

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, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF )  
TRANSPORTATION, )  
Agency )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

OEA Matter No. 1601-0023-21

Date of Issuance: January 11, 2022

ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.  
SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Employee *Pro-Se*  
Kathleen R. Miskovsky, Esq., Assistant General Counsel - DDOT

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On April 19, 2021, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal in the above captioned matter contesting his removal from service from the District Department of Transportation (“DDOT” or “Agency”). Employee’s last position of record was Street and Bridge Maintenance Mechanic (RW-4701-10). This matter was assigned to the Undersigned Administrative Judge on September 3, 2021. After review, a Prehearing/Status Conference was convened in order to evaluate the appropriate next steps in this matter. During this Conference, it was strongly suggested that the parties revisit settlement talks in this matter. The parties agreed and underwent additional mediation talks. On January 7, 2022, the parties notified the Undersigned that their settlement talks were successful and that they had settled the matter. In adherence to one of the terms of their agreement, the parties also submitted an executed Joint Motion to Dismiss. This Motion indicated that the parties had settled and that they were jointly requesting that the above-captioned matter be dismissed. After review of the salient documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are necessary. The record is now closed.

**JURISDICTION**

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

ISSUE

Whether this matter should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

According to the Joint Motion for Dismissal, the parties were able to reach an amicable settlement of this matter. Apparently, one of the actions needed to be taken in furtherance of the settlement was Employee voluntarily withdrawing his petition for appeal. Since Employee has voluntarily withdrawn his Petition for Appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that the above-captioned Petition for Appeal be dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Eric T. Robinson  
Eric T. Robinson, Esq.  
Senior Administrative Judge