



CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

DEPARTMENT OF CITY CIVIL SERVICE
SUITE 900 – 1340 POYDRAS ST.
NEW ORLEANS LA 70112
(504) 658-3500 FAX NO. (504) 658-3598

CITY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
BRITTNEY RICHARDSON, CHAIRPERSON
JOHN KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON
MARK SURPRENANT
RUTH WHITE DAVIS
ANDREW MONTEVERDE

AMY TREPAGNIER
DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL

Thursday, November 6, 2025

Mr. Eric Hessler
PANO 320 N. Carrollton Avenue #202
New Orleans, LA 70119

Re: **Anthony Bakewell VS.
Department of Police
Docket Number: 9705**

Dear Mr. Hessler:

Attached is the decision of the City Civil Service Commission in the above-referenced appeal.

This is to notify you that, in accordance with the rules of the Court of Appeal, Fourth Circuit, State of Louisiana, the decision for the above captioned matter is this date - 11/6/2025 - filed in the Office of the Civil Service Commission at 1340 Poydras St. Suite 900, Orleans Tower, New Orleans, Louisiana.

If you choose to appeal this decision, such appeal must conform to the deadlines established by the Commission's Rules and Article X, 12(B) of the Louisiana Constitution. Further, any such appeal shall be taken in accordance with Article 2121 et. seq. of the Louisiana Code of Civil Procedure.

For the Commission,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Doddie K. Smith".

Doddie K. Smith
Chief, Management Services Division

cc: Anne E. Kirkpatrick
Max V. Camp, William Goforth
Jay Ginsberg

file

**CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CITY OF NEW ORLEANS**

**ANTHONY BAKEWELL,
Appellant**

Docket No. 9705

v.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Appointing Authority**

DECISION

Appellant, Anthony Bakewell, brings this appeal pursuant to Article X, § 8(A) of the Louisiana Constitution and this Commission's Rule II, § 4.1 seeking relief from the March 30, 2025, demotion to Police Sergeant and termination of his employment, communicated by letter dated March 21, 2025. (Ex. HE-1). At all relevant times, Appellant had permanent status as a Police Sergeant or Police Lieutenant. (Ex. HE-1; Tr. at 14). Lt. Bakewell also served as the Seventh District Assistant Commander. (Tr. at 14). A Hearing Examiner, appointed by the Commission, presided over a hearing on May 21, 2025. At this hearing, both parties had an opportunity to call witnesses and present evidence. Appellant filed a motion to supplement the record on October 7, 2025, with the disposition of the criminal sexual battery charge. NOPD opposed this motion. After reviewing the briefs of the parties, the Commission granted the request to supplement the record.

The undersigned Commissioners have reviewed and analyzed the entire record in this matter, including the transcript from the hearing, all exhibits submitted at the hearing and thereafter, the post-hearing briefs submitted by the parties, the Hearing Examiner's report dated August 20, 2025, and controlling Louisiana law.

For the reasons set forth below, Lt. Bakewell's appeal is DENIED.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. NOPD Criminal and Administrative Investigations

The Office of Independent Police Monitor (OIPM) received an anonymous complaint on August 27, 2023, about Lt. Bakewell and other Seventh Police District officers. (Tr. at 118; Ex. NOPD-7). The complainant alleged sexual harassment and payroll fraud through abuse of overtime and other misconduct on the part of Lt. Bakewell. (Ex. NOPD-7). The complainant informed the OIPM on September 1, 2023, that Lt. Bakewell had sexually harassed [REDACTED] (Ex. NOPD-7). The NOPD Public Integrity Bureau intake form of this OIPM anonymous complaint is dated September 2, 2023. (Tr. at 131; Ex. NOPD-7). NOPD began an administrative investigation on September 15, 2023. (Tr. at 145).

