



# 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 H. KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON  
MARK SURPRENANT  
RUTH WHITE DAVIS  
ANDREW MONTEVERDE

AMY TREPAGNIER  
DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL

Wednesday, June 25, 2025

Mr. Cyril Manego

Re: **Cyril Manego VS.  
Department of Property Management  
Docket Number: 9658**

Dear Mr. Manego:

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 - 6/25/2025 - filed in the Office of the Civil Service Commission at 1340 Poydras St. Suite 900, Amoco Building, New Orleans, Louisiana.

If you choose to appeal this decision, 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 purple ink that reads "Stacie Joseph".

Stacie Joseph  
Management Services Division

cc: Howard E. Nobles, III  
Averil Sanders  
Jay Ginsberg  
file

**CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
CITY OF NEW ORLEANS**

**CYRIL MANEGO,  
Appellant**

**Docket No. 9658**

v.

**DEPARTMENT OF PROPERTY  
MANAGEMENT,  
Appointing Authority**

**DECISION**

Appellant Cyril Manego brings this appeal pursuant to Article X, § 8(A) of the Louisiana Constitution and this Commission's Rule II, § 4.1 seeking relief from a one-day emergency suspension imposed on August 27, 2024. (Exhibit HO-1). At all relevant times, Mr. Manego had permanent status as an Accountant III in the Department of Property Management. (Tr. at 8). A Hearing Examiner, appointed by the Commission, presided over a hearing on January 17, 2025. At this hearing, both parties had an opportunity to call witnesses and present evidence.

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, the Hearing Examiner's report dated April 15, 2025, and controlling Louisiana law.

For the reasons set forth below, Mr. Manego's appeal is DENIED.

**I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

Mr. Manego refused to place an order for uniforms because he viewed the request as unethical, requiring a violation of an accounting concept known as "segregation of duties." (Tr. at 11-12). Whitney Lucas, in Human Resources, asked Mr. Manego on August 14, 2024, to correct two uniform orders: 1) the wrong size pants for the first employee; and 2) the incorrect division embroidered on the uniform for the second employee. (Tr. at 22-23, 32). She also asked for five

extra shirts for the first employee. (Tr. at 32). Ms. Lucas testified that she asked Mr. Manego to correct the uniform orders because his subordinate, Sonja Brunious, had performed this task in the past, but she was not at work. (Tr. at 37, 45).

On August 15, 2024, Mr. Manego met with Enrico Sterling, the Deputy Director of Property Management, and Mr. Manego informed Mr. Sterling that he could not place a new uniform order. (Tr. at 25, 51). Mr. Sterling testified that this task could have been accomplished with a phone call, and that correcting a uniform order is not a violation of law or policy. (Tr. at 56, 53-64).

On August 21, 2024, Mr. Manego, Ms. Lucas, Mr. Sterling, Jovan Bell-Walker, and Howard Nobles, III, the Director of Property Management, met with Mr. Manego about his refusal to order uniforms. (Tr. at 35, 52). The Director asked Mr. Manego to correct the uniform orders. (Tr. at 52-53, 69-70). Mr. Nobles testified that he asked Mr. Manego to correct two orders, one with the wrong division embroidered and another with the wrong size pants. (Tr. at 81). Mr. Manego refused to correct the uniform orders. (Tr. at 70). Mr. Manego stated that he could perform the requested task if Mr. Nobles promoted him to Budget Coordinator. (Tr. at 36-37).

Mr. Nobles testified that Mr. Manego was confused about the procurement process and confused about the segregation of duties. (Tr. at 90). Mr. Nobles explained that generally, an individual submits a requisition, then after another individual approves the requisition, a purchase order is created. (Tr. at 82). Addressing Mr. Manego's ethical concern about segregation of duties, Mr. Nobles testified that the individual with requisition authority does not have approval authority. (Tr. at 81-82). Mr. Nobles also testified that calling a vendor would not have constituted approval of a requisition. (Tr. at 82-83). After a purchase order is created, a vendor can submit an invoice for payment. (Tr. at 82). In this case, blanket funds are placed on the purchase order at the

beginning of the year. (Tr. at 89). According to Mr. Nobles, these uniforms should have been on a past requisition. (Tr. at 81). The replacement uniforms were authorized by a purchase order that was already issued, and the invoice should not have been paid if the uniforms were not what the Department of Property Management ordered. (Tr. at 85).

## II. ANALYSIS

### A. Legal Standard for Commission's Review of Discipline

#### 1. The Appointing Authority must show cause for 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).

**2. 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 suspending 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”).

**B. The Department of Property Management has Shown Cause for the Discipline of Mr. Manego**

The Department of Property Management has shown that Mr. Manego was insubordinate when he refused to correct two uniform orders, even after the Director of the Department of Property Management directed him to perform this task. Mr. Manego’s objection that the request requires him to engage in unethical conduct is misplaced, as Mr. Manego was unable to support this objection. Insubordination by an employee impairs the efficient operation of the Department of Property Management, interfering with the performance of work. (Tr. at 94-95).

**1. The penalty of a one-day suspension is commensurate with the violation**

A one-day suspension is commensurate with Mr. Mangelo's repeated refusal to perform a simple task, even when requested to do so by successively higher levels of supervision.

Mr. Manego's appeal is DENIED.

WRITER:



---

JOHN KORN, VICE-CHAIRPERSON

CONCUR:



---

[Brittney Richardson \(Jun 24, 2025 19:20 CDT\)](#)

---

BRITTNEY RICHARDSON, CHAIRPERSON



---

[Ruth Davis \(Jun 16, 2025 16:01 CDT\)](#)

---

RUTH DAVIS, COMMISSIONER