

USAGM Involuntary Separation Group 1 Consolidation v. U.S. Agency for Global Media

Docket # CF-0752-26-0137-I-1

Response to 07 17 2026 Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order

Summary Page

Case Title : USAGM Involuntary Separation Group 1 Consolidation v. U.S. Agency for Global Media

Docket Number : CF-0752-26-0137-I-1

Pleading Title : Response to 07 17 2026 Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order

Filer's Name : Erik Snyder

Filer's Pleading Role : Appellant

Details about the supporting documentation

#	Title / Description	Mode of Delivery
---	---------------------	------------------

USAGM Involuntary Separation Group 1 Consolidation v. U.S. Agency for Global Media

Docket # CF-0752-26-0137-I-1

Response to 07 17 2026 Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order

Table of Contents

[Summary](#) 1

[Table of Contents](#) 2

[Interview](#) 3

[Body](#) 4

[2026.07.17 Status update \(final\).pdf](#) 4

[Exhibit 1 - Spreadsheet With Appellants' Information.pdf](#) 9

[Exhibit 2 - March 7 DDC Order.pdf](#) 11

[Exhibit 3 - March 17 DDC Order.pdf](#) 13

[Exhibit 4 - June 8 DC Cir Order.pdf](#) 15

[Exhibit 5 - June 19 DC Cir Order.pdf](#) 17

[Certificate of Service](#) 19

1. What is the title of the MSPB notice or order to which you are responding?

Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order

2. What is the date of that notice or order?

06/12/2026

3. Does your pleading assert facts that you know from your personal knowledge?

No

4. Do you declare, under penalty of perjury, that the facts stated in this pleading are true and correct?

No

USAGM INVOLUNTARY SEPARATION GROUP 1 CONSOLIDATION

V.

Agency.

Hon. Paul DiTomasso
Administrative Judge

1. A table outlining each consolidated Appellant by name, individual docket number, and method of separation from the Agency is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
2. As set forth in the attached orders, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia found that Kari Lake was improperly appointed as the Agency's acting CEO and further found that the actions taken by the Agency to cease operations and reduce its staff violated the Administrative Procedures Act. Exhibits 2 and 3 (March 7 and 17 DDC Orders). As a result of these findings, the Court held that all official actions taken by Kari Lake and/or under Ms. Lake's delegated authority during her tenure as acting CEO of the Agency were void. Exhibit 2. The Court further found that all of the Agency's actions taken to reduce staff were also void. Exhibit 3 (setting aside, *inter alia*, all actions taken pursuant to the "March 18 Statutory Minimum Memorandum," which described the Agency's plan to reduce staffing); *Widakuswara v. Lake*, 824 F. Supp. 3d 1

(D.D.C. 2026). Appellants uniformly contend that the Agency's DRP, VERA, and VSIP offers were made under Ms. Lake's delegated authority and/or as part of the Agency's plan to reduce its staff and are thus void. As all Appellants were separated pursuant to one or more of these offers, they contend that their separations were therefore involuntary. None of the consolidated Appellants are raising any other claims.

3. Appellants hereby provide the following update regarding the status of the federal cases upon which their claims are based:

The procedural posture of the federal cases against the Agency is complex. After Kari Lake assumed de facto control on or about March 5, 2025, numerous lawsuits were filed challenging various actions taken by the Agency under her authority. *See Radio Free Asia v. United States*, No. 1:25-cv-907 (D.D.C.) and *Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Inc. v. United States*, No. 1:25-cv-00966 (D.D.C.) (each challenging the Agency's decision to cancel various grants); *Widakuswara v. Lake*, No. 1:25-cv-01015 (D.D.C.) and *Abramowitz v. Lake*, No. 1:25-cv-00887 (D.D.C.) (each challenging Agency decisions to cease operations and place most of its staff on administrative leave). In April of 2025, Hon. Royce C. Lamberth granted preliminary injunctions in each of these cases, which the Agency appealed. *See Radio Free Asia v. United States*, No. 25-5151 (D.C. Cir. April 25, 2025); *Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Inc. v. United States*, No. 25-5150 (D.C. Cir. April 25, 2025); *Widakuswara v. Lake*, No. 25-5144 (D.C. Cir. April 24, 2025) and *Abramowitz v. Lake*, No. 25-5145 (D.C. Cir. April 24, 2025).

