

## Employee Disciplinary Considerations and Decision

Employee Name: IAN LaBORDE IA# 2017-0018  
Appointing Authority: Ken Holmes

The following information was considered when making the discipline to be imposed decision:

- Employee's work record.
- Discipline imposed on other employees is the same as in similar circumstances.
- Employee was sustained on Policy CP-2.29D, Failure to Meet Standards and Policy GB-2.72, Command Responsibility.
- Evidence supports the employee is a supervisor.
- Evidence supports the employee responded to an inmate who needed to be removed from his cell so medical personnel could attend to a wound the inmate had sustained.
- Evidence supports the employee ordered another officer to tase the inmate who was agitated and covered in blood.
- Evidence supports the inmate was passively resisting other officers orders before he was tased.
- Evidence supports the inmate was laying on the cell floor before he was tased.
- Evidence supports the employee mismanaged the use of force which resulted in the inmate sustaining injuries.
- The policy violations equate to misconduct stated in Category 2 (f), Category 1(g) and Category 1(b), of GC-17.
- The Disciplinary Matrix was considered and an 8 hour suspension to a 32 hour suspension is the minimum and maximum range of discipline.
- The employee has one other act of misconduct.
- Due to the fact this is a Category 2 offense with one other act of misconduct, I find an 8 hour suspension to be appropriate.

### PDH Factors:

Sergeant LaBorde said he takes full responsibility for his actions. He referred to his 5 minute closing with the investigator as for taking responsibility.

### Final Decision (based on the above factors):

8 hour suspension

Appointing Authority Signature: 

Date: 8.29.17