

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the District of Columbia Register. Parties are requested to notify the Office Manager of any formal errors in order that corrections be made prior to publication. This is not intended to provide an opportunity of a substantive challenge to the decision.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

_____)	
In the Matter of:)	
)	
LEWIS BLAKENEY,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0266-10
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: July 30, 2012
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
_____)	
Lewis Blakeney, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>		
Nana Bailey Thomas, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On January 15, 2010, Lewis Blakeney (“Employee”) filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the D.C. Department of Transportation’s (“Agency”) decision to terminate him from his position as a Motor Vehicle Operator. On February 19, 2010, Agency submitted its Answer to Employee’s petition for appeal, along with other supporting documents.

I was assigned this matter on or around June 10, 2012. On June 11, 2012, I issued an Order directing the parties to attend a Status Conference on July 11, 2012. On June 19, 2012, Employee’s copy of the June 11, 2012, Order which was mailed to his address on record was returned to this Office marked “RETURN TO SENDER; VACANT; UNABLE TO FORWARD.” Agency was present for the Status Conference, but Employee was a no-show. Thereafter, on July 12, 2012, I issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause. Employee was ordered to submit a statement of good cause based on his failure to attend the July 11, 2012 Status Conference. Employee had until July 25, 2012 to respond. The Order specifically noted that if either party did not appear at the Status Conference, sanctions may be imposed pursuant to OEA Rule 621, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012). On July 25, 2012, the July 12, Order mailed to Employee’s address on record was also returned to this Office marked “RETURN TO SENDER;

NO SUCH STREET; UNABLE TO FORWARD. As of the date of this decision, Employee has not responded to this Order. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The Office has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001).

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule 628.1, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012) states:

The burden of proof with regard to material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. “Preponderance of the evidence” shall mean:

That degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue.

OEA Rule 628.2 *id.* states:

The employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

OEA Rule 621.1 grants an Administrative Judge (“AJ”) the authority to impose sanctions upon the parties as necessary to serve the ends of justice. The AJ “in the exercise of sound discretion may dismiss the action or rule for the appellant” if a party fails to take reasonable steps to prosecute or defend an appeal.¹ Failure of a party to prosecute or defend an appeal includes, but is not limited to, a failure to:

- (a) Appear at a scheduled proceeding after receiving notice;
- (b) Submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such submission; or
- (c) Inform this Office of a change of address which results in correspondence being returned.

¹ *Id.* at 621.3.

This Office has consistently held that a matter may be dismissed for failure to prosecute when a party fails to appear at a scheduled proceeding or fails to submit required documents.² Employee did not appear at the Status Conference, and did not provide a written response to my Order for Statement of Good Cause. Additionally, Employee failed to inform this Office of a change in his address, and as such, both Orders from this Office to Employee were returned. These actions were required for a proper resolution of this matter on its merits. I conclude that, Employee's failure to prosecute his appeal is consistent with the language of OEA Rule 621. Employee was notified of the specific repercussions of failing to establish good cause for his failure to attend a scheduled proceeding. Accordingly, I find that Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office, and that therefore, the matter should be dismissed for his failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the petition in this matter is dismissed for Employee's failure to prosecute his Appeal.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Administrative Judge

² *Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985); *Williams v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0244-09 (December 13, 2010); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010).