

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

KAMINI P. HAWN,
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER
SF-0752-12-0238-I-1

v.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Agency.

DATE: August 1, 2012

THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL*

Kenneth J. Kroopf, Esquire, Monterey, California, for the appellant.

Curtis L. Heidtke, Monterey, California, 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* A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future decisions.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](#)).

In this petition for review, the appellant challenges the initial decision that dismissed for lack of jurisdiction her appeal of her termination at the expiration of her time-limited appointment as a language instructor. Petition for Review File, Tab 1. The appellant reasserts her argument that the agency had renewed her tenure track appointment as a language instructor and she is entitled to due process rights in connection with her termination, citing Supreme Court cases involving constitutional rights and tenure battles. *Id.* The administrative judge thoroughly addressed these issues in the initial decision and we discern no reason to disturb those well-reasoned findings. *See Crosby v. U.S. Postal Service*, [74 M.S.P.R. 98](#), 106 (1997) (finding no reason to disturb the administrative judge's findings where the administrative judge considered the evidence as a whole, drew appropriate inferences, and made reasoned conclusions); *Broughton v. Department of Health & Human Services*, [33 M.S.P.R. 357](#), 359 (1987) (same).

The agency's termination of the appellant on July 10, 2009, at the end of her time-limited appointment, is not an adverse action within the Board's jurisdiction. *See Leonard v. Department of the Army*, [78 M.S.P.R. 492](#) (1998). Regarding the appellant's due process arguments, the administrative judge correctly found that the appellant's allegation that the agency failed to provide minimal due process does not confer upon the Board an independent basis to review matters outside of its statutory jurisdiction. Initial Appeal File, Tab 13, Initial Decision at 8; *Johnson v. U.S. Postal Service*, [110 M.S.P.R. 679](#), ¶ 12 (2009).

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. 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.