On March 7, 2026, Judge Lamberth granted partial summary judgment in favor of the *Widakuswara* plaintiffs, holding that Ms. Lake had not been properly appointed. Exhibit 2; *Widakuswara v. Lake*, 2026 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47041 (D.D.C. 2026). On March 17, 2026, Judge Lamberth granted summary judgment to both the *Widakuswara* and *Abramowitz* plaintiffs on

their APA claims, holding that the Agency's actions to reduce staff were arbitrary and capricious. Exhibit 3; *Widakuswara v. Lake*, 824 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2026).¹ These are the decisions upon which Appellants' claims are based. The Agency has also appealed each of these decisions. See *Widakuswara v. Lake*, No. 26-5087 (D.C. Cir. March 20, 2026) and *Abramowitz v. Lake*, No. 26-5086 (D.C. Cir. March 20, 2026).

On June 8, 2026, the D.C. Circuit issued an Order dismissing the appeals of Judge Lamberth's 2025 preliminary injunctions (Nos. 25-5144, 25-5145, 25-5150, and 25-5151) as moot because the relief requested was subsumed by the appeals of his 2026 summary judgment decisions. Exhibit 4 (June 8 D.C. Cir. Order). In the same Order, the D.C. Circuit held the 2026 summary judgment appeals (Nos. 26-5086 and 26-5087) in abeyance pending an *en banc* resolution of yet another appeal, *NTEU v. Vought*, No. 25-5091 (D.C. Cir.) (argued Feb. 24, 2026). *Id.*

The *NTEU* case concerns orders given by Russel Vought in his capacity as the acting Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB). See *NTEU v. Vought*, 774 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2025). Like in *Widakuswara* and *Abramowitz*, the *NTEU* plaintiffs asserted that Mr. Vought was improperly appointed and that he engaged in "an unlawful effort 'to dismantle an agency that Congress established'" in violation of the APA. *Id.* at 39 n.6, 46. The District Court entered a preliminary injunction based on the APA claims, but did not reach the appointment claim. *Id.* at 39 n. 6, 77-78. This injunction is the matter now on appeal to the D.C. Circuit.

¹ The *Widakuswara* and *Abramowitz* plaintiffs also alleged several additional theories of liability that they assert would also invalidate the Agency's actions, including claims that the Agency's actions violated the First Amendment, were *ultra vires*, and violated statutes intended to guarantee the Agency's editorial independence. These claims were not included in the plaintiffs' motions for summary judgment and remain pending.

However, while *NTEU* was briefed and argued in February 2026, it will likely be some time before any decision is reached. This is because, on June 19, 2026, the D.C. Circuit partially remanded the *NTEU* appeal to the District Court for further findings based on subsequent agency action. Exhibit 5 (June 19 D.C. Cir. Order). The D.C. Circuit expressly declined to set a specific time limit for the appeal to be returned. *Id.* If the appeal is returned to the D.C. Circuit, it will likely need to be at least partially re-briefed and re-argued in light of any additional findings the District Court makes (or does not make). As such, there is presently no timetable for the resolution of *NTEU*, and thus no timetable for the resolution of *Widakuswara* or *Abramowitz*.

Appellants anticipate the Agency will argue that this case should not proceed until all *Widakuswara*-related appeals have been exhausted. Appellants stridently oppose this position. The D.C. Circuit could have stayed the District Court's *Widakuswara* orders, but it did not. For the foreseeable future, the District Court's orders voiding the Agency's actions are law. The possibility that these orders may someday be reversed is speculation and should not be cause for delay.

In 5 U.S.C. § 7701(i), Congress “directed the Board to expeditiously process appeals consistent with fairness and other Board priorities, and the Board has maintained a policy of holding hearings promptly unless extraordinary circumstances have been shown.” *Thomas v. Dep’t of Veterans Affs.*, 51 MSPR 218, 220 (1991). This policy exists “because delays adversely affect employees who might be unemployed while their appeals are pending, or who, at the least, are subject to great uncertainty about the future course of their careers.” *Id.*

Consistent with this Congressional mandate for expeditious adjudication, the Board has held that a case may not go on indefinitely. *Ayers v. NASA*, 80 MSPR 550, ¶ 7 (1999). Indeed, the Board has a policy of deciding appeals within 120 days. *See Milner v. Dep’t of Justice*, 87

MSPR 660, ¶ 10 (2001); *see also* 5 U.S.C. § 7701(i)(4) (it “shall be the duty of the Board, and administrative law judge . . . to hear any proceeding under this section to expedite to the extent practicable that proceeding).

