THE WEST VIRGINIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES GRIEVANCE BOARD

CRAIG COTSMIRE,
Grievant,

v. **Docket No. 2011-0391-CONS**

WEST VIRGINIA OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Respondent.

DECISION

Grievant, Craig Cotsmire, filed a grievance against Respondent, West Virginia Office of Technology, on August 19, 2010. The grievance was Docket No. 2011-0187-DOA and asserted that Respondent was retaliating against Grievant by imposing an improper leave restriction. As relief Grievant sought, "to be made whole including expunging reprimand and reversal of retaliatory measures." On September 17, 2010, Grievant filed grievance Docket No. 2011-0390-DOA. That grievance asserted that Respondent wrongfully terminated Grievant without good cause. As relief Grievant sought, "to be made whole including all lost wages with interest, restored benefits and tenure."

A level one conference was held on August 31, 2010, for grievance Docket No. 2011-0187-DOA. That grievance was denied at that level on September 2, 2010. Because grievance Docket No. 2011-0390-DOA is contesting a dismissal, Grievant elected to file directly to level three of the Public Employees Grievance Procedure. *See* W.VA. CODE § 6C-2-4(a)(4). On September 22, 2010, the two grievances were consolidated as Docket No. 2011-0391-CONS, therefore, both grievances proceeded directly to level three.

A level three hearing was held on February 1, 2011 and April 27, 2011 at the Public Employees Grievance Board in Charleston, West Virginia.[1] Grievant was represented by Gordon Simmons, West Virginia Public Workers Union, UE Local 170. Respondent was represented by Stacy L. DeLong, Assistant Attorney General. This matter became mature for decision on June 14, 2011, upon final receipt of the parties' written Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

Synopsis

Respondent terminated Grievant for gross misconduct. Grievant inappropriately used State resources, during work hours, for non-work related purposes. Respondent lost faith in Grievant when he sent emails describing his attempted plan of disrupting wv.gov web pages. Grievant argues that Respondent was improperly monitoring his work email account. Grievant asserts that Respondent monitoring his work emails and ultimately terminating him were acts of retaliation against him for making public comments against his employer and participating in union rallies.

Respondent has met its burden in this matter. Therefore, this grievance is DENIED.

Findings of Fact

1. Grievant was employed by Respondent as a Programmer Analyst III.

2. Grievant's work hours were 8:00a.m.-4:00p.m. Monday through Friday.

3. Respondent's attendance policy[2] requires that an employee use sick and

---

[1]Administrative Law Judge Wendy A. Elswick conducted the first day of hearing on February 1, 2011. The matter was transferred to the undersigned for administrative purposes. The undersigned presided over the level three hearing on April 27, 2011.

[2]Respondent's Exhibit No. 1.

annual leave when absent or tardy, and that the employee is expected to call in prior to the start of the work day and let the employer know that the employee will not be at work. An employee is to submit his application for annual leave at least 48 hours prior to the start of the annual leave and an employee is to notify his employer of his use of sick leave no later than 45 minutes before the time the employee is scheduled to begin work.

4. Due to Grievant being absent on unexcused sick leave or annual leave without prior approval during the time period of January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009, Grievant was placed on leave restriction in July 2009.

5. The memo[3] dated July 15, 2009, notifying Grievant of the leave restriction stated:

> "The purpose of this memorandum is to emphasize the need for you to improve your attendance and the need for you to maintain more consistent work hours. Of particular note is the time period of January 1, 2009 through June 30, 2009. During this period you were absent on unexcused sick leave, or not prior approved annual leave for approximately 9.3% of the time. The OOT standard is less than 5%. Your continued attendance pattern is unacceptable, and is unfair to other employees in the group.
>
> Because of the frequency of your use of accrued sick leave we are requiring that you present a completed form DOP-L3, Physician's/Practitioner's Statement for all sick leave usage, including family sick leave.
>
> Your record of frequent absences has placed an unfair hardship on the Application Development Center as well as your co-workers who must assume your assigned duties during your absences.
> ....
> [W]hen absence occurs so frequently that an employee's presence cannot be counted on, the employee's value to the employer can be questioned.
> ....
> The restrictions outlined in this letter will continue in effect until you demonstrate a sustained, acceptable level of attendance and the ability to meet the established standards (approximately 6 months). I will review your

[3]Respondent's Exhibit No. 2.

> attendance record at that time to determine if a lifting of the restrictions and a removal of this letter from your personnel file would be merited.

....

> Please be aware that if your attendance does not improve, additional disciplinary actions such as but not necessarily including delayed payroll assignment, suspension, demotion, and dismissal may be forthcoming."

6. On July 14, 2010, Grievant participated in a union rally outside of Building 5 at the Capitol Complex in Charleston, WV, regarding the proposed outsourcing of the agency.

7. On August 3, 2010, Grievant emailed Harry Bergstrom, then Deputy Chief of Staff for the Manchin Administration, stating in part:

> "Since you have failed to even contact me back over my previous concerns I am giving the Manchin administration until Friday August 6, 2010 to address and rectify these issues, at that point I will be forced to go to the media and other unions within the state and inform them just how this administration deals with law abiding union members."

The email[4] was sent at 3:46p.m., during Grievant's work hours and from Grievant's work email account.

8. Respondent's Information Security Policy[5] states that using the State network for personal use should be limited to a *de minimis* amount, e.g. 10-15 minutes during break and/or lunch periods. The policy states that "employees have no expectation of privacy while using State-provided information resources." Employees are prohibited from downloading, distributing or installing any software or inappropriate files. The policy also prohibits employees from wasting Information Technology (IT) resources by intentionally placing a program in an endless loop, disrupting the use or performance of State-provided

---

[4]Grievant's Exhibit No. 1.

[5]Respondent's Exhibit No. 8.

IT resources or any other computer system or network, and storing unauthorized information or software on State-provided IT resources. Under the policy, employees may not use State-provided technology for any political promotion.

9. Grievant was fully aware of Respondent's policy that employees should not have an expectation of privacy within the state email system. As an employee for Respondent, Grievant was warned of the policy each time he turned on his computer, by use of a flash screen that required affirmative action on the part of the Grievant by clicking "OK." The flash screen warning[6] stated:

> This system is for authorized users only. Users of this system must abide by the State of WV policies, procedures, and standards. All system use is subject to monitoring and recording by authorized personnel. Misuse may lead to disciplinary action and/or prosecution. Employees should have no expectation of privacy while using State-provided information resources (e.g. cell phones, Internet, etc.)."

10. Grievant's internet use from his State computer, on the State network, while at work, was frequently not work related. Grievant habitually accessed non-work related sites, such as news sites or shopping sites.[7]

11. On August 4, 2010, Grievant emailed the Raese Campaign stating in part:

> "I just wanted to let Mr. Raese know some of the illegal acts going on by the Manchin administration.
> ....
> If you would like more information and facts on the above issues please call me at... I would love to sit down and show your team the facts and failures of both IBM and the office of technology."

---

[6]Respondent's Exhibit No. 7.

[7]*See* Respondent's Exhibit No. 17.

The email[8] was sent at 1:16p.m., during Grievant's work hours and from Grievant's work email account.

12. On August 13, 2010, at 9:49a.m., during work hours, Grievant downloaded onto his work computer's desktop, the Adobe Acrobat Document titled *Hacking For Dummies*.

13. Due to Grievant being absent on unexcused sick leave or annual leave without prior approval during the time period of January 1, 2010 through June 30, 2010[9], Grievant was again placed on leave restriction in August 2010.

14. The memo[10] dated August 19, 2010, notifying Grievant of the leave restriction stated:

> "The purpose of this memorandum and reprimand is to emphasize the need for you to continue to improve your attendance, to comply with the West Virginia Office of Technology *Information Security Policy*, and refrain from sending inappropriate e-mail messages.
> .....
> Due to your continued pattern of absenteeism, you are hereby notified that leave restrictions will continue. During the period of January 1 through June 30th of this year, you were absent on unexcused sick leave, or not prior approved annual leave in excess of 7.2% of the time. Over the past 12 months you have been taken off payroll 13 times.
> .....
> Because of the frequency of your use of accrued sick leave we are requiring that you present a completed form DOP-L3, Physician's/Practitioner's Statement for all sick leave usage, including family sick leave.
> ....

---

[8]Grievant's Exhibit No. 13.

[9]Grievant was absent on sick leave without the required DOP Practitioner's Statement 13 times during this period. *See* Respondent's Exhibit No. 5. At the level three hearing, Grievant presented invoices for doctor's visits on August 27, 2009 and September 8, 2009. *See* Grievant's Exhibit No. 6.

[10]Respondent's Exhibit No. 4.

Effective immediately, no annual leave will be approved unless it is requested by you at least forty eight (48) hours in advance of when it is to be taken.

....

Your work hours will be 9:00a.m.-5:00p.m. Monday through Friday.

....

I believe that you will agree that regardless of the reason(s) for an employee's absence, when absence occurs so frequently that an employee's presence cannot be counted on, the employee's value to the employer can be questioned.

....

Please be aware, the very next occurrence of unexcused absence or not gaining prior approval for annual leave will result in additional disciplinary actions such [as] suspension, demotion, or dismissal.

.....

Additionally, Deputy Chief of Staff, Harry Bergstrom, forwarded to Secretary Robert Ferguson an email from you dated August 3, 2010, with the subject "Union Intimidation." The threatening tone of this note is both inappropriate and accusatory. Sending this type of ultimatum is inappropriate.

....

Please be aware, any continued action of this type could result in additional disciplinary actions such as suspension, demotion or dismissal.

....

Finally, in your correspondence with Deputy Chief of Staff, Harry Bergstrom, you made reference to the media. I fully support every employee's First Amendment Right to contact the media and I encourage employees to remain current, but this is not to be done on state time or utilizing state assets. It appears as if you have spent countless hours accessing news sites that are not related to your work activities. From June 30, 2010, through present, less than 1% of your internet activity appears to be job related. Of the 56,395 internet hits over this period, 85%, or over 43,000, of the hits were to news sites... This far exceeds limited personal use of state assets.

Excessive use of the internet for personal use is in violation of the West Virginia Office of Technology Information Security Policy (WVOT-PO1001). You are instructed to cease this non-work activity immediately. As a reminder, employees do not and should not have an expectation of privacy per "Splash Screen Security Warning on Boot-up." Your email and internet usage are subject to review at all times.

Due to the tone of your email to Harry Bergstrom, the unsubstantiated claims of employee intimidation from IT middle management, the inappropriate use of state assets and your continued leave abuse, you are hereby issued this written warning."

15. On September 1, 2010, at 9:52a.m., during work hours, Grievant sent an email[11] from his State email account outlining his belief that "it cost[s] the state .50 cents every time anyone logs on to one of the WV interactive web pages. So I log on and off 40 or so times a day here at work. I have a[n] autobot setup at home that does it 60 time[s] an hour for 8 hours a day every day." The email was sent to another state employee.

16. On September 10, 2010, at 2:55p.m., during work hours, Grievant sent an email to Robert Bryant, Program Analyst II for the West Virginia Division of Labor, from his State email account stating:

> "Hey can you write something that will automatically go to a website, wait 10 or so seconds then close site then repeat until it is turned off. The free ware I have is not working correctly for what I am doing with wv.gov."

17. A predetermination meeting was held on September 17, 2010.

18. By letter[12] dated September 20, 2010, Grievant was terminated from employment with Respondent for gross misconduct. The termination letter states:

> "[I]t was determined that you were in violation of policy and procedure in that you misused state provided resources for personal and potentially criminal activity.
> .....
> *(copy of September 1, 2010, email, Respondent's Exhibit No. 10, inserted here in termination letter)*
> It is clear from this statement that you were attempting to establish an auto bot (an automated series of commands to repeatedly execute a procedure) to bring harm to the state.
> .....
> *(copy of the September 10, 2010, email, Respondent's Exhibit No. 14, inserted here in termination letter)*
> It is apparent that the autobot previously mentioned was not working and you were attempting to solicit technical expertise from a higher skilled technician.

---

[11]Respondent's Exhibit No. 10.

[12]Respondent's Exhibit No. 18.

.....
We also discovered that you had a copy of *Hackers for Dummies* loaded onto your pc hard drive. This is also in violation of policy and most likely copyright laws.
.....
The evidence collected such as the Google searches, the hacker manual and several attempts to access restricted sites, shows the intent of your actions go well beyond what would be needed to prove someone was reading your email.
.....
The state's security team wards off thousands of security threats from outside entities each month. It is extremely concerning when a threat of this nature comes from one of our own employees. We are trusted custodians of our customers' business applications and your actions have violated that trust. While it was clear that your intent was to bring harm to the state, the reality is, an automatic routine pushing hundreds, if not thousands, of bogus commands to a webserver could have seriously impacted other legitimate users of critical web applications. Due to the above mentioned actions, I have lost confidence in your ability to serve this department or the state agencies we serve.
.....
The State of West Virginia and its agencies have a right to expect their employees to observe a standard of conduct which will not cast doubt upon the abilities and integrity of their employees, or create suspicion with reference to their employees' capability in discharging their duties and responsibilities. I believe the nature of your gross misconduct is sufficient to cause me to conclude that you did not meet an acceptable standard of conduct as an employee of the Office of Technology, thus warranting your dismissal.

Discussion

In disciplinary matters, the employer bears the burden of establishing the charges by a preponderance of the evidence. *Hoover v. Lewis County Board of Education*, Docket No. 93-21-427; *Landy v. Raleigh County Board of Education*, Docket No. 89-41-232. A preponderance of the evidence is defined as "evidence which is of greater weight or more convincing than the evidence which is offered in opposition to it; that is, evidence which as a whole shows that the fact sought to be proved is more probable than not." *Leichliter v.*

West Virginia Department of Health & Human Resources, Docket No. 92-HHR-486. Where the evidence equally supports both sides, a party has not met its burden of proof. *Id.* State employees who are in the classified service can only be dismissed for "good cause," meaning "misconduct of a substantial nature directly affecting the rights and interest of the public, rather than upon trivial or inconsequential matters, or mere technical violations of statute or official duty without wrongful intention." Syl. Pt. 1, *Oakes v. W. Va. Dep't of Finance & Admin.*, 164 W. Va. 384, 264 S.E.2d 151 (1980); *Guine v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 149 W. Va. 461, 141 S.E.2d 364 (1965).

Respondent terminated Grievant for gross misconduct. Grievant violated Respondent's Information Security Policy by downloading a copy of *Hackers for Dummies* onto his work personal computer; using his State email account during work hours to contact a political organization; using his State computer to access internet sites that were not work related, during work hours; and, intentionally trying to harm the State's webserver and/or web applications. Grievant asserts that he was merely setting a "trap" to catch his employer monitoring his State email account. Grievant argues that he did not create an autobot, just that he sent "bait" emails referencing the creation of an autobot because he suspected Respondent was monitoring his emails.

The "term gross misconduct as used in the context of an employer-employee relationship implies a willful disregard of the employer's interest or a wanton disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has a right to expect of its employees." *Graley v. W. Va. Parkways Economic Dev. and Tourism Auth.,* Docket No. 91-PEDTA-225 (Dec. 23, 1991) (*citing Buskirk v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 175 W. Va. 279, 332 S.E.2d 579 (1985).

See Blake v. Civil Serv. Comm'n, 172 W. Va. 711, 310 S.E.2d 472 (1983). "[I]f, however, the misconduct is of a substantial nature and can be shown to affect directly the rights and interests of the public by bearing directly in a substantial manner on the duties which the employee is required to discharge, then the employing authority and the Civil Service Commission have the power and the duty, upon such a showing, to enforce such remedial steps, including a dismissal, as may be found proper under all of the circumstances of the case." *Thurmond v. Steele*, 159 W. Va. 630, 225 S.E.2d 210 (1976). While progressive discipline is normally followed, an employee may be terminated for a singular transgression if it amounts to gross misconduct. "Gross misconduct is a major offense which could warrant immediate dismissal . . ., *Davis v. W.Va. Dept. of Motor Vehicles*, Docket No. 89-DMV-569 (Jan. 22, 1990)." *Morris v W. Va. Dep't of Human Services*, Docket No. 90-DHS-135/168 (Feb. 6, 1991).

In the instant matter, Respondent was attempting to utilize progressive discipline with Grievant to correct his leave abuse. Grievant was habitually absent on unexcused sick leave or annual leave that had not received prior approval. However, it was Grievant's gross misconduct which ultimately warranted his termination. Respondent's written reprimand dated August 19, 2010, warned Grievant against continuing to inappropriately use state assets, specifically mentioning excessive personal use, in violation of the Information Security Policy. The written reprimand[13] also reminded Grievant that state employees should not have an expectation of privacy and that "email and internet usage are subject to review at all times." Following the warning, Grievant continued to misuse

[13]Respondent's Exhibit No. 4.

State resources by sending emails on September 1 and 10, 2010, to other State employees seeking to create an autobot to intentionally cause harm to the wv.gov web pages.

Respondent terminated Grievant because it had lost faith in him when he sent emails describing his attempted plan of disrupting wv.gov web pages. Grievant argues that Respondent was improperly monitoring his work email account. State employees have no expectation of privacy in their emails. Respondent's Information Security Policy makes that abundantly clear. Grievant was reminded of the policy every time he turned on his computer because the policy appeared in a flash screen which Grievant had to affirmatively mouse click on the "OK" button to progress to the next screen.

Grievant's work emails outlined an outrageous scheme for an autobot to log on and off the wv.gov interactive web pages in hopes of costing the State money and potentially bringing harm to the State. Grievant argues that he did not intend to actually create an autobot. Grievant asserts he was merely setting a "trap" because he suspected Respondent was monitoring his work emails. The undersigned is not convinced that the autobot emails were merely "bait" when Grievant also violated Respondent's Information Privacy Policy by downloading *Hacking for Dummies* onto his State personal computer. Furthermore, the undersigned does not find it logical for any employee to attempt to set a "trap" for his employer. The employee-employer relationship is clearly flawed and lacking trust if an employee were to consider setting a "trap" for his employer.

Respondent could not allow a computer programmer with access to the main computer network and systems for the State, who demonstrated malicious intent to the computer system, to be allowed continued access to the network and system. Respondent

has met its burden of proof. Grievant acted in gross misconduct that beared directly on Grievant's duties and responsibilities for Respondent, therefore, justifying termination.

Grievant asserts that Respondent monitoring his work emails and ultimately terminating him were acts of retaliation against him for making public comments against his employer and participating in union rallies. WEST VIRGINIA CODE § 6C-2-2(o) defines reprisal as "the retaliation of an employer toward a grievant, witness, representative or any other participant in the grievance procedure either for an alleged injury itself or any lawful attempt to redress it." To demonstrate a *prima facie* case of reprisal, the Grievant must establish by a preponderance of the evidence the following elements:

> (1) That he engaged in protected activity (i.e., filing a grievance);
> (2) That he was subsequently treated in an adverse manner by the employer or an agent;
> (3) That the employer's official or agent had actual or constructive knowledge that the employee engaged in the protected activity; and
> (4) That there was a causal connection (consisting of an inference of a retaliatory motive) between the protected activity and the adverse treatment.

Cook v. Div. of Natural Res., Docket No. 2009-0875-DOC (Jan. 22, 2010); *Vance v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.* Docket No. 02-19-272 (Oct. 31, 2002); *Conner v. Barbour County Bd. of Educ.*, Docket Nos. 93-01-543/544 (Jan. 31, 1995). *See also Frank's Shoe Store v. W. Va. Human Rights Comm'n*, 179 W. Va. 53, 365 S.E.2d 251 (1986).

Grievant's August 3, 2010, email to Harry Bergstrom, then Deputy Chief of Staff for the Manchin Administration, was his own undoing. That email alerted Grievant's supervisors that Grievant was inappropriately using his State email account during work hours for use unrelated to his work. Grievant's inappropriate use of state resources triggered Respondent's decision to monitor his internet usage and email account.

Retaliatory motive cannot be inferred when Grievant's actions were in violation of Respondent's policy and justified termination.

Accordingly, the undersigned concludes that Respondent did not abuse its discretion when it determined that Grievant's actions constituting gross misconduct, warranted termination. Grievant failed to meet the standard to establish reprisal by Respondent. Therefore, this grievance is DENIED.

