

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register*. Parties should promptly notify the Administrative Assistant 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:)

CARRIE ROULHAC)
Employee)

v.)

D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS (DOT))

Agency)

OEA Matter No. 2401-0101-05

Date of Issuance: October 4, 2005

Lois Hochhauser, Esq.
Administrative Judge

Carrie Roulhac, Employee
Harriet Segar, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF FACTS

Employee filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) on June 15, 2005. At the time she filed the petition, she was a full-time permanent employee with Agency. In her petition, she contended that the Agency had initiated a reduction-in-force (RIF), and that she had received a notice that she would be terminated as a result of the RIF on June 22, 2005. On June 17, 2005, Agency notified OEA that it was canceling the RIF. Shortly thereafter Employee advised this Office that she had not been separated and wished to withdraw the petition for appeal.

This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge on or about August 8, 2005, and on August 22, she issued an *Order* directing Employee to notify her by September 2, 2005 if she wished to pursue the appeal given the rescission of the RIF and her request that the petition be withdrawn. She was advised that her failure to respond would be interpreted as consent to the dismissal of the petition. The parties were advised that unless they

were notified to the contrary, the record would close on September 2, 2005. Employee did not respond to the *Order* and the record closed on that date.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Should this matter be dismissed?

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION


It is undisputed that since the RIF has been rescinded, the petition for appeal is now moot. This Office is not required to hear a matter that is moot. *See, e.g. Culver v. D.C. Fire Department*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0121-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (January 16, 1991), __ D.C. Reg. ____ ().

In addition, a petition for appeal may be dismissed with prejudice when an employee fails to prosecute his or her appeal pursuant to OEA Rule 622.3, 46 D.C. Reg. 9313 (1999). According to this Rule, failure to prosecute includes the failure to “[s]ubmit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such submission.” Employee’s failure to respond to the August 22, 2005 *Order* constitutes a failure to prosecute. *See, e.g., Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985). Employee did not respond to the *Order* despite being advised that her failure to respond would be interpreted as consent to the dismissal of the petition. This Administrative Judge concludes that Employee has failed to prosecute this appeal and that this provides an additional ground for the dismissal of this petition.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the petition for appeal is DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:



LOIS HOCHHAUSER, Esq.
Administrative Judge