

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 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:	)	
	)	
CARROLL W. ALESTOCK	)	OEA Matter No. 2401-0054-03
Employee	)	
	)	Date of Issuance: May 4, 2006
v.	)	
	)	Daryl J. Hollis, Esq.
	)	Senior Administrative Judge
D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS	)	
Agency	)	

H. David Kelly, Jr., Esq., Employee Representative  
Harriet Segar, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 19, 2003, Employee, a General Maintenance Repair Work Leader, LW-9, filed a petition for appeal from Agency's final decision separating him from Government service pursuant to a reduction-in-force (RIF).

This matter was assigned to me on July 17, 2003. I conducted a Prehearing Conference in this and related matters on September 4, 2003, and a Status Conference on January 8, 2004. An evidentiary Hearing was scheduled in this matter for May 24, 2004. However, that Hearing was held in abeyance after I was informed by Employee's former attorney that Employee was a party to a consolidated case filed in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. The lawsuit, filed by the employee's union, challenged

the validity of this and other RIF's conducted by Agency and involving similarly-situated members of the bargaining unit.

On February 22, 2006, I was informed by Employee's current attorney, Mr. Kelly, that after he had taken over the case he discovered that Employee was not a party to the lawsuit. I then conducted a teleconference on April 25, 2006, at which time Mr. Kelly advised me that Employee would be withdrawing his petition for appeal. On May 3, 2006, I received that withdrawal. The record is closed.

### JURISDICTION

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

### ISSUE

Whether this matter may now be dismissed.


### ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Employee has voluntarily withdrawn his petition for appeal. Pursuant to this withdrawal, I conclude that this matter may now be dismissed.

### ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that this matter is DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

  
DARYL J. HOLLIS, Esq.  
Senior Administrative Judge