

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 of Employee Appeals' Chief Operating Officer 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,	)	
Employee	)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0072-25
	)	
v.	)	Date of Issuance: March 30, 2026
	)	
UNIVERSITY OF THE	)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,	)	
Agency	)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
	)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
	)	
Employee, <i>Pro-Se</i>		
Anessa Abrams, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 18, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or the “Office”) contesting the University of the District of Columbia’s (“UDC” or the “Agency”) action of removing her from service. Employee’s last position of record with the Agency was Operations Manager. By letter dated July 24, 2025, Employee was informed of Agency’s final decision to terminate her employment with an effective date of July 24, 2025. On August 19, 2025, the OEA’s Executive Director sent a letter to UDC requiring it to submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal by September 18, 2025. On September 15, 2025, Agency, through counsel, requested an Extension of Time to file its Answer, via e-mail. On that same date, the OEA’s Executive Director replied to this e-mail and granted this extension. UDC timely filed its Answer on October 17, 2025.

This matter was assigned to the Undersigned on October 17, 2025. On October 23, 2025, the Undersigned issued an Order Convening a Prehearing/Status Conference. This conference was initially scheduled for December 2, 2025. However, on multiple occasions, the parties requested Continuances so that discovery could be completed. On February 10, 2026, a Status Conference was held and as a result an Order was issued that provided, in pertinent part, a timeline for discovery related activities to be completed. On March 24, 2026, UDC submitted a Motion to

Dismiss wherein it asserted that Employee did not comply with the February 10, 2026, Order and requested that the matter be dismissed due to Employee's failure to prosecute her appeal. In response, on March 27, 2026, Employee submitted a signed notice that she wanted to withdraw her Petition for Appeal. After reviewing the documents of record, I have determined 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

Since Employee voluntarily withdrew her Petition for Appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal should be dismissed.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that the above-captioned Petition for Appeal be dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ *Eric T. Robinson*

Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
Senior Administrative Judge