The well-known saying, “justice delayed is justice denied,” applies in this appeal. Appellants were separated from their positions on September 30, 2025. Delaying this proceeding, potentially for years, could have a profoundly negative effect on Appellants’ livelihoods, families, and careers. Appellants should not have to wait to conduct discovery, develop the record, or receive a hearing. If they prevail, they should receive interim relief during the pendency of any appeals.

Respectfully submitted,



Erik D. Snyder, Esq.
Marlene A. Laimeche, Esq.
Kevin L. Owen, Esq.
William C. Schubert, Esq.
Gilbert Employment Law, P.C.
8403 Colesville Rd, Suite 1000
Silver Spring, MD 20910
Tel: (301) 608-0880
Fax: (301) 608-0881
esnyder-efile@gelawyer.com
mlaimeche-efile@gelawyer.com
kowen-efile@gelawyer.com
wschubert-efile@gelawyer.com

Appellant's Name	Appellant's Docket Number	Method of Separation from the Agency
Haider Ary	DC-0752-26-1762-I-1	VSIP
Delondra Barron	DC-0752-26-1763-I-1	DRP
Zorislav Baydyuk	DC-0752-26-1764-I-1	VERA / VSIP
Kenneth Bredemeier	DC-0752-26-1782-I-1	VSIP
Steven Brody	DC-0752-26-1783-I-1	VSIP
Mia Bush	DC-0752-26-1765-I-1	DRP
Felicia Butler	DC-0752-26-1784-I-1	VERA / VSIP
Vivian Chakarian	DC-0752-26-1766-I-1	DRP
Arkady Cherepansky	DC-0752-26-1785-I-1	DRP
Wonwoo Cho	DC-0752-26-1786-I-1	VSIP
Dereje Desta	DC-0752-26-1749-I-1	DRP
Kane Farabaugh	DC-0752-26-1337-I-1	DRP / VERA
Bruce Ferder	DC-0752-26-1751-I-1	VSIP
Ibrahim Garba	DC-0752-26-1752-I-1	VSIP
Walter Gensurowsky	DC-0752-26-1756-I-1	DRP
Nigel Gibbs	DC-0752-26-1760-I-1	DRP
Laura Keel	DC-0752-26-1793-I-1	DRP
Myroslava Gongadze	DC-0752-26-1774-I-1	DRP / VERA
Richard Green	DC-0752-26-1754-I-1	VERA / VSIP
Sonya Green	DC-0752-26-1338-I-1	DRP
Anabela Guedes	DC-0752-26-1775-I-1	DRP
Berhan Hailu	DC-0752-26-1787-I-1	VSIP
Mwamoyo Hamza	DC-0752-26-1776-I-1	VSIP
Dahai Han	DC-0752-26-1788-I-1	DRP
MoeMoe Htun	DC-0752-26-1789-I-1	DRP
Elizabeth Jepsen	DC-0752-26-1790-I-1	VSIP
Daniel Joseph	DC-0752-26-1791-I-1	DRP
Etienne Karekezi	DC-0752-26-1792-I-1	VSIP
Amy Katz	DC-0752-26-1339-I-1	VSIP
Pamela Lenz	DC-0752-26-1777-I-1	VSIP
John Lippman	DC-0752-26-1778-I-1	VSIP
Leakhena Sreng	DC-0752-26-1803-I-1	DRP
Heather Maxwell	DC-0752-26-1755-I-1	DRP
Robert McLean	DC-0752-26-1757-I-1	DRP
Lori Lundin	DC-0752-26-1794-I-1	VSIP
Meredith Meads	DC-0752-26-1761-I-1	DRP
Beth Mendelson	DC-0752-26-1758-I-1	VSIP
Ajdin Muratovic	DC-0752-26-1341-I-1	DRP
Deirdre Murray-McIntosh	DC-0752-26-1795-I-1	VSIP
Scott Orcutt	DC-0752-26-1779-I-1	DRP
Angel Ortiz-Arroyo	DC-0752-26-1796-I-1	DRP
Mohammad Osmanzoi	DC-0752-26-1812-I-1	VSIP
Eric Phillips	DC-0752-26-1797-I-1	DRP
Khadija Riyami	DC-0752-26-1798-I-1	VSIP
Karine Roushanian	DC-0752-26-1799-I-1	VSIP
Gyaltsen Samsur	DC-0752-26-1800-I-1	VSIP

