

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

v.

ANDREA FLORENCE REID

Case No. 2025-CAB-004022

Hon. Maribeth Raffinan

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court upon Plaintiff District of Columbia’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings filed on September 25, 2025. No opposition has been filed, and the time to do so has passed.¹ For the reasons herein, Plaintiff’s Motion is granted.

I. Procedural Background

On June 23, 2025, Plaintiff filed its Complaint against Defendant under statutory authority “for traffic citations—many for dangerous and unsafe driving offenses—totaling \$56,010 in unpaid fines, penalties, and fees owed to the District of Columbia.” Compl. at 1. “From June 2013 through October 2024, Defendant Reid amassed 206 citations for traffic infractions across her Maryland driver’s license, four Maryland license plates, and three Virginia license plates, the majority for excessive speeding and other unsafe driving in the District.” Compl. at 1. “Rather than pay the thousands of dollars in tickets she has amassed over the years, Defendant Reid has acted as if there are no consequences for her lawlessness. At this point, she owes the District \$56,010 in unpaid fines, penalties, and fees for her unsafe driving.” Compl. at 2.

Defendant filed an Answer on July 18, 2025, arguing that she is not liable “because there were several redlight and speed cameras that were listed in this case to have photographed [her]

¹ The Court previously granted Defendant an extension of time to file an opposition, allowing Defendant to file “no later than November 28, 2025.” 11/14/2025 Order.

car while the machines were malfunctioning” which Defendant observed “tak[ing] continuous pictures of all cars driving in the vicinity where they were located.” Ans. at 1-2. Defendant included a list of such cameras and their locations in the Answer. Ans. at 2. Defendant further asserts that violations which were listed by Plaintiff are “over 10 [years] old” and, after performing some research, she believes that such violations “can be removed.” Ans. at 3.

On September 25, 2025, Plaintiff filed the subject Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings.

II. Factual Background

As this matter comes before the Court upon a motion for judgment on the pleadings, the Court views the facts presented in the pleadings and the inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party, Defendant.

Defendant holds Maryland driver’s license R300067255608; is the registered owner of Maryland license plates 7AJ2294, T105357, 2EM5994, and 2GC4247; and is the registered owner of Virginia license plates VBH9920, VHY6737, and VUY2744. Compl. at 6.

From June 11, 2013, to August 30, 2013, the District issued four traffic tickets under Maryland license plate 7AJ2294. Compl. at 17. Plaintiff seeks \$570 as a result of these traffic tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding these traffic infractions. Compl. at 17-18.

From February 24, 2015, to May 12, 2015, the District issued seven traffic tickets to Defendant under Virginia license plate VBH9920. Compl. at 16. Plaintiff seeks \$972 as a result of these traffic tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding these traffic infractions. *Id.*

On July 11, 2015, the District issued a traffic ticket to Defendant under the Maryland license. Compl. at 6. Plaintiff seeks \$120 as a result of this traffic ticket, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding this traffic infraction. *Id.*

From September 15, 2015, to June 22, 2016, the District issued three traffic tickets to Defendant under Virginia license plate VHY6737. Compl. at 16-17. Plaintiff seeks \$840 as a result of these traffic tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding these traffic infractions. Compl. at 17.

From February 17, 2017, to April 1, 2017, the District issued fourteen traffic tickets to Defendant under Maryland license plate T105357. Compl. at 15-16. Plaintiff seeks \$4,212 as a result of these traffic tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding this traffic infraction. *Id.*

From April 21, 2017, to December 19, 2019, the District issued forty-seven traffic tickets to Defendant under Virginia license plate VUY2744. Compl. at 12-14. Plaintiff seeks \$12,816 as a result of these traffic tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding these traffic infractions. Compl. at 14-15.

From January 15, 2021, to January 27, 2024, the District issued ninety-four traffic tickets to Defendant under Maryland license plate 2EM5994, seventy-nine for speeding and fifteen for running red lights. Compl. at 6-10. Plaintiff seeks \$26,160 as a result of these tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding these traffic infractions. Compl. at 10.

From March 1, 2024, to October 13, 2024, the District issued thirty-six traffic tickets to Defendant under Maryland license plate 2GC4247. Compl. at 11-12. Plaintiff seeks \$10,320 as a result of these tickets, and Defendant has failed to answer regarding these traffic infractions. Compl. at 12.

Five of the cameras which photographed Defendant's car, at various locations in Washington, D.C., were malfunctioning and took "continuous pictures of all cars driving in the vicinity." Ans. at 1-2.

