

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:)	
)	
EMPLOYEE ¹ ,)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0059-24
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: August 16, 2024
)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency)	Senior Administrative Judge
)	
Employee, <i>Pro se</i>		
Teresa Q. Hyden, Esq., Agency Representative		

ERRATA AND ADDENDUM TO “INITIAL DECISION”

Please strike the following from page 1 of the August 14, 2024, Initial Decision in the above-captioned matter: “twelve (12) days” and replace with “seven (7) days”.

/s/ *Monica N. Dohnji* _____
MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and the Office of Employee Appeals' website. Parties should promptly notify the Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:)	
)	
EMPLOYEE ¹ ,)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0059-24
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: August 14, 2024
)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency)	Senior Administrative Judge
)	

Employee, *Pro se*
Teresa Q. Hyden, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 21, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA”) contesting the Metropolitan Police Department’s (“Agency” or “MPD”) decision to suspend him for twelve (12) days,² with five (5) days held in abeyance, for one (1) year, effective July 28, 2024. OEA issued a Request for Agency Answer to Petition for Appeal on June 21, 2024. Thereafter, on July 19, 2024, Agency filed its Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction, noting that Employee is a Management Supervisory Service (“MSS”) employee, and that Employee’s twelve (12) days suspension with five (5) days held in abeyance for one (1) year is below OEA’s jurisdictional requirement of ten (10) days suspension. This matter was assigned to the undersigned on July 19, 2024. Subsequently, on July 29, 2024, I issued an Order requiring Employee to address the jurisdiction issue raised by Agency in its Motion to Dismiss. Employee brief was due on or before August 12, 2024, and Agency had the option to submit a reply brief on or before August 26, 2024. Thereafter, on August 9, 2024, Employee filed a

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

² The undersigned inadvertently noted in the July 29, 2024, Order that Employee was suspended for fifteen (15) days with five (5) days held in abeyance for one (1) year.

Notice of Withdrawal wherein, Employee noted that “I hereby withdraw my petition for appeal of MPD’s Final Agency Decision.”³ The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to *D.C. Official Code, § 1-606.03 (2001)*, has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether Employee’s Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In the instant matter, since Employee has voluntarily withdrawn his appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Monica N. Dohnji
MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

³ See Notice of Withdrawal (August 9, 2024).