

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:)	
)	
MICHAEL CHAMBERS)	OEA Matter No. 1601-0034-01AF08
Employee)	
)	Date of Issuance: January 30, 2009
v.)	
)	Lois Hochhauser, Esq.
D.C. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS)	Administrative Judge
Agency)	
)	

H. David Kelly, Esq., Employee Representative
Pamela Smith, Esq., Agency Representative

ADDENDUM DECISION ON ATTORNEY FEES

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF FACTS

Employee filed a petition with the Office of Employee Appeals (OEA) on April 8, 2008, appealing Agency’s final decision to terminate his employment as an Electrical Worker. On March 7, 2005, Daryl Hollis, Senior Administrative Judge, issued an Initial Decision in which he reversed the removal and ordered Employee reinstated.

Following the time for the exhaustion of all appeals, I was assigned this matter on or about April 9, 2008 to address Employee’s request for the payment of attorney fees. At the status conference held with the representatives on May 29, 2008, the parties agreed to utilize the mediation services offered by this Office. On January 23, 2009, the parties notified me that they had successfully resolved the matter, and Employee requested that the fee petition be dismissed. The record is closed on January 23, 2009.

JURISDICTION

This Office has jurisdiction pursuant to D.C. Office Code Section 1-606.08 (2001).

ISSUE

Should this matter be dismissed?

FINDINGS OF FACT, ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

The parties agree that all issues concerning attorney fees have been resolved, and Employee, through counsel, has requested that his request for the payment of attorney fees should be dismissed. The Administrative Judge commends the parties on their successful resolution of this matter. She concludes that the fee request should be dismissed. *See Rollins v. District of Columbia Public Schools*, OEA Matter No. J-0086-92, *Opinion and Order on Petition for Review* (December 3, 1990) _____ D. C. Reg. _____ ().

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that Employee's request for attorney fees is DISMISSED.

FOR THE OFFICE:

Lois Hochhauser, Esq.
Administrative Judge