

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the *District of Columbia Register* and on 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)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 2401-0069-25
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: January 15, 2026
)	
D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,)	Natiya Curtis, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
)	
Employee, Pro se		
Jeremy Greenberg, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On August 12, 2025, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Office of the Attorney General’s (“Agency” or “OAG”) decision to separate her from service as a Restorative Justice Facilitator due to a Reduction-in-Force (“RIF”).² In a letter dated August 12, 2025, OEA requested that Agency submit an Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal by September 11, 2025. Agency submitted its Answer by the prescribed deadline. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on September 11, 2025. On September 19, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order Convening a Prehearing Conference for October 23, 2025. Prehearings statements were due by October 16, 2025.

On September 30, 2025, Agency submitted a Consent Motion for Continuance and Referral to Mediation. On October 7, 2025, the undersigned issued an Order Regarding Agency’s Consent Motion, which cancelled the Prehearing Conference and scheduled a Status Conference for November 18, 2025. The undersigned also referred this matter for mediation with this Office.

During the Status Conference convened on November 18, 2025, the parties noted that they were negotiating a settlement. Thus, the undersigned issued a Post Status Conference Order requiring

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

² Employee’s Petition for Appeal (August 12, 2025)

the parties to submit a joint written status report by January 6, 2026, or a motion to withdraw Employee's Petition for Appeal if a settlement agreement was reached by that date.

On January 5, 2026, Employee submitted a notice to withdraw her Petition for Appeal.

JURISDICTION

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

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based on Employee's withdrawal of the Petition for Appeal.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In her January 5, 2026, submission, Employee noted she would like to withdraw her petition for appeal in this matter. Accordingly, I find that since Employee has filed a request to withdraw her Petition for Appeal, that Employee's Petition should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that Employee's Petition in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Natiya Curtis, Esq.
Administrative Judge