

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. 1601-0066-24
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: February 24, 2025
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	
PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	
Agency)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
)	

Rashida I. Sims, Esq., Employee Representative
Angel Cox, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On July 11, 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 Public Schools’ (the “Agency”) action of separating him from service due to a charge of Misconduct pursuant to 5-E DCMR § 1401.2 (s). Employee’s last position of record with the Agency was Teacher. On July 11, 2024, 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 August 10, 2024.¹ The Agency timely filed its Answer on August 12, 2024. This matter was then assigned to the Undersigned Administrative Judge on August 13, 2024. After review, a Prehearing/Status Conference was convened on September 17, 2024. Subsequently, a Status Conference was held on October 9, 2024. During this extended stretch, the parties participated in settlement talks on their own accord. On February 14, 2025, Employee, through counsel, submitted an executed Stipulation of Dismissal which indicated that he was requesting 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.

¹ The Undersigned takes judicial notice that August 10, 2024, was a Saturday. Accordingly, Agency’s Answer, which was received the next business day, is deemed to be timely filed.

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