

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:)	
)	
RONALD HOLDMAN,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0100-12C15
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: January 22, 2016
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	Monica Dohnji, Esq.
PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	Senior Administrative Judge
Agency)	
_____)	
Keith Grimes, Employee’s Representative)	
Carl Turpin, Esq., Agency’s Representative)	

ADENDUM DECISION ON COMPLIANCE

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On May 17, 2012, Ronald Holman (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools’ (“Agency”) decision to terminate him from his position as a Custodian effective June 1, 2012. Employee was terminated for violating 5-E District of Columbia Municipal Regulations (“DCMR”) section 1401.2: (h) falsification of official records; (i) dishonesty; and (u) any other cause authorized by the laws of the District of Columbia.¹ On July 2, 2012, Agency submitted its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal. Following Agency’s failure to defend its action, I issued an Initial Decision (“ID”) on December 26, 2013, reversing Agency’s decision to terminate Employee.

Agency appealed the ID to the OEA Board but the Board denied Agency’s Petition for Review. On June 5, 2015, Employee filed a Motion to Compel, alleging that Agency had failed to comply with the ID. Following several Status Conferences and email correspondence, on

¹ Specifically, Agency noted that Employee “knowingly and willfully failed to fully and/or accurately report [his] earnings from the District of Columbia Public Schools when [he] applied for and/or received unemployment insurance benefits through the District of Columbia Department of Employment Services’ Office of Unemployment Compensation. As a result of this failure to report [his] earnings, [he] collected unemployment insurance benefits to which [he] was not entitled.”

January 21, 2016, Agency submitted documents showing that Employee was reinstated in August of 2015. The document also demonstrated that Employee has received his back pay and all his benefits were restored in November of 2016. Employee's representative does not dispute the fact that Employee has been reinstated or that he has received his back pay and all his benefits restored.² 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 motion for compliance should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Since agency has complied with this Office's decision, Employee's motion to compel is dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the petition in this matter is dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

² See email correspondence between the undersigned and the parties dated January 6, 2016.