

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register*. 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:	)	
	)	OEA Matter No.: 2401-0044-10
LORRAINE LAND,	)	
Employee	)	
	)	Date of Issuance: January 20, 2012
v.	)	
	)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	)	
PUBLIC SCHOOLS,	)	
Agency	)	Sommer J. Murphy, Esq.
_____	)	Administrative Judge
Lorraine Land, Employee, <i>Pro Se</i>		
Sara White, Esq., Agency Representative		

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On October 19, 2009, Lorraine Land (“Employee”) filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “the Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Public School’s (“Agency” or “DCPS”) action of abolishing her position through a Reduction-in-Force (“RIF”). Employee’s position of record at the time she filed this appeal was a Psychologist at Seaton Elementary School. The effective date of the RIF was November 2, 2009.

I was assigned this matter on or around November of 2011. On December 13, 2011, I issued an Order scheduling a Status Conference on January 9, 2012, for the purpose of assessing the parties’ arguments in reference to this appeal. Counsel for Agency appeared at the conference; however, Employee did not. I subsequently issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause on January 10, 2012, directing Employee to submit a statement of cause for her failure to appear at the Status Conference. Employee was ordered to submit a response no later than the close of business on January 18, 2011. Employee did not file a response to the Order for Statement of Good Cause.

**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 for failure to prosecute.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

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

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 consistently 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 any required documents.<sup>1</sup> In this case, Employee was warned that the failure to appear at a scheduled conference may lead to the imposition of sanctions, including dismissal of the appeal. Employee was further afforded an opportunity to establish good cause for her failure to appear at the January 9, 2012 conference. Employee did not comply with either order. Employee has not exercised diligence in pursuing her appeal, thus her petition for appeal is dismissed for failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the petition in this matter is dismissed for failure to prosecute.

FOR THE OFFICE:

\_\_\_\_\_  
SOMMER J. MURPHY, 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), \_\_\_ D.C. Reg. \_\_\_ (); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010), \_\_\_ D.C. Reg. \_\_\_ ().