

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 Operations 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. J-0088-24
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: August 7, 2025
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR)	
GENERAL,)	
Agency)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
)	
Diane Seltzer, Esq., Employee Representative		
Zita Orji, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 6, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or the “Office”) in the above captioned matter contesting the District of Columbia Office of the Inspector General (the “Agency”) action of separating him from service. Employee’s last position of record with the Agency was Assistant Special Agent in Charge. On that same day, the OEA sent a notice to the Agency 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 6, 2024. The Agency timely filed its Answer on October 1, 2024. This matter was then assigned to Administrative Judge Lois Hochhauser on October 2, 2024. During the pendency of this matter, AJ Hochhauser left the OEA. This matter was then reassigned to the Undersigned on June 11, 2025. After review, a Prehearing/Status Conference was convened on July 18, 2025. During this conference, the OEA’s jurisdiction was questioned given that at the time of his removal, Employee served in the Management Supervisory Service (“MSS”). A briefing schedule was then provided for the parties. On August 4, 2025, Employee submitted an executed letter asking that the above-captioned matter be dismissed. After reviewing the salient documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are necessary. The record is now closed.

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

Since Employee voluntarily withdrew his Petition for Appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

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