

Notice: This decision is subject to formal revision before publication in the District of Columbia Register. The 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:)	
)	
LLOYDETTA BRIGHT,)	
Employee)	OEA Matter No. J-0182-12
)	
v.)	Date of Issuance: October 16, 2012
)	
DISTRICT DEPARTMENT OF)	
TRANSPORTATION,)	
Agency)	
)	ERIC T. ROBINSON, Esq.
)	Senior Administrative Judge

Lloydetta Bright, Employee *Pro-Se*
Nana Bailey-Thomas, Esq., Agency Representative

INITIAL DECISION

INTRODUCTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On August 7, 2012, Lloydetta Bright (“Employee”) filed a petition for appeal with the Office of Employee Appeals (“OEA” or “the Office”) contesting the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (“the Agency”) action of removing her from service. I was assigned this matter on or about August 27, 2012. After reviewing the matter, I determined that there existed a question as to whether the OEA may exercise jurisdiction over this matter. Accordingly, I issued an Order dated September 17, 2012, wherein I required the parties to address the jurisdictional issue of whether Employee cause of action was outside of the OEA’s authority to adjudicate. According to said Order, Employee was required to submit her brief on or before September 28, 2012. Employee did not comply. Accordingly, on October 1, 2012, I issued an Order for Statement of Good Cause, wherein I required Employee to provide good cause for her failure to timely submit her response and she was required to submit her response to my order dated August 20, 2012. Employee response to the aforesaid Order for Statement of Good Cause was due on or before October 10, 2012. To date, I have not received a response from Employee. Due to Employee’s failure to actively prosecute her appeal, I have decided that no further proceedings are required. 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 matter should be dismissed.

BURDEN OF PROOF

OEA Rule 628 *et al.*, 59 DCR 2129 (March 16, 2012) states:

628.1 The burden of proof with regard to material issues of fact shall be by a preponderance of the evidence. Preponderance of the evidence shall mean the degree of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to find a contested fact more probably true than untrue.

628.2 The employee shall have the burden of proof as to issues of jurisdiction, including timeliness of filing. The agency shall have the burden of proof as to all other issues.

FINDING OF FACTS, ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSIONS

OEA Rule 621.3, *id.*, states as follows:

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:

- (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.

This Office has held that a matter may be dismissed for failure to prosecute when a party or fails to submit required documents. *See, e.g., Employee v. Agency*, OEA Matter No. 1602-0078-83, 32 D.C. Reg. 1244 (1985). Here, Employee did not file her response as she was required to do pursuant to my September 17, 2012, Order. Furthermore, she did not provide a

written response to my Order for Statement of Good Cause. All were required for a proper resolution of this matter on its merits. Employee has not exercised the diligence expected of an appellant pursuing an appeal before this Office. Accordingly, I find that this matter should be dismissed.

ORDER

It is hereby ORDERED that this matter be DISMISSED due to Employee's failure to prosecute her appeal.

FOR THE OFFICE:

ERIC T. ROBINSON, ESQ.
Senior Administrative Judge