

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:)	
)	
EMPLOYEE,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0047-23
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: September 15, 2023
)	
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS,)	
Agency)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
)	SENIOR ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

Employee, *Pro-Se*
Gehrrie Bellamy, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On June 23, 2023, Employee filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA”) contesting his removal from the District of Columbia Public Schools (“Agency”). On that same day, the OEA Executive Director sent a letter to the Agency alerting it that Employee’s Petition for Appeal has been filed and that it is required to submit an Answer no later than July 23, 2023. On July 24, 2023, Agency filed its Answer and Motion to Dismiss. In this motion, Agency contends that Employee’s cause of action is outside the scope of OEA’s purview due to Employee’s failure to procure a license to teach. Employee’s last position of record was Special Education Teacher. This matter was assigned to the Undersigned on July 24, 2023. After review, the Undersigned determined that Employee needed to address Agency’s Motion to Dismiss. Accordingly, on August 1, 2023, the Undersigned issued an Order to Employee requiring him to respond in writing to Agency’s Motion to Dismiss. According to this Order, Employee was required to respond by August 17, 2023. Employee did not provide a response. On August 29, 2023, the Undersigned issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause requiring Employee to explain why he did not respond to the August 1, 2023, Order. On September 14, 2023, the Undersigned received a response from Employee which indicated that he wanted to withdraw his petition for appeal. After reviewing the record, the Undersigned has determined that no further proceedings are warranted. The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office, pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-606.03 (2001), has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether this matter should be dismissed.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

According to Employee's response received on September 14, 2023, he voluntarily withdrew his Petition for Appeal. Since Employee voluntarily withdrew his Petition for Appeal, I find that Employee's Petition for Appeal 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