



BOARD OF ETHICS AND GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY
GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

June 30, 2026

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

RE: Dismissal of Complaint due to lack of jurisdiction

Dear [REDACTED],

This letter is in response to the Open Meetings Act¹ complaint that you submitted to the Office of Open Government (“OOG”) regarding the White House regarding law enforcement issues. We have assigned this matter number OOG-2026-0013, for tracking purposes (“Complaint”).

The Director of Open Government (Director) is authorized to issue advisory opinions regarding the Open Meetings Act (“OMA”), OMA statute and regulations (D.C. Official Code § 2-571 *et seq.*; 3 District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (DCMR) 10400 *et seq.*), upon request.² The OMA does not apply to non-District of Columbia entities, including the White House and Executive Office of the President of the United States.³ Therefore, on behalf of the Director of Open Government, as discussed below, I must dismiss your complaint pursuant to 3 DCMR § 10403.1(a).

I. BACKGROUND

You submitted a complaint to OOG on Sunday, June 21, 2026, where you alleged the following:

No action on information that could be a threat to domestic security and rule of law including explosives, explosive ordinance and no decommissioned military hardware hidden behind false walls as well as providing protection from reprisal for reporting the issue or actually forwarding it to the proper no local or non corrupt domestic enforcement agency or agencies [sic] I have directly contradicting statements from 2 different regional police departments

¹ D.C. Official Code § 2-571 *et seq.*

² See D.C. Official Code §§ 1-1162.05c(a)(1), 2-579(g) (section 205c(a)(1) of the Government Ethics Act of 2011, section 409(g) of the OMA).

³ D.C. Official Code § 2-574(3)(A).

about certain issues they have mishandled and not one person seems to care to actually look at provided documents including his office of which a link to were sent via the white house website.⁴

A discussion of the Complaint and the application of the OMA to this matter follows.

II. DISCUSSION

In your OMA Complaint you ask OOG to take “[w]hatever action you feel necessary” regarding the allegations concerning the White House.⁵

OOG is an office within the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability (BEGA) charged with advancing open governance in the District of Columbia. The OOG’s mission is to ensure that government operations at every level are transparent, open to the public, and promote civic engagement. The OOG ensures compliance with the District of Columbia Open Meetings Act, which requires that all public bodies gathered to consider, conduct or advise on public business take all official action during public meetings and provide proper notice and detailed records of their meetings. The public bodies subject to the DC Open Meetings Act include any government council, the Council of the District of Columbia, boards, commissions and boards of directors of instrumentalities, and advisory boards, but not District agencies.

Pursuant to 3 DCMR § 10400 et seq., OOG's legal staff reviewed your complaint and recommended dismissal due to the threshold question of whether the Director of Open Government has jurisdiction over the matters referenced in the complaint. The Director only has statutory jurisdiction over a public body when that entity is subject to the OMA. Further, 3 DCMR § 10403.1(a) provides that the Director may dismiss a complaint that "does not raise issues within the Director's authority under the Open Meetings Act." The White House and Executive Office of the President are not “public bodies” that are subject to the OMA. Thus, I must dismiss this OMA complaint because it does not raise issues under the Director’s authority.

OOG did not consider the merits of the Complaint because the threshold question of jurisdiction was not met.

III. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, pursuant to 3 DCMR § 10403.1(a) this Complaint is dismissed because it does not raise issues within the Director’s authority under the OMA and this matter is closed with respect to OOG. For allegations of misconduct related to federal officials or administration policies, consider contacting your [U.S. Representative](#) or [Senator](#) to launch an inquiry.


If you have any questions or concerns about this dismissal for lack of jurisdiction, please contact OOG Trial Attorney Brandon Lewis, at brandon.lewis@dc.gov, or OOG Chief Counsel Louis Neal, at louis.neal@dc.gov.

⁴ OMA Complaint Form, June 21, 2026 (attached).

⁵ *Id.*

Sincerely,

NIQUELLE M. ALLEN
DIRECTOR OF OPEN GOVERNMENT

By:  _____
Louis L. Neal, Jr.
Chief Counsel