

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BEFORE

THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

In the Matter of:)
)
Gregory Williams) Matter No. 2401-0015-12
Employee)
) Date of Issuance: November 21, 2013
v.)
) Senior Administrative Judge
Department of Mental Health) Joseph E. Lim, Esq.
Agency)

Gregory Williams, Employee *pro se*
Andrea Comentale, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND AND FINDINGS OF FACT

On October 31, 2011, Gregory Williams (Employee) filed a petition for appeal with this Office from Agency's final decision terminating him from his position as a Dental Lab Technician due to a Reduction-in-Force (RIF). The matter was assigned to the undersigned judge on or around July 26, 2013. On August 7, 2013, I ordered Employee to respond to the issue of jurisdiction based on Agency's allegation that Employee had retired.¹ Employee failed to comply. On October 4, 2013, I issued an Order For Good Cause Statement to Employee. Again, Employee failed to respond. Despite prior warnings that failure to comply could result in sanctions, including dismissal; Employee has failed to respond. The record is closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

FINDING OF FACTS, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

In accordance with OEA Rule 621.3, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012), this Office has long maintained that a petition for appeal may be dismissed when an employee fails to prosecute the appeal. In this matter, Employee failed to respond to all Orders that I issued. All 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

1 Agency's Answer to Employee's Petition for Appeal, Tab 5.

address he listed as his home address in his petition and in his 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., Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No.1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985).

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the petition in this matter is dismissed for failure to prosecute.

FOR THE OFFICE:

JOSEPH E. LIM, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge