

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the District of Columbia Register and OEA Website. Parties are requested to notify the Office Manager of any formal errors in order that corrections may be made prior to publication. 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,)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0041-23
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: August 23, 2023
)	
D.C. FIRE & EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES,)	Joseph E. Lim, Esq.
<u>Agency</u>)	Senior Administrative Judge
<hr/>		
Andrew Rimm, Employee <i>pro se</i>		
Conner Finch, Esq., Agency Representative		

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On April 21, 2023, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the D.C. Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the D.C. Fire & Medical Services’ (“Agency” or “DCFEMS”) decision to terminate him from his position as a Fire Fighter effective March 25, 2023, due to testing positive for a controlled substance. On April 21, 2023, OEA issued a letter requiring Agency to submit an Answer in this matter. On May 18, 2023, Agency submitted its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal.

This matter was assigned to the undersigned Senior Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on May 18, 2023. On June 12, 2023, I issued an Order scheduling a Prehearing Conference for July 6, 2023, and ordered the submission of Prehearing Statements. While Agency complied with this Order, Employee did not. As a result, I issued a Show Cause Order on July 6, 2023, requiring Employee to show cause for his failure to appear for the Prehearing Conference and submit a Prehearing Statement. Employee had to submit a response by July 17, 2023. 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.

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

OEA Rule 624.3 states in relevant part that the “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:¹

- (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. (Emphasis added).

This Office has consistently held that failure to prosecute an appeal includes a failure to appear and/or a failure to submit required documents after being provided with a deadline for such a submission.² In this matter, Employee failed to submit a Prehearing Statement or appear at the scheduled Prehearing Conference. Employee also failed to respond to a Show Cause Order issued in this matter.

Accordingly, I find that Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office. I further find that Employee’s failure to prosecute his appeal is a violation of OEA Rule 624. For these reasons, this matter should be dismissed for failure to prosecute.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the petition in this matter is **DISMISSED** for failure to prosecute.

FOR THE OFFICE:

s/ Joseph Lim

JOSEPH E. LIM, ESQ.
Senior Administrative Judge

¹ 68 DCR 012473 (December 27, 2021).

² *Williams v. D.C. Public Schools*, OEA Matter 2401-0244-09 (December 13, 2010); *Brady v. Office of Public Education Facilities Modernization*, OEA Matter No. 2401-0219-09 (November 1, 2010).