

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:)	
)	
MAUREEN LITTLE,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 2401-0058-13
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: May 22, 2014
)	
UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
OF COLUMBIA,)	Administrative Judge
Agency)	
)	
Maureen Little, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>		
Anessa Abrams, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On February 21, 2013, Maureen Little (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the University of the District of Columbia’s (“Agency”) decision to abolish her position pursuant to a Reduction-in-Force (“RIF”). The effective date of the RIF was February 28, 2013. At the time her position was abolished, Employee’s official position of record was a Secretary. On April 10, 2013, Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal.

This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on February 24, 2014. Because Agency’s Answer was not in the case file, on February 25, 2014, the undersigned issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause to Agency wherein, Agency was ordered to explain its failure to submit its Answer on or before March 7, 2014. On March 7, 2014, Agency provided its response to the February 25, 2014, Order, noting that it submitted a timely Answer. Agency also submitted a copy of its Answer, along with documentation in support of its assertion. Subsequently, on March 14, 2014, I issued an Order wherein, I required the parties to submit briefs addressing the issue of whether the RIF was properly conducted in this matter. Agency’s brief was due on April 4, 2014, however, on March 26, 2014, Agency requested that its brief due date be extended to May 5, 2014. This request was granted in an Order dated March 31, 2014. Additionally, this Order also extended Employee’s brief due date to May 30, 2014. Agency

submitted a timely brief. On May 21, 2014, Employee submitted a letter wherein, she stated that, "...I hereby request that this case be dismissed." The 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.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Since Employee has voluntarily withdrawn her appeal, Employee's Petition for Appeal is dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Administrative Judge