

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD**

MARILYN W. LAI-FANG,  
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER  
PH-315H-12-0031-I-1

v.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,  
Agency.

DATE: July 23, 2012

**THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL**\*

Marilyn W. Lai-Fang, Charles Town, West Virginia, pro se.

Raymond F. Montano, Albuquerque, New Mexico, for the agency.

**BEFORE**

Susan Tsui Grundmann, Chairman  
Anne M. Wagner, Vice Chairman  
Mark A. Robbins, Member

**FINAL ORDER**

The appellant has filed a petition for review in this case asking us to reconsider the initial decision issued by the administrative judge. We grant petitions such as this one only when significant new evidence is presented to us that was not available for consideration earlier or when the administrative judge

---

\* A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future decisions. In contrast, a precedential decision issued as an Opinion and Order has been identified by the Board as significantly contributing to the Board's case law. See [5 C.F.R. § 1201.117\(c\)](#).

made an error interpreting a law or regulation. The regulation that establishes this standard of review is found in Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 1201.115 ([5 C.F.R. § 1201.115](#)).

We have reviewed the initial decision and find it to be correctly decided. On review, the appellant alleged violations of several of the Merit System Principles enumerated in [5 U.S.C. § 2301\(b\)](#). Petition for Review File, Tab 1 at 3-5. An alleged violation of one or more Merit System Principles will not serve as an independent basis for Board jurisdiction. *Phillips v. General Services Administration*, [917 F.2d 1297](#), 1298 (Fed. Cir. 1990). This also appears to be a new argument. We found no evidence in the record that the appellant raised this issue before the administrative judge, and on review, she has offered no new and material evidence in support of her argument. The Board will not consider an argument raised for the first time in a petition for review absent a showing that it is based on new and material evidence not previously available despite the party's due diligence. *Banks v. Department of the Air Force*, [4 M.S.P.R. 268](#), 271 (1980). Accordingly, the administrative judge properly dismissed the appeal for lack of Board jurisdiction.

After fully considering the filings in this appeal, we conclude that there is no new, previously unavailable, evidence and that the administrative judge made no error in law or regulation that affects the outcome. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.115\(d\)](#). Therefore, we DENY the petition for review. Except as modified by this Final Order, the initial decision of the administrative judge is the Board's final decision.

#### **NOTICE TO THE APPELLANT REGARDING YOUR FURTHER REVIEW RIGHTS**

This is the Board's final decision in this matter. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.113](#). You have the right to request the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit to review this final decision. You must submit your request to the court at the following address:

United States Court of Appeals  
for the Federal Circuit  
717 Madison Place, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20439

The court must receive your request for review no later than 60 calendar days after your receipt of this order. If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this order before you do, then you must file with the court no later than 60 calendar days after receipt by your representative. If you choose to file, be very careful to file on time. The court has held that normally it does not have the authority to waive this statutory deadline and that filings that do not comply with the deadline must be dismissed. *See Pinat v. Office of Personnel Management*, [931 F.2d 1544](#) (Fed. Cir. 1991).

If you need further information about your right to appeal this decision to court, you should refer to the federal law that gives you this right. It is found in Title 5 of the United States Code, section 7703 ([5 U.S.C. § 7703](#)). You may read this law, as well as review the Board's regulations and other related material, at our website, <http://www.mspb.gov>. Additional information is available at the court's website, [www.cafc.uscourts.gov](http://www.cafc.uscourts.gov). Of particular relevance is the court's "Guide for Pro Se Petitioners and Appellants," which is contained within the court's [Rules of Practice](#), and [Forms 5, 6, and 11](#).

FOR THE BOARD:

-----  
William D. Spencer  
Clerk of the Board

Washington, D.C.