



**U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION**

**Office of Federal Operations**

**P.O. Box 77960**

**Washington, DC 20013**

[REDACTED]  
Jerrold K,<sup>1</sup>  
Complainant,

v.

Louis DeJoy,  
Postmaster General,  
United States Postal Service  
(Field Areas and Regions),  
Agency.

Appeal No. 2024004983

Agency No. 4E920010824

**DECISION**

Complainant timely appealed with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC" or "Commission") from the Agency's August 2, 2024, dismissal of her complaint of unlawful employment discrimination in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"), as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq. Upon review, the Commission MODIFIES the Agency's decision to dismiss the complaint and REMANDS the matter for further processing in accordance with this Decision and the following Order.

**ISSUES PRESENTED**

Whether Claim 1 of Complainant's complaint was properly dismissed pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(1), for stating the same claim that is pending before or has been decided by the agency or Commission, or, in the alternative, whether Claim 1 was properly dismissed for untimely EEO contact pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(2).

---

<sup>1</sup> This case has been randomly assigned a pseudonym which will replace Complainant's name when the decision is published to non-parties and the Commission's website.

Whether Claims 2, 3, and 4 of Complainant's complaint were properly dismissed for failure to state a claim pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.107(a)(1).

### BACKGROUND

At the time of events giving rise to this complaint, Complainant was employed by the Agency as Sales Services/Distribution Associate, 06-P, for the Spring Valley Main Office in Spring Valley, California. As part of her duties, Complainant spends part of her day at the La Mesa Retail Office ("LMR"), where she processes passports for customers with appointments.

On July 11, 2024, Complainant filed a Formal EEO Complaint alleging that she was subjected to discrimination, including a hostile work environment, by the Agency on the bases of race (African-American) and color (black). The Agency framed Complainant's claims as follows:

1. On January 10, 2024, Management falsely accused Complainant of creating a disturbance at work, contacted the local police to escort Complainant off of postal property and subsequently, placed Complainant on emergency placement off-duty status without pay;
2. On May 16, 2024, and May 20, 2024, the Postmaster delegated Complainant's supervisors to give Complainant work instructions;
3. On May 16, 2024, and May 20, 2024, Management cancelled customers' passport appointments in order to have Complainant work an eight (8) hour day; and
4. On May 20, 2024, the Postmaster refused to sign Complainant's PS Form 3971 after having the supervisor instruct Complainant to submit the PS Form 3971. Complainant then told Postmaster, "Don't call your passport customers" and "since you are refusing to sign my PS Form 3971 don't demand it again."

In her Formal EEO Complaint, Complainant states that she is the only African-American employee in the office. Complainant feels like she is on pins and needles any time she is around Postmaster, and constantly demeaned. Postmaster instructs and speaks with other employees directly, but has other supervisors convey her instructions to Complainant, even if Complainant is nearby.

Complainant has become exhausted and irritable outside of work, and for the first time in her life, she has been experiencing anxiety attacks.

Complainant alleged that, on January 10, 2024, Postmaster (via another supervisor) instructed Complainant not to work at LMR as scheduled. Complainant said she did not feel comfortable working at the Main Office and her uniform and keys were at LMR. Complainant went to LMR, explained that she felt unsafe and harassed while at the Main Office, and asked that another employee be assigned to the Main Office. The LMR Manager ("Manager"), who was on the phone with Postmaster, yelled at Complainant to return to the Main Office. Complainant reiterated that she did not feel safe, and that Postmaster was harassing her. Complainant tried to continue working, but Manager followed Complainant around, threatened to fire her, and said he would call the police. Police arrived and, in front of Complainant's coworkers and customers, walked Complainant through the post office so she could retrieve her belongings, then escorted her from the premises. Complainant recounts, "[n]ever had anything even remotely similar to this happened to me at any point in my life because I am a law-abiding citizen. I was so embarrassed; my whole character and sense of being felt tarnished and ripped away." Complainant recalls crying uncontrollably as she left. Postmaster then placed Complainant on Emergency Placement without pay.

Complainant alleged that, on May 16, 2024, Postmaster instructed a supervisor to "personally oversee" Complainant's removal from her workstation. Complainant asserted that Postmaster singled her out for random enforcement of an "8 hours only rule." Additionally, at Postmaster's instruction, Complainant had to cancel the appointments of the three passport customers who had already arrived and were awaiting Complainant's assistance. Complainant recounts that the customers were irate and cursed her out. Complainant asserts, that Postmaster's action was intended to harass and demean her. "Postmaster is aware that abruptly canceling scheduled passport appointments triples my work," and results in hostile treatment from customers. The manner in which Complainant was forced to leave in the middle of helping customers felt humiliating and reminded Complainant of when the police were called on her. Complainant identified another employee who is regularly permitted to work over 8 hours when performing the same assignment.

Complainant alleged that, on May 20, 2024, Complainant obtained a PS Form 3971 to account for an absence earlier that week, and told the supervisor she would bring it back later, as she was assigned to LMR.

The supervisor then ran after Complainant in the parking lot, saying that Postmaster wanted the 3971 "NOW" and she would cancel Complainant's passport customers so Complainant would work an 8-hour day. While filling out the form, Postmaster told the supervisor to tell Complainant to pass out keys (Complainant was also within hearing distance). Complainant, wanting to prevent a repeat of May 16, 2024, said she had to go to LMR and could not pass out the keys. Postmaster set the 3971 aside and began working on her computer. Complainant asked Postmaster to please sign the 3971, and not to cancel the passport customers. Postmaster ignored Complainant and kept typing, even though Complainant was right in front of her and Postmaster had instructed Complainant to bring her the 3971. Complainant recounts that she picked the Form back up and told Postmaster, "since you're refusing to sign it, please don't demand it again."

#### *Prior EEO Complaint*

The record includes documentation establishing that on January 31, 2024, Complainant initiated a prior EEO Complaint, Agency Case No. 4E920004024, comprised of the following allegation:

On January 10, 2024, Management decided to call the police and have Complainant escorted out of the building. The police report states they were called because Complainant was being disruptive. After Complainant was escorted, Postmaster sent a letter saying not [to report to work] the following day because Complainant was a danger to herself and others.

Complainant received a Notice of Right to File a Formal EEO Complaint on April 5, 2024. After Complainant failed to respond within the time frame provided, the Agency closed Agency Case No. 4E920004024 at the informal stage of the complaint process. Complainant does not acknowledge her prior EEO activity related to Agency Case No. 4E920004024 in her Formal EEO Complaint or in her Appellate Brief.

For the instant complaint, the Agency, citing Agency Case No. 4E920004024, dismissed Claim 1 pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.107(a)(1), for stating the same claim that is pending before or has been decided by the agency or Commission. The Agency also dismissed Claim 1 pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.107(a)(2), for untimely EEO contact.

The Agency dismissed Claims 2, 3, and 4 pursuant to 29 C.F.R. §1614.107(a)(1) for failure to state a claim. The Agency reasoned that none of the claims concerned a term, condition, or privilege of employment and that even considered together, the claims did not constitute harassment.

#### CONTENTIONS ON APPEAL

Complainant contends that since January 2024, Postmaster has “constantly” subjected Complainant to “outrageous, humiliating and degrading treatment,” creating an *ongoing* hostile work environment. Complainant also contends that the Agency’s dismissal failed to adequately address the concerns set forth in her Formal EEO Complaint and evidence. For instance, regarding Claim 1, Complainant emphasizes that Management failed to acknowledge her *repeated* assertions that she did not feel her working conditions under Postmaster were safe, and Management’s response of calling local police instead of postal inspectors was excessive and inappropriate. For the remaining claims, Complainant contends that Postmaster made false and misleading statements, which can be refuted with witness testimony. Complainant recounts that Postmaster routinely permits non-African American employees to work over 8 hours, yet Complainant has been “forced” off the clock, resulting in completing her work assignments without pay. As a remedy, Complainant requests reimbursement for therapy costs, back pay for lost wages, and a transfer.

The Agency did not file a response to Complainant’s appeal.

