

U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Administrative Law Judges
800 K Street, NW, Suite 400-N
Washington, DC 20001-8002

(202) 693-7300
(202) 693-7365 (FAX)



Issue Date: 08 July 2016

Case No: 2016-WIA-00003

In the Matter of:

RIVER CITY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Complainant,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Respondent.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This matter arises under the Workforce Investment Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2801 *et seq.*, and the implementing regulations at 29 C.F.R. Part 96 and 20 C.F.R. Parts 660 through 670.

On December 18, 2015, a Grant Officer of the United States Department of Labor (“DOL”), Employment and Training Administration (“ETA”) issued a final determination against the River City Community Development Corporation (“Complainant”) regarding an audit of programs operated by Complainant, Audit Report Number 24-15-557-03-390. The final determination detailed administrative findings and assessed a debt owed to the DOL in the amount of \$36,000.00. The Office of Administrative Law Judges (“OALJ” or “Office”) received Complainant’s request for hearing pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 96.63(b) and 20 C.F.R. § 667.800 on January 12, 2016.¹

This Office issued a *Notice of Docketing and Prehearing Order* (“Notice”) on January 15, 2016. The Notice required each party to file certain prehearing exchange information with this Office within 45 days. However, on March 2, 2016 and April 14, 2016, I granted the parties’ joint requests for extensions of time to file prehearing information in order to allow the parties additional time to review Complainant’s documentation. On June 1, 2016, I issued an order suspending all deadlines at the parties’ request and in anticipation of the filing of a joint stipulation for dismissal.

On July 7, 2016, Respondent filed a *Joint Stipulation of Dismissal with Prejudice* requesting that this case be dismissed with prejudice because the matter has been resolved. Respondent explains that the “Grant Officer for DOL, based upon documentation provided by [Complainant] and verified by DOL, has provided a signed memorandum to [Complainant]

¹ Complainant subsequently faxed a copy of the final determination letter to this Office on January 14, 2016.

stating that DOL considers the questioned costs in this case to be resolved.” Respondent states that Complainant’s representative “concur[s] with the Joint Stipulation for Dismissal.”

Accordingly, Respondent’s motion is GRANTED and this matter is hereby DISMISSED with prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

STEPHEN R. HENLEY
Chief Administrative Law Judge