Matter Close Date	Matter Number	Matter Description
1/17/2012	(b)(6)	(b)(6) TSI appealing 28-day suspension for negligent performance of duties, failure to follow directions, and lack of candor.
2/29/2012	(b)(6)	(b)(6) FAM appealing indefinite suspension.
3/14/2012		(b)(6) TSI-A appealing removal for failure to follow instructions, failure to complete mandatory training, AWOL.

3/16/2012	(b)(6)	(b)(6) in OHC appealing termination and lots of other stuff. Reopening previous case after dismissal w/o prejudice.
6/22/2012		Whistleblower claim
6/27/2012		FAM USERRA thing
9/7/2012		(b)(6) TSM appealing removal for negligence, falsifying T&A records, AWOL.
9/25/2012		Former (b)(6) FSD appealing removal.
12/31/2012		(b)(6) TSO appealing termination during trial period. Also alleging whistleblowing and discrimination and all kinds of stuff.
1/2/2013		(b)(6) TSM appealing removal for failure to report sexual harassment, failure to follow instructions, negligent performance of duty, disrespectful conduct, and lack of candor.
3/13/2013		(b)(6) MSC Internal Investigations Admin Specialist appealing disability retirement (involuntary) and Agency's alleged's refusal to return Appellant to work.
3/29/2013		Attorney's fees petition
4/1/2013		(b)(6) TSI-C appealing removal for calling an STSI a fucking cunt and then lying about it.
4/2/2013		(b)(6) TSM (CT) appealling removal for lack of candor, conduct unbecoming a management official, misuse of position, and failure to timely report a romantic/intimate relationship with a subordinate
4/2/2013		(b)(6) TSM appealing removal for testing positive for marijuana.

5/6/2013	(b)(6)	(b)(6) TSM appealing removal for negligent performance of duties, lack of candor, and submission of a falsified document.
6/4/2013		(b)(6) FAM appealing indefinite suspension following clearance suspension following positive test for marijuana.
6/17/2013		(b)(6) TSM making IRA appeal, termination appeal.
6/20/2013		MSPB PFR Remand (b)(6) TSM-BDO appealing demotion.
6/28/2013		(b)(6) SFAM appealling removal for conduct unbecoming, violation of firearms policy.
7/29/2013		(b)(6) TSM appealing removal for various failures and misconduct.
9/13/2013		(b)(6) TSM appealing removal.
9/16/2013		(b)(6) TSM appealling removal for fudging his hours.
9/20/2013		HQ (b)(6) Program Analyst (J-Band) appealing demotion to Program Specialist (H-Band), mitigated from removal, for unacceptable performance.

12/18/2013	(b)(6)	(b)(6) TSM appealing removal for inappropriate conduct, lack of candor, failure to follow instructions, and unprofessional comments. Claims his removal was discriminatory, whistleblower retaliation.
2/20/2014		(b)(6) TSM appealling reassignment for misrepresentation, claims whisteblower reprisal.
2/27/2014		(b)(6) FAM appealing indefinite suspension for sexual assault.
3/10/2014		(b)(6) FAM appealling removal for domestic abuse and lack of candor.
9/17/2014		Supervisory Program Specialist in (b)(6) appealling removal for lack of candor, misuse of government equipment.
12/18/2014		C, a Deputy Assistant Federal Security Director (DAFSD),SV-1801 (Band J), at the (b)(6) (b)(6) is appealing Agencys decision of removal from Federal Service based on: 1.Charge One: Driving under the Influence of Alcohol 2.Charge Two: Lack of Candor 3.Charge Three: Failure to Report Arrest
12/22/2014		Attorneys Fees
12/22/2014		Petition for Enforcement
1/13/2015		(b)(6) TSM-BDO appealing failure to be allowed to returned to work.
1/14/2015		Appellant promoted and accepted position as a SFAM (Pay Band- J), in Virginia. Requested a voluntary lateral transfer back to (b)(6) and agreed to accept downgrade to an I band. Appellant met with Virginia manager, DSAC, who advised his J band pay fell within the I band, and management had the latitude to maintain his pay. April 2012 agency reduced appellants base pay and hazardous duty pay.

1/22/2015	(b)(6)	L-Band HQ Division Director appealing bump down to K-Band FSD in (b)(6) claiming whistleblower retaliation.
1/29/2015		(b)(6) FAM appealing removal for conduct unbecoming and lack of candor following brawl in (b)(6) (b)(6)
2/3/2015		A, a DFSD at (b)(6) California, is appealing her removal from federal service.
3/5/2015		A, a HR Specialist at (b)(6), is appealing her reduction in grade from I band to G band. This is a performance-based action. The A denies that her performance failed to meet established performance standards. In addition, the A alleges that the agency retaliated against her based upon prior EEO activity and other activities protected under 5 USC 2302(b).
4/2/2015		A, Program Assistant at (b)(6) is appealing her removal from federal service. (Submitted an application for F band HR Assistant position; charged with Misrepresentation and Lack of Candor).
7/10/2015		(b)(6) FAM appealling removal.
7/13/2015		(b)(6) FAM appealing removal.
8/28/2015		(b)(6) Supervisory Coordination Center officer appealing demotion to TSO (mitigated from removal) for lack of candor and inappropriate comments.
9/30/2015		A, a (b)(6) at HQ is APPEALING TERMINATION DURING PROBATIONARY AND INVOLUNTARY RESIGNATION

10/9/2015	(b)(6)	C, a TSO (SV-1802-D) at (b)(6) AZ alleges that the agency committed Prohibited Personnel Practices when: □ 1) January 11, 2014 the C turned in a memorandum to (b)(6) about STSO misconduct about eating food, using cellphones for non-work related activities, and having inappropriate conversations in front of passengers while screening, which are violations of TSA MD, and a violation of law, rule violation. C also viewed this as a threat to the public since Supervisors lacked domain awareness. □ 2) On January 28, 2014 C sent an email to TSA HR, (b)(6) to inform them that part time employees SF-50's were not being updated in accordance with OPM Chapter 24. Change in Work schedule/change in hours. C believed this was a violation of law, rule or regulation □ 3) On January 31, 2014 C filed an EEO complaint against (b)(6) for allowing a part time female to work full time hours and did not allow males the same opportunity. EEO case number (b)(6) (b)(6). C alleges this to be retaliation for other protected activity. □ 4) On April 27, 2014 C was approved to be TSO (b)(6) personal representative during his grievance and appeal procedure for his proposed disciplinary action. April 22, 2014 was when the form was first submitted to (b)(6) alleges this to be retaliation for other protected activity. □ 5) After termination of C, TSA has provided false information about circumstances into C termination. They provided false testimony to the AZDES and in AZDES appeal they wrote and, Senator Jeff Flake inquiry. They stated C did not give medical documentation after September 2013; however C has evidence from a supervisor that C did provide medical documentation. □

1/18/2016	(b)(6)	Complainant, a (b)(6) (SV-1801-I) at the (b)(6) Georgia duty station is appealing based on allegations that: He has oversight over (b)(6) In Spring 2011, Appellant reported to Congressman Lynn Westmoreland that TSA was continuing to pay local law enforcement agencies (b)(6) Police Department) funds to support canine operations for a substantial number of positions that were no longer actually staffed. The Office of Security Operations (OSO) had many individuals in their program who continued to receive pay, automobiles and reimbursements when they had no actual substantive work to perform. This was verified through the Canine Web Site. One example of this is when one person preformed one hour of duty in a four week period of time. Appellant's disclosures prompted an investigation by the Government Accountability Office which subsequently issued a report criticizing TSA canine operations. In October 2011, appellant discovered that a TSA canine handler at the (b)(6) had falsely reported that his dog had found an explosive device at the airport. The handler's report caused Building (b)(6) domestic air cargo, to be evacuated. This caused Delta Airlines to be unable to ship its cargo on outbound aircraft for over 4 hours and approx. 40 million dollars of air freight shipments to be delayed. When Appellant reported the handler's behavior to his supervisor he was directed not to investigate the incident and not to discuss it with anyone. Appellant also had advised (b)(6) (b)(6) that TSA was paying local law enforcement agencies for canine support items that had not been secured, including facilities to house canines and rabies shots for canines used at the (b)(6) airport. He advised (b)(6) that 16 (b)(6) Police Department canines in service at the Airport had not received rabies vaccinations even though TSA had

