

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register*. 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:)	
)	
VALENTIN CHICAS,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0157-13
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: August 18, 2014
)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	
Agency)	Eric T. Robinson, Esq.
)	Senior Administrative Judge
_____)	
Valentin Chicas, Employee <i>Pro-Se</i>)	
Carl K. Turpin, Esq., Agency Representative)	

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 6, 2013, Valentin Chicas (“Employee”) filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “the “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools’ (“DCPS” or the “Agency”) action of removing him from service. Employee’s last position of record with DCPS was Custodian at Bancroft Elementary School. The undersigned was assigned this matter on or about May 14, 2014. Thereafter, pursuant to an Order dated May 30, 2014, I required the parties to appear for a prehearing conference on July 29, 2014. The parties were also required to submit their respective prehearing statements by July 18, 2014. It should be noted that DCPS fully complied with this order. However, Employee failed to submit his prehearing statement and he failed to appear for the prehearing conference. On July 29, 2014, I issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause to Employee requiring him to establish good cause for his prehearing conference absence and his failure to submit his prehearing statement. Employee’s response was due on or before August 11, 2014. To date, Employee has not filed a response to said order. 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

OEA Rule 621.3, *id.*, states as follows:

If a party fails to take reasonable steps to prosecute or defend an appeal, the Administrative Judge, in the exercise of sound discretion, may dismiss the action or rule for the appellant. Failure of a party to prosecute or defend an appeal includes, but is not limited to, a failure to:

- (a) Appear at a scheduled proceeding after receiving notice;
- (b) Submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such submission; or
- (c) Inform this Office of a change of address which results in correspondence being returned.

As noted above, OEA Rule 621.3 allows for a matter to be dismissed for failure to prosecute when a party does not appear for scheduled proceedings after having received notice or fails to submit required documents. Here, Employee did not appear for the prehearing conference as scheduled and he did not file his prehearing statement and he did not file a response to my Order for Statement of Good Cause. All of the preceding were required for a proper resolution of this matter on its merits. Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office. Accordingly, I find that this matter should be dismissed due to his failure to prosecute his appeal.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that the above-captioned petition for appeal be dismissed.

FOR THE OFFICE:

ERIC T. ROBINSON ESQ.
Senior Administrative Judge