

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 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:)	
)	
Keisha Jones)	
)	
Complainant)	PERB Case No. 20-U-09 MFR
)	
v.)	Opinion No. 1793
)	
National Association of Government Employees)	
)	
Respondent)	
)	

DECISION AND ORDER

On April 28, 2021,¹ Keisha Jones, *pro se*, (Complainant) filed a Motion for Reconsideration (Motion).

The Complainant requests reconsideration of an administrative dismissal issued by the Executive Director on March 31, 2021. In the administrative dismissal letter, the Executive Director found that all but one of the Complainant’s allegations were untimely. The Executive Director found that the timely allegation, taken as true, failed to state a claim upon which the Board could provide relief.

In the Motion, the Complainant argues that the Board should reconsider the Executive Director’s dismissal. However, the Motion does not raise any mistake in the analysis of the dismissal letter but rather raises unrelated concerns between the parties that occurred outside of the instant case. The Complainant has not provided any authority that would compel the Board to reach a different result than the Executive Director. Absent such authority, the Board will not overturn the decision.² Therefore, the Motion is denied.

¹ The Motion failed to contain a certificate of service. The Executive Director notified the Complainant to cure the deficiency, however, the Complainant did not file a new certificate of service. However, the Respondent admits that the *pro se* Complainant served it with a copy of the Motion on May 3, 2021, well within the time to cure the deficiency. In *Charles Bagenstose v. WTU*, 59 D.C. Reg. 3808, Slip Op. No. 894 at 3, PERB Case No. 06-U-37 (2006), the Board held that *pro se* litigants must be given a reasonable opportunity to present a case without undue focus on technical flaws and imperfections. Here, the Respondent is not prejudiced by the failure to include a signed certificate of service, so the Board will review the merits of the Motion.

² *FOP/MPD Labor Comm. v. MPD*, 60 D.C. Reg. 12058, Slip Op. No. 1400 at p. 6, PERB Case No. 11-U-01 (2013).

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. Complainant's Motion for Reconsideration is hereby denied; and,
2. Pursuant to Board Rule 559.1, this Decision and Order is final upon issuance.

BY ORDER OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS BOARD

By unanimous vote of Board Chairperson Douglas Warshof, and members Barbara Somson, and Peter Winkler.

June 17, 2021

Washington, D.C.