

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website. Parties should promptly notify the Chief Operating Officer 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)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0081-25
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: April 24, 2026
)	
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN)	
RESOURCES,)	NATIYA CURTIS, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
_____)	
Employee, <i>Pro se</i>)	
Connor Finch, Esq., Agency Representative)	

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 22, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources’ (“Agency” or “DCHR”) decision to separate her from service as a Human Resources (“HR”) Specialist, effective August 22, 2025.² On September 23, 2025, OEA requested that Agency submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal by October 23, 2025. Agency submitted its Answer on October 21, 2025. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on October 21, 2025. Thereafter, on October 30, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order convening a Prehearing Conference for December 9, 2025. Prehearing Statements were due by December 2, 2025. On November 14, 2025, Employee filed a Motion for Continuance of the Prehearing Conference for sixty (60) days, citing medical reasons. In an Order dated November 21, 2025, the undersigned granted Employee’s Motion and rescheduled the Prehearing Conference for January 29, 2026.³ Prehearing Statements were due by January 22, 2026. On January 21, 2026, Agency filed a Consent Motion for Continuance and Extension of time to continue the Prehearing Conference and extend the deadline for Prehearing Statements, citing that the parties were engaged in settlement discussions. In an Order dated January 23, 2025, I granted Agency’s Consent Motion and rescheduled the Prehearing Conference for March 5, 2026, with Prehearing Statements due by February 26, 2026.

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.
² Agency’s Answer, at Attachment 4 (p. 62) (October 22, 2025) (page numbers not in the original but included for ease of reference).
³ The undersigned Amended this Order on December 4, 2025, to correct a clerical error. No substantive changes were made.

On February 26, 2026, Agency filed a Consent Motion for Continuance and Extension of time to continue the Prehearing Conference and extend the deadline for Prehearing Statements, citing that the parties remained in settlement discussions. Accordingly, in an Order dated March 4, 2026, the undersigned granted Agency's Consent Motion in part and stayed the Prehearing Conference pending settlement negotiations. I further required the parties to submit a joint written Status Report updating this Office on the status of their settlement discussions by April 10, 2026. Subsequently, on April 10, 2026, Employee submitted a Notice of Withdrawal of the Petition for Appeal with Prejudice, citing that the parties had reached a settlement agreement. I have determined that an Evidentiary Hearing is not required in this matter. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed with prejudice based on the parties' settlement of this matter and Employee's withdrawal of the Petition for Appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

D.C. Official Code § 1-606.06 (b) (2001) states in pertinent part that:

If the parties agree to a settlement without a decision on the merits of the case, a settlement agreement, prepared and signed by all parties, shall constitute the final and binding resolution of the appeal, and the [Administrative Judge] shall dismiss the appeal with prejudice.

In the instant matter, Employee submitted a Notice of Withdrawal of her Petition for Appeal on April 10, 2026, citing that the parties had reached an agreement. For these reasons, and pursuant to the aforementioned code provision, I find that the Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Employee's Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED with PREJUDICE**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Natiya Curtis, Esq.
Administrative Judge