

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the *District of Columbia Register*. Parties are requested to notify the Office Manager of any formal errors in order that corrections may be made prior to publication. 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. 1601-0274-10
MICHELLE JAMES	)	
Employee	)	Date of Issuance: November 26, 2013
	)	
v.	)	Lois Hochhauser, Esq.
	)	Administrative Judge
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIC OFFICE OF	)	
THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	)	
Agency	)	
_____	)	
Margaret Radabaugh, Esq., Agency Representative	)	
Donald Terrell, Esq., Employee Representative	)	

**INITIAL DECISION**

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Michelle James, Employee, filed a petition with the Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) on February 17, 2010, appealing the decision of the District of Columbia Office of the Inspector General, Agency, to remove her from her position as Management Analyst, effective January 25, 2010. The matter was assigned first to Senior Administrative Judge Joseph E. Lim on July 2, 2012; and then reassigned to this Administrative Judge on March 18, 2013.

A status conference was convened on April 26, 2013. A summary of that proceeding, including time frames agreed upon by the parties to move this matter to resolution by way of a hearing or settlement, was included in the Order issued on April 29, 2013. In the Order, the parties were directed to file a status report by June 7, 2013. No status report was filed. On October 31, 2013, I issued an Order directing the parties to file the status report by November 15, 2013. Shortly after the issuance of the Order, the representatives advised me that Employee had decided to withdraw her appeal. On November 21, 2013, Employee filed a motion requesting that her appeal be dismissed. The record is hereby closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Should this matter be dismissed?

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Employee, represented by counsel, decided that she did not want to pursue this matter further, and filed a motion asking that this petition for appeal be dismissed. Her decision appears to be voluntary and deliberate. The Administrative Judge has determined that good cause exists to grant the motion; and pursuant to OEA Rule 619.2(c), 46 D.C. Reg. 9317 (1999), the motion is hereby granted.

ORDER

Based on these findings and conclusions, and consistent with this analysis, it is hereby:

ORDERED: The petition for appeal is dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

LOIS HOCHHAUSER, Esq.  
Administrative Judge