

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 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:)	
)	OEA Matter No.: 1601-0085-24
EMPLOYEE, ¹)	
Employee)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: December 9, 2024
)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	NATIYA CURTIS, Esq.
Agency)	Administrative Judge
)	

Employee, *Pro se*
Angel Cox, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 3, 2024, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Public Schools’ (“Agency” or “DCPS”) decision to terminate her from her position as Teacher, effective August 2, 2024. The removal action was based upon a final IMPACT rating of ineffective.² OEA issued a letter dated September 4, 2024, requesting Agency file an Answer on or before October 4, 2024. Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal as required. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge on October 4, 2024. On October 7, 2024, I issued an Order Convening a Status Conference for October 22, 2024. During the Status Conference, Employee asserted that she wished to withdraw her appeal, citing that she had also filed a grievance through her union. I explained that the request to withdraw was required to be submitted in writing to this Office. Employee stated she would submit her written withdrawal. On November 15, 2024, I issued an Order for Employee Response, requiring Employee to submit a response by November 25, 2024, regarding whether she intended to withdraw her Petition for Appeal. On November 25, 2024, Employee submitted a written response, stating that she was withdrawing her appeal. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

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

² Agency’s Answer to Petition for Appeal (October 4, 2024).

The jurisdiction of this Office has not been established in this matter.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based upon Employee's voluntary withdrawal.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

On November 25, 2024, Employee submitted a written request, to have this matter dismissed. 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 the Petition for Appeal in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

/s/ Natiya Curtis
NATIYA CURTIS, ESQ.
Administrative Judge