

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:	)	
	)	
EMPLOYEE, ¹	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0008-24C25
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: August 26, 2025
	)	
OFFICE OF CONTRACTING	)	
AND PROCUREMENT,	)	MONICA DOHNJI, ESQ.
Agency	)	Senior Administrative Judge
	)	

Sandra A. Maddox Britt, Esq., Employee Representative
Timothy McGarry, Esq., Agency Representative

ADDENDUM DECISION ON COMPLIANCE

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 9, 2023, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the D.C. Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the Office of Contracting and Procurement’s (“OCP” or “Agency”) decision to summarily remove Employee from her position as a Contract Specialist, effective October 10, 2023. Employee was terminated for False Statements/Record: Deliberate falsification of a material item on an application for employment or other personal history record by omission or by making a false entry.² Following an Evidentiary Hearing, the undersigned issued an Initial Decision (“ID”) on September 18, 2024, reversing Agency’s decision to terminate Employee. Agency did not appeal the September 18, 2024, Initial Decision, accordingly, the September 18, 2024, ID became the final decision in this matter.

On January 3, 2025, Employee filed a Motion to Enforce the Final Decision. The matter was reassigned to the undersigned on December 2, 2024, to address the pending compliance issues. On February 19, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order convening a Status Conference for March 19, 2025. Both parties attended the scheduled Conference. Thereafter, Agency filed its Compliance Statement on May 19, 2025. Agency noted therein that Employee submitted her resignation letter on September 19, 2024, and that it was processing Employee’s backpay. Employee filed a Response to Agency’s Compliance Statement on May 19, 2025. Subsequently, on May 28, 2025, the undersigned

¹ Employee’s name was removed from this decision for the purposes of publication on the Office of Employee Appeals’ website.

² This cause of action is found in 6-B DCMR §1605.4(b)(1).

issued an Order requiring Agency to provide written status update, along with documentation of Agency's full compliance by July 7, 2025. Agency submitted its Compliance Statement on July 7, 2025, citing that Employee's backpay was still being processed. On July 8, 2025, Employee filed a Motion for Leave to File One Day Out of Time the Hard Copy of Employee's Status Update, Request for Sanctions and Attorney's Fees at the *Fitzpatrick* or *Laffey* Rate. On July 16, 2025, Agency filed a Response to Employee's Request for Sanctions. The undersigned issued an Order on July 31, 2025, granting Employee's Motion for Leave to file One Day Out of Time and denying Employee's Motion for Sanctions. This Order also required Agency to provide written status update, along with documentation of Agency's full compliance by September 3, 2025.

On August 25, 2025, Employee filed a Notice of Compliance citing that "the Office of Pay and Retirement Services has issued [Employee] her checks, she has received them, and that office has answered any questions that she had satisfactorily. This is pursuant to the Senior Administrative Judge's September 18, 2024 Order. Unless this Honorable Court has any questions or concerns, the only thing left to determine in this matter is the Employee's Attorney Fees Petition." The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether Employee's January 3, 2025, Motion to Enforce should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In the instant matter, since Employee has resigned from Agency, and has received her backpay, I find that Agency has fully complied with the September 18, 2024, ID. Consequently, I further find that Employee's January 3, 2025, Motion to Enforce has been resolved and should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the January 3, 2025, Motion to Enforce in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Monica N. Dohnji

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge