

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

ARTHUR BLACK,
Appellant,

DOCKET NUMBER
AT-3443-17-0480-I-1

v.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE,
Agency.

DATE: October 26, 2022

THIS FINAL ORDER IS NONPRECEDENTIAL¹

Arthur Black, Fresno, California, pro se.

Mark Manta, Esquire, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for the agency.

BEFORE

Cathy A. Harris, Vice Chairman
Raymond A. Limon, Member
Tristan L. Leavitt, Member

FINAL ORDER

¶1 The appellant has filed a petition for review of the initial decision, which dismissed his nonselection appeal for lack of jurisdiction. Generally, we grant petitions such as this one only in the following circumstances: the initial decision contains erroneous findings of material fact; the initial decision is based on an

¹ A nonprecedential order is one that the Board has determined does not add significantly to the body of MSPB case law. Parties may cite nonprecedential orders, but such orders have no precedential value; the Board and administrative judges are not required to follow or distinguish them in any future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

erroneous interpretation of statute or regulation or the erroneous application of the law to the facts of the case; the administrative 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. Title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, section 1201.115 ([5 C.F.R. § 1201.115](#)). After fully considering the filings in this appeal, 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, which is now the Board's final decision. [5 C.F.R. § 1201.113\(b\)](#).

¶2 On petition for review, the appellant repeats his argument that he was not allowed to apply for a position, which he identifies for the first time as postal inspector, due to race and age discrimination. The appellant also reiterates his general reference to a previous Board appeal, and he seeks to introduce new evidence regarding his nonselection. Petition for Review (PFR) File, Tab 1. The appellant also seeks to submit new evidence on review, namely "emails from the agency that said [he] was not allowed to apply for the position of postal inspector because [he] was not competitive or fulfilled requirements." *Id.* at 3. He argues that he did not submit this evidence into the record below because "the agency lied and refused to reply to inquiry." *Id.* at 3-4. He actually did not submit the purported new evidence with his petition for review. In any event, we would not have considered the evidence because the appellant has failed to show that the emails, for which he provides little information, are new or material or demonstrate how the agency's "lies" prevented him from submitting them into the record below. See *Avansino v. U.S. Postal Service*, [3 M.S.P.R. 211](#), 214 (1980) (stating that, under [5 C.F.R. § 1201.115](#), the Board will not consider evidence submitted for the first time on review absent a showing that it was unavailable

before the record was closed despite the party's due diligence). Moreover, the Board generally will not grant a petition for review based on "new" evidence absent a showing that it is of sufficient weight to warrant an outcome different from that of the initial decision. *Russo v. Veterans Administration*, [3 M.S.P.R. 345](#), 349 (1980). The appellant has provided no argument or facts describing how the emails would alter the dispositive jurisdictional finding in the initial decision.

¶3 The appellant asserts that he was eligible to apply for the postal inspector position based on his qualifications and status as a disabled veteran. PFR File, Tab 1 at 3-4. However, he has not alleged any facts that might implicate jurisdiction pursuant to the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act of 1998 or the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (codified as amended at [38 U.S.C. §§ 4301-4335](#)). Initial Appeal File (IAF), Tab 1; PFR File, Tab 1. Instead, he argues that his nonselection was the result of race and age discrimination. PFR File, Tab 1 at 3-4. The Board lacks jurisdiction over such discrimination claims absent an otherwise appealable action. *See Wren v. Department of the Army*, [2 M.S.P.R. 1](#), 2 (1980), *aff'd*, [681 F.2d 867](#), 871-73 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

¶4 On review, the appellant asserts that he was "allowed to apply" for a position 4 years after he filed a previous Board appeal, and he seeks Board approval now to apply for the unspecified position in the present appeal. PFR File, Tab 1 at 5. In his initial appeal, the appellant had alleged that the agency's denial of his "opportunity to apply for employment" was in part "motivated by retaliation for previous [Board] activity for the same offense." IAF, Tab 1 at 5. The administrative judge noted this argument in the initial decision but did not address it in his jurisdictional determination. IAF, Tab 5, Initial Decision at 1-2. Board records show that the appellant filed a prior appeal in October 2012 alleging that he had been denied the opportunity to apply for a postal inspector position because of his age. *Black v. U.S. Postal Service*, MSPB Docket No. SF-3330-13-0129-I-1, Initial Decision (Jan. 14, 2013). That appeal was

dismissed as withdrawn by the appellant, and nothing in the prior appeal record impacts the jurisdictional determination in the present appeal. *Id.*

¶5 Accordingly, we deny the petition for review and affirm the initial decision.

