

Corpus Juris Secundum
Database updated June 2005

Officers and Public Employees
By Brett J. Haacker, J.D., John R. Kennel, J.D. of NLRG, Sonja Larsen, J.D., Kimberly Simmons, J.D., Eric C.
Surette, J.D.

VIII. Removal or Demotion
B. Civil Service and Veterans Restrictions
1. Civil Service Restrictions
b. Necessity and Sufficiency of Grounds

Topic Summary Correlation Table

§ 165. Insubordination or willful disobedience

West's Key Number Digest

West's Key Number Digest, Officers and Public Employees 69.7

The insubordination or willful disobedience of a civil service employee is sufficient cause to justify his or her discharge.

"Insubordination" is sufficient to justify the discharge of a civil service employee,[FN1] and an employee who is dismissed from a classified position for insubordination stemming from a refusal to obey a direct order of a superior is discharged for cause.[FN2] Insubordination is rightfully predicated only upon a refusal to obey some order which a superior is entitled to give and entitled to have obeyed,[FN3] and it requires proof that a person knows what he or she is doing and intends to do it.[FN4]

A civil service employee may also be discharged for "willful disobedience" of established rules or departmental orders promulgated in good faith.[FN5] The terms "insubordination" and "willful disobedience," as grounds for discipline of civil servants, overlap; so far as they are distinguishable, however, "disobedience" connotes a specific violation of a command or prohibition,[FN6] while "insubordination" implies a general course of mutinous disrespectful or contumacious conduct.[FN7]

[FN1] U.S.—Walker v. Washington, 627 F.2d 541 (D.C. Cir. 1980); Byrd v. Campbell, 591 F.2d 326 (5th Cir. 1979).

La.—<u>Creadeur v. Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police, 364 So. 2d 155 (La. Ct. App. 1st Cir. 1978)</u>.

Mo.—Heitzler v. Eppenberger, 596 S.W.2d 458 (Mo. Ct. App. E.D. 1980).

N.Y.—Short v. Nassau County Civil Service Commission, 45 N.Y.2d 721, 408 N.Y.S.2d 471, 380 N.E.2d 298 (1978).

[FN2] La.—Portis v. Department of Corrections, Hunt Correctional Center, 407 So. 2d 435 (La. Ct. App. 1st Cir. 1981).

N.Y.—Zeggert v. Connelie, 86 A.D.2d 952, 448 N.Y.S.2d 588 (3d Dep't 1982).

[FN3] Hawaii—Cunningham v. Civil Service Commission, Hawaii County, 48 Haw. 278, 398 P.2d 155

(1964).

Or.—Stephens v. Department of State Police, 271 Or. 390, 532 P.2d 788 (1975).

R.I.—Guarino v. Department of Social Welfare, 122 R.I. 583, 410 A.2d 425 (1980).

Wis.—State ex rel. Momon v. Milwaukee County Civil Service Commission, 61 Wis. 2d 313, 212 N.W.2d 158 (1973).

Insubordination shownU.S.—<u>Alicea Rosado v. Garcia Santiago</u>, 562 F.2d 114 (1st Cir. 1977). Insubordination not shownCal.—<u>Parrish v. Civil Service Commission of Alameda County</u>, 66 Cal. 2d 260, 57 Cal. Rptr. 623, 425 P.2d 223 (1967).

N.Y.—<u>Reisig v. Kirby, 62 Misc. 2d 632, 309 N.Y.S.2d 55 (Sup 1968)</u>, judgment aff'd, <u>31 A.D.2d 1008, 299 N.Y.S.2d 398 (2d Dep't 1969)</u>.

[FN4] Cal.—Coomes v. State Personnel Bd., 215 Cal. App. 2d 770, 30 Cal. Rptr. 639 (3d Dist. 1963).

Intentional and willful disobedience implied N.Y.—<u>Reisig v. Kirby, 62 Misc. 2d 632, 309 N.Y.S.2d 55 (Sup 1968)</u>, judgment aff'd, 31 A.D.2d 1008, 299 N.Y.S.2d 398 (2d Dep't 1969).

[FN5] Ill.—Philbin v. Civil Service Commission of Cook County, 66 Ill. App. 3d 772, 23 Ill. Dec. 509, 384 N.E.2d 145 (1st Dist. 1978).

N.C.—Employment Sec. Commission of North Carolina v. Lachman, 305 N.C. 492, 290 S.E.2d 616 (1982).

Or.—Ashman v. Children's Services Division, 37 Or. App. 865, 588 P.2d 665 (1978).

Pa.—McCook v. State Civil Service Commission, 15 Pa. Commw. 311, 325 A.2d 479 (1974).

W.Va.—Zigmond v. Civil Service Commission, 155 W. Va. 641, 186 S.E.2d 696 (1972).

Refusal to obey invalid order insufficient groundsLa.—<u>Cormier v. Louisiana State Penitentiary, State Dept.</u> of Institutions, 206 So. 2d 771 (La. Ct. App. 1st Cir. 1968).

[FN6] Cal.—Peters v. Mitchell, 222 Cal. App. 2d 852, 35 Cal. Rptr. 535 (3d Dist. 1963).

Refusal to accept reassignmentWhere under the facts of the case a reassignment of an employee is proper, he or she may be dismissed upon refusal to accept the reassignment, and such a dismissal is not the consequence of arbitrary or capricious action.

U.S.—Pauley v. U. S., 419 F.2d 1061 (7th Cir. 1969).

[FN7] Cal.—Coomes v. State Personnel Bd., 215 Cal. App. 2d 770, 30 Cal. Rptr. 639 (3d Dist. 1963).

© 2005 Thomson/West

CJS OFFICER § 165

END OF DOCUMENT