Cheyn Shah	DC-0752-26-1801-I-1	DRP
Janice Sokol	DC-0752-26-1802-I-1	DRP
Laurence Gomez	DC-0752-26-1767-I-1	DRP
Jeffrey Swicord	DC-0752-26-1804-I-1	VSIP
Andrea Tadic	DC-0752-26-1805-I-1	DRP / VERA
Sonny Tang	DC-0752-26-1806-I-1	VERA / VSIP
Tewelde Tesfagabir	DC-0752-26-1807-I-1	VSIP
Sabina Thomas	DC-0752-26-1808-I-1	VSIP
Adrienne Tyson	DC-0752-26-1780-I-1	VERA / VSIP
John Walker	DC-0752-26-1781-I-1	DRP
Abdirahman Weheliye	DC-0752-26-1809-I-1	VSIP
Candace Williams	DC-0752-26-1810-I-1	DRP
Arben Xhixho	DC-0752-26-1811-I-1	DRP

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PATSY WIDAKUSWARA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KARI LAKE, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-1015-RCL

ORDER

Upon consideration of the plaintiffs' [168] Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, the defendants' [202] Cross-Motion and Opposition, the plaintiffs' [208] Cross-Opposition and Reply, the defendants' [214] Cross-Reply, the plaintiffs' [216-1] Sur-Reply, the plaintiffs' [212] February 26, 2026 Notice, and the statements of fact and exhibits appended thereto, and the entire record, and for the reasons stated in the Memorandum Opinion to follow, it is hereby **ORDERED** that

the plaintiffs' [168] Motion is **GRANTED** in favor of the plaintiffs on Counts X and XI of the Supplemental Complaint; and it is further **ORDERED** that

all official actions taken by Defendant Kari Lake between July 31 and November 19, 2025, including but not limited to the reduction-in-force notices issued on August 29, 2025, and all actions otherwise taken by Defendant Lake pursuant to the delegated authorities contained in the March and/or July Delegation documents, "shall have no force or effect," *see* 5 U.S.C. § 3348(d)(1)–(2); and it is further **ORDERED** that

the defendants' [202] Cross Motion is **DENIED**; and it is further **ORDERED** that

the plaintiffs' [144] Motion to Enforce the Preliminary Injunction, which requested an order enjoining the August 29 RIF, is therefore **MOOT** due to the relief already granted herein; and it is further **ORDERED** that

no later than the close of business on March 11, 2026, the defendants shall file a Status Report identifying:

- (i) the individual or individuals who have served as acting CEO of USAGM since November 19, 2025, and any appointing order(s) thereof;
- (ii) to the extent different from (i), the individual serving as acting CEO following this Order, and any appointing order thereof;
- (iii) the current succession plan for the CEO of USAGM; and
- (iv) copies of all orders delegating the authorities of the CEO of USAGM entered since January 20, 2025; and it is further **ORDERED** that

should any future order or other document designate a new acting CEO, or delegate the authorities of the CEO, the defendants shall file a copy of such document in this Court within forty-eight hours of its issuance.

SO ORDERED.

Date: March 7, 2026



Royce C. Lamberth
United States District Judge

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MICHAEL ABRAMOWITZ, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KARI LAKE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-887-RCL

PATSY WIDAKUSWARA, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KARI LAKE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-1015-RCL

