

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 of Employee Appeals’ 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,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0063-23
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: May 22, 2024
)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE)	
DEPARTMENT,)	
Agency)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
_____)	

Anthony M. Conti, Esq., & Ryan Carter, Esq., Employee Representatives
Anna Kent, Esq., & Jacob Thole, Esq., Agency Representatives

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 31, 2023, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal in the above captioned matter contesting the Metropolitan Police Department’s (“MPD or the “Agency”) action of Indefinite Suspension Without Pay.¹ On September 1, 2023, the OEA sent a notice to MPD requesting that it submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal. According to this notice, the Agency’s Answer was due on or before October 1, 2023. MPD filed its Answer on September 29, 2023. This matter was assigned to the Undersigned Administrative Judge on September 29, 2023. After review, a Prehearing/Status Conference was initially set to convene on November 1, 2023. The parties then requested multiple extensions of time so that they could conduct ongoing discovery. A Status Conference was then set to occur on May 30, 2024. However, on May 21, 2024, Employee, through counsel, submitted an executed Notice of Dismissal which indicated that the parties had settled this matter and that he was requesting that the above-captioned matter be dismissed. After review of the salient documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are necessary. The record is now closed.

¹ See, Petition for Appeal (August 31, 2023).

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether this matter should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

According to the Notice of Dismissal, the parties were able to reach an amicable settlement of this matter. Since Employee voluntarily withdrew his petition for appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.²

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that the above-captioned Petition for Appeal be dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Eric T. Robinson

Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

² In accordance with Employee's withdrawal of his petition for appeal, the Status Conference that was scheduled for May 30, 2024, is hereby CANCELLED.