

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:)	
)	
LENORE PETERS,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0070-19
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: March 4, 2021
)	
D.C. OFFICE OF THE)	
INSPECTOR GENERAL,)	
Agency)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, Esq.
)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	
Lenore Peters, Employee <i>Pro-Se</i>)	
Ryan Martini, Esq., Agency Representative)	

INITIAL DECISION¹

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 5, 2019, the D.C. Office of the Inspector General (“OIG” or the “Agency”) removed Lenore Peters (“Employee”) from service. Employee’s last position of record was Senior Auditor, Grade 14. OIG alleged that Employee received an erroneous overpayment for a Worker’s Compensation wage loss benefit that originated from a prior work-related injury. Agency further alleged that Employee did not timely notify it or the District agency responsible for disbursing this benefit, the D.C. Office of Risk Management (“ORM”) of this overpayment. Employee asserted that she did timely notify ORM that she had returned to work and to stop the wage-loss benefit. However, she further asserted that at the time of the overpayment, there was not a commonly known or approved process for rectifying her situation. Of note, Employee was in the process of repaying the overpayment to ORM at the time she was removed from service.

¹ This decision was issued during the District of Columbia's COVID-19 State of Emergency.

Employee contested her removal by filing a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” of the “Office”). After initial review of the documents of record, a Prehearing Conference and multiple Status Conferences were held and, *inter alia*, the parties explored the possibility of settling this matter. The mediation process was protracted but ultimately successful. On March 1, 2021, Employee submitted a Voluntary Withdrawal notice informing the Undersigned that the parties had settled this matter and that she was moving the OEA to dismiss her Petition for Appeal. After reviewing the documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are warranted. 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

Since Employee voluntarily withdrew her 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