

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

LAURA A. HUNT,  
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBERS:  
CH-0831-10-0708-M-1  
CH-0831-09-0791-M-1

v.

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL  
MANAGEMENT,  
Agency.

DATE: September 13, 2012

**THIS ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL\***

Laura A. Hunt, Chicago, Illinois, pro se.

Roxann Johnson, Washington, D.C., for the agency.

**BEFORE**

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

**ORDER**

These joined cases are before the Board following remand by our reviewing court in *Hunt v. Merit Systems Protection Board*, and *Hunt v. Office of Personnel Management*, Nos. 2011-3001, 2011-3154 (Fed. Cir., Mar. 27, 2012), for the

---

\* A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future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

Board to determine whether the appellant had sought reconsideration of the denial of her request to the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) that she be permitted to make a redeposit of her withdrawn Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) retirement contributions and whether OPM had issued a final decision on the appellant's request. *Id.*, slip op. at 2-3.

The appellant has filed a July 21, 2012 submission with Clerk of the Board which contains a copy of her May 5, 2011 request for reconsideration to OPM, and a copy of OPM's May 10, 2012 reconsideration decision on her request to make a redeposit. MSPB Docket No. CH-0831-10-0708-M-1, Remand Appeal File (RAF), Tab 2 at 1-3, 25-27. The appellant's submission also contains an appeal form signed by the appellant and dated July 20, 2012, with the date of the agency action involved listed as May 10, 2012. *Id.* at 32. We therefore assume the appellant intends the appeal form to be an appeal of OPM's May 10, 2012 reconsideration decision, which the appellant should have filed as a new appeal in the Board's Chicago Regional Office, as the appellant was apparently informed in OPM's reconsideration decision. *Id.* at 3. Generally, when an appellant fails to direct an appeal to the appropriate office of the Board, the Board will forward the appeal to the correct office. *See, e.g., Jones v. U.S. Postal Service*, [31 M.S.P.R. 130](#), 131-32 (1986) (forwarding an appeal that was erroneously filed with the Clerk of the Board to the proper regional office of the Board). The date the appeal was erroneously filed with the Clerk of the Board will be considered the date the appeal was filed with the regional office. *Branch v. Department of the Army*, [110 M.S.P.R. 663](#), ¶¶ 6-7 (2009). We therefore forward the appellant's July 21, 2012 submission to the regional office for docketing as a new appeal of OPM's May 10, 2012 reconsideration decision. We note, however, that the regional office will need to address whether the appeal was timely filed. *See 5 C.F.R. § 1201.22(b)(1)*; *Smith v. Office of Personnel Management*, [114 M.S.P.R. 395](#), ¶ 6 (2010).

**ORDER**

We FORWARD the appellant's July 21, 2012 submission to the Clerk of the Board to the regional office for docketing as a new appeal of OPM's May 10, 2012 reconsideration decision.

FOR THE BOARD:

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

Washington, D.C.