

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:	)	
	)	
ANGELO WILLIAMS,	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 2401-0249-09
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: February 1, 2011
	)	
OFFICE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION	)	
FACILITIES MODERNIZATION,	)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency	)	Administrative Judge
_____	)	
Charles J. Brown, Jr., Esq. Agency Representative	)	
Angelo Williams, <i>Pro se</i>	)	

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

On August 28, 2009, Angelo Williams (“Employee”) filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization’s (“Agency”) action of abolishing his position as a Motor Vehicle Operator through a Reduction-In-Force (“RIF”). I was assigned this matter on December 14, 2010. On December 22, 2010, I issued an Order directing the parties to attend a Prehearing Conference set for January 31, 2011, and to submit a Prehearing statement by January 21, 2011. 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. This 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 the Order Convening the Prehearing Conference that failure to comply could result in sanctions including dismissal. Employee did not provide a written prehearing statement and failed to appear at the Prehearing Conference. Both were required by the aforementioned Order. 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 his failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the petition in this matter is dismissed for Employee's failure to prosecute his 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), \_\_\_ D.C. Reg. \_\_\_ ( ); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010), \_\_\_ D.C. Reg. \_\_\_ ( ).