

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. 1601-0008-25
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: March 23, 2026
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)	
DEPARTMENT OF)	
CORRECTIONS,)	
Agency)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE
)	
_____ Employee, <i>Pro-Se</i> Zita Orji, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On November 12, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal in the above captioned matter contesting the District of Columbia Department of Corrections (“DOC” or the “Agency”) action of placing him on Enforced Leave. Later that day, the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or the “Office”) sent a notice to DOC requesting that it submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal. According to this notice, the Agency’s Answer was due on or before December 12, 2024. DOC timely filed its Answer on December 5, 2024. This matter was assigned to the Undersigned Senior Administrative Judge on December 6, 2024. After review, a Prehearing/Status Conference was initially set to convene on January 13, 2025. On December 23, 2024, February 21, 2025, and March 3, 2025, Agency made continuing requests for extensions of time in order to conduct and complete discovery in this matter.

Of note, on June 6, 2025, Employee filed another Petition for Appeal in OEA Matter No. 1601-0046-25. In that matter, Employee was removed from service. On July 8, 2025, that matter was initially assigned to my colleague, Administrative Judge Natiya Harris. Thereafter, the removal action was reassigned to the Undersigned. Initially, the Undersigned was wholly unaware that this reassignment occurred. Eventually, the reassignment was brought to the Undersigned’s

active attention and pursuant to an Order dated January 15, 2026, a Status Conference was set for February 12, 2026. The purpose of this Status Conference was to reassess the adjudication track necessary for an adequate review of both matters. Employee did not appear at this conference, so on that same date, an Order for Statement of Good Cause was issued wherein Employee was ordered to explain his absence. On February 27, 2026, Employee timely filed a satisfactory response. Accordingly, the Status Conference was rescheduled for March 19, 2026. During this conference, a wide range of topics were discussed. However, in pertinent part, Employee verbally expressed his desire to discontinue prosecuting his Petition for Appeal in the instant matter but wanted to continue to prosecute his Petition for Appeal in the removal action. Employee was instructed that if he wanted to discontinue prosecuting his appeal in this matter that he had to submit a signed letter indicating as much.

On March 19, 2026, Employee submitted an executed notice which indicated in pertinent part as follows "[p]lease know that I agree that the [OEA] grant summary judgment to the [DOC] because there is no genuine dispute of material facts that warrant an employee appeal hearing for (*sic*) and that my employee appeal petition failed as a matter of law." After reviewing the salient documents of record, I have determined that no further proceedings are necessary. 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 interpret Employee's statement in his notice dated March 19, 2026, as he opting to withdraw his Petition for Appeal. This decision does not affect the pendency of Employee's appeal in his related removal matter (OEA Matter No. 1601-0046-25). Since Employee voluntarily withdrew his Petition for Appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal, in this matter, 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