ORDER

Upon consideration of the plaintiffs' [Widakuswara 166, Abramowitz 103] Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, the defendants' [Widakuswara 189, Abramowitz 118] Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and the entire record, it is hereby **ORDERED**

that the plaintiffs' Motion on Count I in Case No. 25-cv-887 and on Count V in Case No. 25-cv-1015 is **DENIED IN PART** to the extent the Motion seeks reinstatement of terminated contracts, and otherwise **GRANTED IN PART**, and it is therefore further **ORDERED**

that all actions taken pursuant to the defendants' decision to reduce USAGM to the "statutory minimum," as set forth in the Statutory Minimum Memorandum are **VACATED** and **SET ASIDE**, including the March 18 Statutory Minimum Memorandum, the March 15 placement of 1,042 employees on administrative leave, the suspension of broadcasting operations, and the

termination of non-contractor staff, and that no later than March 23, 2026, all employees placed on administrative leave pursuant to the defendants' March 2025 directive shall return to work; and it is further **ORDERED**

that the defendants' Cross-Motion is **GRANTED IN PART** to the extent it challenges the Court's jurisdiction to reinstate the terminated contracts and otherwise **DENIED IN PART**; and it is further **ORDERED**

that in light of the permanent relief granted herein, the Court will **FIND AS MOOT** the plaintiffs [*Widakuswara* 144, *Abramowitz* 84] Joint Motion to Enforce Preliminary Injunction, the defendants' [*Widakuswara* 175, *Abramowitz* 108] Motion to Dissolve or Modify the April 22, 2025 Preliminary Injunction, and the defendants' [*Widakuswara* 73] Motion to Vacate the March 28, 2025 Temporary Restraining Order; and it is further **ORDERED**

that the parties shall meet and confer no later than seven days following the issuance of this Order and, no later than seventy-two hours thereafter, shall file a joint statement proposing a plan for further proceedings in this case.

SO ORDERED.

Date: March 17, 2026



Royce C. Lamberth
United States District Judge

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5144

September Term, 2025

1:25-cv-00887-RCL

1:25-cv-01015-RCL

Filed On: June 8, 2026

Patsy Widakuswara, et al.,

Appellees

v.

Kari Lake, in her official capacity as Senior
Advisor to the Acting CEO of the U.S. Agency
for Global Media, et al.,

Appellants

Consolidated with 25-5145, 26-5086, 26-5087

No. 25-5150

1:25-cv-00966-RCL

Middle East Broadcasting Networks, Inc.,

Appellee

v.

United States of America, et al.,

Appellants

No. 25-5151

1:25-cv-00907-RCL

Radio Free Asia,

Appellee

v.

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5144**September Term, 2025**

United States of America, et al.,

Appellants

BEFORE: Henderson, Wilkins, and Katsas, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of appellees' suggestion of mootness of appeal Nos. 25-5144 and 25-5145, the response thereto, and the replies; appellants' motion to hold appeals Nos. 26-5086, 26-5087 in abeyance, or in the alternative to modify the briefing order, the opposition thereto, and the reply; and appellants' unopposed motion for extension of time to file the opening brief, it is

ORDERED that case Nos. 25-5144 and 25-5145 be dismissed as moot. It is

FURTHER ORDERED, on the court's own motion, that related appeals Nos. 25-5150 and 25-5151 be dismissed as moot.

FURTHER ORDERED that the consolidation of Nos. 26-5086 and 26-5087 with No. 25-5144, et al., be terminated. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the motion to hold case Nos. 26-5086 and 26-5087 in abeyance be granted and these cases are hereby held in abeyance pending the en banc court's resolution of NTEU v. Vought, No. 25-5091 (argued Feb. 24, 2026).

The parties are directed to file motions to govern within 30 days of the court's disposition of No. 25-5091.

The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate in Nos. 25-5144, 25-5145, 25-5150 and 25-5151 until seven days after resolution of any timely petition for rehearing or rehearing en banc. See Fed. R. App. P. 41(b); D.C. Cir. R. 41(a)(1).

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Michael C. McGrail
Deputy Clerk

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 25-5091**September Term, 2025****1:25-cv-00381-ABJ****Filed On: June 19, 2026**

National Treasury Employees Union, et al.,

Appellees

v.

Russell T. Vought, in his official capacity as
Acting Director of the Consumer Financial
Protection Bureau and Consumer Financial
Protection Bureau,

Appellants

BEFORE: Srinivasan, Chief Judge; Henderson, Millett*, Pillard*, Wilkins,
Katsas, Rao, Walker, Childs*, Pan*, and Garcia, Circuit Judges

ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion to modify the stay pending appeal, for a limited remand, and to place the appeal in abeyance, the response thereto, and the reply, it is

