

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 of Employee Appeals’ Chief Operating Officer 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,	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0014-26
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: February 19, 2026
	)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE	)	
DEPARTMENT,	)	
Agency	)	Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
	)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____	)	
Daniel J. McCartin, Esq., Employee Representative	)	
Kelsey Penna, Esq., Agency Representative	)	

**INITIAL DECISION**

**INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On December 2, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or the “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department’s (“Agency”) adverse action of indefinitely suspending him without pay. Employee’s last position of record was Police Officer. The effective date of this action was November 17, 2025. By letter dated December 2, 2025, the Executive Director of the OEA required Agency to submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal by January 1, 2026. Agency timely submitted its Answer on December 24, 2025. This matter was assigned to the Undersigned on or around December 24, 2025. By Order dated December 29, 2025, the parties were required to appear virtually for a Prehearing/Status Conference (“PSC”) on January 28, 2026. At the parties’ request, the PSC was rescheduled for February 10, 2026. The conference was held on this date and then it was determined that the parties would litigate this matter through written legal briefs. Through written Order dated February 10, 2026, the Undersigned provided a briefing schedule to the parties. On February 18, 2026, Employee, through counsel, submitted a Praecipe to Withdraw Employee’s Petition for Appeal wherein Employee formally notified the OEA that he is opting to withdraw his petition for appeal. After reviewing the salient documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are necessary. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether this matter should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Since Employee voluntarily withdrew his petition for appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that the above-captioned Petition for Appeal be dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Eric T. Robinson

Eric T. Robinson, Esq.  
Senior Administrative Judge