NOPD also commenced a criminal investigation of Lt. Bakewell based on the OIPM complaint. NOPD assigned the misdemeanor criminal battery allegation to Sergeant Claudia Bruce, in the Special Victims Unit. (Tr. at 92-94). Sergeant Bruce found all parties to be credible, but she issued a criminal summons¹ to Lt. Bakewell. (Tr. at 107). Sgt. Bruce's investigation of criminal battery ended in January of 2024. (Tr. at 115).

NOPD assigned the criminal payroll fraud complaint to Detective Sean Ogden for investigation. (Tr. at 117-18, 147). Detective Ogden ended his criminal investigation on June 3, 2024. (Tr. at 161).

Detective Ogden then began an administrative investigation into the sexual harassment allegations. (Tr. at 124). NOPD's administrative investigation concluded on August 8, 2024, with

¹ A criminal summons is a noncustodial arrest. (Tr. at 194).

the issuance of a notice of completion of investigation and pre-disciplinary hearing to Lt. Bakewell. (Tr. at 170; Ex. NOPD-8).

B. Sexual Harassment Allegations against Lt. Bakewell

NOPD assigned Officer ██████ to the Seventh District in March of 2021. (Tr. at 34). Sgt. Officer ██████'s direct supervisor was Sgt. Meghan Constantine, then Sgt. Summer Turner. (Tr. at 35). Sergeant Bakewell wrote on Officer ██████ dry-erase board, referring to himself as “yo baby daddy” in a bubble sticker on the board. (Tr. at 53; Ex. NOPD-1). Officer ██████ testified that Sgt. Bakewell made all five comments in the bubbles, including “AJD is yo baby daddy” and “Can I be your baby daddy?” (Tr. at 49; Ex. NOPD-1).

Lt. Bakewell stated that he did not recall writing “baby daddy” comments in the stickers in his administrative statement, but at the hearing he testified that the comments were directed at another employee whose child was often at the station. (Tr. at 17, 30). Officer Marsha Thompson corroborated this explanation. (Tr. at 232). Lt. Bakewell also testified that the dry-erase board was already on the wall when Officer ██████ moved her desk, but this testimony was contradicted by Officer ██████ (Tr. at 49).

Officer ██████ testified that then-Sgt. Bakewell engaged in offensive physical touching at the Seventh District station in late 2022. Officer ██████ testified she was coming out of the elevator on the third floor between 6:00 and 6:25, and she met Sgt. Bakewell coming out of his office, located directly opposite the elevator. (Tr. at 39). She said “good morning” to him, and he responded in kind. (Tr. at 39). As Officer ██████ was walking in front of Sgt. Bakewell, he slapped her on her behind, and said, “You nasty bitch, you don’t have no drawers on.” (Tr. at 39). Officer ██████ responded, “Don’t play with me like that.” (Tr. at 39). Lt. Bakewell testified this

incident did not occur. (Tr. at 19). Officer ██████ testified there were no witnesses to this conduct. (Tr. at 40).

Officer ██████ testified that Sgt. Bakewell told her that “He’s not here to protect you anymore, so give me that pussy.” (Tr. at 37). Officer ██████ explained that Lt. Bakewell was referring to a higher-ranking officer with whom she had engaged in a consensual extramarital romantic relationship. (Tr. at 62). The disciplinary letter refers to this sexual advance as a request for Officer ██████ to be Sgt. Bakewell’s “girlfriend.” (Ex. HE-1 at 2). Lt. Bakewell testified that he never “took his shot” with Officer ██████, and he never had the type of relationship with her where he felt comfortable joking. (Tr. at 18).

Officer ██████ also testified she was offended by Sgt. Bakewell’s suggestion in a September text message sent as her shift ended that he visit her at home: “I wanted to come by u.” (Ex. NOPD-2). He also referred to her as “Bae” in this text exchange. (Ex. NOPD-2).

