

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.: 1601-0090-14
HAYLEIGH ALLINGHAM,)	
Employee)	
)	Date of Issuance: November 24, 2014
v.)	
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	
Agency)	
)	
)	Arien P. Cannon, Esq.
)	Administrative Judge

Hayleigh Allingham, *Pro se*
Carl Turpin, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On June 20, 2014, Hayleigh Allingham (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“Office” or “OEA”) challenging the District of Columbia Public Schools’ (“Agency”) decision to remove her from her position as a Special Education Teacher. Agency filed its Answer on August 13, 2014. Agency filed a Motion to Dismiss on September 25, 2014. This matter was assigned to me on October 10, 2014. A Status Conference was held on November 21, 2014, via telephone conference. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction of this Office is established in this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001).

ISSUE

Whether Employee’s Petition for Appeal should be dismissed based on Agency’s Motion to Dismiss.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Agency filed a Motion to Dismiss on September 25, 2014, essentially arguing that Employee's appeal is moot, as she is still currently employed by Agency (DCPS). Agency issued its Final Notice of Termination on June 20, 2014. On June 30, 2014, Agency issued a Transfer Letter to Employee indicating that she had been chosen to fill a position at another Agency school.¹ This letter apparently resolved any termination issue involving Employee.

A Status Conference was held on November 21, 2014, via telephone conference at which time Employee indicated that she no longer wished to pursue her appeal and did not oppose Agency's Motion to Dismiss. Accordingly, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal is moot and Agency's Motion to Dismiss shall be granted.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Agency's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED** and Employee's Petition for Appeal is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

FOR THE OFFICE:

Arien P. Cannon, Esq.
Administrative Judge

¹ Agency's Motion to Dismiss, Tab 1 (September 25, 2014).