#### STANDARD OF REVIEW

The Agency’s decision to dismiss a complaint is subject to *de novo* review by the Commission, which requires the Commission to examine the record without regard to the factual and legal determinations of the previous decision maker and issue its decision based on the Commission’s own assessment of the record and its interpretation of the law. 29 C.F.R. § 1614.405(a). The Commission should construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the complainant and take the complaint’s allegations as true. See Cobb v. Department of the Treasury, EEOC Request No. 05970077 (March 13, 1997). Thus, all reasonable inferences that may be drawn from the complaint’s allegations must be made in favor of the complainant.

## ANALYSIS

### *Abandoned Claim – Claim 1*

Pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(1), an agency shall dismiss a complaint that "states the same claim that is pending before or has been decided by the agency or Commission." However, this provision does not apply to claims previously raised at the informal stage of the EEO process. See Complainant v. U.S. Postal Serv., EEOC Request No. 0520140201 (June 10, 2014) (The Commission has held that it is error to dismiss a claim on the grounds that a claim was previously raised when it was raised in an informal complaint); Francis v. U.S. Postal Serv., EEOC Appeal No. 01A20240 (Dec. 9, 2002) (if not formal complaint filed, "not possible to have a prior complaint pending or decided" on the same matter).

We agree with the Agency's assessment that the allegation in Claim 1 was previously raised in Agency Case No. 4E920004024. However, it is undisputed that Complainant never filed a Formal EEO Complaint for Agency Case No. 4E920004024. Claim 1 cannot be dismissed on the grounds that it "states the same claim that is pending before or has been decided by the agency or Commission." Complainant v. Dep't of Def., EEOC Appeal No. 0120140929 (Jan. 6, 2015).

Nevertheless, Complainant is barred from raising the allegation in Claim 1 in the instant complaint. Where a complainant raises a claim during EEO counseling but fails to pursue a formal EEO Complaint on the matter, the claim is deemed abandoned, and the complainant cannot raise it again in a subsequent EEO action. See Small v. United States Postal Service, EEOC Request No. 05980289 (July 16, 1999). We deem Claim 1 abandoned because Complainant did not pursue a formal EEO complaint for Agency Case No. 4E920004024. It is unnecessary to review the Agency's alternate dismissal of Claim 1 for untimely EEO contact pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(2).

While the allegation in Claim 1 is not actionable, the underlying facts are still relevant to Complainant's complaint and shall be considered as background information for Claims 2, 3, and 4.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As Complainant is *pro se* we note that the Commission has previously found that an incident where an agency called the police on a complainant is relevant to the EEO Investigation and to the *prima facie* analysis for discriminatory motive. See Myung S. v. United States Postal Serv., EEOC

*Failure to State a Claim – Claims 2, 3 and 4*

Under the regulations set forth at 29 C.F.R. Part 1614, an agency shall accept a complaint from an aggrieved employee or applicant for employment who believes that they have been discriminated against by that agency because of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age or disability. 29 C.F.R. §§ 1614.103, .106(a). The Commission's federal sector case precedent has long defined an "aggrieved employee" as one who suffers a present harm or loss with respect to a term, condition, or privilege of employment for which there is a remedy. Diaz v. Dep't of the Air Force, EEOC Request No. 05931049 (Apr. 21, 1994). If the complainant cannot establish that they are aggrieved, the agency shall dismiss a complaint for failure to state a claim. 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(1).

The Agency properly found that Claims 2 and 4 do not identify a loss with respect to a term, condition, or privilege of employment.

However, Claim 3 essentially alleges that on two occasions, May 16 and 20, 2024, Complainant was denied an opportunity to work overtime. Complainant explained in her Formal EEO Complaint and in her appellate brief that Postmaster regularly allowed other employees to work more than 8 hours per shift when assigned to passports but would not do so for Complainant. In the EEO Counselor's Report, Complainant raised the same matter and Postmaster responded by referencing an overtime policy. We note that *the Agency also interpreted Claim 3 as alleging denial of overtime*. In the June 25, 2024 Notice of Right to File, Claim 3 read: "Management denied [Complainant] to work overtime and forced [Complainant] to be off the clock in eight hours and Management does not require other employees to only work 8 hours." Inexplicably, the Agency reframed Claim 3 to omit the issue of overtime prior to issuing the instant decision.

