

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 Chief Operations 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,	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0015-24
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: June 23, 2025
	)	
OFFICE OF UNIFIED	)	
COMMUNICATIONS,	)	
Agency	)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
	)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
	)	

Susan T. Musa, Esq., Employee Representative  
Daniel Thaler, Esq., Agency Representative

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On December 4, 2023, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA”) contesting her removal from the District of Columbia Office of Unified Communications (“Agency”). The effective date of her removal was November 3, 2023. On December 5, 2024, the OEA Executive Director sent a letter to the Agency alerting it that Employee’s Petition for Appeal has been filed and that it is required to submit an Answer no later than January 4, 2024. On January 6, 2024, Agency filed its Answer. Employee’s last position of record was Telecommunications Equipment Operator. This matter was then assigned to the Undersigned on January 26, 2024. On January 30, 2024, the Undersigned issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference. The conference was initially set to be held on March 5, 2024. However, the parties requested multiple extensions of time due to a change in Employee’s legal counsel and press of business. During the pendency of Employee’s appeal, the parties notified the Undersigned that they were in settlement talks. These settlement talks took an extended period of time during which the parties would periodically update the Undersigned that they were progressing. On June 23, 2025, the Undersigned received an executed notice from Employee, through counsel, which indicated that she wanted to withdraw her petition for appeal in adherence to a settlement agreement that had been reached with the Agency. After reviewing the record, the Undersigned has determined that no further proceedings are warranted. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001), has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether this matter should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

According to Employee's response received on June 23, 2025, she voluntarily withdrew her Petition for Appeal. 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