2/19/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, a TSI (EDCH) at the (b)(6) OR is appealing based on allegations that: a. The Agency cannot meet its burden of proving its charge of unsatisfactory performance of duties by preponderant evidence; b. The Agency established unrealistic performance objectives that were purposely designed to cause the Appellant to fail; c. The Agency failed to adequately communicate the performance standards to the Appellant or provide any training or remedial training to the Appellant; d. The removal was the product of bad faith on the part of the Agency; e. The Agency committed a prohibited personnel practice when it proposed the Appellant's removal and issued the removal decision to Appellant due to the Appellant's wife's prior protected activity; and f. The removal resulted from harmful procedural error.
3/22/2016	(b)(6)	MSPB PFR (b)(6) appealing removal for escorting a GSA employee through the checkpoint without being screened and misrepresenting his authority to do so.

4/5/2016	(b)(6)	Complainant, a TSAR at the (b)(6) is appealing based on allegations that: The Agency engaged in harmful procedural error, as: a. Appellant claims harmful procedural error in the substantiation of the charges in the Notice of Decision as the Agency did not prove any of the charges by a preponderance of the evidence and did not consider Appellant's factual and legal arguments in defense of his actions. b. Appellant claims the Agency cannot meet its burden of proving a sufficient nexus between the alleged misconduct and Appellant's federal employment/the efficiency of the service. c. Appellant claims the penalty of removal is too severe and unreasonable given the mitigating circumstances in this case. Hence, the Agency cannot meet its burden of proving that the penalty of removal was reasonable. d. Appellant claims the Agency's action/decision violated Appellant's due process rights. e. Appellant claims several prohibited personnel practices in this case including, inter alia, race discrimination in violation of 5 U.S.C. §§ 2302(b)(l) and other relevant laws. No discrimination case has been filed with the Agency's EEO office.

7/28/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, a Federal Air Marshal (FAM) at the (b)(6) New Jersey is appealing based on allegations that: 1. The agency considered a May 2012 suspension as "significantly aggravating" because the facts and alleged misconduct of that suspension are purportedly similar to the facts and alleged misconduct in this action. Actually, the facts and alleged misconduct in the two actions differ. The agency would have reached a different conclusion from the one It reached in the absence or cure of this error. 2. The agency indicated that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) "admitted to OOI agents during [his] interview that (b)(6) (b)(6) fired [his] FAMS-issued weapon without [his] permission." There is no such statement in (b)(6);(b)(7)((b)(6);(b)(7)(C) affidavit nor in OOIs related Memorandum of Interview. The agency would have reached a different conclusion from the one it reached in the absence or cure of this error. 3. Charge One is not supported by a preponderance of the evidence. The agency would have reached a different conclusion from the one it reached in the absence or cure of this error. 4. The agency rendered a decision based upon misstatements of facts to include, but not limited to, that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) left his FAMS-Issued weapon unattended at a gun range, that (b)(6) fired (b)(6);((b)(6);(b)(7) FAMS-issued weapon, and that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) "surrendered" his weapon to (b)(6) (b)(6) The agency would have reached a different conclusion from the one it reached in the absence or cure of this error. 5. The agency erroneously found that (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) was not rehabilitative. The agency would have reached a different conclusion from the one it reached in the absence or cure of this error. 6. The Deciding Official misconstrued the facts surrounding the two gun range trips. The agency would have reached a different conclusion from the one It reached in the absence or cure of this error. 7. There Is no nexus between (b)(6);(b)(7)(C) alleged off-duty gun range incident and the TSA's mission and/
8/18/2016	(b)(6)	(b)(6) TSI appealing removal for unacceptable performance