Conclusions of Law

1. In disciplinary matters, the employer bears the burden of establishing the charges by a preponderance of the evidence. *Hoover v. Lewis County Board of Education*, Docket No. 93-21-427; *Landy v. Raleigh County Board of Education*, Docket No. 89-41-232. A preponderance of the evidence is defined as "evidence which is of greater weight or more convincing than the evidence which is offered in opposition to it; that is, evidence which as a whole shows that the fact sought to be proved is more probable than not." *Leichliter v. West Virginia Department of Health & Human Resources*, Docket No. 92-HHR-486. Where the evidence equally supports both sides, a party has not met its burden of proof. *Id.*

2. State employees who are in the classified service can only be dismissed for "good cause," meaning "misconduct of a substantial nature directly affecting the rights and interest of the public, rather than upon trivial or inconsequential matters, or mere technical violations of statute or official duty without wrongful intention." Syl. Pt. 1, *Oakes v. W. Va. Dep't of Finance & Admin.*, 164 W. Va. 384, 264 S.E.2d 151 (1980); *Guine v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 149 W. Va. 461, 141 S.E.2d 364 (1965).

3. The "term gross misconduct as used in the context of an employer-employee relationship implies a willful disregard of the employer's interest or a wanton disregard of standards of behavior which the employer has a right to expect of its employees." *Graley v. W. Va. Parkways Economic Dev. and Tourism Auth.,* Docket No. 91-PEDTA-225 (Dec. 23, 1991) (*citing Buskirk v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 175 W. Va. 279, 332 S.E.2d 579 (1985). *See Blake v. Civil Serv. Comm'n*, 172 W. Va. 711, 310 S.E.2d 472 (1983). "[I]f, however, the misconduct is of a substantial nature and can be shown to affect directly the rights and interests of the public by bearing directly in a substantial manner on the duties which the employee is required to discharge, then the employing authority and the Civil Service Commission have the power and the duty, upon such a showing, to enforce such remedial steps, including a dismissal, as may be found proper under all of the circumstances of the case." *Thurmond v. Steele*, 159 W. Va. 630, 225 S.E.2d 210 (1976).

4. "Gross misconduct is a major offense which could warrant immediate dismissal . . ., *Davis v. W.Va. Dept. of Motor Vehicles*, Docket No. 89-DMV-569 (Jan. 22, 1990)." *Morris v. W. Va. Dep't of Human Services*, Docket No. 90-DHS-135/168 (Feb. 6, 1991).

5. Respondent did not abuse its discretion when it determined that Grievant's actions constituting gross misconduct, warranted termination.

6. WEST VIRGINIA CODE § 6C-2-2(o) defines reprisal as "the retaliation of an employer toward a grievant, witness, representative or any other participant in the grievance procedure either for an alleged injury itself or any lawful attempt to redress it."

7. To demonstrate a *prima facie* case of reprisal, the Grievant must establish

by a preponderance of the evidence the following elements:

> (1) That he engaged in protected activity (i.e., filing a grievance);
> (2) That he was subsequently treated in an adverse manner by the employer or an agent;
> (3) That the employer's official or agent had actual or constructive knowledge that the employee engaged in the protected activity; and
> (4) That there was a causal connection (consisting of an inference of a retaliatory motive) between the protected activity and the adverse treatment.

Cook v. Div. of Natural Res., Docket No. 2009-0875-DOC (Jan. 22, 2010); *Vance v. Jefferson County Bd. of Educ.* Docket No. 02-19-272 (Oct. 31, 2002); *Conner v. Barbour County Bd. of Educ.*, Docket Nos. 93-01-543/544 (Jan. 31, 1995). *See also Frank's Shoe Store v. W. Va. Human Rights Comm'n*, 179 W. Va. 53, 365 S.E.2d 251 (1986).

8. Grievant failed to meet the standard to establish reprisal by Respondent.

Accordingly, this grievance must be DENIED.

Any party may appeal this Decision to the Circuit Court of Kanawha County. Any such appeal must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this Decision. *See* W. VA. CODE § 6C-2-5. Neither the West Virginia Public Employees Grievance Board nor any of its Administrative Law Judges is a party to such appeal and should not be so named. However, the appealing party is required by W. VA. CODE § 29A-5-4(b) to serve a copy of the appeal petition upon the Grievance Board. The Civil Action number should be included so that the certified record can be properly filed with the circuit court. *See also* 156 C.S.R. 1 § 6.20 (2008).

DATE: August 8, 2011

_____
Jennifer Lea Stollings-Parr
Administrative Law Judge