



**Decision and Order**  
**PERB Case No. 95-U-06**  
**Page 2**

Examiner's Report and Recommendation.<sup>3/</sup> However, the Complainant does not make specific objections to the Hearing Examiner's findings and conclusions based on the record evidence, but states that there are errors in his own testimony Complainant made before the Hearing Examiner. (Obj. at para. 2.) The Complainant requests that the Board reconsider the findings and conclusion of the Hearing Examiner based on submitted written testimony contained in his objections.

The Board has held that once closed we will deny any request to reopen a hearing absent compelling reasons. See, e.g. IBPO and DCDGS and AFSCME, D.C. Council 20, Local 2087, 29 DCR 4605, Slip Op. 48, PERB Case No. 82-R-04 (1982). Permitting the submission of post-hearing evidence by the Complainant would unfairly prejudice the Respondent by denying it an opportunity to cross-examine the evidence. The Complainant does not contend that he was denied a full opportunity to meet his burden of proof and establish his case before the record was closed. Therefore, Complainant has not presented nor do we find any compelling reason for reopening the record.

The remainder of the Complainant's objections consist of his general disagreement with the findings of the Hearing Examiner and his request that the Board reconsider the record evidence and arguments made in his previously filed pleadings. Pursuant to D.C. Code Sec. 1-605.2(3) and Board Rule 520.14, the Board has reviewed the findings and conclusion of the Hearing Examiner and find them to be reasonable and supported by the record. We further note that the conclusion that no violation was established did not turn solely on the testimony Complainant now asserts was in error but rather on the record as a whole. (R&R at 13.)

Therefore, we find no merit to Complainant's objections and adopt the Hearing Examiner's findings, conclusions and recommendation that the Complaint be dismissed.

---

<sup>3/</sup> Board Rule 556.3 provides that a "party may file precise, specific, written exceptions with the Board." Most of Complainant's "objections" are neither precise nor specific. However, Complainant has represented himself in these proceedings and we have held that we will not impose upon the pleadings of pro se complainants strict compliance with the clarity and completeness requirements otherwise prescribed by our Rules. See, e.g., Clarence Mack, et al. v. FOP/DOC Labor Committee, Slip Op. No. 386, PERB Case No. 94-U-24 (1994) (pro se litigant was not required to strictly comply with Board Rule 520.3(d)).

Decision and Order  
PERB Case No. 95-U-06  
Page 3

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

The Complaint is dismissed.

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

December 20, 1995