

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:)	
)	
HORACE DOUGLAS,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0048-16
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: November 3, 2016
)	
METROPOLITAN POLICE)	
DEPARTMENT,)	
Agency)	Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	
Daniel J. McCartin, Esq., Employee Representative		
Brenda Wilmore, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On May 16, 2016, Horace Douglas (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the District of Columbia Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “the Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department’s (“MPD” or “the Agency”) adverse actions of suspending him for 15 days, demoting him from the rank of Sergeant to the rank of Officer, and transferring him to the Patrol Services Bureau. This matter was assigned to the Undersigned on or about August 5, 2016. On August 16, 2016, the Undersigned issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference set for September 27, 2016. The conference was held as scheduled. During it, the parts expressed a mutual interest to pursue mediation in lieu of continued adjudication.

The parties participated in settlement talks under the auspices of the OEA’s Mediation Department. On November 3, 2016, Employee, through counsel, submitted a Stipulation of Dismissal. It noted that the parties had reached a settlement in this matter and requested that this matter be dismissed in compliance with the settlement agreement. Considering the record as a whole, I find that no further proceedings are warranted. 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

I am guided by the OEA rules in this matter. OEA 606.2¹ provides that “the Office shall exert every possible effort to resolve matters by mediation, to the extent possible, rather than through litigation.” Furthermore, OEA Rule 606.11 states that “if the parties reach a settlement, the matter shall be dismissed in accordance with D.C. Official Code § 1-606.06(b) (2006 Repl.)” It is evident from the record that the parties have settled their differences in this matter. Accordingly, I find that Employee’s Petition for Appeal should be dismissed in accordance with OEA Rule 606.11.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that this matter be DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge

¹ 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012).