

WADE BOWSER

*

NO. 2003-CA-0821

VERSUS

*

COURT OF APPEAL

**NEW ORLEANS POLICE
DEPARTMENT**

*

FOURTH CIRCUIT

*

STATE OF LOUISIANA

* * * * *

APPEAL FROM
CITY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ORLEANS
NO. 6615

* * * * *

JUDGE

JOAN BERNARD ARMSTRONG

* * * * *

(Court composed of Judge Joan Bernard Armstrong, Judge David S. Gorbaty
and
Judge Edwin A. Lombard)

ERIC J. HESSLER
FRANK G. DESALVO, A.P.L.C.
201 SOUTH GALVEZ STREET
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70119

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF/APPELLANT

SHERRY S. LANDRY, ACTING CITY ATTORNEY
FRANZ L. ZIBILICH, CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
JOSEPH V. DIROSA, JR., DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
JANE L. BEEBE, ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY
1300 PERDIDO STREET
CITY HALL - ROOM 5E03
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70112

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLEE

AFFIRMED.

On June 6, 2002, NOPD Officer Sharon Ricks, plaintiff-appellant's ex-girlfriend, filed a complaint of damage to property in her apartment against appellant following an act of domestic violence. The next day, Sergeant Michael Harrison, appellant's supervising officer, instructed him not to attempt to contact Ricks pending the investigation. That very afternoon, appellant made numerous attempts to contact Ricks by cellular telephone and computer e-mail. The substance of the calls was evidently that the appellant loved Ricks and their six month old son. The appellant evidently begged to talk to Ricks and threatened suicide. In a subsequent taped statement, appellant admitted he disobeyed orders. A five day suspension was imposed against the appellant who is a sixteen year veteran with no history of suspension, and the Civil Service Commission affirmed. At the hearing, the appellant did not testify, but did not contest the facts as reported by Harrison. The Commission found that the appellant was simply asking it to excuse his behavior. In part, the Commission stated:

We do not find [the appellant's] argument persuasive. A review of the e-mail does not reflect a father acting in the best interest of his son. It reflects an emotionally distraught individual not following orders and making a situation worse. While we realize that work place romances are inevitable, and that such romances sometimes end badly, we do not consider an individual's failure to control his emotions a viable excuse for disobeying instructions from an authoritative source.

This appeal followed.

The Civil Service Commission has a duty to decide independently from the facts presented whether the appointing authority has a good or lawful cause for taking disciplinary action and, if so, whether punishment imposed is commensurate with the dereliction. Walters v. Department of Police of New Orleans, 454 So.2d 106 (La. 1984). The appointing authority has the burden of proving by the preponderance of the evidence the occurrence of the complained of activity and that the conduct complained of impaired the efficiency of the public service. Cittadino v. Department of Police, 558 So.2d 1311 (La. App. 4 Cir. 1990). In reviewing the decisions of a Civil Service Commission, a reviewing court should not reverse a Commission conclusion as to the existence or absence of cause for dismissal, unless the decision is arbitrary, capricious or an abuse of the Commission's discretion. Jones v. Louisiana Dept. of Highways, 259 La. 329, 250 So.2d 356 (La. 1971); Konen v. New Orleans Police Dept., 226 La. 739, 77 So.2d 24 (1954).

In civil service disciplinary cases, an appellate court is presented with a multifaceted review function. First, as in other civil matters, deference will be given to the factual conclusion of the Commission. Hence, in deciding whether to affirm the Commission's factual finding, a reviewing court should apply the clearly wrong or manifest error rule prescribed

generally for appellate review. Walters, 454 So.2d at 114.

Second, in evaluating the Commission's determination as to whether the disciplinary action is based on legal cause and the punishment is commensurate with the infraction, this Court should not modify the Commission's order unless it is arbitrary, capricious or characterized by an abuse of discretion. Id. "Arbitrary or capricious" means that there is no rational basis for the action taken by the Commission. Bannister v. Department of Streets, 95-0404, p. 8 (La.1/16/96), 666 So.2d 641, 647.

In Stevens v. Department of Police, 2000-1682 (La. App. 4 Cir. 5/9/01), 789 So.2d 622, the officer was responding to a call of an undercover officer in distress. The officer ran a stop sign on a prominent, busy Uptown street and totaled the police vehicle. He alleged his view was blocked by an oak tree. The Superintendent issued a disciplinary letter, imposing a fifteen day suspension. The Commission reduced the suspension to ten days, and this court reversed, reinstating the twenty day suspension. This court stated:

Legal cause exists whenever an employee's conduct impairs the efficiency of the public service in which the employee is engaged. Cittadino v. Department of Police, 558 So.2d 1311 (La.App. 4th Cir.1990). The Appointing Authority has the burden of proving the impairment. La. Const. Art. X, Sec. 8(A). The appointing authority must prove its case by a preponderance of the evidence. Cittadino, supra.

