



**IN THE MATTER OF:**

**MADHURI TRIVEDI,**

**ARB CASE NO. 2023-0043**

**COMPLAINANT,**

**ALJ CASE NO. 2023-SOX-00014**

**CHIEF ALJ STEPHEN R. HENLEY**

**v.**

**DATE: September 14, 2023**

**GENERAL ELECTRIC and  
GE HEALTHCARE,**

**RESPONDENTS.**

**Appearances:**

***For the Complainant:***

**Madhuri Trivedi; *pro se*; Boston Massachusetts**

***For the Respondents:***

**Cassandra Beckman Widay, Esq.; *Dentons US LLP*; New York, New York**

**Before HARTHILL, Chief Administrative Appeals Judge, and PUST,  
Administrative Appeals Judge**

**DECISION AND ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR REVIEW**

**PER CURIAM:**

This case arises under the whistleblower protection provisions of Section 806 of the Corporate and Criminal Fraud Accountability Act of 2002, Title VIII of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act (SOX),<sup>1</sup> and its implementing regulations.<sup>2</sup> Madhuri Trivedi (Complainant) filed a whistleblower complaint against General Electric and GE

---

<sup>1</sup> 18 U.S.C. § 1514A.

<sup>2</sup> 29 C.F.R. Part 1980 (2023).

Healthcare (Respondents) for alleged retaliation. On August 7, 2023, the United States Department of Labor’s Chief Administrative Law Judge issued a Decision and Order (D. & O.) dismissing the complaint based on his finding that Complainant did not suffer an adverse action.<sup>3</sup>

On August 21, 2023, the Administrative Review Board (Board) received a motion from Complainant requesting an extension of time, until December 30, 2023, to file a petition for review. On August 23, 2023, the Board granted Complainant’s motion to extend time to file a petition for review in part,<sup>4</sup> providing Complainant with an additional ten calendar days following the date of the order to file her petition for review.<sup>5</sup> The Board cautioned Complainant that no further extensions would be granted and that failure to respond as directed “may result in the issuance of sanctions, including dismissal of this appeal.”<sup>6</sup>

As of September 2, 2023, that being ten days after the date of the Board’s order, Complainant has not filed a petition for review. Rather, on August 24, 2023, Complainant filed a second motion for an extension of time, again requesting until December 30, 2023, to file her petition for review. On September 8, 2023, Complainant filed a third motion for an extension of time that is identical to her August 24, 2023 motion.

The Board has the inherent power to dismiss a case for failure to prosecute in an effort to control its docket and to promote the efficient disposition of its cases.<sup>7</sup> Pursuant to this authority, the Board may dismiss a complaint in a case in which the complainant failed to adequately explain a failure to comply with the Board’s briefing schedule.<sup>8</sup>

Complainant failed to file a petition for review within the extended timeframe ordered by the Board. Although Complainant filed second and third motions for an extension of time to file a petition for review, Complainant was

---

<sup>3</sup> Decision and Order Dismissing Complaint and Granting, in Part, Respondents’ Motion Requesting Litigation Controls at 6.

<sup>4</sup> Order Granting, In Part, Complainant’s Motion to Extend Time to File a Petition for Review at 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 2.


<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> *Lewman v. Ken Brick Masonry Supply*, ARB No. 2007-0015, ALJ No. 2006-STA-00018 (ARB Oct. 31, 2007) (citing *Link v. Wabash R. R. Co.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962)).

<sup>8</sup> *Boch v. J.P. Morgan Secs.*, ARB No. 2022-0029, ALJ Nos. 2020-CFP-00002, 2020-SOX-00004 (ARB June 15, 2022) (dismissing the appeal where Complainant failed to respond to, and comply with, the Board’s orders).

cautioned that no further extensions would be granted.<sup>9</sup> Complainant was further cautioned that failure to file a petition for review as ordered could result in dismissal of her appeal. Given Complainant's failure to comply the Board's order, we **DISMISS** Complainant's appeal.<sup>10</sup>

**SO ORDERED.**<sup>11</sup>



---

**SUSAN HARTHILL**  
**Chief Administrative Appeals Judge**



---

**TAMMY L. PUST**  
**Administrative Appeals Judge**

---

<sup>9</sup> Order Granting, In Part, Complainant's Motion to Extend Time to File a Petition for Review at 2.

<sup>10</sup> Complainant also filed a motion to have her case reassigned and a motion for a stay. In light of the Board's dismissal of this case, these issues are moot.

<sup>11</sup> In any appeal of this Decision and Order that may be filed, we note that the appropriately named party is the Secretary, Department of Labor, not the Administrative Review Board.