judge will also be unable to rule on any motions/requests to change the Final Order.

Legal Counsel Requirement for Corporate Entities: If you are seeking to file a Petition for Review on behalf of a corporation, LLC, partnership, or other business entity, be advised that your Petition for Review must be signed by legal counsel. D.C. App. R. 15(a)(6). Although a company may appear before the D.C. Office of Administrative Hearings through a non-attorney representative, a corporation must be represented by counsel in the D.C. Court of Appeals. *See, e.g., Moore Energy Res., Inc. v. D.C. Pub. Serv. Comm'n*, 785 A.2d 300, 304 (D.C. 2001) (noting “the long-standing precedent that a corporation cannot appear in court pro se”).

Certificate of Service:

By Email Only:

Aron Yabes, PSN



Sophia Mietus
Office of General Counsel
400 Sixth Street NW
Washington, DC 20001
Sophia.Mietus@dc.gov

Suzanne Fenzel
Department of Health
2201 Shannon Place, SE Fl. #4
Washington, DC 20020
suzanne.fenzel3@dc.gov

General Counsel
District of Columbia Department of Health
2201 Shannon Place, SE, 4th Floor
Washington, DC 20020
Telephone: (202) 442-5977
Facsimile: (202) 442-4797
doh.oah@dc.gov

I hereby certify that on September 29, 2026, this document was served upon the parties named on this page using the addresses listed and the means stated.

/s/ *A. Sullivan*

Clerk / Deputy Clerk