

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the District of Columbia Register. Parties are requested to notify the Office Manager of any formal errors in order that corrections be made prior to publication. This is not intended to provide an opportunity of a substantive challenge to the decision.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BEFORE
THE OFFICE OF EMPLOYEE APPEALS

_____)	
In the Matter of:)	
)	OEA Matter No.: 2401-0026-15
OLANDIS WILLIAMS,)	
Employee)	
)	Date of Issuance: May 8, 2015
v.)	
)	
D.C. WATER AND SEWER AUTHORITY,)	
Agency)	Monica Dohnji, Esq.
_____)	Administrative Judge
Olandis Williams, Employee <i>Pro Se</i>		
Charles Zamstein, Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On December 19, 2014, Olandis Williams (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the D.C. Water and Sewer Authority’s (“Agency”) decision to abolish his position through a Reduction-in-Force (“RIF”). The effective date of the RIF was December 23, 2014. Employee’s position of record at the time his position was abolished was a Utility Systems Operator. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on January 4, 2015. On January 21, 2015, Agency filed its Answer to the Petition for Appeal.

On February 24, 2015, I issued an Order requiring the parties to submit briefs on the issue of whether Agency conducted the instant RIF in accordance with applicable District laws, statutes, and regulations. While Agency submitted a timely response to the February 24, 2015, Order, on March 23, 2015, Employee did not submit his brief as requested. Subsequently, on April 17, 2015, I issued a Statement of Good Cause, wherein, Employee was ordered to explain his failure to submit a response to the February 24, 2015, Order, on or before May 4, 2015. As of the date of this decision, Employee has not responded to either Order. 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 this appeal should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule 628.1, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012) states:

The burden of proof with regard to material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. “Preponderance of the evidence” shall mean:

That degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue.

OEA Rule 628.2 *id.* states:

The employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

OEA Rule 621.1 grants an Administrative Judge (“AJ”) the authority to impose sanctions upon the parties as necessary to serve the ends of justice. The AJ “in the exercise of sound discretion may dismiss the action or rule for the appellant” if a party fails to take reasonable steps to prosecute or defend an appeal.¹ 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.

This Office has consistently held that, failure to prosecute an appeal includes a failure to submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such submission.² Here,

¹ OEA Rule 621.3.

² *Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985); *Williams v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0244-09 (December 13, 2010); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010).

Employee was warned in the February 24, 2015; and April 17, 2015, Orders that failure to comply could result in sanctions, including dismissal. Employee did not provide a written response to these Orders. These were required for a proper resolution of this matter on its merits. I find that Employee's failure to prosecute his appeal is a violation of OEA Rule 621. Accordingly, I further find that Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office. Therefore, this matter should be dismissed for his failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that this matter be **DISMISSED** for Employee's failure to prosecute her Appeal.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MONICA DOHNJI, Esq.
Administrative Judge