

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Steve Pappas, et al. v. District of Columbia, et al.

Pappas · No. Civil Action No. 19-2800 (RC) · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia grants Vincent Hopkins’s amended motion to intervene in the class action challenging the Metropolitan Police Department’s disability-retirement policy under the ADA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. The court permits intervention to pursue individual monetary damages but limits intervention by denying separate claims for declaratory or injunctive relief. The court concludes that the requirements for permissive intervention are satisfied and that intervention will not cause undue delay or prejudice.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Rudolph Contreras
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Columbia
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Action No. 19-2800 (RC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court considered Vincent Hopkins's amended pro se motion for permissive intervention under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b) in an existing certified class action alleging violations of Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Permissive intervention under Rule 24(b) is discretionary. The court considers whether the applicant has an independent basis for subject-matter jurisdiction, filed a timely motion, presents a claim or defense sharing a common question of law or fact with the main action, satisfies Rule 24(c)'s pleading requirements, and whether intervention would unduly delay or prejudice adjudication of the original parties' rights.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	published district court memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Steve Pappas, et al. v. District of Columbia, et al.

TOPICS

intervention

class actions

civil procedure

ada / disability

disability discrimination

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

employment law

disability discrimination

class actions

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Hopkins satisfied the jurisdictional, timeliness, common-question, and pleading requirements for permissive intervention under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(b)(1) and (c).
2. Whether allowing Hopkins to intervene for individual monetary damages would unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the original parties' rights under Rule 24(b)(3).
3. Whether Hopkins could intervene to pursue declaratory or injunctive relief separate from the certified Rule 23(b)(2) class.

HOLDINGS

1. Hopkins satisfied Rule 24(b)(1) and (c)'s prerequisites because his ADA and Section 504 claims presented federal questions, his motion was timely or his one-day delay was excusable, his claims shared common questions of law or fact with the class action, and he stated the grounds for intervention and submitted a proposed complaint.
2. Hopkins could permissively intervene to pursue individual monetary damages because adding his damages claims would not meaningfully delay or prejudice the existing parties, particularly while fact discovery remained open.
3. Hopkins could not intervene to pursue declaratory or injunctive relief separate from the certified Rule 23(b)(2) class; the court limited his intervention to individual monetary damages.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A nonparty seeking to intervene must ordinarily present: “(1) an independent ground for subject matter jurisdiction; (2) a timely motion; and (3) a claim or defense that has a question of law or fact in common with the main action.”” (at 3)

“the “key to the (b)(2) class is ‘the indivisible nature of the injunctive or declaratory remedy warranted—the notion that the conduct is such that it can be enjoined or declared unlawful only as to all of the class members or as to none of them.’”” (at 7-8)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The underlying certified class action challenges the Metropolitan Police Department's disability-retirement policy under the ADA and Section 504. Hopkins served as an MPD officer, contracted COVID-19 after being placed on sick leave in 2020, developed post-viral COVID syndrome, was referred for disability retirement in August 2021, and was ultimately disability retired under the challenged policy. He sought to intervene to pursue individual monetary damages and related relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously certified a Rule 23(b)(2) class and subclasses and later required notice to absent class members concerning their potential individual damages claims. Hopkins timely filed an initial motion to intervene, which was denied without prejudice because it did not state the grounds for intervention and lacked a proposed complaint. After receiving leave to amend, Hopkins filed an amended motion and proposed complaint; the court granted intervention for individual monetary damages but denied intervention to the extent he sought separate declaratory or injunctive relief.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Pappas v. District of Columbia, 513 F. Supp. 3d 64, 74-77 (D.D.C. 2021)
- Pappas v. District of Columbia, No. 19-cv-2800, 2024 WL 1111298, at *2, *16 (D.D.C. Mar. 14, 2024)
- Pappas v. District of Columbia, No. 19-cv-2800, 2024 WL 3985366, at *2-4 (D.D.C. Aug. 29, 2024)
- Pappas v. District of Columbia, No. 19-cv-2800, 2025 WL 2023211, at *3 (D.D.C. July 18, 2025)
- EEOC v. National Children's Center, Inc., 146 F.3d 1042, 1045-46, 1048 (D.C. Cir. 1998)
- United States v. Facebook, Inc., 456 F. Supp. 3d 105, 114 n.9 (D.D.C. 2020)
- Hedrick v. FBI, 216 F. Supp. 3d 84, 93 (D.D.C. 2016)
- Nuesse v. Camp, 385 F.2d 694, 704, 706 (D.C. Cir. 1967)
- Massachusetts School of Law at Andover, Inc. v. United States, 118 F.3d 776, 782 (D.C. Cir. 1997)
- Friends of Earth v. Haaland, No. 21-cv-2317, 2022 WL 136763, at *2 (D.D.C. Jan. 15, 2022)
- Aristotle International, Inc. v. NGP Software, Inc., 714 F. Supp. 2d 1, 18 (D.D.C. 2010)
- Center for Biological Diversity v. Raimondo, No. 18-cv-112, 2021 WL 2823102, at *2 (D.D.C. July 7, 2021)
- Amador v. U.S. Department of the Interior, 772 F.3d 901, 903 (D.C. Cir. 2014)
- NAACP v. New York, 413 U.S. 345, 366 (1973)
- Roane v. Leonhart, 741 F.3d 147, 151 (D.C. Cir. 2014)
- Crown, Cork & Seal Co. v. Parker, 462 U.S. 345, 351 n.4 (1983)
- NYC C.L.A.S.H., Inc. v. Carson, No. 18-cv-1711, 2019 WL 2357534, at *3 (D.D.C. June 4, 2019)
- Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, 564 U.S. 338, 360 (2011)