

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



IN THE MATTER OF:

Date: November 19, 2025

J [REDACTED] Dempson

CASE NO: 25-0053-P

ORDER

Pursuant to the authority conferred by D.C. Official Code § 1-1162.13 and pursuant to authorization by the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability (“BEGA”), the Director of Government Ethics has conducted a preliminary investigation into allegations that the Respondent, J [REDACTED] Dempson, violated the District of Columbia’s Code of Conduct, which prohibits using public office or position for private gain and prohibits engaging in outside activities that conflict with District government employment. The allegations contend that Respondent used confidential information, obtained solely through his District government employment, with the intent to collect a monetary reward.

Based on the results of the preliminary investigation, and the Show Cause Hearing held on September 17, 2025, the Director of Government Ethics has determined that the Respondent’s actions violated District Personnel Regulations, 6B DCMR § 1800.3(g) and 6B DCMR § 1807.1(f). Pursuant to 3 DCMR § 5535.4, Respondent is hereby Publicly Reprimanded.

Statement of the Case

This matter was a preliminary investigation into allegations that Respondent, employee of the Department of Youth and Rehabilitation Services (“DYRS”), disclosed information about a youth offender, which he obtained through the course of his employment, to obtain a monetary award.

Summary of Evidence

Respondent is an employee for DYRS at the New Beginnings Development Center (“New Beginnings”). Respondent became aware that the Metropolitan Police Department (“MPD”) was searching for a suspect who may have committed a crime. Respondent recognized the suspect on the MPD BE-ON-THE-LOOKOUT notice because the suspect had been a youth resident of New Beginnings, prior to the suspected crime, for approximately three years. Respondent called MPD and reported an anonymous tip alerting them of the suspect’s name and that the suspect’s mother lived in Baltimore.

Respondent knew the suspect very well because of their interactions at New Beginnings. Respondent did not know the youth suspect outside of the New Beginnings facility, nor did he communicate with the suspect in his personal life. Respondent obtained the youth's name, identity, and personal information through his employment at DYRS.

According to DYRS's Protection of Confidential Information Policy, dated April 23, 2013, which applies to all DYRS employees, confidential information should not be disclosed except as authorized by the policy and applicable law. Specifically, juvenile case records, juvenile social records, DYRS records, and law enforcement records pertaining to juveniles are confidential. It further states that non-confidential information means information that does not identify any individual youth or make possible the identification of any individual youth. The policy clarifies that conformation of confidential information that is in the possession of another person constitutes disclosure.

After providing the information, Respondent contacted MPD again and asked if he could receive the cash reward for his tip. Respondent was advised that because he is a District government employee, he was not eligible for the reward. Respondent was later subpoenaed to testify during the criminal hearing on the suspected crime. Respondent's testimony surrounded his identification of the suspect as having been a resident at DYRS.

Conclusions of Law

Based on the evidence of record, I therefore conclude:

1. The District Personnel Regulation, 6B DCMR § 1800.3(g) provides that employees shall not use public office or position for private gain.
2. 6B DCMR § 1807.1(f) provides that employees shall not engage in outside activities or private representations that includes divulging any official government information to any unauthorized person or in advance of the time prescribed for its authorized issuance or otherwise making use of or permitting others to make use of information not available to the general public.
3. D.C. Official Code § 1-1162.21(a)(3) states that the Board [of Ethics and Government Accountability] may issue a schedule of fines for violations of [the Code of Conduct], which may be imposed ministerially by the Director of Government Ethics. The Board has so issued that Schedule of Fines.¹
4. Respondent violated 6B DCMR § 1800.3(g) by using confidential information, that he obtained through his DYRS employment, as a means to collect a monetary award for his own private gain.
5. Respondent violated 6B DCMR § 1807.1(f) by engaging in an outside activity in which he divulged confidential information that he obtained through his DYRS employment.

¹ See 3 DCMR § 5530, *et seq.*

WHEREFORE, pursuant to the authority conferred upon me by D.C. Official Code § 1–1162.21(a)(3) and 3 DCMR § 5535.1, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Respondent is **Publicly Reprimanded**.



ASHLEY COOKS
Director of Government Ethics

11/19/2025

DATE

SERVICE OF ORDER

This is to certify I have served a true copy of the foregoing Order on J. [REDACTED] Dempson via email at [REDACTED]



NOTICE

Any party adversely affected by this Order may file an appeal with the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability at 1030 15th Street N.W., Suite 700 West, Washington, D.C. 20005, or by emailing bega@dc.gov. All such appeals must be received by the Board no later than ten (10) days from the date of this Order, excluding weekends and District government holidays.