As overtime is a term, condition, or privilege of employment, Claim 3 states a claim pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(1).

---

Appeal No. 2024001012 (May 1, 2024) citing Maxima R. v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, EEOC Appeal No. 2021000505 (Feb. 3, 2022) (inference of racial discrimination found where the agency called the police on a complainant and there was no evidence that the complainant posed a physical threat); Roderick P. v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, EEOC Appeal No. 012161268 (Mar. 23, 2018), and Ferebee v. Dep't of Homeland Sec., EEOC Appeal No. 0720100039 (Apr. 24, 2012).

### *Hostile Work Environment*

The Commission has held that where a complaint does not challenge an agency action or inaction regarding a specific term, condition, or privilege of employment, a claim of harassment may survive if it alleges conduct that is sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of the complainant's employment. See Harris v. Forklift Systems, Inc., 510 U.S. 17, 23 (1993).

The allegations in Claims 2 and 4 describe common workplace occurrences, that typically do not constitute harassment. Gray v. United States Postal Serv., EEOC Appeal No. 0120091101 (May 13, 2010) (Complainant's allegations involve routine work assignments, instructions, and admonishments, which are all "common workplace occurrences" that do not rise to the level of severity and pervasiveness necessary to constitute harassment) citations omitted. We also note that while an employee may prefer to perform certain duties, among others within their work assignment, or may have a different idea about how operations should be run, *these are not issues which should be pursued in the EEO complaint process* since decision makers in the complaint process cannot substitute their judgment on how to run the day to day operations of an Agency for that of the managers involved. Dewitt L. v. Dep't of the Navy, EEOC Appeal No. 0120160682 (May 3, 2016).

Similarly, while Claim 3 states a claim of discrimination, it is insufficient, *on its own*, to establish a hostile work environment because it consists of two isolated incidents. We have repeatedly found that allegations of a few isolated incidents of alleged harassment usually are not sufficient to state a harassment claim. See Phillips v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, EEOC Request No. 05960030 (July 12, 1996); Banks v. Dep't of Health and Human Servs., EEOC Request No. 05940481 (Feb. 16, 1995).

However, we consider Claims 2, 3, and 4 within the context of the background information provided in Claim 1. There, Postmaster engaged in similar conduct (e.g. communicating through Manager, taking Complainant off passport duties), but when Complainant insisted on working at her preferred location, Postmaster called the police and placed Complainant on unpaid leave. The Commission has previously found similar events sufficient to establish a hostile work environment. See Johnson P. v. United States Postal Serv., EEOC Appeal No. 2023000071 (Jan. 5, 2023) (the humiliation the complainant experienced when a management official had police escort him from his work facility in front of coworkers, was sufficiently severe to alter the conditions of his employment); Myung S. v. United States Postal

Serv., EEOC Appeal No. 2024001012 (May 1, 2024) (complainant stated a claim of hostile work environment where “multiple” coworkers informed her that management called the police on her, and, on appeal, and the complainant described the experience as degrading and harmful to her mental health) citations omitted. As with the complainants in Johnson P. and Myung S., Complainant was not engaged in threatening conduct, calling into question Postmaster’s motivation.

It is the Commission’s long held position that unless it is reasonably established that the actions were somehow abusive or offensive and were *taken in order to harass the complainant on the basis of any of their protected classes*, such everyday events are not sufficiently severe or pervasive so as to offend the general sensibility of an individual experiencing such occurrences in the workplace. See Wolf v. United States Postal Service, EEOC Appeal No. 01961559 (July 23, 1998)); Long v. Veterans Administration, EEOC Appeal No. 01950169 (Aug. 14, 1997).

In this case, the background information provided about Management calling the police on Complainant reasonably establishes that Postmaster’s actions in Claims 2, 3, and 4 were taken in order to harass complainant on the basis of her protected classes. We also note Complainant’s assertion that she experienced demeaning treatment by Postmaster on a daily basis, and her reports to Management about feeling unsafe were ignored. See, e.g., Anne G. v. Dep’t of Veterans Affairs, EEOC Appeal No. 2022003036 (Jan. 31, 2023) (taking microaggressions into consideration when finding that the complainant stated a claim of harassment).

