

**THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
BEFORE  
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS**

## INITIAL DECISION

<sup>2</sup> Employee also filed a request for mediation on February 11, 2025. However, at that time, Agency indicated in email correspondence that it was in ongoing discussions with Employee's representative and that mediation was not necessary at that time.

On March 12, 2025, Employee, by and through her counsel, filed a Notice of Dismissal (“Notice”). Employee cited that the parties had reached a settlement and requested a dismissal of the Petition for Appeal before this Office. I have determined that an Evidentiary Hearing is not warranted. The record is now closed.

### JURISDICTION

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

### ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based on the parties’ settlement of this matter and Employee’s request for dismissal.

### FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

D.C. Official Code § 1-606.06 (b) (2001) states in pertinent part that:

If the parties agree to a settlement without a decision on the merits of the case, a settlement agreement, prepared and signed by all parties, shall constitute the final and binding resolution of the appeal, and the [Administrative Judge] shall dismiss the appeal with prejudice.

In the instant matter, the parties reached a settlement agreement. Furthermore, on March 12, 2025, Employee filed a Notice of Dismissal citing that a settlement had been reached and requested that this matter be dismissed before this Office. For these reasons, and pursuant to the aforementioned code provision, I find that Employee’s Petition for Appeal should be dismissed with prejudice.

### ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Employee’s Petition in this matter is **DISMISSED with Prejudice**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Michelle R. Harris  
Michelle R. Harris, Esq.  
Senior Administrative Judge