9/15/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, TSM at the (b)(6) New York duty station is appealing based on allegations that: The removal is excessive under the circumstances. (b)(6) has not committed misconduct sufficient to warrant removal. (b)(6) reserves the right to prove other and further reasons as to why the Agency's actions were wrong, including, but not limited to, the improper application of the Douglas factors by the Agency, as well as the use of Affirmative defenses. Other additional claims include, but are not limited to, harmful procedural error, unlawful discrimination, and retaliation for engaging in protected activity.
9/15/2016	(b)(6)	A, a SFAM at the (b)(6) alleges his supervisors committed violations of his rights by retaliating for whistleblowing.

9/28/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, Transportation Security Specialist-Explosives at (b)(6) in (b)(6) CA is appealing based on allegations that Appellant is not responsible for the misconduct alleged against him and believes the penalty of termination is beyond the bounds of reasonableness. Charge 1: Lack of Candor Specification 1: On February 23, 2016, while conducting an official investigation, Assistant Federal Security Director - Generalist (AFSD-G) (b)(6) asked if, on February 5, 2016, Appellant told Transportation Security Officer (TSO) (b)(6) that he should commit suicide by firearm. Appellant responded, "I did not would never say that to anybody." Appellant also stated the same in his February 24, 2016, written statement. TSO (b)(6) and Lead Transportation Security Officer (LTSO) (b)(6) however, reported that you made the statement. Specification 2: On March 7, 2016, AFSD-G (b)(6) conducted a follow-up interview. He advised Appellant that a witness had heard Appellant tell TSO (b)(6) that TSO (b)(6) should go home and kill himself. He asked if Appellant would like to revise Appellants February 23 and 24, 2016, statements. Appellant responded in the negative. Charge 2: Inappropriate Conduct Specification 1: In December 2015, while conducting training, Appellant stated to his class that "[i]f this was a class when I was in the military, Appellant would be handing out dirt naps." The phrase "dirt nap" is slang term for unconsciousness or death. In Appellants February 24, 2016 written statement, Appellant acknowledged that he made this statement. Specification 2: On February 5, 2016, Appellant stated to TSO (b)(6) "You should go home and shoot yourself. Swallow the barrel and pull the trigger," or words similar to that affect. Specification 3: On February 5, 2016, after making the statement described in Charge 2, Specification 2, Appellant made a gesture imitating a gun, with Appellants hand, and pointing towards Appellan

11/3/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, Transportation Security Manager (TSM) at (b)(6) Alaska is appealing based on allegations that: a. The Agency cannot meet its burden of proving the charges by preponderant evidence; b. The penalty of demotion is too severe and unreasonable given the mitigating circumstances in this case. Hence, the Agency cannot meet its burden of proving that removal is warranted. c. The Agency committed a prohibited personnel practice when it proposed the Appellant's demotion and issued the demotion decision to Appellant due to the Appellant's prior protected EEO activity.
11/7/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, Program Specialist, (b)(6) VA is appealing based on allegations of Harmful procedural error, constitutional error, violation of federal laws and prohibited personnel practices: disability discrimination.

11/9/2016	(b)(6)	Appellant, Transportation Security Inspector (TSI) at (b)(6) Florida is appealing based on allegations of Harmful Procedural Error: Error by the agency in the application of its procedures that is likely to have caused the agency to reach a conclusion different from the one it would have reached in the absence or cure of the error. Specifically, (b)(6) was issued a proposed removal in January 25, 2016, which was rescinded because of the Agency's failure to meet the mandatory deadlines. The subsequent April 20, 2016 Notice of Proposed removal was issued to circumvent the deadlines imposed by Part 432 and to gather new and additional information to support its proposed removal of (b)(6) to her detriment. Prohibited Personnel Practices: Unlawful Discrimination: The agency action was the result of prohibited discrimination based on the appellant's national origin, Hispanic. Specifically, (b)(6) made numerous complaints to her supervisors, both Orally and in writing, about the discrimination she was being subjected to by her acting supervisor based on her national origin. Since putting her supervisor on notice about the discrimination, she was subjected to a hostile work environment and disruptive behavior by her supervisors. Prohibited Personnel Practices: Retaliation for Other Protected Activity: The agency action was taken in retaliation for the exercise of a right. Specifically, the removal is in retaliation for the protected disclosure to her supervisors about the hostile work environment and bullying based on her national origin, Hispanic.
2/28/2017	(b)(6)	An IRA appeal of Appellants removal for lack of candor regarding allegations against a TSO and Appellants apparent attempt to fabricate evidence against the TSO.
4/19/2017		(b)(6) FAM appealing removal for conduct unbecoming and missed mission.

