**Notice:** This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the District of Columbia Register. Parties should promptly notify this office of any formal errors so that they may be corrected before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

## GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS BOARD

)

In the Matter of:

Doctors' Council of District of Columbia General Hospital,

Complainant,

v.

District of Columbia General Hospital,

Respondent.

PERB Case No. 95-U-10 Opinion No. 441

## DECISION AND ORDER

On June 15, 1995, we issued Opinion No. 437, denying Respondent's Motion to Dismiss the Complaint filed in the abovecaptioned proceeding. Since the record remained unclear and inconclusive, we deferred making a determination on Complainant's (Doctors' Council of D.C. General Hospital) Motion for Summary Judgement and\or Decision on the Pleadings and directed the parties to provide further evidence and argument on the issues presented by the Complaint.

Upon consideration of the parties' submissions, we conclude that significant issues of fact remain in dispute. Therefore, we must deny Complainant's Motion. Furthermore, we shall refer the matter to a hearing examiner to develop a complete record upon which findings, conclusions and recommendations can be made with respect to the asserted unfair labor practice.<sup>1</sup>/ In view of the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>/ We note that the Complaint violation asserted in PERB Case No. 95-U-18 concerns the same subject matter, i.e., alleged fee-for-service arrangements with bargaining unit employees. In view of this connection and economies of the Board's processes, we shall consolidate PERB Case 95-U-18 with the instant Complaint for a hearing.

Decision and Order PERB Case No. 95-U-10 Page 2

unclear impact of the issues presented on the violation asserted, it would not be in the interest of justice to award Complainant costs should they ultimately prevail in this proceeding. Therefore, the Complainant's request for costs is denied.

## ORDER

## IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Motion for Summary Judgement and  $\$  Decision on the Pleadings is denied.

2. Complainant's request for costs is denied.

3. The Complaint is referred to a hearing examiner to make findings, conclusions and a recommendation to the Board.

4. This case is consolidated with PERB Case 95-U-18 and referred for a hearing.

BY ORDER OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS BOARD Washington, D.C.

July 21, 1995