Therefore, based on the facts specific to this complaint, Claims 2, 3, and 4, are sufficient to state a claim of hostile work environment pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(1).

### *Remedies*

In her Formal EEO Complaint and on appeal, Complainant explains that the alleged discrimination had a lasting impact on her mental health and requests compensatory damages, reimbursement for medical expenses, back pay, and a transfer to a different supervisor.

As Claim 1 was abandoned, Complainant cannot recover damages arising from the alleged events in Claim 1. Ulanoff v. United States Postal Serv., EEOC Request No. 05950396 (Jan. 26, 1996) (complainant not entitled to compensatory damages where allegation failed to state a claim), see also,

e.g. Nicki B. v. Dep't of Veterans Affairs, EEOC Appeal No. 2024004959 (Feb. 4, 2025) (the Commission cannot order the Agency to transfer a complainant where the alleged discriminatory act fails to state a claim, even if the alleged act impacted the complainant's health).

For Claims 2, 3, and 4, Complainant may only recover damages under Title VII if there is a finding of discrimination. At this time, Complainant has established that she states a claim of discrimination pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.107(a)(1), thereby warranting an investigation (see order below). It is not possible to determine whether and to what extent Complainant is entitled to damages until after an investigation and a decision is issued.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Agency's final decision dismissing Complainant's complaint is MODIFIED. The Agency's dismissal of Claim 1 is AFFIRMED, and the Agency's dismissal of Claims 2, 3, and 4 is REVERSED.

Claims 2, 3, and 4 are hereby REMANDED to the Agency for further processing in accordance with this Decision and the Order below.

### **ORDER (E0224)**

The Agency is ordered to process the remanded claims in accordance with 29 C.F.R. § 1614.108. The Agency shall acknowledge to the Complainant that it has received the remanded claims **within thirty (30) calendar days** of the date this decision was issued. The Agency shall issue to Complainant a copy of the investigative file and also shall notify Complainant of the appropriate rights **within one hundred fifty (150) calendar days** of the date this decision was issued, unless the matter is otherwise resolved prior to that time. If the Complainant requests a final decision without a hearing, the Agency shall issue a final decision **within sixty (60) days** of receipt of Complainant's request.

As provided in the statement entitled "Implementation of the Commission's Decision," the Agency must send to the Compliance Officer: 1) a copy of the Agency's letter of acknowledgment to Complainant, 2) a copy of the Agency's notice that transmits the investigative file and notice of rights, and 3) either a copy of the complainant's request for a hearing, or a copy of the final agency decision ("FAD") if Complainant does not request a hearing.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMISSION'S DECISION (K0719)

Under 29 C.F.R. § 1614.405(c) and § 1614.502, compliance with the Commission's corrective action is mandatory. Within seven (7) calendar days of the completion of each ordered corrective action, the Agency shall submit via the Federal Sector EEO Portal (FedSEP) supporting documents in the digital format required by the Commission, referencing the compliance docket number under which compliance was being monitored. Once all compliance is complete, the Agency shall submit via FedSEP a final compliance report in the digital format required by the Commission. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.403(g). The Agency's final report must contain supporting documentation when previously not uploaded, and the Agency must send a copy of all submissions to the Complainant and his/her representative.

If the Agency does not comply with the Commission's order, the Complainant may petition the Commission for enforcement of the order. 29 C.F.R. § 1614.503(a). The Complainant also has the right to file a civil action to enforce compliance with the Commission's order prior to or following an administrative petition for enforcement. See 29 C.F.R. §§ 1614.407, 1614.408, and 29 C.F.R. § 1614.503(g). Alternatively, the Complainant has the right to file a civil action on the underlying complaint in accordance with the paragraph below entitled "Right to File a Civil Action." 29 C.F.R. §§ 1614.407 and 1614.408. A civil action for enforcement or a civil action on the underlying complaint is subject to the deadline stated in 42 U.S.C. 2000e-16(c) (1994 & Supp. IV 1999). **If the Complainant files a civil action, the administrative processing of the complaint, including any petition for enforcement, will be terminated.** See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.409.