5/8/2017	(b)(6)	(b)(6)	TSI-E/K9 appealling removal for misuse of a government vehicle, timecard falsification, submitting inaccurate training records, and lack of candor.

Disposition	Disposition Description
Settled	1. Within 30 days of the effective date of this Agreement, Agency will issue a Notification of Personnel Action (SF-50) that reflects Appellants 10-day suspension, effective September 12, 2011, and retain it in her Official Personnel Folder (OPF). 2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this Agreement, Agency will remove Notification of Personnel Action (SF-50) that reflects her 28-day suspension, dated September 12, 2011. 3. Within 90 days of the effective date of this Agreement, Agency will calculate and pay to the Appellant the back pay and interest corresponding to eighteen days of her suspension. 4. Agency will pay the Appellant a lump-sum payment of $5,000.00, in settlement of any claim to compensatory damages and attorney fees. 5. On the effective date of this agreement, Agency will end the Appellants Performance Improvement Plan with a determination that the Appellant has successfully completed the Plan. 6. Within 30 days of the effective date of this agreement, the Agency will appoint the Appellant as the Phoenix Coordinator of the Aviation Screening Assessment Program (ASAP). The Appellant will learn and comply with all current and future After-Action Reporting Processes, and will take the Online Learning Center training course for ASAP Coordinators. The Appellant will develop and conduct training for all local Field Office personnel to act as Team Leads during assigned ASAP testing. Appellant will develop inspector schedules to ensure ASAP testing is completed in a timely manner. The Agency will make reasonable adjustments to the Appellants inspector duties to accommodate the time necessary for her to perform her ASAP Coordinator duties. 7. Within 30 days of the effective date of this agreement, the Agency will reissue the September 12, 2011, Notice of Decision for 28-day suspension without pay to reflect a 10-day suspension, and will not include a lack-of-candor charge.
Settled	14 Day suspension, $15.000.00 towards Atty fees
Settled	Settled for $15,000 and replacement of removal SF-50 with resignation SF-50.

Settled	Parties entered into a settlement agreement on 2/22/2011 and AJ issued decision on 2/23/2011. Lump sum of $7,500
Settled	Settled for $50,000.
Settled	Lump sum payment of $6,000.
Settled	Settled for $3,000 and resignation. See attached settlement agreement.
Settled	Case settled on the day before hearing. Agency agreed to: 1. Rescind the removal and allow Appellant to resign on August 19, 2012; 2. Allow appellant to use sick leave, annual leave, and FMLA LWOP; 3. Grant 4 pay periods of administrative leave; 4. Pay $225,000 attorney fees; 5. Remove all references to the termination from Appellant's OPF; 6. supply neutral job reference to subsequent employers.
Settled	Case settled through MSPB MAP program. Settled for $15,000 payable to law firm and resignation in lieu.
Settled	Agency cancelled removal action and restored Appellant to his position, with full back pay. Agency agreed to cover a portion of his attorney's fees ($5,000). Coordinated his restoration date with Lockheed and PER SEC to ensure his return as quickly as possible, given agency vulnerability for back pay.
Settled	Settled for $20,000
Settled	Agency settled Appellant's attorney's fees petition for $56,000.00.
Settled	Appellant acepted voluntary demotion to STSO, 30 day suspension, and $25,000 in attorney fees.
Settled	Settled for $13,186
Settled	Agency agreed to settle appeal by allowing appellant to resign and pay a lump sum of $6,500.

Settled	Case was settled for a voluntary resignation and lump sum payment of $10,000 to the Appellant. There are no attorneys fees paid.
Settled	Settled for $5,000
Settled	Settled for $15,000 lump sum and resignation.
Settled	Appellant was demoted one level, there was a lump sum payment of $115,000.
Settled	Case setteled and Appellant's October 3, 2012 removal action was cancelled and rescinded. Appellant was returned to federal service as a Senior Federal Air Marshal, SV-1801-I; at a base rate of pay of $70,726.00, plus locality pay of $20,313.33, plus LEAP pay of $22,760.00 for a total salary of $113,799.00; and stationed at the Federal Air Marshal Service (b)(6) Appellant was allowed to submit documentation for care of sick family member to use accrued sick leave under FMLA to cover a portion of time while he was removed.
Settled	Settled for lump sum of $40,000. See attached settlement agreement.
Settled	Case settled on July 31, 2013 for $89,500 in attorney fees and reinstatement to TSM position with backpay.
Settled	Agency settled the appeal, giving Appellant a clean SF-50 and $4,000.
Settled	The Agency will cancel and rescind Appellants June 2, 2013 involuntary demotion and reduction in pay band action taken for unacceptable performance. The Agency will issue an SF-50 reflecting Appellants voluntary demotion from the Program Analyst, SV-0343-J position to a Program Specialist, SV-0301, H Band effective June 2, 2013 and enter the document in Appellants Official Personnel Folder (OPF). Although the demotion will reduce Appellants pay band from the J Pay Band to an H Pay Band, she will retain her base salary of $73,504.00. Within ninety (90) calendar days of the Agreement Effective Date, the Agency will pay back-pay for the loss of pay effective June 2, 2013. Within ninety (90) calendar days of the Agreement Effective Date, the Agency will remove from Appellants OPF and local personnel folder all references to the June 2, 2013 involuntary demotion and reduction in pay band action and any and all documents referring to, relating to, or evidencing the reason for said involuntary demotion and reduction in pay for unacceptable performance. Appellant understands that the Agency Office of Chief Counsel will maintain its files concerning the action.

Settled	After mediation, case settled for payment to Appellant of a lump-sum amount of forty thousand dollars ($40,000), cancellation and rescission of Appellants March 3, 2013, removal action, and Appellant agreeing to voluntarily resign from the Agency effective March 3, 2013.
Settled	Settled for lump sum of $4,670.
Settled	Dismissed with prejudice, in return terminated indefinite suspension, paid back pay from October 2013 to present.
Settled	Settled for lump sum of $45,000, resignation, and amended supervisor's statement to submit to OPM regarding Appellant's application for disability retirement.
Settled	settled. $93,544.69 back pay, $33,107.20 lump sum annual leave, and $73,157.80 in attorney fees.
Settled	Prior to a hearing, the parties reached a settlement agreement. (b)(6) had applied for disability retirement, which was approved by OPM effective November 1, 2014. The Agency agreed to allow (b)(6) to remain in an LWOP status from his late date in pay status until November 1, 2014. The Agency also agreed to remove references to his removal from his eOPF and to pay him a lump sum of $7500.00
Settled	Appellant withdrew, with prejudice, his application for attorney fees, in exchange for payment of $50,000.00 from Agency. Appellant originally asking for approx $65,000.00 in fees.
Settled	Appellant withdrew, with prejudice, his petition for enforcement. In return, the Agency paid $50,000.00 in atty fees to Appellant's counsel. (Original demand approx. $65,000.00.)
Settled	In October 2014, settled after adverse decision by AJ, but before initial decision became final. Agency agreed to cancel the involuntary suspension, pay Appellant back pay, and pay his attorneys $18,000. Notified on January 13, 2015, that settlement amounts had been paid.
Settled	Settled with Back Pay

