

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the District of Columbia Register and OEA Website. Parties are requested to notify the Office Manager of any formal errors in order that corrections may be made prior to publication. 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:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE,	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0068-25
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: December 17, 2025
	)	
DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH	)	JOSEPH E. LIM, ESQ.
REHABILITATION SERVICES,	)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
<u>Agency</u>	)	
Employee <i>pro se</i>		
Conner Finch, Esq., Agency Representative		

**INITIAL DECISION**

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Employee filed a petition with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA”) on August 11, 2025, appealing the decision of the D.C. Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services (“Agency”) to terminate her from her position as a Youth Development Representative. In response to OEA’s August 12, 2025, letter, Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition on September 11, 2025. The matter was assigned to me on September 11, 2025. On October 2, 2025, I scheduled a Prehearing Conference for November 17, 2025.

Only the Agency representative appeared at the conference. On November 17, 2025, I ordered Employee to show cause for her failure to appear at the conference. Employee was notified that her submission was due on November 26, 2025, and that the record would close on that date unless the parties were notified to the contrary. Employee was further advised that failure to respond would result in the dismissal of this matter. The Order was sent to the address listed on Employee’s petition by first class mail, postage prepaid. It was not returned and is presumed delivered. To date, Employee has not responded to the Order. The record is closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Should the petition be dismissed?

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In accordance with OEA Rule 624.3, 6B DCMR Ch. 600 (December 27, 2021), this Office has long maintained that a petition for appeal may be dismissed with prejudice when an employee fails to prosecute the appeal. In this matter, Employee failed to respond to two Orders that I issued. Both had specific time frames and both contained warnings that failures to comply could result in penalties, including the dismissal of the petition. The Orders were sent to Employee at the address she listed as her home address in her petition and in her subsequent submissions. They were sent by first class mail, postage prepaid and were not returned. They are presumed to have been delivered in a timely manner. *See, e.g., Prater v. MPD*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0135-03, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (November 28, 2006).

This petition is being dismissed based on Employee's failure to prosecute her appeal and to comply with properly issued Orders from the undersigned.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that this matter is DISMISSED for failure to prosecute.

FOR THE OFFICE:

*s/s Joseph Lim*

JOSEPH E. LIM, ESQ.

Senior Administrative Judge