

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 Office Manager of any formal errors so that this Office can correct them before publishing the decision.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

_____)	
In the Matter of:)	
)	
CLINTON HALL,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0015-17
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: August 3, 2018
)	
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF)	
FORENSIC SCIENCES,)	
Agency)	Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	

Robert J. Shore, Esq., Employee Representative
Nada Paisant, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On November 22, 2016, Clinton Hall (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or the “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Department of Forensic Sciences (“Agency”) action of removing him from service. Employee’s last position of record with the Agency was Fingerprint Analyst. This matter was assigned to the Undersigned on or around March 6, 2017. A Prehearing conference was held on June 29, 2017. A delay in adjudicating this matter ensued due to the Undersigned having been involved in a serious motorcycle accident. Because of this accident, I was out of the Office, recuperating, for an extended period of time. Moreover, the Evidentiary Hearing was rescheduled multiple times due to unavailability of the parties involved in this matter. Ultimately, the Evidentiary Hearing was held on May 31, 2017. At the end of that session, I determined that a second day of hearing was necessary. On June 27, 2018, the parties informed the Undersigned that they had reached a settlement of this matter. On August 2, 2018, Employee, through counsel, submitted a Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice which states in pertinent part that Employee “hereby moves to have the above captioned Appeal dismissed with prejudice as settled.” After reviewing the record, I have determined that no further proceedings are warranted. 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 matter may now be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

I am guided by the OEA rules in this matter. OEA 606.2¹ provides that “the Office shall exert every possible effort to resolve matters by mediation, to the extent possible, rather than through litigation.” Furthermore, OEA Rule 606.11 states that “if the parties reach a settlement, the matter shall be dismissed in accordance with D.C. Official Code § 1-606.06(b) (2006 Repl.)” Employee, through counsel, has submitted a fully executed Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice, noting that the parties have settled their differences and lodging a request to withdraw his Petition for Appeal. Accordingly, I find that Employee’s Petition for Appeal should be dismissed in accordance with OEA Rule 606.11.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that this matter be DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

¹ 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012).