

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 <sup>1</sup>	)	OEA Matter No.: 1601-0030-25
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: August 13, 2025
	)	
D.C. COMMISSION ON THE ARTS	)	
AND HUMANITIES,	)	
Agency	)	NATIYA CURTIS, Esq.
	)	Administrative Judge
	)	
Employee, <i>Pro se</i>		
Jeremy Greenberg, Esq., Agency Representative		

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On March 12, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Commission on the Arts and Humanities’ (“Agency” or “CAH”) decision to terminate him from his position as a Community Development Specialist, effective February 10, 2025. The removal action was based upon 6B DCMR 1605.4(k) and D.C. Official Code § 2-1402.11(c-2)) (Sexual Misconduct/Harassment), and 6B DCMR 1605.5(d)) (Failure or Refusal to Follow Instructions). OEA issued a letter dated March 13, 2025, requesting that Agency file an Answer by April 12, 2025. Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal as required.

This matter was assigned to Administrative Judge Lois Hochhauser on April 10, 2025, and reassigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge on June 11, 2025. On June 17, 2025, I issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference for July 29, 2025. On July 24, 2025, Employee submitted a written response, stating that he was withdrawing his appeal. The record is now closed.

**JURISDICTION**

The jurisdiction of this Office has been established in this matter.

---

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

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based upon Employee's voluntary withdrawal.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

On July 24, 2025, Employee submitted a written request, to have this matter dismissed. Accordingly, I find that since Employee has filed a request to withdraw his Petition for Appeal, 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/ Natiya Curtis  
NATIYA CURTIS, ESQ.  
Administrative Judge