



**District of Columbia
Court of Appeals**

Nos. 17-CV-96, 17-CV-97, 17-CV-191 & 17-CV-197

ANNA MARIA AGOLLI,

Appellant,

v.

2016 CAB 3036

2016 CAB 3265

2016 CAB 3631

2016 CAB 4292

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *et al.*,

Appellees.

BEFORE: Glickman, Easterly, and McLeese, Associate Judges.

JUDGMENT

On consideration of appellees' motions for extension of the time to file their brief and appellant's oppositions thereto, appellees' motion for summary affirmance and appellant's opposition thereto, appellant's brief and appendix, and the record on appeal, it is

ORDERED that appellees' motion for summary affirmance is granted. *See Oliver T. Carr Mgmt., Inc. v. Nat'l Delicatessen, Inc.*, 397 A.2d 914, 915 (D.C. 1979). Appellant's consolidated complaints were dismissed, *inter alia*, as time-barred. The only challenge to dismissal on this basis raised in appellant's brief is that her causes of action did not accrue until she received all the proof she desired of appellees' alleged wrongdoing. However, for each of her claims, appellant was aware of the alleged wrongdoing almost immediately, and the statutes of limitation thus ran without delay. *See Logan v. LaSalle Bank Nat. Ass'n*, 80 A.3d 1014, 1019-20 (D.C. 2013) ("Ordinarily, the statute of limitations begins to run when the injury occurs, whether the plaintiff knows the full scope of misconduct or not, so long as [s]he had at least 'inquiry notice that she might have suffered an actionable injury.'") (quoting *Medhin v. Hailu*, 26 A.3d 307, 310 (D.C. 2011); *Drake v. McNair*, 993 A.2d 607, 617 (D.C. 2010) ("A statute of limitations begins to run when a plaintiff has either actual or inquiry notice of (1) the existence of the alleged injury, (2) its cause in fact, and (3) some evidence of wrongdoing."). Additionally, in her brief, appellant does not raise any specific challenge to the dismissal of any claim of a violation of the District of Columbia Freedom of Information Act (FOIA); therefore, she has abandoned any challenge to a FOIA violation on appeal. *See generally In re*

Nos. 17-CV-96, 17-CV-97, 17-CV-191 & 17-CV-197

Shearin, 764 A.2d 774, 778 (D.C. 2000) (“Points not urged in a party’s initial brief are treated as abandoned.”). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that appellees’ motions for extension of the time to file their brief are denied as moot. It is

FURTHER ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the order on appeal be and hereby is affirmed.

ENTERED BY DIRECTION OF THE COURT:



JULIO A. CASTILLO
Clerk of the Court

Copies to:

Honorable Maurice A. Ross

QRB - Civil Division
Moultrie Bldg., Room 5000

Anna Maria Agolli
3304 6th Street, SE
Apartment 304
Washington, DC 20032

Copies e-served to:

Loren L. AliKhan, Esquire
Solicitor General – D.C.

Carl J. Schifferle, Esquire

cml

**Additional material
from this filing is
available in the
Clerk's Office.**