

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register*. 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:)	
)	
DEATER BROWN,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0130-15
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: March 15, 2016
)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	
Agency)	Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	
Ralph E. Avery, Esq., Employee Representative		
Carl K. Turpin, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On August 20, 2015, Deater Brown (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or the “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools’ (“Agency”) adverse action of removing her from service. In her Petition for Appeal, it was explained that Employee fell ill and is currently receiving medical care at a nursing home. It was also explained that Employee is currently unable to communicate; therefore her interests in this matter were propounded through a court appointed Guardian/Conservator.¹ This matter was assigned to the undersigned on October 21, 2015. The next day, I issued an Order on whether the OEA may exercise jurisdiction over this matter. Thereafter, Employee’s Guardian/Conservator requested that that date for responding to this order be extended. Thereafter, the parties requested that this matter be referred to the OEA’s Mediation Department. On March 14, 2016, the undersigned was informed by the assigned mediator, Senior Administrative Judge Joseph Lim, that the parties’ had settled their differences and they had

¹ At the onset of Employee’s appeal process, her appointed Guardian/Conservator was Gemma Antoine-Belton. However, during the course of the appeal and mediation process, Ms. Antoine-Belton resigned her position and her duties were transferred to Richard Tappan.

submitted a Joint Motion to Dismiss this matter. After reviewing the documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are required. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether this matter should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Since Employee voluntarily withdrew her petition for appeal, I find that Employee's petition for appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the above-captioned petition for appeal be dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

ERIC T. ROBINSON ESQ.
Senior Administrative Judge