During discussion of a holiday potluck in December of 2022, in front of at least five other officers in the sallyport, when someone asked what Officer ██████ intended to bring to the potluck, Officer ██████ testified Sgt. Bakewell said, “put down by Nicky, ‘I’m broke, but I got good pussy.’” (Tr. at 41-42). Officer ██████ responded, “Don’t fucking do me like that.” (Tr. at 42). According to Officer ██████ Sgt. Bakewell then said, “This is my fucking unit. I say what I want when I want, and if you don’t like it, then you can get the fuck out of my unit.” (Tr. at 42).

According to Lt. Bakewell, he stated that he wanted to put a “broke ass” on a t-shirt because Officer ██████ kept saying she was “broke.” (Tr. at 22).

Although Officer Clemons testified she did not hear the comment in the sallyport, she also testified the comment was “something about money.” (Tr. at 260). Officer Clemons testified she “just saw the aftermath” of Sgt. Bakewell’s comment to Officer ██████, and she consoled

Officer [REDACTED]. (Tr. at 251, 262). Officer Clemons testified that Officer [REDACTED] told her that “she felt like everybody was judging her, from her past, some issues that she had in her past.” (Tr. at 257).

Officer [REDACTED] testified that Lt. Bakewell became her second-level supervisor when NOPD promoted him to police lieutenant in January of 2023. (Tr. at 36).

Officer [REDACTED] feared for her safety following her interview with Sgt. Bruce, and she obtained a protective order on September 29, 2023. (Tr. at 54). This protective order expired in April of 2025. (Tr. at 54).

C. Letter of demotion/termination

On March 21, 2025, NOPD demoted Lt. Bakewell, relying on two instances of sexual harassment – when Lt. Bakewell slapped Officer [REDACTED] on the buttocks when she was exiting the elevator and when Lt. Bakewell made an offensive and derogatory remark about Officer [REDACTED] during a discussion about the holiday potluck. (Ex. HE-1 at 6-7). NOPD also disciplined Lt. Bakewell for other violations of the policy prohibiting workplace sexual harassment: “You violated this rule when on multiple occasions you committed acts of sexual harassment against a female subordinate employee through sexually explicit comments towards her.” (Ex. HE-1 at 6).

NOPD terminated Lt. Bakewell’s employment based on on-duty criminal misdemeanor sexual battery. (Ex. HE-1 at 8). NOPD policy does not require that an officer be arrested, charged, or convicted of the criminal offense as a predicate to discipline. (Ex. HE-1 at 7).

NOPD also issued a letter of reprimand based on a violation of the policy requiring professional conduct. (Ex. HE-1). This discipline was imposed because Lt. Bakewell demeaned a fellow officer by using derogatory language toward her: “The language was used to humiliate or embarrass the officer in the presence of fellow officers and your subordinates.” (Ex. HE-1 at 6).

Lt. Bakewell did not appeal the letter of reprimand, and in an off-the-record discussion with the hearing officer, took the position that the violation of the professionalism policy might stand even if the Commission determined that no sexual harassment or battery occurred. (Tr. at 8).

I. ANALYSIS

A. Police Officer Bill of Rights

The Police Officer Bill of Rights requires that investigations of officers be completed within 75 days, absent an extension of time: “Except as otherwise provided in this Paragraph, each investigation of a police employee or law enforcement officer which is conducted under the provisions of this Chapter shall be completed within seventy-five days, inclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays.” La. R.S. 40:2531(B)(7). “The investigation shall be considered complete upon notice to the police employee or law enforcement officer under investigation of a pre-disciplinary hearing or a determination of an unfounded or unsustained complaint.” *Id.* “Nothing in this Paragraph shall limit any investigation of alleged criminal activity.” *Id.*

In this appeal, the investigation began on September 15, 2023. (Tr. at 145); *Abbott v. New Orleans Police Dep't*, 2014-0993 (La. App. 4 Cir. 2/11/15), 165 So. 3d 191, 203 (investigation is initiated when NOPD completes misconduct forms (then called DI-1)). The investigation concluded on August 8, 2024, when NOPD issued the Notice of Completed Investigation and Notice of Pre-Disciplinary Hearing to Lt. Bakewell. (Ex. NOPD-8).

