

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CIVIL DIVISION**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

v.

LEON L. CARTER

*
*
*
*
*

Case No. 2025-CAB-001029

Hon. Robert Okun

ORDER

The Plaintiff’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (“Motion for Judgment”), filed on September 25, 2025, is pending before the Court. For the reasons set forth below, the Motion for Judgment will be granted.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 20, 2025, the Plaintiff filed a verified Complaint against the Defendant alleging violations of the Strengthening Traffic Enforcement, Education, and Responsibility Amendment Act (“STEER Act”), D.C. Code § 50-2201.04, in Count I, and seeking to recover \$30,666.00 in delinquent debt under the Delinquent Debt Recovery Act, D.C. Code § 1-350.06, in Count II. More specifically, the Complaint alleged that the Defendant was the sole, registered owner of vehicles associated with five distinct Maryland license plates and one distinct Virginia license plate on which he owed \$30,666.00 in debt after he amassed 84 citations for traffic infractions for these associated vehicles, all but four of which were for excessive speeding in the District, and either failed to answer or resolve the traffic citations for these infractions. Compl. ¶¶ 1, 9, 90.

On August 14, 2025, the Defendant filed his Answer to the Complaint. In his Answer, the Defendant did not dispute any of the allegations in the Complaint and instead stated he had requested to arrange a payment plan but his request was denied because he was not a D.C. resident, and that he remained committed to resolving the matter on any fair and reasonable terms.

On September 25, 2025, the Plaintiff filed its Motion for Judgment, arguing that it was entitled to judgment on the pleadings because the Defendant had admitted his liability by not denying the allegations in the Complaint, citing Super. Ct. Civ. R. 8(b)(6) and 12(c) in support of its argument. On October 7, 2025, the Defendant filed his Opposition¹. In this Opposition, the Defendant did not deny the allegations in the Complaint, but instead stated that he would like to have a trial because the District would not let him arrange for a payment plan because he was not a D.C. resident. On October 15, 2025, the Plaintiff filed its Reply, reiterating that it was entitled to judgment as a matter of law because the Defendant still had not contested the allegations set forth in the Complaint. Finally, on November 26, 2025, the Defendant filed another Opposition, this time stating that he never received the tickets in the mail but again not contesting the underlying violations alleged in the Complaint.

ANALYSIS

D.C. Superior Court Civil Rule 8(b)(6) states that “[a]n allegation – other than one relating to the amount of damages – is admitted if a responsive pleading is required and the allegation is not denied.” Further, D.C. Superior Court Civil Rule 12(c) states that “a party may move for judgment on the pleadings” after the pleadings are closed but “early enough not to delay trial.” D.C. Super. Civ. R. 12(c). “Judgment on the pleadings may be granted only if, on the facts as so admitted, the moving party is clearly entitled to judgment.” *Wilson Courts Tenants Ass’n v. 523-525 Mellon St., LLC*, 924 A.2d 289, 292 (D.C. 2007) (quoting *Bennings Assocs. v. Joseph M. Zamoiski Co.*, 379 A.2d 1171, 1173 (D.C. 1977)). “In considering such a motion the trial court is required to view the facts presented in the pleadings and inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” *Id.* (internal citation omitted). “A motion for

¹ The Defendant, using a pre-printed Court form, titled his Opposition as a Motion, but the Court construed it as an Opposition, which is what it was in substance.

judgment on the pleadings should not be granted where there is a genuine issue of material fact.”
Id. (citing *Amberger & Wohlfarth, Inc. v. District of Columbia*, 300 A.2d 460 (D.C. 1973)).

In this case, the Defendant did not deny the allegations in the Complaint when he filed his Answer. Thus, these allegations are admitted pursuant to Rule 8(b)(6). Further it is clear, based on the facts admitted by the Defendant, that the Plaintiff is entitled to the relief it seeks. Indeed, even in his Oppositions to the Plaintiff’s Motion for Judgment, the Defendant still has not contested his liability for the infractions and unpaid fines, penalties, and fees set forth in the Complaint. Thus, the Court finds that the Plaintiff is entitled to judgment as a matter of law and will grant its Motion for Judgment.

Accordingly, it is this 2nd day of February, 2026, hereby

ORDERED that the Plaintiff’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings is **GRANTED**; and it is further

ORDERED that a separate Judgment will be entered on behalf of the Plaintiff in the amount of \$30,666.00.



Judge Robert Okun
(Signed in Chambers)

Copies to: Counsel of record.

Leon L. Carter
Defendant