

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:)	
)	
CHANTELLE TEASDELL,)	
Employee)	
)	OEA Matter No. J-0090-15
v.)	
)	Date of Issuance: October 23, 2015
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF)	
HUMAN RESOURCES,)	
Agency)	
_____)	
)	MICHELLE R. HARRIS, Esq.
)	Administrative Judge
Daniel Hornal Esq., Employee Representative)	
John Cheek, Esq., Agency Representative)	

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On June 18, 2015, Chantelle Teasdell (“Employee”) filed a Petition for Appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Department of Human Resources¹ (“Agency” or “DCHR”) decision denying her request for back pay. On July 22, 2015, Agency filed its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal along with a Motion to Dismiss. This matter was assigned to the undersigned Administrative Judge (“AJ”) on August 5, 2015.

On August 10, 2015, I issued an Order directing Employee to address the jurisdiction issue raised by Agency in its Answer to Employee’s Petition for Appeal. Employee’s brief was due on or before August 24, 2015. Additionally, Agency had the option to submit a response to Employee’s brief. On August 24, 2015, Employee filed a Consent Motion to Extend Time to Respond. On August 26, 2015, I issued an Order granting this Motion. Employee’s brief was now due on or before September 24, 2015. Employee did not submit a brief by the deadline. Consequently, I issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause to Employee on September 29, 2015. Employee was ordered to submit her brief and a statement of good cause based on her failure to provide a response to the August 26, 2015 Order. Employee had until October 9, 2015, to respond.

¹ Employee filed her Petition for Appeal citing the D.C. Office of Aging (“DCOA”) as the Agency. Employee was employed by DCOA until her termination. However, following her termination, the request for back pay was reviewed and subsequently denied by the D.C. Department of Human Resources. Further, all responses in this matter have been from the D.C. Department of Human Resources.

On October 14, 2015, Employee filed a “Notice of Concession to District’s Motion”, where Employee indicated that she “consents to the Agency’s contention that the Office of Employee Appeals does not have jurisdiction to hear Employee Teasdell’s pay claim and consents to dismissal of this action.”² The record is now closed.

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Office has not been established.

ISSUE

Whether this appeal should be dismissed based upon Employee’s voluntary concession to the dismissal of this matter.

FINDINGS OF FACTS, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

In the instant matter, since Employee has voluntarily conceded to the dismissal of this matter, Employee’s petition is hereby dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the petition in this matter is **DISMISSED**.

FOR THE OFFICE:

MICHELLE R. HARRIS, Esq.
Administrative Judge

² Employee’s Notice of Concession to District’s Motion (October 14, 2015).