

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:)	
)	
EMPLOYEE ¹)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0013-21C22
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: May 02, 2022
)	
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,)	Monica Dohnji, Esq.
Agency)	Senior Administrative Judge
)	
<hr/>		
Employee, <i>Pro Se</i>		
Bradford Seamon, Esq., Agency’s Representative		

ADDENDUM DECISION ON COMPLIANCE

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 19, 2021, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the D.C. Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the D.C. Department of Corrections’ (“DOC” or “Agency”) decision to suspend her for fifteen (15) days from her position as an Operations Research Analyst, effective January 4, 2021. Employee was suspended for Conduct Prejudicial to the District Government: use of abusive, offensive, unprofessional, distracting, or otherwise unacceptable language, gestures, or other conduct; quarrelling; creating a disturbance or disruption; or inappropriate horseplay, pursuant to District of Columbia Municipal Regulation (“DCMR”) 1607.2(a)(16).

On January 7, 2022, I issued an Initial Decision (“ID”), reversing Agency’s decision to suspend Employee. Agency did not appeal the ID. Thereafter, on March 19, 2022, Employee filed a Request for Compliance via email. On March 23, 2022, the undersigned issued an Order scheduling a Status Conference for April 20, 2022. Both parties were present for the April 20, 2022, Status Conference. Following the Status Conference, the parties were required to update the undersigned periodically, on the status of this matter. On April 28, 2022, Employee emailed the undersigned and opposing counsel, noting that “... I just wanted to reach out to you all and

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

inform you that I received my backpay from the department of corrections today. Thank you for attention to this mattter (sic).”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 request for Compliance should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Employee noted in her April 29, 2022, email, “I just wanted to reach out to you all and inform you that I received my backpay from the department of corrections today. Thank you for attention to this mattter (sic).”³ Since Agency has complied with this Office’s decision, Employee's Request for Compliance is DISMISSED.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the Request for Compliance in this matter is DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Monica N. Dohnji
MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

² Employee's email (April 28, 2022). The undersigned responded to Employee’s email requiring Employee to provide an official Voluntary Withdrawal Notice by April 29, 2022, so the matter can be dismissed. As of the date of this decision, Employee has not responded to the undersigned’s email.

³ *Id.*