Failure by an agency to either file a compliance report or implement any of the orders set forth in this decision, without good cause shown, may result in the referral of this matter to the Office of Special Counsel pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 1614.503(f) for enforcement by that agency.

STATEMENT OF RIGHTS - ON APPEAL  
RECONSIDERATION (M0124.1)

The Commission may, in its discretion, reconsider this appellate decision if Complainant or the Agency submits a written request that contains arguments or evidence that tend to establish that:

1. The appellate decision involved a clearly erroneous interpretation of material fact or law; or

2. The appellate decision will have a substantial impact on the policies, practices, or operations of the agency.

Requests for reconsideration must be filed with EEOC's Office of Federal Operations (OFO) **within thirty (30) calendar days** of receipt of this decision. If the party requesting reconsideration elects to file a statement or brief in support of the request, **that statement or brief must be filed together with the request for reconsideration.** A party shall have **twenty (20) calendar days** from receipt of another party's request for reconsideration within which to submit a brief or statement in opposition. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.405; Equal Employment Opportunity Management Directive for 29 C.F.R. Part 1614 (EEO MD-110), at Chap. 9 § VII.B (Aug. 5, 2015).

Complainant should submit their request for reconsideration, and any statement or brief in support of their request, via the EEOC Public Portal, which can be found at

<https://publicportal.eeoc.gov/Portal/Login.aspx>

Alternatively, Complainant can submit their request and arguments to the Director, Office of Federal Operations, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, via regular mail addressed to P.O. Box 77960, Washington, DC 20013, or by certified mail addressed to 131 M Street, NE, Washington, DC 20507. In the absence of a legible postmark, a complainant's request to reconsider shall be deemed timely filed if OFO receives it by mail within five days of the expiration of the applicable filing period. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.604.

An agency's request for reconsideration must be submitted in digital format via the EEOC's Federal Sector EEO Portal (FedSEP). See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.403(g). Either party's request and/or statement or brief in opposition must also include proof of service on the other party, unless Complainant files their request via the EEOC Public Portal, in which case no proof of service is required.

Failure to file within the 30-day time period will result in dismissal of the party's request for reconsideration as untimely, unless extenuating circumstances prevented the timely filing of the request. **Any supporting documentation must be submitted together with the request for reconsideration.** The Commission will consider requests for reconsideration filed after the deadline only in very limited circumstances. See 29 C.F.R. § 1614.604(f).

COMPLAINANT'S RIGHT TO FILE A CIVIL ACTION (T0124)

This decision affirms the Agency's final decision/action in part, but it also requires the Agency to continue its administrative processing of a portion of your complaint. You have the right to file a civil action in an appropriate United States District Court **within ninety (90) calendar days** from the date that you receive this decision on both that portion of your complaint which the Commission has affirmed and that portion of the complaint which has been remanded for continued administrative processing. In the alternative, you may file a civil action **after one hundred and eighty (180) calendar days** of the date you filed your complaint with the Agency, or your appeal with the Commission, until such time as the Agency issues its final decision on your complaint. If you file a civil action, you must name as the defendant in the complaint the person who is the official Agency head or department head, identifying that person by their full name and official title. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of your case in court. "Agency" or "department" means the national organization, and not the local office, facility or department in which you work. If you file a request to reconsider and also file a civil action, **filing a civil action will terminate the administrative processing of your complaint.**

RIGHT TO REQUEST COUNSEL (Z0815)

If you want to file a civil action but cannot pay the fees, costs, or security to do so, you may request permission from the court to proceed with the civil action without paying these fees or costs. Similarly, if you cannot afford an attorney to represent you in the civil action, you may request the court to appoint an attorney for you. **You must submit the requests for waiver of court costs or appointment of an attorney directly to the court, not the Commission.** The court has the sole discretion to grant or deny these types of requests. Such requests do not alter the time limits for filing a civil action (please read the paragraph titled Complainant's Right to File a Civil Action for the specific time limits).

FOR THE COMMISSION:



Carlton M. Hadden, Director  
Office of Federal Operations

February 24, 2025

Date