NOTICE OF APPEAL RIGHTS²

You may obtain review of this final decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(a\)\(1\)](#). By statute, the nature of your claims determines the time limit for seeking such review and the appropriate forum with which to file. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)](#). Although we offer the following summary of available appeal rights, the Merit Systems Protection Board does not provide legal advice on which option is most appropriate for your situation and the rights described below do not represent a statement of how courts will rule regarding which cases fall within their jurisdiction. If you wish to seek review of this final decision, you should immediately review the law applicable to your claims and carefully follow all filing time limits and requirements. Failure to file within the applicable time limit may result in the dismissal of your case by your chosen forum.

Please read carefully each of the three main possible choices of review below to decide which one applies to your particular case. If you have questions about whether a particular forum is the appropriate one to review your case, you should contact that forum for more information.

(1) Judicial review in general. As a general rule, an appellant seeking judicial review of a final Board order must file a petition for review with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which must be received by the court within **60 calendar days** of the date of issuance of this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).

² Since the issuance of the initial decision in this matter, the Board may have updated the notice of review rights included in final decisions. As indicated in the notice, the Board cannot advise which option is most appropriate in any matter.

If you submit a petition for review to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you must submit your petition to the court at the following address:

U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20439

Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit 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, 10, and 11.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

(2) Judicial or EEOC review of cases involving a claim of discrimination. This option applies to you only if you have claimed that you were affected by an action that is appealable to the Board and that such action was based, in whole or in part, on unlawful discrimination. If so, you may obtain judicial review of this decision—including a disposition of your discrimination claims—by filing a civil action with an appropriate U.S. district court (*not* the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit), within **30 calendar days** after you receive this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(2\)](#); see *Perry v. Merit Systems Protection Board*, 582 U.S. ____ , [137 S. Ct. 1975](#) (2017). If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this decision before you do, then you must file with the district court no later than **30 calendar days** after your representative receives this decision. If the action involves a claim of

discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, or a disabling condition, you may be entitled to representation by a court-appointed lawyer and to waiver of any requirement of prepayment of fees, costs, or other security. See [42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5\(f\)](#) and [29 U.S.C. § 794a](#).

Contact information for U.S. district courts can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

Alternatively, you may request review by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) of your discrimination claims only, excluding all other issues. [5 U.S.C. § 7702\(b\)\(1\)](#). You must file any such request with the EEOC's Office of Federal Operations within **30 calendar days** after you receive this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7702\(b\)\(1\)](#). If you have a representative in this case, and your representative receives this decision before you do, then you must file with the EEOC no later than **30 calendar days** after your representative receives this decision.

If you submit a request for review to the EEOC by regular U.S. mail, the address of the EEOC is:

Office of Federal Operations
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
P.O. Box 77960
Washington, D.C. 20013

If you submit a request for review to the EEOC via commercial delivery or by a method requiring a signature, it must be addressed to:

Office of Federal Operations
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
131 M Street, N.E.
Suite 5SW12G
Washington, D.C. 20507

(3) Judicial review pursuant to the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012. This option applies to you only if you have raised claims of reprisal for whistleblowing disclosures under [5 U.S.C. § 2302\(b\)\(8\)](#) or

other protected activities listed in [5 U.S.C. § 2302\(b\)\(9\)\(A\)\(i\), \(B\), \(C\), or \(D\)](#). If so, and your judicial petition for review “raises no challenge to the Board’s disposition of allegations of a prohibited personnel practice described in section 2302(b) other than practices described in section 2302(b)(8), or 2302(b)(9)(A)(i), (B), (C), or (D),” then you may file a petition for judicial review either with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction.³ The court of appeals must receive your petition for review within **60 days** of the date of issuance of this decision. [5 U.S.C. § 7703\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).

If you submit a petition for judicial review to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you must submit your petition to the court at the following address:

U.S. Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20439

Additional information about the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit 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, 10, and 11.

If you are interested in securing pro bono representation for an appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, you may visit our website at <http://www.mspb.gov/probono> for information regarding pro bono representation for Merit Systems Protection Board appellants before the Federal Circuit. The

³ The original statutory provision that provided for judicial review of certain whistleblower claims by any court of appeals of competent jurisdiction expired on December 27, 2017. The All Circuit Review Act, signed into law by the President on July 7, 2018, permanently allows appellants to file petitions for judicial review of MSPB decisions in certain whistleblower reprisal cases with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or any other circuit court of appeals of competent jurisdiction. The All Circuit Review Act is retroactive to November 26, 2017. Pub. L. No. 115-195, 132 Stat. 1510.

Board neither endorses the services provided by any attorney nor warrants that any attorney will accept representation in a given case.

Contact information for the courts of appeals can be found at their respective websites, which can be accessed through the link below:

http://www.uscourts.gov/Court_Locator/CourtWebsites.aspx.

FOR THE BOARD:

/s/ for

Jennifer Everling
Acting Clerk of the Board

Washington, D.C.