

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and on 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. 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:)	
)	OEA Matter No.: J-0060-24
EMPLOYEE, ¹)	
Employee)	
)	Date of Issuance: September 13, 2024
v.)	
)	
D.C. DEPARTMENT)	
OF TRANSPORTATION,)	NATIYA CURTIS ESQ.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
)	
)	

Employee, *Pro Se*
Nana Bailey-Thomas, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 28, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Department of Transportation’s (“Agency” or “DDOT”) decision to terminate her from her position as a Traffic Control Officer, effective June 7, 2024. In a letter dated June 28, 2024, OEA requested Agency submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal by July 28, 2024. On July 5, 2024, Employee submitted a Notice to Withdraw her Petition for Appeal, noting that Agency reinstated her employment. Agency did not file an Answer. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on August 1, 2024. On August 8, 2024, the undersigned issued an Order Scheduling Status Conference for Thursday, August 22, 2024. Due to scheduling conflicts between the parties, the undersigned rescheduled the Status Conference for August 27, 2024. Both parties appeared for the Status Conference as required.

On August 27, 2024, the undersigned issued a Post Status Conference Order, requiring Agency to submit a responsive statement regarding Employee’s notice to withdraw her Petition for Appeal. This Statement was due on or before September 10, 2024. Agency submitted its statement as required. I have determined that an Evidentiary Hearing is not required in this matter. The record is now closed.

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office has not been established in this matter.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based upon Employee's voluntary withdrawal.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In her July 5, 2024, submission to this Office, Employee noted that she would like to withdraw her appeal and have this matter dismissed.² Accordingly, I find that since Employee has requested to withdraw her Petition for Appeal, that Employee's Petition should be dismissed.

ORDER

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

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Natiya Curtis
NATIYA CURTIS, ESQ.
Administrative Judge

² Employee's Notice to Withdraw (July 5, 2024).