ORDERED that the motion to modify the stay pending appeal be denied and the motion for a limited remand be granted. The court will remand the record for the district court to decide in the first instance whether to modify, suspend, or dissolve the preliminary injunction in light of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau's issuance of a revised reduction-in-force plan and the other intervening developments identified in the appellants' motion. See Mot. 2, 12–17. The appellees do not oppose a remand for that purpose, see Resp. 6–8, and the remand is limited to enabling the district court to consider only those intervening developments identified in the appellants' motion. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the appellants' request to impose a 45-day limit on the remand, which the appellees oppose, be denied. See Mot. 12; Resp. 7–8. The district court has moved expeditiously throughout this litigation, see Reply 11, and it is assumed that the court would continue to do so on remand. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the appellants' unopposed motion to hold this appeal in abeyance be granted. See Mot. 18; Resp. 7. The en banc court will retain jurisdiction over this appeal. See D.C. Cir. R. 41(b); D.C. Cir. Handbook of Practice & Internal Procedures 35-36 (2025). The Clerk is directed to transmit a copy of this order to the district court. The district court is requested to notify this court promptly upon deciding the issues presented by the limited remand. Absent further direction from this court, the parties are directed to file motions to govern future proceedings in this court no later than 21 days following the district court's decision.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/

Scott H. Atchue

Deputy Clerk

* Because this court is retaining jurisdiction over the case, Judges Millett, Pillard, Childs, and Pan would wait until the legal questions pending before the *en banc* court are resolved before remanding to the district court.

Certificate of Service

e-Appeal has handled service of the assembled pleading to MSPB and the following Parties.

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
MSPB: Washington Regional Office	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Bredemeier, Kenneth	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Bush, Mia	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Butler, Felicia	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Chakarian, Vivian	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Cherepansky, Arkady	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Cho, Wonwoo	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Consolidation, USAGM Involuntary Separation Group 1	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
DeMaster, Jennifer	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Farabaugh, Kane	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Ferder, Bruce	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Garba, Ibrahim	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Gensurowsky, Walter	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Gomez, Laurence	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal

e-Appeal has handled service of the assembled pleading to MSPB and the following Parties.

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
Green, Sonya	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Hailu, Berhan	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Hampton, Danielle	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Hamza, Mwamoyo	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Han, Dahai	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Jepsen, Elizabeth	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Joseph, Daniel	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Karekezi, Etienne	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Katz, Amy	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Keel, Laura	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Laimeche, Marlene	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Lenz, Pamela	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Lippman, John	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Lundin, Lori	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
McLean, Robert	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Mendelson, Beth	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal

e-Appeal has handled service of the assembled pleading to MSPB and the following Parties.

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
Muratovic, Ajdin	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Murray-McIntosh, Deirdre	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Orcutt, Scott	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Ortiz-Arroyo, Angel	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Owen, Kevin	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Phillips, Eric	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Riyami, Khadija	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Schubert, William	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Shah, Cheyn	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Sreng, Leakhena	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Swicord, Jeffrey	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Tang, Sonny	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Tesfagabir, Tewelde	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Weheliye, Abdirahaman	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal
Williams, Candace	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	e-Appeal

I agree to send a printed copy of the electronic pleading with attachments to all parties by the end of next business day, as follows:

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
Ary, Haider U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Barron, Delondra U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Baydyuk, Zorislav U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Brody, Steven U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Desta, Dereje U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Gibbs, Nigel U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Gongadze, Myroslava U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Green, Richard U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Guedes, Anabela U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail

I agree to send a printed copy of the electronic pleading with attachments to all parties by the end of next business day, as follows:

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
Appeal available under current contact list.		
Document Number: 4053002 e-Appeal Submission: 07/17/2026 03:30 PM ET MSPB Page 23 of 25		

I agree to send a printed copy of the electronic pleading with attachments to all parties by the end of next business day, as follows:

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
Htun, Moe Moe U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Maxwell, Heather U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Meads, Meredith U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Osmanzoi, Mohammad U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Roushanian, Karine U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Samsur, Gyaltsen U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Sokol, Janice U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Tadic, Andrea U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail

I agree to send a printed copy of the electronic pleading with attachments to all parties by the end of next business day, as follows:

Name & Address	Documents	Method of Service
Thomas, Sabina U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Tyson, Adrienne U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Walker, John U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail
Xhixho, Arben U.S. mail address on file with MSPB e-Appeal available under current contact list.	Response to 06 12 2026 Case Processing Order	US Mail