

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:)	
)	
STEPHANIE LINNEN,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0039-18C19
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: July 3, 2019
)	
OFFICE OF THE STATE)	
SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION,)	MONICA DOHNJI, ESQ.
Agency)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	
Stephanie Linnen, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>		
Kevin Stokes, Esq., Agency Representative		

ADDENDUM DECISION ON COMPLIANCE

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 9, 2018, Stephanie Linnen (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the D.C. Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the Office of the State Superintendent of Education’s (“OSSE” or “Agency”) decision to suspend her for ten (10) days from her position as a Staff Assistant, effective March 1, 2018 through March 14, 2018. Following an Agency investigation, Employee was charged with (1) Neglect of Duty – failure to carry out assigned tasks and (2) Insubordination.¹ On April 12, 2018, Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal. On February 13, 2019, I issued an Initial Decision (“ID”), reversing Agency’s decision to suspend Employee.

On May 28, 2019, Employee informed this Office that Agency had not complied with the February 13, 2019, ID.² A Status Conference was held in this matter on June 24, 2019, wherein, Agency provided Employee with her back-pay checks, as well as her annual leave payout check for the suspension period. Additionally, the undersigned ordered Agency to issue an official notice to Employee rescinding the suspension. On July 2, 2019, Agency filed a Statement of

¹ Agency’s Answer at Exhibits A and B (April 12, 2018).

² See Employee’s May 28, 2019, filing.

Compliance, along with a letter rescinding the adverse action of suspension. 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 Employee's request for compliance should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Since Agency has complied with this Office's decision, Employee's request for compliance is dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that Employee's request in this matter is DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge