

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 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:)	
)	
PAULA BONAPARTE,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. J-0052-17
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: September 1, 2017
)	
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER,)	MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Agency)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	
Paula Bonaparte, Employee, <i>Pro Se</i>		
Chaia Morgan, Esq., Agency's Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On May 25, 2017, Paula Bonaparte (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the Office of the Chief Financial Officer’s (“Agency” or “OCFO”) decision to terminate her from her position of Legal Instrument Examiner, effective April 27, 2017. I was assigned to this matter on or around June 5, 2017. On June 19, 2017, Agency filed a Motion to Dismiss For Lack of Jurisdiction, noting that OEA lacked statutory authority to assert jurisdiction in personnel matters involving Agency.

Thereafter, I issued an Order on June 21, 2017, requiring Employee to address the jurisdictional issue raised by Agency in its Motion to Dismiss. Employee’s brief on jurisdiction was due on or before July 7, 2017, and Agency had the option to submit a reply brief on or before July 17, 2017. Following Employee’s failure to submit her brief on jurisdiction, on August 11, 2017, I issued a Statement of Good Cause, wherein, Employee was ordered to explain her failure to submit a response to the June 21, 2017, Order, on or before August 24, 2017. On August 17, 2017, Employee filed a response to the August 11, 2017, Order noting that “[a]fter consulting with an attorney, it was advised to not pursue this action with the OEA. With this information, I halt any further movement with the OEA. This is a Withdrawal of my intention and/or request for Dismissal.”¹ The record is now closed.

¹ Employee Response for Statement of “Good Cause” – Advisement that OEA lack Jurisdiction of the OCFO (August 17, 2017).

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to *D.C. Official Code, § 1-606.03 (2001)*, has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In the instant matter, since Employee has voluntarily withdrawn her Petition for Appeal, Employee's appeal is dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the Petition for Appeal in this matter is DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge