

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

CAMILO A. SERRANO,
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER
PH-0353-12-0093-I-1

v.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,
Agency.

DATE: February 11, 2013

THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL¹

Camilo A. Serrano, Passaic, New Jersey, pro se.

Colette A. Walsh, Esquire, New York, New York, 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. Generally, we grant petitions such as this one only when: the initial decision contains erroneous findings of material fact; the initial decision is based on an erroneous

¹ A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future decisions.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\(c\)](#).

interpretation of statute or regulation or the erroneous application of the law to the facts of the case; the judge's rulings during either the course of the appeal or the initial decision were not consistent with required procedures or involved an abuse of discretion, and the resulting error affected the outcome of the case; or new and material evidence or legal argument is available that, despite the petitioner's due diligence, was not available when the record closed. *See* Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 1201.115 ([5 C.F.R. § 1201.115](#)).² After fully considering the filings in this appeal, and based on the following points and authorities, we conclude that the petitioner has not established any basis under section 1201.115 for granting the petition for review. Therefore, we DENY the petition for review and AFFIRM the initial decision issued by the administrative judge, which is now the Board's final decision. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.113\(b\)](#).

In an initial decision dated July 25, 2012, the administrative judge dismissed this appeal as settled. He found, *inter alia*, that the appeal was within the Board's jurisdiction, and he entered the settlement agreement into the record for enforcement purposes. The appellant has filed a petition for review of the initial decision. However, he does not allege that the agreement is invalid or otherwise proffer any reason why the Board should set aside the initial decision. Instead, he asserts that the agency has breached the agreement in calculating his back pay. Under the circumstances, it is appropriate to deny the appellant's petition for review to the extent he challenges the validity of the settlement agreement and forward his allegations of noncompliance to the regional office for adjudication as a petition for enforcement. *See, e.g., Hawkes v. Department of Agriculture*, [103 M.S.P.R. 345](#), ¶ 12 (2006).

² Except as otherwise noted in this decision, we have applied the Board's regulations that became effective November 13, 2012. We note, however, that the petition for review in this case was filed before that date. Even if we considered the petition under the previous version of the Board's regulations, the outcome would be the same.

ORDER

We FORWARD the appellant's allegations of noncompliance to the Northeastern Regional Office for adjudication as a petition for enforcement.

NOTICE TO THE APPELLANT REGARDING YOUR FURTHER REVIEW RIGHTS

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 the date of this order. See [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#) (as rev. eff. Dec. 27, 2012). 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](#)) (as rev. eff. Dec. 27, 2012). You may read this law as well as other sections of the United States Code, at our website, <http://www.mspb.gov/appeals/uscode/htm>. 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.