

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:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE, <sup>1</sup>	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0090-24
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: January 20, 2026
	)	
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH	)	
REHABILITATION SERVICES,	)	Natiya Curtis, Esq.
Agency	)	Administrative Judge
	)	

Diane Bradley, Esq., Employee Representative  
Daniel P. Thaler, Esq., Agency Representative

### INITIAL DECISION

### INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 16, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services’ (“Agency” or “DYRS”) decision to suspend him from service as a Restorative Justice Specialist for fifteen (15) days, effective August 27, 2024.<sup>2</sup> On September 18, 2024, OEA requested that Agency submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal by October 18, 2024. Agency submitted its Answer on October 10, 2024. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on October 11, 2024. On October 15, 2024, the undersigned issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference for November 22, 2024. Prehearing statements were due by November 15, 2024. The parties submitted their prehearing statements as required.

During the Prehearing Conference held on November 22, 2024, the parties noted they were still engaged in discovery. On November 25, 2024, I issued an Order Convening a Status Conference for January 7, 2025. At the January 7, 2025, Status Conference, the parties again noted they were engaged in discovery but expected to complete discovery by January 17, 2025. Thus, on January 7, 2025, I issued an Order Convening a Status Conference, which scheduled a Status Conference for January 23, 2025. The Status Conference was held as scheduled. On January 24, 2025, I issued a Post-Status Conference Order, which provided the parties with the option to revise their prehearing statements by February 20, 2025.<sup>3</sup>

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

<sup>2</sup> Employee’s Petition for Appeal, p. 16 (September 16, 2024).

<sup>3</sup> both parties submitted revised prehearing statements.

I determined that an Evidentiary Hearing was warranted in this matter. In a Status Conference Order dated March 21, 2025, I scheduled a Status Conference for April 10, 2025, to discuss Evidentiary Hearing dates.<sup>4</sup> On April 21, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order Convening an Evidentiary Hearing for August 25, 2025, and August 26, 2025. On August 22, 2025, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Vacate the Evidentiary Hearing Dates, citing that the parties were engaged in productive settlement discussions. On August 25, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order Regarding the Joint Motion to Vacate the Evidentiary Hearing Dates, which granted the parties joint Motion and scheduled a Status Conference for Tuesday, August 26, 2025.

On August 27, 2025, the undersigned issued a Post Status Conference Order, which required the parties to submit a joint written status report by September 30, 2025. The parties submitted their report by the prescribed deadline and noted that settlement discussions were still pending. On November 14, 2025, I issued an Order Regarding Joint Status Report requiring the parties to submit a joint status report by December 18, 2025. On December 18, 2025, the parties filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss With Prejudice. I have determined that an Evidentiary Hearing is no longer required in this matter. The record is now closed.

#### JURISDICTION

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

#### ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based on the parties' settlement of this matter and the parties' joint motion to dismiss this matter with prejudice.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

D.C. Official Code § 1-606.06 (b) (2001) states in pertinent part that:

If the parties agree to a settlement without a decision on the merits of the case, a settlement agreement, prepared and signed by all parties, shall constitute the final and binding resolution of the appeal, and the [Administrative Judge] shall dismiss the appeal with prejudice.

In the instant matter, the parties submitted a Joint Motion to Dismiss With Prejudice and noted therein that the parties have executed a settlement agreement resolving this matter. For these reasons, and pursuant to the aforementioned code provision, I find that the parties' motion should be granted and the Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Status Conference was held as scheduled.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the parties' Joint Motion to Dismiss with Prejudice is **GRANTED**. Employee's Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED with PREJUDICE**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Natiya Curtis, Esq.  
Administrative Judge