

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:)	
)	
CHRISTOPHER GLASS,)	
Employee)	
)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0012-16
v.)	
)	Date of Issuance: February 12, 2016
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	
PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	
Agency)	
)	MICHELLE R. HARRIS, Esq.
)	Administrative Judge
Christopher Glass, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>		
Nicole C. Dillard, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On November 13, 2015, Christopher glass (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools’ (“Agency” or “DCPS”) decision to terminate him. On December 17, 2015, Agency filed its Motion to Dismiss and Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on December 21, 2015.

On December 23, 2015, I issued an Order directing Employee to address the jurisdiction issue raised by Agency in its Motion to Dismiss. Employee’s brief was due on or before January 12, 2016. Additionally, Agency had the option to submit a response to Employee’s brief. Employee did not submit his brief by the deadline. Consequently, I issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause to Employee on January 20, 2016. Employee was ordered to submit his brief and a statement of good cause based on his failure to provide a response to the December 23, 2015 Order. Employee had until February 1, 2016, to respond. As of the date of this decision, Employee has not responded to this Order. Agency submitted a renewal of its Motion to Dismiss on January 21, 2016. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule 628.1, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012) states:

The burden of proof with regard to material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. “Preponderance of the evidence” shall mean:

That degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue.

OEA Rule 628.2 *id.* states:

The employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

OEA Rule 621.3 states in relevant part that the “Administrative Judge, in the exercise of sound discretion, may dismiss the action or rule for the appellant if a party fails to take reasonable steps to prosecute or defend an appeal. Failure of a party to prosecute or defend an appeal includes, but is not limited to, a failure to:

- (a) Appear at a scheduled proceeding after receiving notice;
- (b) *Submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such submission (Emphasis added);* or
- (c) Inform this Office of a change of address which results in correspondence being returned.”¹

This Office has consistently held that failure to prosecute an appeal includes a failure to submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such a submission.² In the instant matter, Employee was provided notice in both the December 23, 2015, and January 20, 2016, Orders that a failure to comply could result in sanctions, including dismissal. Employee did not respond to either Order. Additionally, all the Orders were sent via mail to the address provided by Employee in his Petition for Appeal. A response to each of these Orders was required to ensure an appropriate review and resolution of the matter. Accordingly, I find that Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office. I further find that

¹ OEA Rule 621.3, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012).

² *Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985); *Williams v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter 2401-0244-09 (December 13, 2010); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010).

Employee's failure to prosecute his appeal is a violation of OEA Rule 621. For these reasons, this matter should be dismissed for Employee's failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the petition in this matter is **DISMISSED** for failure to prosecute.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MICHELLE R. HARRIS, Esq.
Administrative Judge