The time period for completion of the administrative investigation was tolled by the criminal investigations: “[A] criminal investigation tolls the time limit for the administrative investigation.” *O'Hern v. Dep't of Police*, 2013-1416 (La. 11/8/13), 131 So. 3d 29, 31. “Following *O'Hern*, this Court has repeatedly found that when the appointing authority initiates an investigation into an officer due to alleged criminal activity, the sixty-day timeframe for the

administrative investigation does not run until the charges against the officer, related to the alleged criminal activity, have reached a conclusion.” *Schuler v. New Orleans Police Dep’t*, 2020-0563 (La. App. 4 Cir. 4/7/21), 365 So. 3d 653, 659

Although the investigative and administrative investigations overlapped, Detective Ogden testified that he ensured the criminal investigation had concluded before he interviewed Lt. Bakewell. (Tr. at 162). Detective Ogden’s criminal investigation concluded on June 3, 2024. (Tr. at 124). Sixty-six days elapsed between June 3, 2024, and August 8, 2024. (Tr. at 164). Therefore, the investigation was completed within 75 days, in compliance with the Police Officer Bill of Rights. La. R.S. 40:2531(B)(7)

B. Legal Standard for Commission’s Review of Discipline

“Employees with the permanent status in the classified service may be disciplined only for cause expressed in writing. La. Const., Art. X, Sec. 8(A).” *Whitaker v. New Orleans Police Dep’t*, 2003-0512 (La. App. 4 Cir. 9/17/03), 863 So. 2d 572 (quoting *Stevens v. Dep’t of Police*, 2000-1682 (La. App. 4 Cir. 5/9/01)). “Legal cause exists whenever an employee’s conduct impairs the efficiency of the public service in which the employee is engaged.” *Id.* “The Appointing Authority has the burden of proving the impairment.” *Id.* (citing La. Const., art. X, § 8(A)). “The appointing authority must prove its case by a preponderance of the evidence.” *Id.* “Disciplinary action against a civil service employee will be deemed arbitrary and capricious unless there is a real and substantial relationship between the improper conduct and the “efficient operation” of the public service.” *Id.* “It is well-settled that, in an appeal before the Commission pursuant to Article X, § 8(A) of the Louisiana Constitution, the appointing authority has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence: 1) the occurrence of the complained of activity, and 2) that the conduct complained of impaired the efficiency of the public service in which the

appointing authority is engaged. *Gast v. Dep't of Police*, 2013-0781 (La. App. 4 Cir. 3/13/14), 137 So. 3d 731, 733 (quoting *Cure v. Dep't of Police*, 2007-0166 (La. App. 4 Cir. 8/1/07), 964 So. 2d 1093, 1094).

1. The Appointing Authority must show the discipline was commensurate with the infraction

The Commission has a duty to decide independently from the facts presented in the record whether the appointing authority carried its legally imposed burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that it had good or lawful cause for disciplining the classified employee and, if so, whether such discipline was commensurate with the dereliction. *Durning v. New Orleans Police Dep't*, 2019-0987 (La. App. 4 Cir. 3/25/20), 294 So. 3d 536, 538, *writ denied*, 2020-00697 (La. 9/29/20), 301 So. 3d 1195; *Abbott v. New Orleans Police Dep't*, 2014-0993 (La. App. 4 Cir. 2/11/15); 165 So.3d 191, 197; *Walters v. Dept. of Police of the City of New Orleans*, 454 So. 2d 106 (La. 1984). The appointing authority has the burden of showing that the discipline was reasonable and not arbitrary or capricious. *Neely v. Dep't of Fire*, 2021-0454 (La. App. 4 Cir. 12/1/21), 332 So. 3d 194, 207 (“[NOFD] did not demonstrate . . . that termination was reasonable discipline”); *Durning*, 294 So. 3d at 540 (“the termination . . . deemed to be arbitrary and capricious”).

