

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS BOARD

In the Matter of:	)
	)
Charles Bagenstose,	)
	)
Complainant,	)
	)
v.	)
	)
District of Columbia	)
Public Schools,	)
	)
Respondent.	)

PERB Case No. 88-U-33  
Opinion No. 345

ORDER

On February 1 and 8, 1993, respectively, the Complainant in the above-captioned proceeding filed documents with the Public Employee Relations Board (Board) styled "Motion That All Erroneous, Misleading, and Deceptive Statements be Corrected or Expunged From Recently Issued Board Orders Pertaining To This Case" and "Motion To Appear Before the Board to Discuss Continued Mistreatment of Me By the Executive Director, the Alteration and Falsification of Records, and Other Irregularities Which Occurred During the Handling of My Case." No response to the Motions were filed by Respondent District of Columbia Public Schools.

Complainant's Motions are hereby denied. 1/

---

<sup>1/</sup> The first of Complainant's two Motions, addresses a previous Board Order issued in response to an earlier Motion by Complainant styled "Motion That I Be Granted An Appearance Before the Board To Discuss The Unprofessional, Discourteous, Accusatorial, and Inappropriate Manner In Which The Director Spoke To Me Sometime During The Month of November, 1991, and The Inappropriate, Prejudicial, Vindictive, and Mean-Spirited Actions Which She Took After That Incident". Complainant objects to, inter alia, (1) the omission of an opinion number when the Order was initially issued and (2) our reference to the Motion which, for the sake of brevity, we referred to as "a Motion requesting to appear before the Public Employee Relations Board." Slip Op. No. 340 at p. 1. We have since corrected the former administrative oversight and provided Complainant with a numbered Order. With respect to his latter objection, we have set forth above, verbatim, the title

Order  
PERB Case No. 88-U-33  
Page 2

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

February 26, 1993

---

<sup>1</sup>(...continued)  
of Complainant's earlier Motion. Nevertheless, we do not find, as Complainant asserts, these nonconformities to be "erroneous, misleading and deceptive" with respect to the substantive disposition of Complainant's previous Motion. Thus, we find no basis for altering our disposition of that Motion or the instant Motion.