

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:	)	
	)	
GINA DOUGLAS,	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 2401-0034-10
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: January 27, 2012
	)	
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH,	)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency	)	Administrative Judge
_____	)	
Gina Douglas, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>	)	
Frank McDougald, Esq., Agency's Representative	)	

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

On October 9, 2009, Gina Douglas (“Employee”) filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the D.C. Department of Mental Health’s (“Agency”) action of abolishing her position as a Training Specialist through a Reduction-In-Force (“RIF”). The effective date of the RIF was September 12, 2009.

I was assigned this matter on or around November 15, 2011. Thereafter, on November 29, 2011, I issued an Order directing the parties to attend a Prehearing Conference set for January 4, 2012. The Order specifically noted that if either party did not appear at the Prehearing Conference, sanctions may be imposed pursuant to OEA Rule 622, 46 D.C. Reg. at 9312. Agency complied, but Employee did not. Subsequently, on January 5, 2012, I issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause to Employee. Employee was ordered to submit a statement of cause based on her failure to attend the Prehearing Conference. Employee had until January 26, 2012, to respond. 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.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

OEA Rule 622.3, 46 D.C. Reg. at 9313 (1999) provides as follow:

If a party fails to take reasonable steps to prosecute or defend an appeal, the Administrative Judge, in the exercise of sound discretion, may dismiss the action or rule for the appellant. 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.

This Office has 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.<sup>1</sup> Here, Employee was warned in each Order that failure to comply could result in sanctions, including dismissal. Employee did not appear at the Prehearing Conference, and did not provide a written response to my Order for Statement of Good Cause. Both were required for a proper resolution of this matter on its merit. I conclude 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 her failure to prosecute.

ORDER

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

FOR THE OFFICE:

---

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.  
Administrative Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> *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).