C. NOPD Carried its Burden of Showing Cause for the Discipline of Lt. Bakewell

NOPD carried its burden of showing that Lt. Bakewell engaged in the complained-of conduct. Lt. Bakewell did not appeal the letter of reprimand, so Lt. Bakewell has conceded that the underlying conduct occurred. *See Johnson v. Bd. of Supervisors of Louisiana State Univ. & Agr. & Mech. Coll.*, 45,105 (La. App. 2 Cir. 3/3/10), 32 So. 3d 1041, 1050 (classified employee abandoned remedies from Civil Service Commission by failing to appeal discipline). The

Commission makes a factual finding that Lt. Bakewell “demeaned a fellow officer by using derogatory language toward her.” (Ex. HE-1 at 6). The Commission further finds as a matter of fact that “[t]he language was used to humiliate or embarrass the officer in the presence of fellow officers and [Lt. Bakewell’s] subordinates.” (Ex. HE-1 at 6).

1. Commission’s credibility determinations

The Commission credits the testimony of Officer ██████ Officer ██████ was a reluctant witness who felt the need to obtain a restraining order following her interview by Sgt. Bruce. (Tr. at 46-48). Disclosure of Lt. Bakewell’s request that she become his “girlfriend” required Officer ██████ to disclose a workplace extramarital romantic relationship with a higher-ranking officer. (Tr. at 62). So, Officer ██████ disclosed this comment against her own interest, which is inconsistent with Lt. Bakewell’s position that Officer ██████ fabricated the allegations.

The Commission finds the testimony of Lt. Bakewell not credible, as his testimony was inconsistent and impeached by other officers. Sergeant Bruce testified that Officer Vanessa Adams corroborated Officer ██████’s allegation that Lt. Bakewell made the sexually offensive comment about the holiday potluck to her in the sallyport in the presence of other officers, which differed from Lt. Bakewell’s version of the comment.² (Tr. at 101-02). Officer Clemons, a witness called by Lt. Bakewell, testified that Officer ██████ told her she was upset about being judged for her past after Lt. Bakewell’s comment in the sallyport, which is inconsistent with Lt. Bakewell’s version of the comment he made to Officer ██████. (Tr. at 257). As for internal inconsistencies,

² Officer Adams has left the employment of NOPD and did not testify at the hearing of this matter, although NOPD attempted to secure her testimony. (Tr. at 95-96). Detective Ogden also interviewed Officer Adams by phone. (Tr. at 133-34). Based on these circumstances, including interviews by two investigators, the Commission finds the hearsay evidence of Officer Adams’ corroboration reliable. *Woods v. French Mkt. Corp.*, 2021-0689 (La. App. 4 Cir. 3/23/22), 336 So. 3d 912, 919, *writ not considered*, 2022-01048 (La. 10/12/22), 348 So. 3d 68 (hearsay evidence was competent evidence that had some degree of reliability and was the type of evidence a reasonable person would rely upon).

Lt. Bakewell admitted he stated in his administrative hearing that he did not recall writing statements on the dry-erase board but then offered an explanation about a co-worker's child at the hearing of this matter. (Tr. at 17, 31). Lt. Bakewell also testified he did not have a close enough relationship with Officer [REDACTED] to joke with her, despite a text message he sent her in September inviting himself to her home. (Tr. at 18). Lt. Bakewell's testimony that he did not joke with Officer [REDACTED] is also inconsistent with his testimony about Officer [REDACTED] and a "broke ass" in the sallyport. (Tr. at 22).

The witnesses who supported Lt. Bakewell also provided inconsistent information. For example, Sgt. Summer Turner informed Det. Ogden that she had heard about Lt. Bakewell's offensive comments about the potluck from Officer Darrell Doucette or Officer Kimberly Clemons, but both Officer Doucette and Officer Clemons denied knowledge of the comments. (Tr. at 141, 262). Officer Clemons's testimony that she did not hear Lt. Bakewell's comment, but that it was about money is also inconsistent and/or incomplete. (Tr. at 257).

NOPD has shown that Lt. Bakewell slapped Officer [REDACTED] on the behind and stated, "You nasty bitch, you don't have no drawers on." (Tr. at 39). Even though NOPD has relied on the criminal nature of this behavior, NOPD's burden of proof as to this complained-of conduct remains a preponderance of the evidence in this civil proceeding. *Shexnayder v. New Orleans Police Dep't*, 474 So. 2d 461, 464 (La. App. 4 Cir. 1985) (concerning check forgery by officer). The dismissal of the criminal charges against Lt. Bakewell is also not determinative: "Because the burden of proof in a criminal case is much greater than in a civil one, the fact that the district attorney's office felt it could not successfully prosecute the plaintiff does not directly bear upon the Civil Service Commission's decision regarding the propriety of the police department's action." *Id.*

As NOPD argued in its Opposition to Appellant's Motion to Supplement the Record, NOPD could have waited until the criminal proceedings concluded under the Police Officer Bill of Rights to discipline Lt. Bakewell, but NOPD disciplined Lt. Bakewell before his criminal trial. Therefore, based on the timing of NOPD's discipline of Lt. Bakewell, NOPD did not rely on a criminal conviction when terminating Lt. Bakewell's employment. Further, the acquittal was based on a failure of a witness to appear, not on a court ruling following a full-blown criminal trial.

NOPD has also shown that Lt. Bakewell stated, referring to Officer ██████'s contribution to a potluck, "Put down for Nicky 'I'm broke but I got good pussy,'" in front of other officers (Tr. at 41-42).

This conduct impaired the efficient operation of NOPD by negatively affecting Lt. Bakewell's effectiveness as a police officer and a supervisor and bringing unwelcome notoriety to NOPD. (Tr. at 200-02).

D. NOPD Carried its Burden of Showing the Penalty is Commensurate with the Violation

The presumptive penalty for sexual harassment was a three-day suspension, with aggravation between a five-day suspension and demotion/dismissal. (Tr. at 199; Ex. NOPD-10). The presumptive penalty for a criminal misdemeanor on duty was a 30-day suspension, with a penalty up to demotion/dismissal for aggravating circumstances. (Tr. at 197; Ex. NOPD-10).

In the letter of demotion/termination, Superintendent Kirkpatrick accepted the Chiefs' Panel's recommendation to aggravate the penalty. The Chiefs' Panel concluded the offense harmed the public trust, and Lt. Bakewell repeatedly engaged in this behavior. (Ex. HE-1 at 4; Ex. NOPD-10 at ¶ 13(g) (whether violation was repeated)). The Chiefs' Panel further recommended aggravation because the conduct was intentional and malicious. (Ex. HE-1 at 3-4; Ex. NOPD-10

at ¶ 12(f)). The Chiefs' Panel also determined that instead of taking responsibility for his actions, Lt. Bakewell attempted to evade accountability. (Ex. HE-1 at 4).

Deputy Chief Jonette Williams, who chaired the Chiefs' Panel, testified about NOPD's aggravation of the penalty against Lt. Bakewell. Chief Williams testified that Lt. Bakewell's conduct brought unwelcome notoriety to NOPD. (Tr. at 192-93; Ex. NOPD-10 at 12(c) (notoriety)). Chief Williams testified that the Panel of Chiefs concluded that Lt. Bakewell was unfit to supervise others in the future, emphasizing the seriousness of a criminal summons and the restraining order obtained by Officer [REDACTED]. (Tr. at 194; Ex. NOPD-10 at ¶¶ 12(d) (criminal conviction or arrest) and 13(c) (management's confidence in future job performance)). In particular, Chief Williams expressed concern about Lt. Bakewell's role as supervisor of violent crimes detectives, testifying that "[y]ou're called upon to deal with people at their most difficult time." (Tr. at 202; Ex. NOPD-10 at ¶ 13(c)). Chief Williams also testified that Lt. Bakewell, who had served as Assistant Commander and head of the Detective Investigative Unit for violent crimes in the Seventh District, should be held to a higher standard as a supervisor. (Tr. at 14, 193; Ex. NOPD-10 at ¶ 12(a) (position of authority)).

The Department of Police appropriately aggravated the penalty for sexual harassment and criminal misdemeanor sexual battery under its disciplinary matrix. (Ex. NOPD-10).

Appellant relies on *Turner v. Dep't of Police*, No. 2023-CA-0387 (La. App. 4 Cir. 3/3/21), 314 So. 3d 888, for the proposition that the penalty was too severe, but the Louisiana Supreme Court granted writs and reinstated the Commission's decision in this case. *Turner v. Dep't of Police*, 2021-C-00476 (La. 6/29/21), 319 So.3d 288. As the Appointing Authority argues in its reply brief, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeal has held that the Commission should not compare the severity of the penalty given to the appellant and the penalty given to other employees.

Richardson v. New Orleans Police Dep't, 2023-0757 (La. App. 4 Cir. 7/10/24); 399 So.3d 449,
452 writ denied, 2024-01001 (La. 11/14/24); 396 So.3d 62.

For the reasons set forth above, Lt. Bakewell's appeal is DENIED.

WRITER:



[John Korn, Vice-Chairperson \(Nov 3, 2025 15:24:39 CST\)](#)

JOHN KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON

CONCUR:



[Brittney Richardson, Chairperson \(Nov 6, 2025 13:35:34 CST\)](#)

BRITTNEY RICHARDSON, CHAIRPERSON

Mark Surprenant, Commissioner

[Mark Surprenant, Commissioner \(Nov 3, 2025 15:17:16 CST\)](#)

MARK SURPRENANT, COMMISSIONER

**CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CITY OF NEW ORLEANS**

**ANTHONY BAKEWELL,
Appellant**

Docket No. 9705

v.

**DEPARTMENT OF POLICE,
Appointing Authority**

ORDER

Following the hearing on May 21, 2025, as to the appeal of Lt. Bakewell's demotion and termination of employment, Lt. Bakewell filed a Motion to Supplement the Record on October 7, 2025, with the disposition on September 4, 2025, of the criminal sexual battery charge in Municipal and Traffic Court of New Orleans. After reviewing the briefs of the parties, the Commission grants the motion to supplement the record.

The Department of Police (NOPD) terminated Lt. Bakewell's employment based on on-duty criminal misdemeanor sexual battery. (Ex. HE-1 at 8). The acquittal of Lt. Bakewell for the charge of misdemeanor sexual battery is relevant to the NOPD's termination of his employment for this criminal conduct. NOPD policy does not require that an officer be arrested, charged, or convicted of the criminal offense as a predicate to discipline. (Ex. HE-1 at 7). The Commission will give this evidence the appropriate weight based on the differing burdens of proof in criminal and civil matters, the timing of NOPD's discipline and the criminal proceedings, NOPD policy, and the totality of the circumstances.

Appellant's Motion to Supplement is GRANTED.



Brittney Richardson, Chairperson (Nov 6, 2025 13:35:34 CST)

BRITTNEY RICHARDSON, CHAIRPERSON



John Korn, Vice-Chairperson (Nov 3, 2025 15:24:39 CST)

JOHN KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON

Mark Surprenant, Commissioner

Mark Surprenant, Commissioner (Nov 3, 2025 15:17:16 CST)

MARK SURPRENANT, COMMISSIONER