



1 of 7 DOCUMENTS

LEXIS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE ANNOTATED
Copyright 2012 by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc.,
a member of the LexisNexis Group.
All rights reserved.

*** Current through September 19, 2012, and through D.C. Act 19-448 ***
*** Annotations current through November 23, 2012 ***

DIVISION I. GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT
TITLE 1. GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION
CHAPTER 6. MERIT PERSONNEL SYSTEM
SUBCHAPTER XVIII. EMPLOYEE CONDUCT

GO TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE ARCHIVE DIRECTORY

D.C. Code § 1-618.02 (2012)

THIS SECTION HAS MORE THAN ONE DOCUMENT WITH VARYING EFFECTIVE DATES.

§ 1-618.02. Conflicts of interest [Formerly § 1-619.2] [Applicable until contingency met]

No employee of the District government shall engage in outside employment or private business activity or have any direct or indirect financial interest that conflicts or would appear to conflict with the fair, impartial, and objective performance of officially assigned duties and responsibilities.

HISTORY: 1973 Ed., § 1-348.2; Mar. 3, 1979, D.C. Law 2-139, § 1802, 25 DCR 5740; 25 DCR 1981 Ed., § 1-619.2.

NOTES: SECTION REFERENCES. --This section is referenced in § 1-1161.01.

EMERGENCY LEGISLATION. --For temporary amendment of section, see § 401(c)(4) of the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Establishment and Comprehensive Ethics Reform Emergency Amendment Act of 2012 (D.C. Act 19-298, January 29, 2012, 59 DCR 683), applicable as of January 29, 2012.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF LAW 2-139. --See note to § 1-601.01.

EDITOR'S NOTES. --For text of section applicable upon the inclusion of the fiscal effect of D.C. Law 19-124 in an approved budget and financial plan, see the second version.

ANALYSIS Torts

TORTS.

Grant of summary judgment held improper in a defamation and intentional interference with contractor relations claim after the inspector's employer sought to terminate him, because the inspector proffered evidence, if believed by reasonable jurors, to raise a genuine issue of material fact as to whether the employee acted with malice in making the statements against the inspector. *Payne v. Clark*, 25 A.3d 918, 2011 D.C. App. LEXIS 440 (2011).