

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 Operating 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 ¹	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0044-26
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: August 7, 2026
	)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,	)	MONICA DOHNJI, ESQ.
Agency	)	Senior Administrative Judge
	)	

Daniel J. McCartin, Esq., Employee Representative
Robert Rich, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 20, 2026, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA”) contesting the Metropolitan Police Department’s (“Agency” or “MPD”) decision to place her on Indefinite Suspension Without Pay, effective March 6, 2026. OEA issued a Request for Agency Answer to Petition for Appeal on March 20, 2026. Agency filed its Answer to the Petition for Appeal on April 20, 2026.

This matter was assigned to the undersigned on April 20, 2026. The undersigned issued an Order on May 12, 2026, scheduling a Status/Prehearing Conference for June 2, 2026. Both parties were present for the scheduled conference. Thereafter, on June 9, 2026, the undersigned issued a Post Status/Prehearing Conference Order requiring the parties to submit briefs. Agency’s brief was due by June 30, 2026; Employee’s brief was due by July 22, 2026; and Agency had the option to file a sur-reply brief by August 5, 2026. Both parties timely filed their required briefs. On August 3, 2026, Employee filed a Notice of Dismissal stating that “the parties in the above-captioned case have reached a settlement. Accordingly, [Employee] hereby moves to dismiss the above-captioned case.” The record is now closed.

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

JURISDICTION

The Office has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001).

ISSUE

Whether Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

D.C. Official Code §1-606.06(b) (2001) states in pertinent part that:

If the parties agree to a settlement without a decision on the merits of the case, a settlement agreement, prepared and signed by all parties, shall constitute the final and binding resolution of the appeal, and the [Administrative Judge] shall dismiss the appeal with prejudice.

In the instant matter, since the parties have reached a settlement agreement, and Employee has requested that this matter be dismissed, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Employee's Notice of Dismissal is **GRANTED** and the Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Monica N. Dohnji

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge