

NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

STATE OF LOUISIANA

COURT OF APPEAL

FIRST CIRCUIT

2006 CA 1846

SHERMAN AUGUSTINE

VERSUS

DPSC – LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY

CONSOLIDATED WITH

2006 CA 1847

SHERMAN AUGUSTINE

VERSUS

DPSC – LOUISIANA STATE PENITENTIARY

Judgment rendered: June 8, 2007

On Appeal from a Decision of the State Civil Service Commission

Docket No. 15883

[consolidated with Docket No. 15908]

Honorable James A. Smith, Chairman;

Burl Cain, Vice-Chairman;

Rosa Jackson, Chatham Reed

David Duplantier, G. Lee Griffin

and John McClure

Anne S. Soileau, Director

Department of Civil Service

Sherman Augustine

Cottonport, LA

Appellant

In Proper Person

L. Bruce Dodd

Angola, LA

Counsel for Appellee

DPSC-LA State Penitentiary

Robert R. Boland, Jr.

Civil Service General Counsel

Baton Rouge, LA

Counsel for Anne S. Soileau

Director, Department of State

Civil Service

BEFORE: PETTIGREW, DOWNING AND HUGHES, JJ.

Handwritten initials and a circled symbol.

DOWNING, J.

This matter arises from a state worker's complaint regarding the new vacation and sick leave policies. Sherman Augustine, a prison worker, appeals the dismissal of his appeal by the Civil Service Commission.

We conclude that the Board determination adequately explains how it made its decision to dismiss Mr. Augustine's appeal. A thorough review of the record supports its decision.¹ Therefore, we affirm. This summary disposition is rendered in accordance with Uniform Rules - Courts of Appeal Rule 2-16.2 (6). All costs of this appeal are assessed against the plaintiff-appellant, Sherman Augustine.

AFFIRMED

¹ On February 21, 2007, this court issued a ruling as follows, in pertinent part: **"MOTION TO AMEND RECORD OF APPEAL DENIED IN PART; REFERRED TO PANEL TO WHOM APPEAL IS ASSIGNED IN PART.** The motion to amend is referred to the appeal panel only in regard to the pre-hearing conference; otherwise it is denied." On review of the record, we deny the motion in regard to the pre-hearing conference. Mr. Augustine does not state what he believes to be included in the minutes or transcript of this conference that might be admissible or helpful to his cause. Accordingly, we see no basis on which to order amendment of the record.