Settled	Agency agreed to pay lump sum of $25,000.00 and refrain from transferring or moving Appellant from his current position until June 1, 2016. Appellant agreed to withdraw his appeal, with prejudice.
Settled	Settled under these terms where: Appellant withdraws appeal; resigns his position effective 11/26/13. Agency rescinds Notice of Decision-Removal and issues new Removal based only on the charge of conduct unbecoming; cancels Appellant's removal; issues SF-50 reflecting Appellant's resignation; pays lump sum of $30,000.
Settled	Reassignment DFSD (b)(6) to DFSD (b)(6) Voluntary demotion from TSES to K-band. $25000 relocation incentive. $11000 lump sum. Up to 40 hours excused absence.
Settled	Appellant will transfer as an I-Pay band HR Specialist to (b)(6) Agency will pay Appellant $7500 for permanent change of station and $35,000 in a lump sum to Appellants's attorney. Agency will also restore all leave taken by Appellant form 11/13/14-12/1/14
Settled	Settled for reinstatement to PA position with a lump sum of $14,500 (no back pay, no attorneys's fees)
Settled	Settled, case dismissed, settlement agreement includes reinstatement with LWOP, resignation, and lump sum in the amount of $75,000
Settled	Agency will issue a SF-50 cancelling Appellant's removal and substitute it with a 14-day suspension without pay or back pay. Lump-sum payment of 50k for attorneys fees. Appellant was approved for disability retirement in 2013.
Settled	Appellant and Agency settled case for a lump sum of 8.5k. Court issued an initial decision dismissing case.
Settled	Rescind termination and replace with resignation. $45,665. Neutral reference.

Settled	Clean record resignation, lump sum $10,000.

Settled	Settled. Lump sum $35,000 ($25,000 attorneys' fees, $10,000 to Appellant), plus salary raise effective July 2013.

Settled	Case settled allowing appellant to resign in lieu of removal with back pay and 3k lump sum.
Settled	Parties agreed to settle request for attorney fees for $60,000.

Settled	Appellant agreed to withdraw his appeal with prejudice. Agency agreed to reinstate Appellant to his previous J-Band position (disciplinary downgrade) at his previous J-Band salary, in a supervisory TSS position in (b)(6) Agency paid all back pay and $10,500.00 in attorney's fees.

Settled	Global settlement of both the MSPB appeal and two EEO complaints.Voluntary resignation and a lump sum payment to Appellant for $18,500.
Settled	Appeal settled on 8/17/2016, Initial Decision entered on 8/18/16. $5k lump sum payment and Appellant permitted to resign/retire.

Settled	Case settled lump sum of $3,500. and change of SF-50 from Removal to Voluntary Resignation.
Settled	Settlement Agreement Effective June 14, 2016. Settlement Terms included (1) $30,000 lump sum; (2) retroactive 2% IPI from date of disciplinary letter (4.24.2013), and (3) rescission of disciplinary letter of reprimand.

Settled	Dirty Paper settlement agreement / rescind removal for voluntary resignation for personal reasons and lump sum payment of $4,500 - No Ability to be rehired with TSA - EVER

Settled	As soon as possible but not later than 90 days from the agreement effective date, the agency will cancel the 4/3/16 demotion action, will issue an SF 50 for appellant's for 30 days suspension from duty, will pay the appellant back pay for demotion time period, and pay attorney's fees in a lump sum to complainant's rep ($4,500).
Settled	Settled with $1,846 to Complainant paid through Tully Rickney

Settled	Settled - $5,000 lump sum, change termination SF-50 to resignation for personal reasons, remove termination from local file, neutral reference
Settled	Settled for $330,000; $235,000 for Appellant and $95,000 for Attorneys.
Settled	Appellant withdrew appeal, with prejudice. Agency agreed to rescind termination and allow Appellant to retire when he had 20 years of LEO service and at 50 years of age. Paid him 2.5 months of back pay (of possible 15 months) and $10,000 in fees. No LEO creds or LEOSA rights.

Settled	Removal modified to 45 day suspension and reassignment to TSM position at same band. Attorney's fees totalling 21.5K, and no traditional back pay, though Appellant was placed on paid admin leave starting June 29, 2014, so that 2014 is creditable for FERS. Total admin leave is approx. 19K.