“The [District of Columbia’s Department of Motor Vehicles (“DMV”)] contacted Defendant Reid by mail, notifying her of *each* traffic ticket, the associated penalties, and the period to resolve each ticket.” Compl. at 18 (emphasis in original). “Overall, the DMV allotted Defendant Reid 120 days from the date of *each* initial traffic ticket to contest or resolve any associated fines and penalties.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). “Due to Defendant Reid’s failure to resolve the traffic tickets with the DMV, the DMV referred Defendant Reid’s unpaid fines and penalties to [Central Collection Unit (“CCU”).]” *Id.* “CCU . . . attempted to collect the underlying delinquent debt on multiple occasions by telephone and postal mail but was unsuccessful.” *Id.* “CCU referred the matter to the Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia to initiate a civil action to collect the debt.” *Id.* “The District now seeks \$56,010 from Defendant Reid for *all* delinquent debt owed to the District arising from Defendant’s outstanding traffic tickets set forth in this Complaint.” Compl. at 22.

III. Legal Standard

“After the pleadings are closed—but early enough not to delay trial—a party may move for judgment on the pleadings.” Super. Ct. 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. Zamioski 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 the inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” *Id.* “A motion for judgment on the pleadings should not be granted where there is a genuine issue of material fact.” *Id.* “Within 14 days after service of the motion or at such other time as the court

may direct, an opposing party must file and serve an opposition. If an opposition is not filed within the prescribed time, the court may treat the motion as conceded.” Super. Ct. Civ. R. 12-I(e).

“The Attorney General may bring a civil cause of action in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia . . . against any driver who is suspected of violating [D.C. Code § 50-2201.04 regarding speeding and reckless driving].” D.C. Code § 50-2201.04(g)(1)(A); *see* D.C. Code § 50-22.01.04(a) (“No vehicle shall be operated at a greater rate of speed than permitted by the regulations adopted under the authority of this part.”). “The operator of a vehicle shall be primarily liable for the civil penalties imposed pursuant to this subchapter.” D.C. Code § 50-2303.04(a)(1). “The owner or lessee of the vehicle, even if not the operator thereof, shall also be liable, unless the owner or lessee can show that the vehicle was used without the owner’s or lessee’s express or implied permission.” *Id.* “Absent an intervening criminal or fraudulent act, the owner of a vehicle issued a notice of infraction shall be liable for payment of the fine assessed for the infraction.” D.C. Code § 50-2209.02(a). “If a person fails to answer the notice within 60 calendar days after the date the notice was issued, or within a greater period of time as prescribed by the Director by regulation, the commission of the infraction shall be deemed admitted and all points, penalties, and fines shall be assessed.” D.C. Code § 50-2302.05(e). “[E]ach District agency shall transfer and refer delinquent debts to the Central Collection Unit within 60 days after a financial obligation owed by a person to the District becomes a delinquent debt.” D.C. Code § 1-350.02(a).

Any limitation on the collection of fines after a ten-year period relevant to moving infractions has not been effective and was later repealed. Fiscal Year 2022 Budget Support Act of 2021, 68 D.C. Reg. 010163 (Nov. 13, 2021) (“amendatory section 207 of the District of Columbia Traffic Adjudication Act of 1978, effective October 30, 2018 (D.C. Law 22-175; D.C. Official Code § 50-2302.07) . . . [is] repealed.”); Traffic and Parking Ticket Penalty Amendment Act of

2018, 65 D.C. Reg. 9546 (Oct. 30, 2018) (adding D.C. Code § 50-2302.07, providing that it “shall apply upon the date of inclusion of [its] fiscal effect in an approved budget or financial plan”); D.C. Code § 50-2302.07 (“If a civil fine or penalty resulting from a notice of infraction adjudicated pursuant to the provisions of this title remains unpaid 10 years after the notice is issued, the infraction shall be dismissed any assessed civil fine or penalty shall be vacated and shall not be collected.”) (repealed Nov. 13, 2021).

IV. Analysis

Taking the facts in the pleadings and the inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to Defendant, the Court finds Plaintiff is entitled to judgment on the pleadings. Plaintiff asserts that Defendant has been issued traffic tickets and failed to contest these tickets within the time allotted such that Defendant must pay fines and penalties totaling \$56,010, and Defendant has not provided any facts showing that it has not been issued such tickets, that it had in fact contested these tickets within the time allotted, or that it should otherwise not be held liable for these violations. While Defendant claims that the cameras were malfunctioning, and the Court takes these assertions in the light most favorable to Defendant, Defendant fails to assert that she raised this issue during the time allotted under the statute such that the commission of these infractions should not have been deemed admitted and fines and penalties not deemed assessed pursuant to D.C. Code § 50-2302.05(e). Furthermore, while Defendant argues that fines and penalties arising from violations ten years ago cannot be collected, the relevant statutory provision has never been applicable and has been subsequently repealed such that this argument fails.

Accordingly, it is this 8th of December 2025 hereby:

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion is **GRANTED**; and it is further,

ORDERED that **JUDGMENT** be entered in favor of Plaintiff District of Columbia and against Defendant Andrea Florence Reid in the amount of \$56,010.00.

SO ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Raffinan', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Judge Maribeth Raffinan
Superior Court of the District of Columbia

Copies served electronically on all parties of record.