"Arbitrary or capricious" can be defined as

the lack of a rational basis for the action taken. Shields v. City of Shreveport, 579 So.2d 961 (La.1991). A reviewing court should affirm the Civil Service Commission conclusion as to existence or cause for dismissal of a permanent status public employee when the decision is not arbitrary, capricious, or an abuse of the Commission's discretion, as presented in this case.

Employees with the permanent status in the classified civil service may be disciplined only for cause expressed in writing. La. Const., Art. X, Sec. 8(A). Disciplinary action against a civil service employee will be deemed arbitrary and capricious unless there is a real and substantial relationship between the improper conduct and the "efficient operation" of the public service. Newman v. Department of Fire, 425 So.2d 753 (La.1983).

In reviewing the Commission's findings of fact, the Court's appropriate standard of review suggests that this Court should not reverse or modify such a finding unless it is clearly wrong or manifestly erroneous. If the Commission's order is not arbitrary, capricious or characterized by abuse of discretion, this Court should not modify the Commission's decision. Cittadino, supra.

The Commission has the authority to "hear and decide" disciplinary cases, which includes the authority to modify (reduce) as well as to reverse or affirm a penalty. La. Const. art. X, § 12; Branighan v. Department of Police, 362 So.2d 1221, 1223 (La.App. 4 Cir.1978). However, the authority to reduce a penalty can only be exercised if there is insufficient cause for imposing the greater penalty. Id. at 1222. Thus, in the instant case, unless the Commission determined that there was insufficient cause for the appointing authority to impose the fifteen day suspension, the penalty must stand.

The appointing authority is charged with the operation of his or her department and it is within his or her discretion to

discipline an employee for sufficient cause. Joseph v. Department of Health, 389 So.2d 739, 741 (La.App. 4 Cir.1980); Branighan, supra. The Commission is not charged with such operation or such disciplining. Id. In James v. Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, 505 So.2d 119 (La.App. 4 Cir. 1987), we considered a decision of the Commission which reversed a five day suspension of an employee and suggested a reprimand instead. In reversing the Commission and reinstating the suspension, we reaffirmed and reiterated the holdings in Joseph and Branighan, stating:

It is not the job of the Commission to decide who should be disciplined how. The appointing authority is charged with the operation of his department. He is the one who must run the department, an obviously necessary part of which is dismissing or disciplining employees. While he may not do so without cause, he may, and indeed must, within the exercise of sound discretion, dismiss or discipline an employee for sufficient cause. The Commission is not charged with such operation or such disciplining.

Id. at 121.

In Chapman v. Department of Police, 97-1384 (La.App. 4 Cir. 1/28/98), 706 So.2d 656, we rejected the Commission's reduction of a suspension from thirty days to ten days, holding that the Commission is not charged with the operation of the NOPD or disciplining its employees. We concluded that the Commission's action was simply a substitution of its judgment for the Superintendent's judgment. We found that the Superintendent had sufficient cause to impose the penalty and that the NOPD carried its burden of proof. The Commission's action was an arbitrary and capricious interference with the authority of the Superintendent to manage his department.

Similarly, in Palmer v. Department of Police, 97-1593 (La.App. 4 Cir. 1/28/98), 706 So.2d 658, we reversed the Commission's reversal of the NOPD's imposition of a two day suspension. In that case, the Commission substituted its

judgment as to the appropriate sanction without an articulated basis for its action. We held the Commission acted arbitrarily and found legal cause for disciplinary action existed where the officer's actions clearly impaired the efficient operation of the public service.

Recently, in Smith v. New Orleans Police Department, 00-1486 (La.App. 4 Cir. 4/11/01), 784 So.2d 806, we reversed the Commission's reduction of a suspension from five days to two days for an officer's failure to complete an investigation of a shoplifting incident by writing a police report and confiscating surveillance tapes that showed the alleged perpetrator fleeing the scene. We found there was ample evidence to show that the Superintendent acted reasonably and with sufficient legal cause in imposing a five day suspension under the circumstances of the case.

The public puts its trust in the police department as a guardian of its safety, and it is essential that the appointing authority be allowed to establish and enforce appropriate standards of conduct for its employees sworn to uphold that trust. Newman, supra. Indeed, the Commission should give heightened regard to the appointing authorities that serve as special guardians of the public's safety and operate as quasi-military institutions where strict discipline is imperative.

Stevens, pp. 5-9, 789 So.2d at 625- 627 (footnotes omitted).

In the present case, there is no dispute that the appellant failed to follow his superior's orders. He was suspended on that basis, not on the basis of any finding of domestic violence or property destruction.

We do not find that the Commission was arbitrary or capricious in affirming the five day suspension.

For the foregoing reasons, the judgment of the Civil Service
Commission is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.