

STATE OF OHIO
STATE PERSONNEL BOARD OF REVIEW

VANESSA HAYES-THOMAS,

Appellant,

Case Nos.: 12-INV-06-0128
12-MIS-06-0129
12-MIS-06-0130

v.

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT,


Appellee

ORDER


This matter came on for consideration on the Report and Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge in the above-captioned appeals.

After a thorough examination of the record and a review of the Report and Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge, along with any objections to that report which have been timely and properly filed, the Board hereby adopts the Recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge.

Wherefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the request for an investigation and appeals in the above-captioned cases be **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for Appellant's failure to comply with the requirements set forth in Ohio Administrative Code §§ 124-11-07(A)(2) and (C).




Casey - Aye
Lumpe - Aye
Tillery - Aye


TERRY L. CASEY, CHAIRMAN

CERTIFICATION

The State of Ohio, State Personnel Board of Review, ss:

I, the undersigned clerk of the State Personnel Board of Review, hereby certify that this document and any attachment thereto constitutes (the original/a true copy of the original) order or resolution of the State Personnel Board of Review as entered upon the Board's Journal, a copy of which has been forwarded to the parties this date, December 20 2012.


Clerk

NOTE: Please see the reverse side of this Order or the attachment to this Order for information regarding your appeal rights.

12-2012

**STATE OF OHIO
STATE PERSONNEL BOARD OF REVIEW**

Vanessa Hayes-Thomas,

Appellant

v.

Dept. of Development,

Appellee

Case No. 12-INV-06-0128

Case No. 12-MIS-06-0129

Case No. 12-MIS-06-0130

October 24, 2012

Christopher R. Young

Administrative Law Judge

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

To the Honorable State Personnel Board of Review:

This cause comes on for consideration on October 24, 2012, upon the Appellant's request for an Investigation filed on June 12, 2012, and upon the Appellee's response to the Investigation Request and the Appellee's Motion to Dismiss filed on July 30, 2012. To date, the Appellant has not responded to Appellee's Motion to Dismiss nor has she filed a request for an extension of time to file a memorandum in opposition to Appellee's motion to dismiss.

In essence, the Appellant has asked this Board to investigate the Appellee, the Ohio Department of Development, by requesting an investigation be conducted into alleged discriminatory and harassing conduct by her supervisor, Melissa Stanford, Section Supervisor, CSBG/HEAP, Field Unit, Office of Community Assistance, Community Service Division; and Lauren Hunter, Assistant Chief Human Relations Officer/Labor Relations.

The record in this case reveals that the Appellant, Ms. Vanessa Hayes-Thomas, is a Community Development Analyst with the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD). Further, the record also reveals that the Appellant is a member of the Ohio Civil Service Employees Association (OCSEA), Local 11 AFSCME, AFL-CIO. While the record indicates via the Appellant citing several events that occurred between December 1, 2011 and June 6, 2012, the only discipline cited by the Appellant was a written reprimand that was issued to her on February 3, 2012. It was noted by the undersigned Administrative Law Judge that the Appellant did not grieve the February 3, 2012 written reprimand, although she could have through the collective bargaining agreement.

Vanessa Hayes-Thomas
Case No. 12-INV-06-0128
Case No. 12-MIS-06-0129
Case No. 12-MIS-06-0130
Page 2

Unlike a court of general jurisdiction, the State Personnel Board of Review has authority only where it has been explicitly conferred upon it by the Ohio General Assembly. This Board's investigatory jurisdiction is derived from Revised Code Section 124.56, which provides that this board shall conduct an investigation when it has reason to believe that:

Any officer, board, commission, head of a department, or person having the power of appointment, layoff, suspension, or removal, has abused such power by making an appointment, layout, reduction, suspension or removal of the employee under [his or their jurisdiction in violation of [Chapter 124.] of the Revised Code.

