

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 be made prior to publication. This is not intended to provide an opportunity of a substantive challenge to the decision.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

_____)	
In the Matter of:)	
)	
CHRIS WHITEHOUSE,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0105-12
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: February 18, 2014
)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
_____)	
Chris Whitehouse, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>		
Kevin Turner, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On May 24, 2012, Chris Whitehouse (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the Metropolitan Police Department’s (“Agency”) decision to terminate him effective May 4, 2012. On June 25, 2012, Agency submitted its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal.

Following a failed mediation attempt, I was assigned this matter in October of 2013. On October 7, 2013, I issued an Order directing the parties to attend a Status Conference on November 19, 2013. On November 18, 2013, Employee requested that the November 19, 2013 Status Conference be postponed until after March 15, 2014. In an Order dated November 22, 2014, Employee’s request was granted in part, and denied in part. The Status conference was rescheduled for January 13, 2014, at 11:00 am. While Agency was present for the Status Conference at the scheduled time, Employee was an hour and a half late. Because Agency’s representative had already been dismissed following Employee’s failure to appear at the scheduled time, in an Order dated January 14, 2014, the undersigned rescheduled the Status Conference for January 29, 2014. Agency complied, but Employee was a no-show. Thereafter, on January 30, 2014, the undersigned issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause. Employee was ordered to submit a statement of good cause based on his failure to attend the January 29, 2014, Status Conference. Employee had until February 10, 2014 to respond. As of the date of this decision, Employee has not responded. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The Office has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001).

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule 628.1, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012) states:

The burden of proof with regard to material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. “Preponderance of the evidence” shall mean:

That degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue.

OEA Rule 628.2 *id.* states:

The employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

OEA Rule 621.1 grants an Administrative Judge (“AJ”) the authority to impose sanctions upon the parties as necessary to serve the ends of justice. The AJ “in the exercise of sound discretion may dismiss the action or rule for the appellant” if a party fails to take reasonable steps to prosecute or defend an appeal.¹ Failure of a party to prosecute or defend an appeal includes, but is not limited to, a failure to:

- (a) Appear at a scheduled proceeding after receiving notice;
- (b) Submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such submission; or
- (c) Inform this Office of a change of address which results in correspondence being returned.

This Office has consistently held that a matter may be dismissed for failure to prosecute when a party fails to appear at a scheduled proceeding or fails to submit required documents.²

¹ *Id.* at 621.3.

² *Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985); *Williams v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0244-09 (December 13, 2010); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010).

Employee did not appear at the November 29, 2014, Status Conference, and did not provide a written response to my Order for Statement of Good Cause. Both were required for a proper resolution of this matter on its merits. I conclude that Employee's failure to prosecute his appeal is consistent with the language of OEA Rule 621. Employee was notified of the specific repercussions of failing to establish good cause for his failure to attend a scheduled proceeding. Accordingly, I find that Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office, and therefore, the matter should be dismissed for his failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that this matter be dismissed for Employee's failure to prosecute his Appeal.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Administrative Judge