

Issue: Group III Written Notice with termination (patient abuse); Hearing Date: 03/28/12; Decision Issued: 03/29/12; Agency: DBHDS; AHO: Carl Wilson Schmidt, Esq.; Case No. 9779; Outcome: No Relief – Agency Upheld.



**COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA**  
*Department of Employment Dispute Resolution*

**DIVISION OF HEARINGS**

**DECISION OF HEARING OFFICER**

In re:

**Case Number: 9779**

Hearing Date: March 28, 2012

Decision Issued: March 29, 2012

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On December 19, 2011, Grievant was issued a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action with removal for client abuse.

On January 6, 2012, Grievant timely filed a grievance to challenge the Agency's action. The outcome of the Third Resolution Step was not satisfactory to the Grievant and she requested a hearing. On February 27, 2012, the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution assigned this appeal to the Hearing Officer. On March 28, 2012, a hearing was held at the Agency's office. Grievant did not appear at the hearing.

**APPEARANCES**

Agency Party Designee  
Agency Representative  
Witnesses

**ISSUES**

1. Whether Grievant engaged in the behavior described in the Written Notice?
2. Whether the behavior constituted misconduct?

3. Whether the Agency's discipline was consistent with law (e.g., free of unlawful discrimination) and policy (e.g., properly characterized as a Group I, II, or III offense)?
4. Whether there were mitigating circumstances justifying a reduction or removal of the disciplinary action, and if so, whether aggravating circumstances existed that would overcome the mitigating circumstances?

### **BURDEN OF PROOF**

The burden of proof is on the Agency to show by a preponderance of the evidence that its disciplinary action against the Grievant was warranted and appropriate under the circumstances. Grievance Procedure Manual ("GPM") § 5.8. A preponderance of the evidence is evidence which shows that what is sought to be proved is more probable than not. GPM § 9.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

After reviewing the evidence presented and observing the demeanor of each witness, the Hearing Officer makes the following findings of fact:

The Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services employed Grievant as a Forensic Mental Health Technician at one of its facilities. The purpose of her position was:

To provide competent nursing care to an adult population ranging from the ages of 18 to 64 in a Forensic/civil setting to maintain a safe, clean, and therapeutic environment and to participate and encourage patients to participate in their prescribe treatment programs.<sup>1</sup>

On November 5, 2011, at 1:27 p.m., Grievant was sitting at table in the day room. The Patient began walking around in a circle near Grievant. The Patient stopped at the water fountain and filled a cup with water. The Patient walked to Grievant's table and threw the water on Grievant which landed on her hair and shoulders. The Patient turned and walked away from Grievant. Grievant got up from her chair and walked towards the Patient from the Patient's back. Grievant reached towards the Patient and he turned around and grabbed Grievant's smock. Grievant punched and kicked the Patient as he attempted to hit her as well. Another employee arose from his seat and grabbed the Patient and attempted to pull him away from Grievant. The Nurse approached Grievant and attempted to move her away from the conflict but Grievant tried to continuing holding the Patient. The Patient and the other employee slipped on the water and fell to the floor. Grievant tried to break free from the Nurse's grasp to

---

<sup>1</sup> Agency Exhibit 4.

resume fighting the Patient. A second nurse was able to help keep Grievant away from the Patient.

## CONCLUSIONS OF POLICY

The Agency has a duty to the public to provide its clients with a safe and secure environment. It has zero tolerance for acts of abuse or neglect and these acts are punished severely. Departmental Instruction (“DI”) 201 defines<sup>2</sup> client abuse as:

Abuse means any act or failure to act by an employee or other person responsible for the care of an individual that was performed or was failed to be performed knowingly, recklessly or intentionally, and that caused or might have caused physical or psychological harm, injury or death to a person receiving care or treatment for mental illness, mental retardation or substance abuse. Examples of abuse include, but are not limited to, acts such as:

- Rape, sexual assault, or other criminal sexual behavior
- Assault or battery
- Use of language that demeans, threatens, intimidates or humiliates the person;
- Misuse or misappropriation of the person’s assets, goods or property
- Use of excessive force when placing a person in physical or mechanical restraint
- Use of physical or mechanical restraints on a person that is not in compliance with federal and state laws, regulations, and policies, professionally accepted standards of practice or the person’s individual services plan; and
- Use of more restrictive or intensive services or denial of services to punish the person or that is not consistent with his individualized services plan.

For the Agency to meet its burden of proof in this case, it must show that (1) Grievant engaged in an act that she performed knowingly, recklessly, or intentionally and (2) Grievant’s act caused or might have caused physical or psychological harm to the Client. It is not necessary for the Agency to show that Grievant intended to abuse a client – the Agency must only show that Grievant intended to take the action that caused the abuse. It is also not necessary for the Agency to prove a client has been injured by the employee’s intentional act. All the Agency must show is that the Grievant might have caused physical or psychological harm to the client.

---

<sup>2</sup> See, Va. Code § 37.1-1 and 12 VAC 35-115-30.

On November 5, 2011, Grievant initiated a fight with a Patient. She punched and kicked the Patient. When separated from the Patient by another employee, Grievant attempted to resume the fight. The Agency has presented sufficient evidence to support the issuance of a Group III Written Notice for client abuse. Upon the issuance of a Group III Written Notice, an agency may remove an employee. Accordingly, the Agency's removal of Grievant must be upheld.

*Va. Code § 2.2-3005.1* authorizes Hearing Officers to order appropriate remedies including "mitigation or reduction of the agency disciplinary action." Mitigation must be "in accordance with rules established by the Department of Employment Dispute Resolution...."<sup>3</sup> Under the *Rules for Conducting Grievance Hearings*, "[a] hearing officer must give deference to the agency's consideration and assessment of any mitigating and aggravating circumstances. Thus, a hearing officer may mitigate the agency's discipline only if, under the record evidence, the agency's discipline exceeds the limits of reasonableness. If the hearing officer mitigates the agency's discipline, the hearing officer shall state in the hearing decision the basis for mitigation." A non-exclusive list of examples includes whether (1) the employee received adequate notice of the existence of the rule that the employee is accused of violating, (2) the agency has consistently applied disciplinary action among similarly situated employees, and (3) the disciplinary action was free of improper motive. In light of this standard, the Hearing Officer finds no mitigating circumstances exist to reduce the disciplinary action.

## DECISION

For the reasons stated herein, the Agency's issuance to the Grievant of a Group III Written Notice of disciplinary action with removal is **upheld**.

## APPEAL RIGHTS

You may file an administrative review request within **15 calendar** days from the date the decision was issued, if any of the following apply:

1. If you have new evidence that could not have been discovered before the hearing, or if you believe the decision contains an incorrect legal conclusion, you may request the hearing officer either to reopen the hearing or to reconsider the decision.
2. If you believe the hearing decision is inconsistent with state policy or agency policy, you may request the Director of the Department of Human Resource Management to review the decision. You must state the specific policy and explain why you believe the decision is inconsistent with that policy. Please address your request to:

Director

---

<sup>3</sup> Va. Code § 2.2-3005.

Department of Human Resource Management  
101 North 14<sup>th</sup> St., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Richmond, VA 23219

3. If you believe that the hearing decision does not comply with the grievance procedure, you may request the Director of EDR to review the decision. You must state the specific portion of the grievance procedure with which you believe the decision does not comply. Please address your request to:

Director  
Department of Employment Dispute Resolution  
600 East Main St. STE 301  
Richmond, VA 23219

You may request more than one type of review. Your request must be in writing and must be **received** by the reviewer within 15 calendar days of the date the decision was issued. You must give a copy of all of your appeals to the other party and to the EDR Director. The hearing officer's **decision becomes final** when the 15-calendar day period has expired, or when administrative requests for review have been decided.

You may request a judicial review if you believe the decision is contradictory to law. You must file a notice of appeal with the clerk of the circuit court in the jurisdiction in which the grievance arose within **30 days** of the date when the decision becomes final.<sup>4</sup>

[See Sections 7.1 through 7.3 of the Grievance Procedure Manual for a more detailed explanation, or call EDR's toll-free Advice Line at 888-232-3842 to learn more about appeal rights from an EDR Consultant].

*S/Carl Wilson Schmidt*

---

Carl Wilson Schmidt, Esq.  
Hearing Officer

---

<sup>4</sup> Agencies must request and receive prior approval from the Director of EDR before filing a notice of appeal.