Thus, the Appellant must allege that the Appellee has made an appointment, layout, reduction, suspension, or removal in violation of Revised Code Chapter 124., In order to trigger this Board's investigatory authority. We are a request for an investigation alleges none of the above referenced triggering devices, the State Personnel Board of Review is without jurisdiction to proceed with an investigation. (See *State ex rel. Carver v. Hull* (1994), 70 Ohio St. 3d 570; *Okapal v. University of Toledo* (1982) SPBR 82-INV-10-3019; *Reed v. Montgomery County Board of Mental Retardation* (1982) SPBR 82-INV-09-2801; *Logsdon v. University of Cincinnati* (1982) SPBR 82-INV-08-2690. As was noted by the Appellant's request for investigation, none of the allegations requested contained an allegation which would in fact trigger this Board's investigatory authority.

In addition, to the reasons stated above, this cause also comes on for consideration due to the Appellee's July 30, 2012 filing of a motion to dismiss regarding the above captioned cases. The motion to dismiss contained: a memorandum in support; the affidavit of Lauren Hunter, Appellee's Assistant Chief Human Relations Officer/Labor Relations, along with various accompanying documentation and pertinent case law. As previously mentioned, the Appellant was provided with the requisite amount of time to file a memorandum contra to Appellee's motion to dismiss, but, to date has not done so.

Vanessa Hayes-Thomas
Case No. 12-INV-06-0128
Case No. 12-MIS-06-0129
Case No. 12-MIS-06-0130
Page 3

O.A.C. 124-11-07 sets forth the motions practice before this Board. O.A.C. 124-11-07 (A)(2) indicates that when a party files a dispositive motion, then an adverse party must respond affirmatively and show that there is a genuine issue in dispute. O.A.C. 124-11-07 (C) sets forth a 10 day time frame to respond to dispositive motions, such as the instant motions to dismiss. Appellant has failed to file the requisite response to Appellee's motion to dismiss and thus, has failed to comply with O.A.C. 124-11-07. Furthermore, Appellee's jurisdictional arguments previously mentioned that were dressed in the above captioned appeals appear to have merit.

As was stated in the Appellant's investigatory requests into alleged discriminatory and harassing conduct by her supervisors impacting upon the Appellant's work environment it should be noted that the Ohio Civil Rights Commission may be a more proper forum in which the Appellant may seek a remedy from these alleged discriminatory practices.

Revised Code Chapter 4112. deals with the powers and duties of the Ohio Civil Rights Commission (OCRC). Revised Code Section 4112.02, entitled, "unlawful discriminatory practices" outlaws various discriminatory practices committed by any employer in the state.

Revised Code Section 4112.02 reads, in part:

It shall be an unlawful discriminatory practice:


- (A) For any employer, because of the race, color, religion, sex, national origin, handicap, age, or ancestry of any person, to discharge without just cause, to refuse to hire, or to otherwise discriminate against that person with respect to hire, tenure, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, or any matter directly or indirectly related to employment.

In her request, the Appellant both expressly and implicitly references alleged practices involving unlawful discrimination and harassing behavior. Because Revised Code 4112., *et seq.*, specifically denominates the Ohio Civil Rights

Vanessa Hayes-Thomas
Case No. 12-INV-06-0128
Case No. 12-MIS-06-0129
Case No. 12-MIS-06-0130
Page 4

Commission to deal with such alleged discrimination, I would suggest that the OCRC may be a more proper forum in which the Appellant may seek a remedy from these alleged discriminatory practices.

Therefore, I respectfully **RECOMMEND** that the instant appeals be **DISMISSED** for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and the Appellee's motion to dismiss these appeals be **GRANTED**, along with Appellant's failure to comply with you requirements set forth in O.A.C. 124-11-07 (A)(2) and (C), along with the State Personnel Board or Review **TERMINATING** these investigation requests for lack of jurisdiction, as well.


Christopher R. Young
Administrative Law Judge

CRY: