

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:)	
)	
NORMA VELASQUEZ-FRINK)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0109-14
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: January 20, 2015
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC)	
SCHOOLS)	Lois Hochhauser, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
)	

Norma Velasquez-Frink, Employee, *Pro Se*
Sara White, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Norma Velasquez-Frink, Employee herein, filed a petition with the Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) on August 13, 2014, appealing the decision of the District of Columbia Public Schools, Agency herein, to terminate her employment from her position as Teacher, effective July 12, 2014.

The matter was assigned to me on December 2, 2014. Upon review of the documents submitted by Employee, I determined that the jurisdiction of this Office was at issue. The first jurisdictional issue was the timeliness of the appeal. The second jurisdictional issue was the basis for Employee's removal, *i.e.*, Employee was terminated because she did not submit documentation that she had a current teaching license, a prerequisite to remaining a teacher. This basis for termination did not appear to be an issue over which this Office has jurisdiction.

On December 26, 2014, I issued an Order summarizing both issues and directing Employee to file her response regarding the jurisdiction of this Office to hear her, by January 15, 2015. In her response, filed on January 15, 2015, Employee stated, in pertinent part:

I realize that my current inability to provide the documentation requested make[s] it impossible for me to properly prove my case...I would, thus, like to hereby respectfully withdraw my appeal.

The record in this matter is now closed.¹

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office was not established.

ISSUE

Should this matter be dismissed?

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Employee submitted a signed statement asking that her petition for appeal be withdrawn. It appears that her decision to withdraw her appeal was made knowingly and voluntarily. The Administrative Judge therefore concludes that Employee's request should be granted, and that this petition for appeal should therefore be dismissed. *See*, OEA Rule 619.2(g), 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012).

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

¹ Since the appeal is being dismissed based on Employee's request to withdraw the appeal, the part of the December 26, 2014 Order directing Agency to respond to Employee's submission by February 5, 2015 and stating that the record would close on that date, is hereby vacated as moot.