

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the District of Columbia Register. Parties should promptly notify the Administrative Assistant 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:)	
)	
DARSELLE MOSEBY)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 2401-0087-05
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: October 4, 2005
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	
PUBLIC SCHOOLS (DOT))	Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
)	

Darselle Moseby, Employee Pro-Se
Harriet Segar Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF FACTS

Pursuant to a Reduction in Force (hereinafter RIF), Employee's position as a full time Motor Vehicle Operator AKC with the District of Columbia Public Schools Division of Transportation (hereinafter DCPS-DOT) was scheduled to be abolished effective June 22, 2005. The Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (hereinafter the Office) on June 13, 2005. By letter dated June 17, 2005 David Gilmore, Transportation Administrator with DCPS-DOT rescinded the RIF. Furthermore, according to a Memorandum to the Record dated August 5, 2005 the Employee informed the Office that he wanted to withdraw his Petition for Appeal. This matter was assigned to the undersigned judge on August 8, 2005.

JURISDICTION

As will be explained below this Office does not have jurisdiction over this matter.

ISSUE

Whether this Office has jurisdiction over this matter?

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

OEA Rule 604.1 (c) states in pertinent part:

Effective October 21, 1998, and except as otherwise provided in the District of Columbia Government Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978, D.C. Code § 1-601.1 *et seq.* or Rule 604.2 below, any District of Columbia government employee may appeal a final agency decision affecting:

(c) A reduction-in-force.


This Office has no authority to review issues beyond its jurisdiction. *See Banks v. District of Columbia Pub. Sch.*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0030-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (Sept. 30, 1992), __ D.C. Reg. __ (). Furthermore, issues regarding jurisdiction may be raised at any time during the course of the proceeding. *See Brown v. District of Columbia Pub. Sch.*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0027-87, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 29, 1993), __ D.C. Reg. __ (); *Jordan v. Department of Human Services*, OEA Matter No. 1601-0110-90, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (Jan. 22, 1993), __ D.C. Reg. __ (); *Maradi v. District of Columbia Gen. Hosp.*, OEA Matter No. J-0371-94, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (July 7, 1995), __ D.C. Reg. __ ().

According to OEA Rule 604.1 (c) this Office may only review a RIF if it has been finalized. In order for a RIF to be finalized, the Employee must be terminated from his position as a result of the RIF. In the instant matter, the Employee was given notice of the RIF but before it became effective, David Gilmore, Transportation Administrator with DCPS-DOT, rescinded the RIF. Consequently, the Employee's position with DCPS-DOT was never abolished as a result of the RIF. I find that the Employee's RIF was never finalized. Furthermore, I find that this Office lacks jurisdiction over this matter and that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that this matter be DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:



ERIC T. ROBINSON, Esq.
ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE