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QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING
P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Good morning. The Board of Louisiana
Private Security Examiners is now in session.
We'll start by Stephanie calling the roll.
MS . ALDRIDGE:
I'll call the roll.
Misty Finchum?
MS . FINCHUM:

Present.

MS . ALDRIDGE:

Durell Pellegrin?
MR. PELLEGRIN:

Here.
MS . ALDRIDGE:

Mark Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS:
Here.

MS . ALDRIDGE:

Edward Robinson?
(No response.)
MS . ALDRIDGE:
Marian Pierre?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

```
Here.
MS . ALDRIDGE :
Maria Landry?
MS. LANDRY:
Here.
MS . ALDRIDGE:
Wilbert Sanders?
MR. SANDERS:
Here.
MS . ALDRIDGE:
And Ritchie Rivers?
MR. RIVERS:
Here.
MS . ALDRIDGE:
Okay. We'll have the Pledge of
Allegiance by Fabian Blache.
MR. BLACHE:
Yes, if everyone would please stand?
(PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
We're going to have a call for the reading of the previous minutes.
MS. LANDRY:
I'd like to make a motion to waive the reading of the minutes until everybody has
```

```
already read them.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Second?
MS . FINCHUM:
Second.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Waiving of the reading of the minutes,
it's been moved and seconded.
MR. CROUCH:
One moment, please? The documents you have in front of you, the folder, don't look at any of that yet. That may be evidence in the upcoming trial. And until it's properly admitted, please don't read it.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
Thanks.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Ron, are you going to collect all of the affidavits, all of the services?
MR. CROUCH:
Yes, but we have an executive session
that we're going to discuss that.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
```

```
Okay.
All right. It's been moved and seconded
that we waive the --
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Second.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
It's been seconded.
Okay. So now, we're up to Hearings,
Appeal on Company License Denial, Delbert
Hyland.
MR. CROUCH:
Mr. Hyland?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Is Mr. Hyland here?
MR. CROUCH:
He is here.
MR. HYLAND:
Yes, ma'am.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Mr. Hyland, why don't you go over there and state your name.
MR. CROUCH:
Ms. Pierre, Fabian and Mr. Ryland (sic)
```

will testify. I would ask that they be sworn
in, both of them be sworn at the same time.
Mr. Fabian can stay because he's the agency
representative.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
Can you swear them in, please?
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Yes.
MR. CROUCH:
Raise your right hand, please.
(WITNESSES COMPLY WITH REQUEST.)
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Raise your right hand. Do you both swear
to tell the truth and nothing but the truth to
the best of your ability before this tribunal?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes, I do.
MR. HYLAND:
I do.
MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chairman, I call Fabian Blache to
the stand.
MR. BLACHE:

You want me to go there or can $I$ stay here?
(MR. ROBINSON ENTERS THE PROCEEDINGS.)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Let the record indicate that Mr. Robinson
is present.

MR. CROUCH:

As long as the -- is the microphone
picking you up here?
MR. BLACHE:

Yes.

MR. CROUCH:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:

She can pick me up here.

MR. CROUCH:

Okay.
MR. BLACHE:
I'll stay here.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

You're going to stay there, Mr. Fabian?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
DIRECT EXAMINATION OF FABIAN BLACHE, III

```
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Mr. Blache, please, for the formalities state your name and business address, please.
A Fabian Blache, 15703 Old Hammond Highway, Baton Rouge.
Q How are you employed?
A As the Executive Director and Chief Administrative Officer of the State Board of Private Security Examiners.
Q And how long have you been in that position?
A Since March of 2016.
Q Briefly, tell the Board what your duties are.
A My duties are to serve as the Chief Administrator of the State Board of Private Security Examiners which regulates the private security industry across unarmed, armed, and armored car companies in the State of Louisiana as part of DPSLSP.
Q In that capacity, do you review applications for approval or denial?
A Yes.
Q And you and your staff, are y'all responsible for the vetting of those applications?
```

A Yes, we are.
Q I want to show you a document that I've marked as Board \#4. Do you recognize that document?

A I do.
Q Tell me what that is.
A This is a letter dated March 19th of 2018 in which we advised Worldwide Security and Mr. Delbert Hyland that their application for a company license was denied by the Board.

Q Can you tell the Board why it was denied?
A It was denied because Mr. Hyland has been restricted and denied and/or revoked in another state, which is one of the indicators in 3289. It says the refusal of a licensing authority in another state or the revocation of suspension or any other restriction imposed on a license permanent certificate issued by such licensing authority. So based upon the actions of the State of Florida's Board of PI and Private Security, we decided to deny the license application.

MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chairman, I would ask that this be offered and introduced into evidence.

Any objections, Mr. Ryland (sic)?

```
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY: Any objection?
MR. HYLAND:
No.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
It's admitted.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q I'm going to show you a document that's marked Board \#2.
A Okay.
Q Do you recognize that document?
A Yes. This is a State of Florida,
Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services Final Order issued to Mr. Delbert Hyland as President of a company indicated as CSI Experts, LLC. And in this document on the second page, there's a reference to some licenses that were either in process or issued indicating that they were revoked and it also indicates a cease and desist that was ordered to Mr. Hyland.
Q What's the date on that document?
A This document is dated -- wait one second -- February 16th of 2006.
Q 2006?
A Uh-huh.
```

MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chairman, I offer and introduce
into evidence, if there's no objection? Mr.
Hyland, do you have any objection?
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Any objection?
MR. HYLAND:
No, Madam Chairman.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q I'm going to show you a document that I've marked as Board \#1. Tell me if you recognize that document.

A Yes. This is a letter from December 4th of 2013 regarding Mr. Hyland and CSI Experts, and it indicates that on February 15th of 2006 , he was issued a Final Order imposing an administrative fine in the amount of $\$ 21,700$, and that he had not paid the fine as of December 4th of 2013.

MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chairman, I'll offer and introduce into evidence, if Mr. Hyland has no objection? HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Any objection?
MR. HYLAND:
No, Madam Chairman.

BY MR. CROUCH:
Q I'm going to show you a document marked Board \#3. Tell me if you recognize that document.

A This is a letter from the Florida
Department of Agriculture dated October 27th of 2015 issued to Mr. Delbert Hyland indicating that his application for a license had been denied by the State of Florida.

MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chairman, I would offer it and
introduce into evidence. Any objection,
Mr. Hyland?
MR. HYLAND:
No objection.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q And I'm going to show you a document marked Board \#5. I would ask the Board to take judicial notice of the statute that forms the basis and the authority for the denial of the license. It is R.S. 37:3289. I'll just ask them to take judicial notice of it.

A Okay.
Q Mr. Blache, did those documents form the basis for your denial of the license?

A Yes.

Q Did you have any conversations or anything other than these documents that you used to form your opinion and your decision to deny the license?

A No, it was based solely on that. MR. CROUCH:

The State rest except for rebuttal. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Mr. Crouch, may I ask that those documents be passed among the Board members for review?

MR. CROUCH:
They will be -- yes, they will be given to you at the end of the hearing so you guys can go through them.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay. I don't want to give you these in advance until you've heard -- until they're properly admitted into evidence.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Okay. Mr. Hyland, did you have a -- do you want to make some comments?

MR. HYLAND:

> Madam Chairman --
> CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
> You have a statement?
> MR. HYLAND:
> Madam Chairman, Members of the Board, there's some extenuating circumstances in this case, the documents that were read before you stemming from the 2006 case. At that time, I was here responding to Hurricane Katrina with the Department of Homeland Security partnered with Blackwater Security Company. During this time, this case, without my knowledge, was conducted by the Louisiana Division of Agriculture.

Upon my completion of my contract here in New Orleans several years later, returning to Florida to find out that this had been wrongly done against me, $I$ was at that time denied any due process to appeal. I still to this day have all the documentation and evidence to prove that that case is false and malicious. But due to the statute of limitations, there's no way for me to have that revisited.

Saying that, since that time, I've been in negotiation with the Division of

Agriculture in Florida to come to some sort of resolution and resolve this so that I could continue operations in Florida. At this point, we are getting close to coming to a conclusion with that, but it's a matter of getting all the -- all the details and things worked out.

That being said, I did continue to work here in Louisiana due to this action when $I$ returned home, came back, took another job for a large company here in Louisiana where I've continued to work until just recently due to me making an attempt to start my own company here. And I just feel that the Board needs to know, you know, that $I$ can understand this action doesn't look good and I am making every attempt to get it resolved, but I don't feel after 13, 15 years of dedication to Louisiana and keeping it safe and its citizens that $I$ should be denied the opportunity to continue doing so.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Is that your statement, Mr. Hyland? MR. HYLAND:
Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay.
MR. HYLAND:

Thank you, Madam Chairman.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. I have a question.

MR. HYLAND:

Yes, ma'am?

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Did you ever pay the fine?
MR. HYLAND :

No, ma'am, not yet. I have --
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

So you've been working in Louisiana?
MR. HYLAND :

Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
But you have not paid the fine?
MR. HYLAND:

Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Any other Board Members?
MR. HYLAND :
I have made offers up to $\$ 15,000$ was the
last offer that $I$ made, and that was rejected.

They wanted the complete 21,000 . And that's
what I'm in the process of trying to obtain
the additional.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Well, after 13 years, I would think that, yes, they would want that.

MR. HYLAND:
Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Any questions by any other Board Members? MS . LANDRY:

Yes. Is the fine due to the State of Louisiana or to the State of Florida? MR. HYLAND:

State of Florida.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. HYLAND:
Yes, ma'am. It was for -- while I was gone, while $I$ was here in Louisiana, they allege that $I$ was teaching classes in Florida, which clearly is impossible. And I wasn't, obviously, but that's where the allegations arose from.

MS . LANDRY:

Okay. So you're not licensed in either Florida right now or in Louisiana?

MR. HYLAND:
As an agency?
MS. LANDRY:
Right.
MR. HYLAND:
No, ma'am.
MS. LANDRY:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you. Any other questions?
MR. SANDERS:
What year did you attempt to apply for a license here in Louisiana?

MR. HYLAND:
The agency license, two years ago.
MR. SANDERS:
Two years ago?
MR. HYLAND:
Yes, sir. And it's been pending 'til
this point here today.
MR. SANDERS:
And that was your first attempt, huh?
MR. HYLAND:

```
Yes, sir.
MR. SANDERS:
That's all. MR. HYLAND:
I have held security license here in Louisiana since 2005 as well as New Orleans Special Officers Commission for several years of that as well. And I've had no complaints or any issues in Louisiana since, like I said, several days before Katrina when I got here. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Was anyone in Florida acting on behalf of your company and teaching classes while you were here? Did you have a business operation in Florida?
MR. HYLAND:
No, your -- no, Commissioner. What happened is my instructor/semi-partner of my company was allowed to copy my company and open its own school in order to continue funds coming to the Division of Agriculture in Florida, which is how they make their money. In Florida, you have to take the courses
```

first, pay your fees to the State, and then you can start temporarily working.

But, no, no classes, no business was conducted from the time $I$ left Florida until the time I returned.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Any other questions? Does any Board member have any other questions?

Thank you, Mr. Hyland.
MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chair, could we have a brief recess while I make copies of this for you guys to review before we vote?

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Make a motion for a brief recess.
MR. CROUCH:
Thank you, Madam Chairman.
MR. HYLAND:
Thank you, Madam Chairman.
(A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN THE PROCEEDINGS.)

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Let's go back on the record. I have one question. Go ahead. MS . LANDRY:

```
Yeah. Let me ask this, on the first
company that was mentioned, was that Worldwide
Security?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
MS. LANDRY:
And then, so what is the relevance
between Worldwide and CSI?
MR. HYLAND:
CSI was my Florida company.
MS . LANDRY:
And then Worldwide is the company you
want to have --
MR. HYLAND:
For Louisiana, yes, ma'am.
MS . LANDRY:
-- in Louisiana?
MR. HYLAND:
Yes, ma'am.
MS . LANDRY:
But CSI no longer exists either; right?
MR. HYLAND:
No, ma'am.
MS . LANDRY:
When was the last time you did business
```

```
as CSI?
MR. HYLAND:
I believe 2003.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
We're off the record?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
We're going back off the record.
(A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN THE
PROCEEDINGS.)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Let's go back on the record. Let's give
the Board members a few minutes to review
this, Ron, before we proceed.
MR. CROUCH:
Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Has the Board had enough time to review
or do we need a few more minutes?
MR. PELLEGRIN:
Need a few minutes.
MS . LANDRY:
I have just one more page.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
```

Okay. Has everybody had a chance to review their information?

Okay. All right. Everybody has had an opportunity to review the information. I'm going to ask if anyone has any questions at this time? Any Board members have any questions about the information that's been presented to them? Any questions?

MS . LANDRY:
I do. I guess I'm the only one. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Me too, but I'll let you go first. MS. LANDRY:

Mr. Hyland, when you were here working with Blackwater, were you licensed -- were you working under a license as CSI or Worldwide while you were here?

MR. HYLAND:
No, ma'am.
MS . LANDRY:
Okay.
MR. HYLAND:
As an individual.
MS. LANDRY:
As an individual with Blackwater.

MR. HYLAND:
Individual guard.
MS . LANDRY:
Oh, as an individual guard with
Blackwater. Okay. What have you been doing since 2006 then?

MR. HYLAND:
I worked for Falcon Security until where
I was Director of Operations, sales marketing, pretty much ran the company until a disagreement about two years ago during Hurricane Irma, and at that time was terminated by Falcon and have been in a lawsuit with them ever since; which just last week, I won that suit against Falcon, Home Depot and Point 2 Point and settled that matter; and, again, why I'm appealing to the Board to have my own agency so that I can continue to work here in Louisiana and raise the standards of the security guards here and ensure that all training and requirements are properly met and followed.

MS . LANDRY:
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

I have a question for you, Mr. Hyland. In 2006, and please correct me if I'm wrong, in 2006, you were notified by Florida that you had a -- that you were being denied, that you did not file your appeal in a timely manner; is that correct?

MR. HYLAND:
Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. And then again in 2013, you were told that you had to pay a fine; is that correct?

MR. HYLAND:
Correct.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. And then we go over to 2015 where they're notifying you again of your denial because of noncompliance; is that correct? MR. HYLAND:

Yes, ma'am. That's because each time I have tried to negotiate for a settlement, so that's why. The continued denials, as my amount got greater, they still continued to deny. So it's --

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Do you have anything to show us that you were in negotiation with them because there's nothing here that shows that? MR. HYLAND:

I'd be happy to provide you with whatever legal documentation you'd like. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

And my other question is that you were continuing to work in Louisiana for Falcon or another company. MR. HYLAND:

Yes, ma'am.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
And you made no payments to the State of Florida. So if you -- I guess what I'm thinking is that if you made no payments to the State of Florida for an outstanding debt that you had since 2006, you continued to work and make money and run Falcon as you say and still not pay the State of Florida any money, what would lead us to believe that you would not do the same thing here? MR. HYLAND:

Well, they would not take any partial payment, Madam Chairman. It had to be an all
or nothing. And the reason that I wouldn't make any payment until agreement was made is because of, one, the case $I$ feel was fictitious to begin with, and numerous attempts since then by the Division of Agriculture of Florida false accusations which have always came out and I did nothing wrong, continued harassment.

So until we come to a complete settlement and ensure that by paying the complete fine that I will get my licenses back and the harassment from Florida stop, we're not going to enter into a settlement until we have all of that in writing. As far as why I didn't make payments in the process, you know, unfortunately, $I$ was making, you know, basically a little more than minimum wage for Falcon Security here in Louisiana. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Blache?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes, ma'am?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Do we have anything, any sort of copies
of any lawsuits or any negotiations that Mr. Hyland has presented to this Board as it relates to his ongoing negotiation with Florida?

MR. BLACHE:
We have -- you have information that we received in a subpoena request that we sent to the Department of Agriculture that may or may not contain some of that information.

The only thing that we factored this decision on was whether or not he had an action taken against him. We noticed that the fines were not paid, not even a penny had been paid even towards the fines, and that was, you know, what put posture for us for denial.

I think Mr. Hyland actually applied to us, if I'm not mistaken, once before. And the first time he applied to us, we denied the application based upon the fact that there was a discrepancy in the disclosure about the background. And then I think at that point, he withdrew the application from that process and then came back around under Worldwide and reapplied again.

It was only then when he was pursuing
that license that we dug a little deeper because now we had another application on our plate that we had to address in a timely fashion. And that's when we came up with this information from Florida that showed that there were some ongoing regulatory issues in the state that would cause us some concern here as well.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
What year was that initial application? MR. BLACHE:

The first application, I think, was in 2016, if I remember correctly. And then this application, I believe, came to us in 2017. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Thank you, Mr. Blache.
MR. ROBINSON:
What company was that in '16?
MR. BLACHE:
I don't --
MR. ROBINSON:
Same company or different company? MR. BLACHE:

I don't recall. I believe it might have been C -- it might have been CSI being used at
the time. I'm not a hundred percent sure. I'll have to pull the original application and take a look at that and see what it was. I don't remember if it was Worldwide or another entity name that he was using at that time. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Mr. Blache, the application that he applied for in 2016, there was some erroneous information in it or -MR. BLACHE:

Yeah. On the disclosure questions on the application, it asks a variety of things about criminal history, backgrounds, et cetera, and there was a material omission in that application that we discovered running the fingerprint background check. And then, you know, we had to go through a back-and-forth exchange of information on that working with the adjudication branch of our agency to figure out what was on the rap sheet versus what was answered on the application. And somewhere in that process, Mr. Hyland basically withdrew from the application process and then came back with a subsequent application in 2017.

| 1 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | So let me ask you, Ron, do you have |
| 3 | anything else other than this before we decide |
| 4 | on a decision as it relates to this |
| 5 | application? |
| 6 | MR. CROUCH: |
| 7 | We do not. Those are the documents that |
| 8 | are admitted into evidence and Mr. Blache's |
| 9 | testimony. |
| 10 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 11 | Does any Board member have any questions |
| 12 | or need any additional information before we |
| 13 | go to -- |
| 14 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| 15 | Yeah, Madam Chairman. |
| 16 | CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: |
| 17 | Okay. |
| 18 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| 19 | Mr. Hyland, you said that you -- did you |
| 20 | say that you made an effort to pay up to at |
| 21 | least \$15,000 for Florida? |
| 22 | MR. HYLAND: |
| 23 | Yes, sir. |
| 24 | MR. WILLIAMS: |
| 25 | And they -- and how long ago was that? |

MR. HYLAND:
Approximately, three, four months ago. MR. WILLIAMS:

So it took place after you had already
taken care of your business with Falcon?
MR. HYLAND:
Yes, sir.
MR. WILLIAMS:
Okay. That's all I had, Madam Chairman.
MR. CROUCH:
Just to be clear, let me ask Mr. Hyland a few questions.

CROSS EXAMINATION OF DELBERT HYLAND
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Prior to the $\$ 15,000$, you had asked that the fine be reduced a number of times; correct? At one time, you had asked that it be reduced to $\$ 200$, I think?

A Yes.
Q And then another time, you asked that it be reduced to $\$ 400$ ?

A Yeah, that was back in when $I$ initially found out about it. Right. Correct.

Q And then at some point, Florida decided they wanted the whole $\$ 21,000$; therefore, they
rejected your offer of $\$ 15,000$; is that correct?
A That's correct.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
That's it?
MR. CROUCH:
Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
All right. If there's no objections, if there's no additional information that's needed by this Board, I move that we go to a vote.

MR. WILLIAMS:
I'll second.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
All in favor? Thank you. Mr. Williams seconds.

So all in favor of holding -- complying with the request of the Executive Director that this, that Mr. Hyland's application be denied, please vote by saying yea or nay. MS. FINCHUM:

Yea.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

We're going to take a roll -- can we get
a roll call?

MS . ALDRIDGE:

Sorry.
Misty Finchum?
MS . FINCHUM:

Yea.

MS . ALDRIDGE:

Durell Pellegrin?
MR. PELLEGRIN:

Yea.
MS . ALDRIDGE:

Mark Williams?
MR. WILLIAMS:
Yea.

MS . ALDRIDGE:

Edward Robinson?

MR. ROBINSON:

Yea.
MS . ALDRIDGE:
Marian Pierre?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yea.
MS. ALDRIDGE:
Maria Landry?

MS . LANDRY:

Yea.

MS . ALDRIDGE:

Wilbert Sanders?

MR. SANDERS:

Yea.

MS. ALDRIDGE:

Ritchie Rivers?
MR. RIVERS:

Yea.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

It has been decided by this Board,
Mr. Hyland, that your application be denied at
this time.

MR. HYLAND :

Madam Chairman, Members of the Board,
thank you for your time.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
You're welcome, sir, and good luck to you.

The next hearing is North Atlantic. Is there anyone here representing North Atlantic? MR. LONG:

If it please, Madam Chairman, Joe Long representing North Atlantic. I have the

President here, Mr. Jabari Edwards.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay. Sir, will you please -- who's
going to make the statements or are you going
to make the statements?
MR. LONG:

I'll make opening statements, your Honor.
I'd ask that Mr. Edwards be allowed to sit at
the table.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Could you identify yourself, sir?
MR. LONG:
Joe Long, Attorney at Law.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
And your address?
MR. LONG:

251 Florida Street, Baton Rouge 70801.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you.
MR. LONG:

Also with me is my law clerk, Mr. Toby
Tatum, who has just graduated from Southern
Law School and is awaiting his Bar results, and I would ask that he be allowed to sit at
the table as well?
MR. CROUCH:
Good luck. It's a painful period of
time.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well, I've got to say, you're going to
one of the best law schools.
MR. TATUM:
It is one of the best in the country. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

It is.
MR. TATUM:
I tell everybody that.
MR. CROUCH:
Madam Chairman, I'd ask that all the witnesses that are going to testify be sworn. And other than the agents, the representative and the representative that Mr . Long chooses to be here for his client, that they be sequestered or excluded under the -CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Mr. Long, do you have any witnesses here? MR. LONG:

Your Honor, I have one witness, Ms. Carli Mateer, who we will designate as the case
agent in the matter. As the owner and the President, he's also a party in this matter and he should be exempt from any sequestration rule.

We have -- we don't anticipate any other witness testimony from our side, your Honor. MR. CROUCH:

Let me -- let me be clear. Both of the people you've named are going to testify? MR. LONG:

Say again.
MR. CROUCH:
Both of the people you've named are going to testify?

MR. LONG:
I don't anticipate Mr. Edwards
testifying, but our case agent will. MR. CROUCH:

I object.
MR. LONG:
Your Honor, this is the first time that I've had the pleasure of being in front of the Board. The first thing we usually go with are preliminary matters. As this is an Administrative Hearing, the laws of evidence
and the rules of evidence are relaxed.
I have made a copy of all the documents and exhibits in law that we plan on using in this hearing and I've given a copy to each Board member. And I would ask the Hearing Officer to admit this document as North Atlantic \#1 In Globo, please. MR. CROUCH:

I object. They're relaxed, but not dispensed with. Documents that are going to be introduced into evidence have to be identified, authenticated, and then an admissibility as to relevance and materiality has to be made a determination. So I would ask that he introduce these documents not In Globo, as he wishes, but one at a time so that we can properly object.

MR. LONG:
Well, we will identify each document and admit them as Counsel requests, but $I$ was looking for a matter of judicial economy. I gave a copy to Counsel this morning. He probably hadn't had an opportunity to review all the documents, so we'll do it as he says, your Honor.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Yes, sir.
MR. LONG:
Ladies and Gentlemen of the Board, my client is here because his license to do business in Louisiana was revoked and he was issued a cease and desist order on August 14th. This revocation was done without a vote of the Board, done pursuant to the Director. He will testify as to why he took these steps ex parte without giving us an opportunity to be heard before you.

We believe that the punishment does not fit the crime, so to speak, in this matter. You will hear evidence of what was alleged and then you will see evidence of what actually occurred. And we believe that our client was severely harmed as a result of the Director's rash actions. And that as a result of the Director's actions, our client lost over \$2 million in business.

So having said that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Crouch. He has -- his Director is going to testify about what he did. MR. CROUCH:

Thank you, Board Members. Just to remind you, the burden of proof is on us to the Board. It's up to us to put before you a prima facie case.

The witnesses that are going to testify, I would ask that they now be sworn and anyone who is -- anyone who is going to be testifying has to be excluded, except for those that are allowed by law to remain. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Will all the witnesses please raise their right hands?
(WITNESSES COMPLY WITH REQUEST.)
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Do you swear to tell the truth to the best of your ability in front of this tribunal in this matter?

MS . MATEER:
Yes.

MR. CROUCH:
And I would ask that they be -- she be excluded.

MR. LONG:

She's my case agent. She doesn't need to be excluded.

MR. CROUCH:

Who is the other representative?
MR. LONG:

He's the owner.
MR. CROUCH:

He's not testifying; correct?
MR. LONG:

No, sir. He is the owner of the company,
a party in the matter and exempt from the sequestration order.

MR. CROUCH:

Right.
Okay. We ready?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yes, we are.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF FABIAN BLACHE, III
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q All right. I would call Fabian Blache to testify.

A Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
And I suppose it's okay for Fabian to remain here?

MR. LONG:
I have no objection during direct. Upon

```
cross, I may ask him to take the witness
stand. But at this point, this is traditional
for him, and \(I\) have no objection to him
testifying from there. That's fine for now. BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Mr. Blache, state your name and address for the record, please?
A Fabian Blache, 15703 Old Hammond Highway, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
Q How are you employed?
A As Executive Director and Chief Administrative Officer of the state Board of Private Security Examiners.
Q How long have you been so employed?
A Since March of 2016.
Q And what are your -- briefly tell the Board what your duties are.
A To administer the laws and the rules that regulate the private security industry in the state of Louisiana.
Q And you do that on behalf of the Board; is that correct?
A That is correct.
Q On or about August 14 th, did you have occasion to do an investigation of North Atlantic
```

```
or employees thereof?
```

or employees thereof?
A Yes.
Q Tell the Board what that involved.
A I went to a location in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, which is a DCFS, Department of Children and Family Services location where a gentleman by the name of Joshua Lands was working an armed post in a State Governmental building. Mr. Lands was working that post armed with a . 38 caliber firearm for which he was not certified to be in possession of the weapon.
That constituted a violation of our rules under Chapter 601. And pursuant to that, and I issued a cease and desist notice to the company related to him being on post with an unauthorized weapon, and indicated to them in the correspondence that they had a 72-hour window of time in which to cease operations in Louisiana and that they had a right to request a hearing from the Board.
Q I'm going to show a document that I've marked for identification as Board \#1. Do you recognize that document?
A Yes. This is a Notice of Revocation of Company License. The letter is dated August 14th that indicates that the license had been revoked

```
and references the inspection conducted at the site in Louisiana. It also indicates that there was a fine imposed and that the reason for the revocation was Rule Chapter 601, which indicates that the registrant was found carrying an unauthorized weapon while performing the duties of a security officer; that the license can be suspended or revoked.

Q Is that your signature?
A That is.
Q Mr. Blache, I'll show you another document that I've marked for identification as Board \#2.

A Uh-huh.
Q Do you recognize that?
A Yes. That is the accompanying cease and desist order notifying North Atlantic to forthwith cease and desist from the agent and the contracts doing business in the state.

Q Those two documents represent the documents by which the revocation action was taken against North Atlantic; is that correct?

A Yes.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay. I'd ask that those two documents
be offered and introduced into evidence? MR. LONG:

Your Honor, that is Page 1 and 2 of North Atlantic In Globo. We have no objection, obviously, to admit Page 1 and 2 as exhibits. MR. CROUCH:

And we would have no objection to the introduction of those in Mr. Long's case. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q I'm going to show you another document marked Board \#3. Do you recognize that document?

A Yes. That is a letter dated August 15th indicating that pursuant to a request by the Office of State Procurement, we extended North Atlantic's ability to operate beyond 72 hours from the 14 th to eight p.m. August 31st. And this was so that the State buildings that they had the contracts at would remain with some sort of security coverage while State Procurement addressed the concern.

Q Do you have any idea how the state agency came to know of the revocation?

A Yes. They were apparently notified by North Atlantic at some point because they contacted
my office when they became aware that the cease and desist had been issued.

Q Did you call the State agency and tell
them about the revocation?
A I did not call them to tell them.
MR. CROUCH:
I would offer and introduce this document
into evidence. Any objection?
MR. LONG:
That would be the extension of the
license through August 31st; correct?
MR. CROUCH:
That's correct. Yeah.
MR. LONG:
We have no objection to that document.
MR. CROUCH:
Thanks. Are you going to offer that as well?

MR. LONG:
I was not.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Mr. Fabian, I'll show you a document that I've marked for identification as Board \#4. Do you

> recognize that?

A Yes. This is a letter dated August 20th in which we notified North Atlantic that they would have a hearing scheduled today after one of the representatives of their company sent us a written request for a hearing.

MR. CROUCH:

Any objection, Mr. Long?

MR. LONG:

No objection as to a request for a hearing document. MR. CROUCH:

Offer and introduce into evidence, your Honor.

And, your Honor, I would ask -- I'm sorry, Madam Chairman and Board members -- I spend too much time in court.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
I think so.

MR. CROUCH:
I would ask you to take judicial notice of your rules, Title 46, Part LIX, whatever that is, Chapter 6 and Section 601. That is the provision that allows for the revocation for a firearm violation.

MR. LONG:
Well, could you read that into the
record, please?
MR. CROUCH:
Absolutely.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Mr. Blache, would you read that into the record, please?

A Certainly. Chapter 601 is entitled, Contested Proceedings. And what it states is before revoking or suspending a license or registration card or imposing fines or costs over \(\$ 500\), the Board will afford the applicant an opportunity for a hearing after reasonable notice of not less than 15 days, except in a case of failure to maintain the required insurance or when a registrant is found carrying an unauthorized weapon while performing the duties of a security officer.

Q Mr. Blache, do you have an opinion as to what an unauthorized weapon is?

A There are requirements -- there are several requirements for a guard in Louisiana to be authorized to possess a weapon. The first is that they have to have completed all classroom training,
the second is that they have to have a valid and current firearms certification, and the third would be that they have to have a cleared criminal background. Because a person who is convicted of a felony within the 10 -year period of time or a violent crime cannot work in the industry and/or possess a firearm.

So an unauthorized weapon would be a person who has a firearms certification that may be current, but their registration has expired, a person who has an expired firearms certification, but their registration is valid, or someone who does not have a clear criminal background or is missing any one of three classroom trainings. That would invalidate their ability to possess a firearm in our state as a security officer.

Q Mr. Blache, does this company have a history of problems with this agency?

A Yes.
Q Briefly tell the Court -- I'm sorry, tell the Board --

A Sure.
Q -- about that history; however --
MR. LONG:
All right. We're going to object to
this, your Honor. The instances that he's talking about are prohibited as similar acts under Article 404 B of the Code of Evidence. Also, all these acts happened before Mr. Edwards even bought the company, so they would be unduly prejudicial and not relevant to these proceedings.

MR. CROUCH:
Let me lay a foundation, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Licensure of companies, Mr. Blache, and changes of ownership of those companies, is the companies' licensure with this agency continuous even though it changes ownership?

A Yes.
Q So would the current owners of a company inherit, so to speak, problems of the previous owner?

A Yes.
MR. LONG:
Okay. Your Honor, with the foundation laid, I renew my objection. It doesn't matter if it happened before my client owned the
company. He had no control over handling it.
He has a different staff, a different owner.
It's not relevant to this violation.
MR. CROUCH:
Before I proffer the testimony and the documents, I'll need a ruling from the referee as to the admissibility or a ruling on Mr. Long's objection.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Long, is your objection relevance?
MR. LONG:
It's irrelevant under 404B, your Honor. It's not a criminal conviction, and so it's not admissible under court.

Also, it's under 403. Even if it were to be relevant, it would be unduly prejudicial since my client, the owner, didn't even own the company back then. His staff didn't even work for the company at the time in Louisiana. And so whatever happened before he bought it is not relevant to these proceedings. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

I'm going to sustain Mr. Long's objection but, Mr. Crouch, allow you to proffer your information.

MR. CROUCH:
And I'm going to have to proffer the testimony as well. That presents a sticky
issue because you guys cannot hear this
testimony. So it's proffered testimony.
For the record, it does not -- it will not go to your decision today. It will be proffered into the record for consideration on appeal.

MR. LONG:
Your Honor, the proper procedure would be to excuse the Board --

MR. CROUCH:
Exactly.
MR. LONG:
-- allow them to go to a conference room, allow Mr. Blache to put his proffered testimony on the record, and then bring the Board back in.

MR. CROUCH:
That is correct. I agree with that. So would you guys like to go get a cup of coffee? CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Sure.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

1

Sure. So we're off the record? MR. CROUCH: We're off the record for a moment. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE: We're off the record. (WHEREUPON, A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN THE PROCEEDINGS.)
(AFTER THE BRIEF RECESS, BOARD MEMBERS EXITED THE MEETING AND PROFFERED TESTIMONY WAS OFFERED)
(WHEREUPON, PROFFERED QUESTIONS AND
ANSWERS ENDED AND A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN THE PROCEEDINGS.)

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Okay.
MR. CROUCH:

Having completed the proffered evidence and except for rebuttal testimony, we rest. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

State Board of Private Security Examiners
```

is now back in session.
MR. LONG:
All right. No more testimony,
Mr. Crouch?
MR. CROUCH:
No.
MR. LONG:
All right. I would ask that Mr . Blache
take the witness stand over here for cross examination.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Mr. Blache, you're still under oath.
MR. LONG:
All right. Mr. Crouch, I'm going to hand this to him and I'll be referring him to some documents and then I'll be asking him -MR. CROUCH:
That's fine. It's the same thing?
MR. LONG:
Correct. It is the same documents.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay.
CROSS EXAMINATION OF FABIAN BLACHE, III BY MR. LONG:
Q Here's your copy, Mr. Blache.

```

A Okay.
Q All right. The documents that I've given you are all numbered and so you should be able to keep up. The number is in the bottom of the page in the center. And so as I refer to documents, I'll ask you to identify it, and then we'll ask Mr. Crouch if he has any objection to offering it in as evidence.

MR. LONG:
Is that a fair procedure to you,
Mr. Crouch?
MR. CROUCH:
Perfectly fine.
BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. Mr. Blache, turning your
attention to Page 1 of North Atlantic In Globo is the cease and desist order that you issued on August 14th, 2018; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you admit that you issued this cease and desist order, and on Page 2 is the revocation. You did that without conferring with the Board; correct?

A Correct.
Q And you did that because you believe your
power as director that you could revoke someone's license because he was carrying an unauthorized weapon; right?

A Yes.

Q Was there any other reason why you revoked the license without conferring with the Board?

A I had identified a couple of other instances where there were security officers working who did not have proper authorization for their weapons.

Q All right. Tell me about that.
A We identified an individual by the name of Samuel Sears --

Q Yes.

A -- who had an expired firearms
certification. We also had another individual by the name of Jamie Briggs who had no classroom training, which is a requirement to be in possession of a firearm.

Q All right. Turning your attention to Page 4, there is an email that you sent to North Atlantic --

A These pages aren't numbered just so you know.
```

Q I'm talking about on my mine. They're not numbered?
A No, sir, so I'm going to look and follow you.
Q Okay. I'll give you this one right here. This one is numbered here. I apologize.
A That's okay.
Q Sorry, Clerks, but you get the unnumbered ones.
MR. RIVERS:
I don't think these are numbered.
MR. LONG:
On the bottom, it should be numbered, sir.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
To your right.
MR. RIVERS:
Okay.
BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. So if I turn your attention to Page 4, there's an email from the Executive Secretary. That's you; right?
A Yeah. Let me see where you're talking about.
Q Page 4. Look at the bottom in the center

```


Okay. So let's do it this way. Page 1, cease and desist order?

MR. CROUCH:
No objection.
MR. LONG:
No objection. Page 2 --
MR. CROUCH:
No objection.
MR. LONG:
-- notice of revocation?
MR. CROUCH:
No objection.
MR. LONG:
Okay. Page 3 is from the Louisiana
Administrative Code identifying what an authorized weapon is.

MR. CROUCH:
No objection.
BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. Let's go over that. In the law --

A Excuse me.
Q Yes?
A I want to point something out.
Q You don't have a question right now, sir.

A This Administrative Code that you're about to reference is not the correct year.

Q Okay. Is it materially different than the new year?

A It could very well be.
Q Is it?
A It could very well be and it needs to be addressed.

Q Okay. Well, you can bring that up in cross examination; all right.

Firearms training, Page 3, all right, it says, authorized weapons on the bottom under \(E\), the following weapons are the only weapons authorized and approved by the Board, the P24 baton, the . 357 caliber revolver with a minimum of a 4-inch barrel, a . 38 caliber ammunition, a . 38 caliber revolver with a 4-inch barrel, a nine millimeter semiautomatic, a shotgun, a . 40 caliber weapon; is that correct?

Those are the authorized weapons by the Board; correct?

A Because this is not the current version of the Rule, I'm not going to respond to that.

Q Okay. Under --
A I have to do this based upon what is
```

currently in effect.
Q Under this Administrative Code --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- which is the law, and you're arguing that it was -- in 2006, this is the 2006 version. Until you show me that there's an updated version where these are not the only authorized weapons -as of 2006, they were the only authorized weapons for the Board; correct?
A As of 2006, that's correct.
Q Okay. And so when you found Mr. Lands on his post over at Family Services, what kind of weapon did he have on his person?
A He had what appeared to be a revolver, either of the . 38 caliber or .357 caliber variety.
Q Okay. And if it was a . 38 caliber revolver, then it would have been an authorized weapon as the Board defines it; correct?
A So let me answer your question.
Q Please answer the question, and then you can explain it any way you want. A . 38 caliber revolver is an authorized weapon; is that right?
A A. 38 caliber revolver pursuant to Chapter 405 under firearms training is one of the types of weapons that security officers are allowed

```
to carry when properly trained and registered and certified. Yes.

Q Okay. Show me in the law where it says that it's an unauthorized weapon if you miss your refresher training or you're not certified with it. Show me where it says that's an unauthorized weapon in the law anywhere. 2006 version? 2011 version? Anywhere other than in your mind?

A Well, in our statute and in our rules completely indicates that for a person to function as a security officer, there are certain requirements that have to be met.

Q That's right, but it doesn't allow you to make an ex parte revocation without talking to the Board first if they're three days out of refresher training?

A Chapter 601 actually, in fact, does allow me to do that. If your insurance expires, it can be done. If the person is on a post with a weapon that they are not authorized to carry, it can be done.

Q Okay. Was Mr. Lands authorized to carry a. 38 - -

A No.
Q -- caliber?

A He was not.
Q Okay. So you're arguing because he was three days out of refresher training, he's carrying an unauthorized weapon?

A Three minutes out, he's unauthorized.
Q Right. But the law says an authorized weapon is a weapon that is authorized by the Board.

A You're talking about a definition under firearms training. I'm talking about what's required by Chapter 601. We're talking about two different portions of the Rule.

Q Can you show me anywhere in the Rule anywhere under the statute under the Administrative Code, any law that supports your definition of unauthorized weapon?

A Yeah, it's under --
MR. CROUCH:
I'm going to object, your Honor. The questions --

A It's under Title 37. And I can direct you to where it indicates what the requirements are to be in possession of a weapon as a security officer.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Let me interrupt testimony. There's an
objection.
MR. CROUCH :

I'm going to object. The question has
been asked and answered. Mr. Fabian has
already given his opinion about 601 versus
405 .

MR. LONG:

I'm giving the witness the opportunity to
tell the Board where in the Code his
definition is.

MR. CROUCH:
He already has. Section 601.
MR. LONG:
601 is very large. What's the statute?
601 what?
MR. CROUCH:

601 -- the Administrative Rule 601.

MR. LONG:

Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
Not Administrative Rule 405 .
MR. LONG:
All right.
MR. CROUCH:

The statute --

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
So I'm going to allow Mr. Blache to finish answering this question.

MR. CROUCH:
Okay.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
And then, Mr. Long, I'm going to ask you
to move on with your cross.
MR. LONG:
Yes, ma'am.

BY MR. LONG:
Q Anything else, sir?
A Yeah. I'm going to look up in Title 37 specifically what it is that you're asking me so I can read it into the record. If you can just give me a moment?

So the first component that addresses this issue is the fact that all security officers must be certified by a state licensed firearms instructor. State licensed firearms instructor comes in four different varieties. One is if they are a POST Certified firearms instructor. The other is if they are an NRA Certified firearms instructor. The third would be a Department of Energy Certified firearms instructor or any US dot
mil navy, army, marine corp, police firearms instructor.

Those are the four varieties that this agency recognizes to issue a license to a person to teach firearms, which then allows them to certify or not certify an individual who wants to function as an armed guard with a weapon.

Q Okay.
A That requirement --
Q So that means he's certified with a weapon or registered with a weapon; correct?

A To have an authorized weapon, you must be certified by a state licensed firearms instructor.

Q You would --
A So the first component to compliance in this process is that the person cannot be trained by just anyone. They have to be trained by a state licensed firearms instructor who possesses one of these four certifications.

Q There's no argument on that. Okay.
A That's --

Q But that's a different violation; right? That means you're out -- that you don't have registration. Doesn't mean that you're carrying an unauthorized weapon. It means you're out of
```

registration.
A No, sir.
Q You're not registered or certified to carry that weapon.
A $\quad$ No.
Q It doesn't mean you're carrying an unauthorized weapon like a machine gun or a flame thrower or a hand grenade, okay. It's an authorized weapon. He's just out of registration.
A No, it's not he's just -- it's out of certification in this case.
Q Okay. Out of certification.
A But they're different. Herein --
Q Would you agree though?
A Herein lies the dilemma.
Q Okay.
A Okay. So let --
Q Would you agree that being out of certification is different than carrying an --
A I'm still trying to answer your first question.
Q -- unauthorized weapon?
A I'm still trying to answer your first question and give you the -- you asked me to show you where. So I'm taking you through it so that

```
it's fully understood. Okay.
The first part of the dilemma is there's a distinct difference between licensure, registration, and certification. Any disconnect with those, problems emerge.

The guard has to possess a registration card to stand even in unarmed posts. They also have training requirements that they must undergo within a certain prescribed time period, even for an unarmed post. The certification issue comes into play when there are guns in the equation.

So a guard can go from being an unarmed guard for a year in their two-year registration cycle to being a firearm carrying armed guard when they are trained by a state licensed instructor and certified --

Q Was Joshua Lands --
A -- to carry the weapon.
Q -- trained under a . 38 caliber weapon --
A Not at that time.
Q -- by a state licensed instructor?
A Not at the time he was inspected, no, sir.

Q The fact is he had been trained. He just hadn't had his refresher training; isn't that
```

right?
A That is correct.
Q All right.
A I agree.
MR. CROUCH:
Your Honor? Your Honor, wait. Wait.
This is going to get very confusing on a record. Please, I would ask the attorney to ask the question, let the witness answer the question, and then rephrase or embellish the question. But, please, don't talk at the same time.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
I'm going to ask Mr. Long and Mr. Blache to wait until, respectfully, until either of you finishes talking before speaking for the purposes of the Board's clarification and so that the court reporter can get everything accurately written.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Anything else?
A Yes. Then, I want to direct you to
37:3284. Under 37:3284, it talks about the training of security officers. This is the statute. This is the law.

```

It says, the Board shall approve all training programs. It says, any security officer employed after the effective date of this chapter shall comply within 30 days of his first work assignment and gain either eight hours of classroom training or an approved curriculum based training course under a licensed instructor. The instructors, again, \(I\) want to reiterate, are licensed by the Board.

In addition to that, it says, armed security officers, in addition to the training requirements outlined in Paragraphs 1 and 4 of this subsection shall complete firearms training and range qualification as prescribed by the Board prior to armed work assignment.

Q Okay.
A The nature and extent of firearms training shall be adequately described and approved. It also says, security officers shall have 60 days from the date of the first work assignment to complete either an additional eight hours of classroom training or an approved curriculum based training course.

It then goes on to say that no more than two of the training requirements provided may be
done in a 24-hour period. Failure to comply with
the required training may preclude future consideration for a license period of one year. All armed security officers must complete an annual firearms retraining course as prescribed by the Board, which includes refresher courses on subjects previously specified.

Q Okay. Go above that on C.
A Uh-huh.
Q And what does it say? Read it to the Board. What does it say?

A Failure to acquire --
Q What's the sanction if you don't do this?
A -- training within a prescribed time period may preclude further consideration for a license for a period of one year.

Q Right. That's the sanction. If they don't do the training within the prescribed time, the guard may not have a license for a year.

A The guards are not licensed, sir. That's the problem. You're misunderstanding. Guards are not licensed in Louisiana.

Q The guard's --
A Companies are licensed.
Q The guard's registration is --
```

A The guard is registered to the company license.
Q -- getting taken away; right?
A Guards are not licensed in Louisiana.
Q Can you pull the ability of a guard to work in Louisiana?
A What do you mean? Clarify the question.
Q Can you prevent a guard from working in Louisiana as the Director?
A Yes.
Q Of course you can. So you can call it whatever you want, but you can stop that guard from working for a period of a year if he doesn't get the proper training; can't you?
A This is referring to the license hold.
Q No, it isn't. It's referring to the training of the security officers, 3284.
A Yeah. But if you look at the rules --
Q Page 102, by the way?
A Now, I'll take you back to the rules. So I'm going to go there and answer your question because they are tied together. When you go back into the rules here and you go to the sanctions table on the rules, what it specifically states is

```
```

    Q Please cite --
    ```
    Q Please cite --
    A -- licensee's --
    A -- licensee's --
    Q Please cite the statute.
    Q Please cite the statute.
    A It's Title 46, Part LIX. And now, I'm
    A It's Title 46, Part LIX. And now, I'm
    in, let's see, 903C. Licensee's failure to have a
    in, let's see, 903C. Licensee's failure to have a
    registrant in their employ trained within the
    registrant in their employ trained within the
    prescribed time period.
    prescribed time period.
    Q Yeah.
    Q Yeah.
    A So it's the licensee's responsibility --
    A So it's the licensee's responsibility --
    Q Continue reading it.
    Q Continue reading it.
    A -- to continue to train. It says, if the
    A -- to continue to train. It says, if the
registrant is not trained within 14 days after the
registrant is not trained within 14 days after the
deadline date, then an Administrative fine
deadline date, then an Administrative fine
accumulates at a daily rate.
accumulates at a daily rate.
    Q Okay.
    Q Okay.
    A Then it says, licensee (inaudible) to
    A Then it says, licensee (inaudible) to
    submit to the Board a training verification form on
    submit to the Board a training verification form on
    the registrant in their employ.
    the registrant in their employ.
    Q In this situation, Mr. Lands was found on
    Q In this situation, Mr. Lands was found on
August 14th of being three days late on his
August 14th of being three days late on his
refresher training.
refresher training.
    A Uh-huh.
    A Uh-huh.
    Q He got his refresher training on
    Q He got his refresher training on
August 15th, which was within four days of the
August 15th, which was within four days of the
deadline date; isn't that right?
```

deadline date; isn't that right?

```
```

A That's talking about the assessment of the actual monetary fine --
Q The point is --
A -- is what it says.
Q The point is, as soon as North Atlantic found out that his refresher training had lapsed, they scheduled the training immediately and got him trained the next day; isn't that right?
A I don't know that.
Q You don't know that?
A They didn't communicate that to me.
Q Well, you'll hear from North Atlantic later.
Let's go back and Page 4 is the email where you said that there were eight additional officers that were out of certification.
A No, I was clarifying a conversation. MR. CROUCH:
Wait. Wait. Wait. What about document, Page 003, are we finished with that? I mean, you're going to offer that into evidence?
MR. LONG:
Yes. You had already said no objection
to that, but --
MR. CROUCH:

```

No. No, not three.
MR. LONG:
Well, three is law, so you can't really object to that.

MR. CROUCH:
I can object to it because it's not the current version.

MR. LONG:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
This section was amended in 2'08.
MR. LONG:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
This is 2'06.
MR. LONG:
All right.
MR. CROUCH:
This is not the correct version of that
law. Now, I --
MR. LONG:
Your Honor, I would --
MR. CROUCH:
If you'd let me finish my objection, please?

MR. LONG:
I'm sorry. I apologize. Go ahead. MR. CROUCH:

I will stipulate that the 2'08 version is substantially the same as this, but I want to clarify the record. And I have no objection to the admissibility of Section, whatever it is, 405 as amended in 2'08.

I think that solves your problem, Joe. MR. LONG:

Would you stipulate that a . 38 caliber was an authorized weapon?

MR. CROUCH:
Certainly.
MR. LONG:
Okay. I think that's --
(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS)
MR. CROUCH: (Inaudible).

MR. LONG:
-- the crepitus of the issue.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Wait. Excuse me, sir. Are we -- is this going in?

MR. LONG:

He says he'd stipulate that this
document, the 2008 is substantially the same; correct?

MR. CROUCH:
And I would just ask the Board to take judicial notice of it and we can provide them with the proper copy of it. They probably have 2'08 in their possession as Board members anyway, so it's a minor point.

But if it goes up on appeal, I just want a clear record for the court.

MR. LONG:
Okay. I'm done.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
So Page 3 is going in --
MR. LONG:
Page 3 is going in.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
-- as the 2006 version of Section 405
of --
MR. LONG:
Which we believe is the same as 2008, substantially the same.

MR. CROUCH:
I think it is substantially the same.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & MS . LANDRY: \\
\hline 2 & No, it is a little bit different. \\
\hline 3 & MR. CROUCH: \\
\hline 4 & It is a little bit different, but I will \\
\hline 5 & stipulate that 405, as amended in 2 '08, is \\
\hline 6 & admissible. I don't have any objection to its \\
\hline 7 & admissibility. \\
\hline 8 & HEARING OFFICER MURRAY: \\
\hline 9 & Okay. \\
\hline 10 & BY MR. LONG: \\
\hline 11 & Q The whole point, Mr. Blache, is whether \\
\hline 12 & it's the '06 version or the '08 version of the law, \\
\hline 13 & a . 38 caliber weapon with a 4-inch barrel is an \\
\hline 14 & authorized weapon; isn't that right? \\
\hline 15 & A In terms of what is defined -- \\
\hline 16 & Q Yes. \\
\hline 17 & A -- as what can be used in the -- \\
\hline 18 & Q Correct. \\
\hline 19 & A -- course and scope of employment -- \\
\hline 20 & Q Correct. \\
\hline 21 & A -- that is correct. \\
\hline 22 & Q All right. So Page 4 asks -- Page 4 is \\
\hline 23 & the guards that you identified as missing refresher \\
\hline 24 & training? \\
\hline 25 & A Actually, that says to clarify because I \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

    1 had a conversation with someone.
    2 Q Okay.
    ```
```

had a conversation with someone.
Q Okay.
A And this was the outgrowth of that conversation. So this was me pushing that information back and giving them an opportunity to address any questions that might exist with these particular folks.
Q Okay.
A Because we were just trying to get some clarity on who was where and what they had them doing.
Q Right. But this is part of why we're here today. You're saying that these eight were also out of certification; correct?
A No, this is -- this is after the $C$ and D was issued. The $C$ and $D$ was issued pursuant to my inspection of Mr . Lands.
Q The cease and desist.
A Correct.
Q Yes.
A I inspected Mr. Lands, had a conversation with him. He explained his situation of his firearms certification and his relationship with North Atlantic. He was not in possession of a North Atlantic card at the time or a firearms

```


```

    1 Board; correct?
    ```
```

Board; correct?
A That's correct.
Q So both of these licensees were in

```
```

violation; correct?

```
violation; correct?
A No, sir, not necessarily. An armed guard can work an unarmed post. When I came upon Mr. Lands, he was working an armed post in a North Atlantic uniform.
Q Okay. How did you find Mr. Lands? Did you have a confidential informant that tipped you to Mr. Lands?
A I received a phone call that Mr. Lands had expressed concerns about his firearms certification and that he was working an armed post.
Q Who gave you that information?
A Mr. Rivers called me.
Q And Mr. Rivers was your confidential informant?
A He was my -- he was the informant. He was the individual that called me, yes.
Q Okay. All right. All allegations and complaints to the Board must be in writing and signed by the complainant; isn't that correct?
A No, not necessarily.
```

Q If I showed you the law on that, would you agree to it? Sir?

A I'm sorry?
Q If I showed you the law that says that all complaints must be in writing and signed by the complainant, if I would direct you to Page 16, it is Title 46, Part LIX, Chapter 1, the Louisiana Administrative Code in accordance with, this is Page 16, in accordance with Title 46, Chapter 1, 105, anonymous tips are not allowed. Complaints to the Board shall be in writing, signed by the individual making the complaint, and including a means by which to contact the individual for investigative purposes; thus, anonymous phone tips are not allowed and cannot be acted upon.

A I didn't say it was an anonymous phone call. You did.

Q Did this complaint get reduced into writing?

A Yeah, it's reduced into writing. I immediately took action on it. I went out and inspected the post.

Q Did the complaint get put in writing and signed by Mr. Rivers?

A Right here in my letter, it indicates
that $I$ conducted an inspection of a North Atlantic security officer.

MR. LONG:
Madam Hearing Officer, I would ask the witness to answer my question.

BY MR. LONG:
Q Was the complaint in writing signed by the complainant as required by Title 46?

A My conversation was with the employee after that, not with Mr. Rivers.

MR. LONG:

I would direct -- I would ask the Hearing
Officer to direct the witness to answer the
question that $I$ ask.
BY MR. LONG:

Q Did you have a written complaint in writing at the time the complaint was made?

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

The witness will answer.

A No, not from Mr. Rivers.

BY MR. LONG:

Q Okay. Later, a month later or three weeks later at this time in this hearing, do you still not have a written complaint signed by Mr. Rivers?

A I do not have a written complaint.
Q So let me get this straight here. Mr. Rivers, who is the employee of Mr. Lands, makes a complaint to you that this security guard is three days out of compliance. You don't reduce Mr. Rivers's complaint to writing and you don't require Mr . Rivers to sign the complaint as required by law; isn't that right?

A I did not reduce that to writing.
Q That's right. And so Mr. Rivers, who has knowledge about Mr. Lands's certification, tips you and says, hey, he's working for another company and he's not certified; right?

A Mr. Rivers was notified by Mr. Lands that his certification was going to expire. Mr. Lands spoke to me and indicated that his certification was going to expire.

I conducted an inspection. I did not take action against North Atlantic based upon a phoned in complaint. I did that based upon personal information.

MR. LONG:
Madam Hearing Officer, at this point, we have evidence that a member of the Board is a fact witness in this hearing. I would ask
that he be sequestered and asked to leave the room.

MR. CROUCH:
Your Honor, one comment. Section 105
that Mr. Long is cross examining on, the title is Consumer Information. That suggests to me that complaints from consumers must be in writing, not members of the Board who are the employees of the Executive Director.

That may seem like a distinction without a difference, but $I$ think it is a distinction. I think the intent of 105 is that complaints from consumers must be in writing to prohibit false and misleading complaints to come to the Board for investigation. I think that's distinguishable from Board members. MR. LONG:

Your Honor, Mr. Rivers is a fact witness in this matter. His testimony will be needed at a later date. The rules of sequestration require him not to hear future testimony until he has testified.

I'm asking that he be recused from this Board on this hearing case, asked -- sworn in as a witness and asked to walk outside as

```
other witnesses have been instructed to do so. We should not have to hear what he told Mr. Blache from Mr. Blache.
Mr. Rivers is going to tell us what he said, why he did it, why he didn't sign a complaint, and why he didn't write a complaint.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Long, are you saying that you intend to call Mr. Rivers today?
MR. LONG:
I do. I will call him right after this witness.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Although he has heard all of the previous
testimony in this matter?
MR. LONG:
We just found out that he is the source. So as soon as we found out, I made the objection, Judge. He has a conflict of interest here. He's a fact witness. He can't be a judge in his own cost.
MR. CROUCH:
I have no objection.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
```

Mr. Crouch and Mr. Long, approach.
(WHEREUPON, MR. CROUCH AND MR. LONG
COMPLIED WITH REQUEST.)
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay. Mr. Rivers, you understand the statements made by Mr. Long and Mr. Crouch? MR. RIVERS:

Yes, ma'am, I do.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
You understand that you are about to be called as a witness in this proceeding and that you'll be sworn and your sworn testimony will be part of the record and may be used at a later time in addition to judicial proceedings regarding this license. MR. RIVERS:

Yes, ma'am.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
And you understand that because you are not being called as a witness, you will be prevented from voting on the decision regarding this license at this time? MR. RIVERS:
Yes, I do.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay. And you understand that you will now be asked to leave the room. And when you are called as a witness, after your testimony, you'll have to participate in the rest of the Board's activities today but not in the voting on this issue?

MR. RIVERS:
Yes, I do.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
I would ask that you go on and swear him in, your Honor.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Raise your right hand.
MR. RIVERS:
(Complies with request.)
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Do you swear that your testimony in this proceeding before this tribunal will be the truth to the best of your knowledge and abilities?

MR. RIVERS:
Yes, I do.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

The witness has been sworn and will now leave, physically leave this room as a part of the previously described sequestration procedures. He will enter to testify, but he will not vote on the revocation or reinstatement of this license. MR. CROUCH:

Do all the Board members understand what just happened?
(YES BY ALL)
MR. CROUCH :

Okay.
MR. LONG:
I would ask that Page 16 be offered into evidence.

MR. CROUCH:

With my previous comment, $I$ have no objection -- subject to my previous comment. MR. LONG:

Now --
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Excuse me. Is there any dispute as to whether this is the 2006 or 2008 or 2011 version of this provision?

MR. LONG:

He just made no objection to the admittance. I'm representing that it's current law.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay.
MR. LONG:
And he's making no objection.
MR. CROUCH:
And I'm looking at -- it hasn't been amended since 2000, so it is the current version.

BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. So now we know how you found out about Mr. Lands, and that was at nine o'clock in the morning. And then you went back to your office and did further investigation?

A Yes.
Q All right. And then at 12:44 p.m., you email North Atlantic and say, hey, there's eight more guards that need refresher training; isn't that correct?

A We were looking at a variety of things actually. We were asking them for whatever it is that they might have had to show what else was going on with any of the armed guards as we began
conducting the investigation to verify training on any individuals that North Atlantic might have in their possession.

Q All right. And in response to your allegation that these eight guards needed refresher training, North Atlantic sent you the certification documents; correct?

A Actually, the question was again based upon a conversation that $I$ had. North Atlantic sent me a table of information that had gaps in it. And my question was with respect to the gaps in the table.

Q Did --
A So I was using their information.
Q Right.
A And then asking them questions back about what was provided to us.

Q Okay. But North Atlantic on the same day, on the same day, did they send you all these firearms verification forms?

A We were able to reconcile questions about a variety of different things with the exception of two other individuals besides Mr. Lands.

Q Let's get down -- speak English for everybody, okay.

So you allegedly had concerns for nine guards; correct?

A North Atlantic gave us concern for nine guards when they sent us the table with gaps in it.

Q When -- after your investigation, you realized seven of the guards that you thought were out of certification actually were in certification?

A Seven of the guards that they didn't immediately have information on, they were able to subsequently provide information on.

Q Okay.
A We accepted that information.
Q So we're here about two guards; correct?
A We're here about three guards.
Q Three guards. Who are they?
A Samuel Sears, Jamie Briggs, and Joshua Lands.

Q Who is Briggs?
A Briggs worked DCFS Oak Park. He has no classroom training.

Q Okay. I'm looking at your document here, your email, Page 4 that's already been admitted into evidence.

A Okay.

```
Q Where is Briggs's name? Is it on there or I'm just missing it?
A Briggs's name is not on that email.
Q All right.
A Because I had already determined that we didn't have the classroom training on Briggs.
Q Yeah, but did you give North Atlantic notice that Briggs needed additional classroom training?
A Actually, they knew because they sent me the table with the blank space saying he didn't have classroom training.
Q Did --
A Your --
Q Where's the email? Where's the notice? Did you put it in the revocation notice? Was that part of the reason why they were revoked?
A No, I did not put it in the revocation.
Q Was that the reason why they were revoked, part of the reason why they were revoked?
A The reason \(I\) did the revocation is because an individual working at a state facility --
Q Right.
A -- was without firearms certification and
```

we had identified that there were other problems with applications that were late, other people without classroom training. We had -- actually, we had another issue that arose where multiple applications were sent in two months late. And, therefore, we were not able to vet the guards
because the fingerprints had not arrived in the building; yet, they were already out on post before they were vetted.

Q Could you review Page 6 --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- 7, 8, 9 --
A Sure.
Q -- 10, 11 --
A Certainly.
Q -- 12, 13 --
A Yes.
Q -- and 14?
A Yes.
Q These are all firearms verification forms that were sent to you by North Atlantic; isn't that right?

A These are -- yeah, these look like forms that they sent us via email.

MR. LONG:

I would ask that they all be offered into evidence as Page 06 through 014.

A Uh-huh.
MR. CROUCH:
Can I have a minute to -- what pages, Joe?

MR. LONG:
Yes, 6 through 14.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Where's the numbers?
MR. LONG:
The numbers are on the bottom.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
On the bottom?
MR. LONG:
Yes.
MR. CROUCH:
I'm going to object. I don't think a proper foundation has been laid for these documents. I don't know their authenticity. Only his company witnesses can lay the foundation for this. I don't think Mr. Blache can lay the foundation for the admissibility of these documents.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Blache just admitted, your Honor, that these are documents he received from North Atlantic certifying that seven of the nine guards did have the proper certification. A That's not what $I$-- no, that's not what I acknowledged. So if you're going to talk about what I acknowledged, then let me state that. MR. LONG:

Your Honor, I know that the witness is not a lawyer, but he cannot talk while I'm making an objection.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Blache, please limit your comments to your testimony. THE WITNESS:

Okay. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Mr. Long, I'm going to ask that you give Mr. Blache time to review the documents, then you will ask the questions to lay the foundation and Mr. Crouch will object or not object as he sees fit during the questioning for the foundation.

MR. LONG:
Yes, your Honor.

BY MR. LONG:
Q Mr. Blache, have you had an opportunity to look at Pages 6 through 14?

A I have.
Q Do you know what these documents are?
A These documents are copies of training certification forms that I notice conspicuously do not have our date stamp on them. So these are forms that were completed, but I can't verify without the date stamp that they were actually submitted to us on the dates that they are supposed to certify training for.

Q But my --
A I do recognize that these are copies of documents that were submitted by North Atlantic to us in response to the C and D .

Q And after you did your investigation, you confirmed that all these documents are actually authentic; correct?

A I would have to go through each one individually and verify that, but $I$ can tell you that we were able to confirm that at least some of them were, yes, in fact. I can't tell you it was all of them because $I$ don't have the database in front of me and all the other materials I would

```
need to do that.
Q Right. But you've told us that they
were -- after you had done your investigation, only
three security guards stood out; correct?
A There were three armed guards without
proper classroom and/or certification --
Q Okay.
A -- that --
Q Now, Lands --
A -- laid the foundation.
Q Let's go to Lands -- and I would offer -excuse me.
MR. LONG:
At this point, I would offer Pages 6 through 14 as evidence.
MR. CROUCH:
I mean I'm going to object to relevance. These prove that certain employees were properly certified. That's not at issue.
What's at issue is the employees that were not properly certified. I'll object to the relevance.
MR. LONG:
Your Honor, the proposed fine is \(\$ 9,500\). That's for a thousand dollars per violation.
```

```
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
I'm going to allow the documents in the record over Mr. Crouch's objection, but his objection is noted for the record at the relevance of the documents, not that they are not business records or not that they are false, but that they are not relevant to the proceeding.
MR. LONG:
Thank you, Judge.
MR. CROUCH:
Thank you, your Honor.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Direct your attention to Page 7, which is Joshua Lands, that's one of the guards at issue here, his firearms training verification.
A Uh-huh.
Q What was the weapon that he was initially trained with with his initial firearms training; a .38, right?
A A. 38 .
Q A. 38 ?
A Yes.
Q And he certified on August 11th, 2017; right?
```

```
A Uh-huh.
Q Now, who was the security company that he was working for when he got his initial training?
A Rivers.
Q Rivers Security, not my client. Rivers Security did his initial firearms training. And then we know now that Rivers Security was your confidential informant to tell you that this guy is out of certification; isn't that right?
A Rivers is the individual who called.
Q Right. So how long after you contacted North Atlantic and told them that Sears and Lands needed refresher training, how long did it take for them to get those two guards refresher training?
A I don't know on Lands. Actually, I don't have that in front of me. It looks like it took them until September 1st or August 31st to get Sears training.
Q Okay. What about Lands, you don't know when he got the training?
A I'll take a look and see if \(I\) can tell you.
Q Was it August \(15 t h\), the next day?
A I don't know. It shows as August 15th, yes, sir.
```

```
Q Correct, the next day. Within 24 hours of getting notice, they got him trained up; correct?
A Yes.
Q All right. But we know at eight to nine o'clock, you were doing your inspection of Lands when you were tipped off. By 12:44, you had completed your investigation and sent off an email that said there were eight more guards that needed refresher training; right?
A No, sir. I got a table from the company indicating gaps in training, and we were clarifying what was or what was not missing.
Q Direct your attention to Page 4, your email.
A Yeah. Right.
Q To clarify --
A It says to clarify.
Q -- Warren Boudreaux has not refreshed; Joshua Lands has not refreshed, and Samuel Sears has not refreshed.
A That's what --
Q Henry Hookfin is not yet refreshed. Tawney Melancon shows no -- now -- I guess that's no training -- shows now training, and I think
```

that's no training, shows no training in portal but is standing an armed post with a 9 millimeter. You found out that was wrong; right?

A They got the training from the other companies one of them worked for.

Q Bruce Niles shows no classroom or firearms training. Carl Trahan has no firearms training in either system. And Brendell Wybel has no firearms training in either system. And that email was not accurate; correct?

A No, because $I$ was basing my --
Q Right.
A -- question off of the table.
Q Right.
A Correct.
Q When you send off the proposed --
A That's correct.
Q -- the revocation and the proposed fines, what was your proposed fine?

A The proposed fine was -- hold on. I have that. The proposed fine was $\$ 9,500$.

Q I direct the Board's attention to Page 2, the letter of revocation, proposed fine, 9,500. What's the maximum amount you can fine for each violation under your law?

```
A Five hundred dollars.
Q And yet, you're filing a \$9,500 fine?
A That's because there's other fines contained in there.
Q Tell me what they are.
A So each time you have a lapse in training --
Q Right.
A -- it's a \(\$ 500\) fine for the lapse in training and a \(\$ 500\) fine for failing to submit the verification.
Q All right.
A So that's a thousand dollars.
Q Yeah.
A So on each three of the firearms instances, that's \$1,000.
Q So that's 3,000.
A The individual with the two classrooms that were missing, that's a thousand dollars per classroom training.
Q But you didn't -- you didn't -- you're telling the Board here that this was regarding three people.
A No. No, you're asking me about the fine component of the letter.
```

```
Q You can't fine somebody if they're not in violation; can you?
A Yes, \(I\) fined them for being in violation.
Q Okay. Continue.
A You're asking me about the fine.
Q Continue. So it's 3,000.
A And then we have multiple individuals whose applications were two months late.
Q Okay.
A Those applications by themselves can amount to upwards of \(\$ 3,000\) per application. It's a fine for the application. It's a fine for the fee, et cetera. So we've got multiple applications that were two months late.
We moved to the system in May 28th. We received applications on people hired in May and July. So there's fines related to those things that came out of our investigation as well.
Q Page --
A So these fines are not just isolated to that.
Q Yeah. Page 2, this is when you gave us notice of why you were fining us, why you were revoking our license. Page 2, on August 14th, the Board conducted an inspection of a North Atlantic
```

security officer posted at a state building in Louisiana. The guard in question was armed with a . 38 caliber for which he was not certified.

A Uh-huh.
Q The guard was not in possession of his registration card and his certification for the weapon he possessed expired August 11th. The Board verified through additional review that an additional eight guards operating in the state without proper firearms certification and training. Uncertified weapons are not covered by insurance and represent a series of egregious violations.

This is what you told us in our notice of revocation, that we had nine guards that were not certified, not this stuff about all this other stuff, late filing. You didn't say anything in that revocation. You said nine guards in violation.

A Uh-huh.
Q Now you've told the Board under oath that's not true.

A What?
Q Yeah. You said it was three guards, three guards. You don't say anything in here about classroom training or anything like that. You say

```
nine guards, an additional eight guards are operating in the state without proper firearms certification.
A Correct. Uh-huh. Again, I just mentioned the fact that we had multiple applications that were not submitted to the Board timely, the fingerprints didn't arrive here timely where we hadn't had a chance to vet those guards. So even if a guard has classroom training or a firearms certification, they also have to have a clear background. And we've talked about that in the testimony as well.
Q Are you saying that these eight people on Page 4 that you said to clarify, that they're all needing refresher training or one of them needs firearms training, you weren't talking about these eight? You were talking about eight other people?
A I'm telling you that North Atlantic has a variety of administrative problems with paperwork --
Q Yeah.
A -- and submitting things timely to this Board --
Q Yeah.
A -- that resulted in them even being
```

confused about who needed what and when. And that's what precipitated this conversation and this table that I've received which ask me -- which then prompted me to ask them to clarify, what are you showing me here, who needs what and where, how many people are working on post, how many aren't.

Q Does anything in your notice of revocation say that you have sloppy paperwork, that you're late submitting documents to the Board, and that's why I'm fining you? Is there anything in that letter that says that?

A No.
Q Right. Next, an egregious violation, if you're operating without an insurance policy, that's an egregious violation; correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. But North Atlantic had a valid insurance at the time; correct?

A I believe they did.
Q All right. So it's all about your definition of an unauthorized weapon; right?

A It's a statutory definition.
Q We went over that. I'm not going to bother them with that.

A Right.

```
Q All right. What other remedies would you have had with Joshua Lands other than revoking my client's right to do business in this state and giving them a cease and desist letter? What other remedies could you have done as it relates to Officer Lands short of the death penalty, revoking their license?
MR. CROUCH:
I object.
BY MR. LONG:
Q I mean, they can't -- they can't work here anymore; can they?
A I -- I do want to answer your question --
Q Yeah.
A \(\quad-\quad\) but \(I\) want to make sure that \(I\) understand it. You're asking me about Mr. Lands or are you asking me about North Atlantic?
Q You said you found Mr. Lands - -
A You said, what other remedy did you have with respect to Mr. Lands.
Q When you found Lands --
A Yeah. Right.
Q -- what other remedy could you have done?
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Long, excuse me. I'm going to ask
```

both attorneys and the witness to tone down the animosity just a little.

MR. LONG:
Noted.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Thank you.
BY MR. LONG:
Q What other remedies could you have done?
A Okay. I'm back to trying to make sure I understand the question so I can answer it. What other remedy with respect to Mr. Lands --

Q Correct.
A -- on post that day? With respect to Mr. Lands, it's the licensee's responsibility to recertify the guard. So the action goes against the licensee.

Q You could have ordered him off the property as the Director; couldn't you have?

A That's a slippery slope. I don't -- I can't necessarily order him off the property.

Q Could you have contacted North Atlantic and had them order --

A The facility that was under security by North Atlantic at that time is one of the contractually mandated sites for an armed guard.

```
Q Right.
A Because of the issues with the protection of life and property at that site, the prudent thing for me to do would not necessarily have been to order the guard immediately off the post, which is what I did do in that instance.
Q Okay. Did you know that the provisions of the contract allow the customer to order the guard off the property if they want to?
A I'm certain it does.
Q Okay. And so if the state, who was the customer in this situation, wanted him off the property, they could have done so by their
```

```
contract; isn't that right?
```

contract; isn't that right?
A I'm sure they could have.
Q North Atlantic could have --
A I haven't seen their contract.
Q North Atlantic could have --
A They could have, but -- I'm sure they could have.
Q North Atlantic could have replaced him with another guard once they found notice that he was three days late on his refresher training; right?
A They could have. And so the question I

```
had for them in my phone call from Mr. Lands's phone was why, when notified three weeks prior that the certification was going to expire rather than let it lapse, why was he now on post at a state facility under a state contract an unauthorized weapon.

Q You said that he called his employer and asked about his refresher training; right?

A Yeah. He told me that he notified North Atlantic three weeks prior to the expiration of his firearms that he needed to refresh his firearms, and that his instructions from North Atlantic, whomever he spoke with were, don't worry about that, just stand your post.

Q Who did he talk to at North Atlantic?
A I don't know who he spoke to.
Q Did you ask him who he talked to?
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Long, just for the Board and my clarification and the court reporter, are we talking about a statement that Mr . Lands made when we're saying he?

MR. LONG:
Yeah.
MR. BLACHE:

Mr. Lands.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay. Mr. Lands is the person --
MR. BLACHE:
Having a conversation with me on post at the site while armed working for North Atlantic.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay. On August 14th?
MR. BLACHE:
And expressed a concern that he had notified his employer three weeks earlier that he would expire, which would have been ample time if they could get it done the next day on the 15th, it would have been ample time three weeks prior for them to put something in action to get it done, including not send Mr. Lands to the post with an unauthorized weapon. BY MR. LONG:

Q Right. So you just got through saying that he contacted his employer, he told them that he needed training, and the employer told him don't worry about it.

A That's what he told me when I inspected.
Q But we know now that he had two
employers; don't we?
A I think that's irrelevant. He was in a North Atlantic uniform on a North Atlantic post under North Atlantic's contract.

Q It's relevant that Ritchie Rivers told him, don't worry about it, and then snitched him out to you so that you could bust this company.

A That's not what Mr. Lands told me. Mr.
Lands told me when he called the office from his phone --

MR. LONG:
I'm going to object.
A -- that he notified North Atlantic.
MR. LONG:
Mr. Rivers is going to tell us and
testify what he said.
A (Inaudible).
(MULTIPLE SPEAKERS SPEAKING)
MR. CROUCH:
Wait. Wait. Wait. You've got this man under cross examination and you're going to object to the answer that he just gave you?

MR. LONG:
As nonresponsive, yes.
MR. CROUCH:

Proper objection is to answer a responsive.

MR. LONG:

I'm objecting to his response as nonresponsive. I want to know.

BY MR. LONG:
Q YOu --

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Wait. Stop. I'm going to ask the Board to disregard the previous question and the previous answer regarding what Mr. Rivers may or may not have said because he's here and he can answer those questions on direct or cross examination.

However -- because even for me, it's getting extremely convoluted in terms of the chronology of who talked to who over the phone or in person at the site or the day before. I'm going to ask you in your question and in your answer to reference -MR. LONG:

Names.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
-- proper names and not pronouns; he said, called, however you want to do it to
```

make sure we understand who was speaking,
whether on the phone or in person, about which thing.
MR. CROUCH :
I've been lost in the pronouns too.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Thank you.
MR. LONG:
I think that's a good idea.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Mr. Rivers notified you that Lands was out of certification. When did he notify you?
A I believe it was on the -- I believe it was on the 13 th.
Q Was that a Monday or do you know?
A I don't remember.
Q I believe August 14th fell on a Tuesday?
A Yeah. I don't remember exactly. I'd have to look at a calendar. Let's see, I believe it was the 13 th.
Q Can you look up on Rivers Security and see if Joshua Lands was standing an armed post while working for them --
A I wouldn't --
Q -- on your information?

```
```

A I wouldn't have that type of information.
Q Do you --
A I don't have any information that tells me where every guard is posted in the State of Louisiana.
Q Okay. All right. Had you ever previously cited someone for not having a registered weapon?
A North Atlantic.
Q Had you ever cited anybody else in your duties as the Director for having an unregistered weapon?
A Unregistered, yes. I took a company license from a company last -- earlier of this -last year, late last year.
Q What was the name of that company?
A Delta Tactical.
Q Delta Tactical. And what was the violation?
A Same violation.
Q What is the violation? Say it.
A Not registered -- not certified with a weapon, and in some cases, not registered or certified.
Q Okay.

```

A And no classroom training.
Q Okay. What were the facts on that?
A They were posting guards at private and public places, parking lots, retail establishments, bars in and about the LSU area, and the individuals that they were posting were carrying weapons that were, by definition, the right type; but by certification and registration, which they did not have, unauthorized, they were not authorized to be there.

So they were cited with Chapter 601 of Title 46, Part LIX, which is the same exact title that's cited in the revocation of North Atlantic. MR. LONG:

Excuse me. The Board -- I'm sorry. I was handed this this morning. I have not had an opportunity to review it. It's the defendant -- the State has given me these documents this morning. MR. CROUCH:

Madam Chairman, while he's reviewing that, could we take a bathroom break, please? CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Yes, we can. Is that okay with everyone? HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
```

Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
We are going off the record again for a -- we're going to have a 10-minute break here. Will that give you enough time?
While we're breaking for a bathroom break, why don't we take a break for -- a 20-minute break and you guys can have lunch or whatever you guys would like to do?
MR. LONG:
Okay. What time will we reconvene, Madam Chairman?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
What time is it now? It's 12:15. It's 12:15.
MR. LONG:
How about 12 -- what time would be good for you?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
We could be back for 12:45.
MR. LONG:
Okay. Thank you.
(A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN THE
PROCEEDINGS.)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

```

The Board of Louisiana Board of Private Security Examiners is now in session. MR. CROUCH:

We have a quorum. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

I have a question before we proceed. I guess this is going to be to Madam Referee. How much longer do we think this is going to -- the cross examinations or the examinations are going to take? Some of the Board members are going to have to leave. Do we think we can be finished around 2:00? MR. LONG:

Yes.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Crouch and Mr. Long, my understanding is we have Board members that would like to or have to get out of here by two, and you're going to be in danger of not having a majority of the vote on this license today. We're already at the point where everything after this is going to have to be moved to the December meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Right.

MR. CROUCH:

That is correct.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
So if we could be as expedient as
possible so that you can get a vote today?
MR. CROUCH:
I --

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

We'd really appreciate it.
MR. CROUCH:
I don't anticipate having to put Fabian
back on. But \(I, ~ o f ~ c o u r s e, ~ w i l l ~ w a n t ~ t o ~ c r o s s ~\) examine his witness.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:

And I -- I'm a lawyer. I can't guarantee how long that's going to take. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

I make a motion for the Board's purposes, I make a motion that we move everything else on the agenda until our December meeting. Do I get a second?

MR. ROBINSON:
Second.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
It's been moved and seconded. Everything will be moved to the December agenda. MR. CROUCH:

And I say this before we go back on the record, I've seen it many times over the years, and \(I\) know nobody wants to do this, including me, but you can always leave a hearing open and conclude it at another time. I've had Civil Service meetings lay over for a year before we got back to concluding it. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

If it gets to that point, Ron, we may have to do that. If some of the Board members have to leave and we do not have a quorum, then we'll have to look at that option. MR. CROUCH:

I got it.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
They're trying to stay.
MR. CROUCH:
I realize these people are from out of state and I appreciate that, Madam Chairman. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Some of our Board members have traveled
```

all the way from Alexandria.
MR. CROUCH:
I understand. I do understand.
MR. LONG:
Madam Chairwoman, are the other members
going to -- should we wait on other members or
not?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
We'll just --
MS. FINCHUM:
He took a phone call.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Misty, you want to --
MS. FINCHUM:
Durell took a call.
MR. CROUCH:
Oh, yeah. Before we go on the record,
let's get everybody.
(A BRIEF RECESS WAS TAKEN IN THE
PROCEEDINGS.)
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. We're back in session, guys.
We're back on the record.
MR. LONG:
All right. Thank you, your Honor.

```

BY MR. LONG:
Q Mr. Blache, you had talked about Delta Tactical being revoked because they had some issues with their weapons; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And I would refer to the Board to The Advocate April 9, 2018 article that quoted you as saying, that the guards were acting like cops; that they had handcuffed a customer and they were roughing him up and shining a light in his face.

A Yeah, that's in reference to a particular observation that was made on the day of -- one of the two days of inspection.

Q You would agree that that kind of activity is not what we're really talking about in the North Atlantic case; right? It's different?

A We're not talking about that.
Q Right. Different. Okay. You revoked my client's license on August 14th, 2018. I would defer to, I believe, Page 1 of the document, the revocation?

A Uh-huh.
Q If you look at Page 88, it gives you Revised Statute 37:3289. I'd ask if you could read that and identify it? Just read it to yourself and
```

    1 identify it.
    ```
```

    Is that the statute that you're familiar
    with?
A Yes.
MR. LONG:
All right. I would ask that Page 88 be
entered into the record as causes for
non-issuance, suspension, revocation, or
restrictions.
MR. CROUCH:
Eighty-eight?
MR. LONG:
Yeah, Number 88, please.
BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. Turning your attention to C,
the concurrence requirement before a license can be
revoked.
A Uh-huh.
Q It requires four concurring votes of the Board before you can revoke a license. Did you get four concurring votes before you revoked North Atlantic's license?
A No.
Q What authority did you rely upon to unilaterally revoke my client's license without a

```
meeting of the Board?
A Chapter 601 of Part LIX of Title 46 of the rules.

Q Look at Page 2 in the packet and you cited that in your letter of revocation; is that correct?

A Correct.

Q Read that to the Board, please.

A Page 2, yes, before revoking or suspending a license or registration card or imposing fines or costs over \(\$ 500\), the Board will afford the applicant an opportunity for a hearing after reasonable notice of not less than 15 days, except in the case of failure to maintain the required insurance or when a registrant is found carrying an unauthorized weapon while performing the duties of a security officer.

Q Does anywhere in 601a say that it dispenses with the concurrence requirement that the Board must vote at least four votes to revoke a license?

What that does is say, you don't get a hearing in the case of an unauthorized weapon. It doesn't say you dispense with the voting requirement of the Board; does it?

A It says that you don't get a hearing before the action is taken.

Q Correct. But you can have a special meeting and call the Board in, tell them what you found out, and they can file a revocation with four concurrent votes; correct?

A That is potentially an option based upon certain variables pursuant to the statute.

Q Show me in the law where it says that you can unilaterally act without the vote of the Board.

A It says that \(I\) am the Chief Administrative Officer of the Board and that in Chapter 601, a revocation or suspension for two specific purposes can be issued prior to a hearing.

Q Right, prior to a hearing, but not prior to a vote. The voting concurrence is found on Page 88 where it says the Board gets to hear what you have and they have to vote to revoke a license. They revoke licenses. You don't revoke licenses. You investigate. You give your evidence to the Board. They vote.

A If you look at -- and if you look at Chapter 601, it also mentions that they can request a hearing in writing that comes after the action.

Q Again, the hearing is --

MR. CROUCH:
Wait. Wait. Wait. I need to object. I don't want to delay this. I'm not trying to be an instructionist, but I would ask counsel to please ask a question rather than testifying. It's okay to phrase his testimony as a question, but he phrases it as a statement. And I would object to that form of questioning.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Right.
MR. LONG:
I'll rephrase it to a form of a question. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Make your questions interrogatory.
MR. LONG:
Right.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Make your statements.
BY MR. LONG:
Q True or false, four concurring votes of the Board shall be required for the revocation of any license, period? That's the law; right?

A That's what it says.
Q It doesn't say Fabian Blache gets to
unilaterally suspend or revoke people's licenses without four votes of the Board; isn't that right?

A That's what C says.
Q Okay. And you admit that you did not have four votes from the Board to revoke North Atlantic's license; isn't that right?

A Because I didn't revoke the license pursuant to 3289 .

Q Did you revoke their license?
A Yes, pursuant to Chapter 601 of the rules.

Q 601. 601a on Page 2 --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- says before revoking or suspending a license or imposing fines, the Board will afford the applicant an opportunity for a hearing, except in two circumstances. That's the hearing requirement. That's not the concurrence requirement.

The concurrence requirement is found on Page 88 and says that this Board that was appointed by the Governor of Louisiana, they decide who gets revoked. You disagree with that?

A I'm not disagreeing with anything.
Q Do you believe that 37:3289C is still
```

valid Louisiana law?

```

A It's in our statute, yes.
Q Right. And you didn't get the permission of the Board; you didn't get the votes of the Board as required by law before you acted against North Atlantic; did you?

A The purpose of the statute and the rule is not to impede the regulation of this industry. The purpose of the statute in the rule is to allow for the regulation of the industry. And that is why it is the only instance, those two, in which a license can be suspended or revoked without having to necessarily convene the Board.

The Board convenes after a request for a hearing is granted. And then they make the terminal decision as to whether or not the suspension or revocation is sustained.

Q Where is that in the law? I just read you the applicable law. The Board has it in front of them.

Where are you pulling that out of?
A From Chapter 6.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Ron?
MR. CROUCH:

I'm sorry.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Can you take a look at this since we're talking about this?

MR. CROUCH:
I'm sorry. Tell me what page.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Well, it's in the rules.
BY MR. LONG:
Q As you revoked --
MR. CROUCH:
Tell me what section.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
46

MR. CROUCH:
Just a second.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Excuse me Mr. Long and Mr. Crouch, the
Board Chairman has asked me to look at Section
103, Title 46 Part LIX, Section \(103 H\) regarding
the duties of the Executive Secretary of the Board.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Right.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

And this is in conjunction with the cross examination?

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Yeah.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Regarding the duties of the Executive Officer of the Private Security Board, which --

MR. LONG:
So the document has -- the document says that the Executive Director has the right to issue a cease and desist order, but it does not say that he may unilaterally revoke a license.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Long, for the purposes of this particular issue, I think you've made your point on the record that there is a difference in your argument between the provisions of the statute, the provisions of the rule, and the witness's application of either in respect to his official duties, but \(I\) think it's been asked and answered that he did -MR. LONG:

I'll move on.
```

    HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
    ```
    HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
    Okay.
    Okay.
BY MR. LONG:
BY MR. LONG:
    Q All right. And you said previously under
    Q All right. And you said previously under
oath that you did not notify the state about the
oath that you did not notify the state about the
revocation; is that correct?
revocation; is that correct?
    A The state contacted us when the site
    A The state contacted us when the site
started notifying them that North Atlantic was no
started notifying them that North Atlantic was no
longer going to be able to provide security
longer going to be able to provide security
services for --
services for --
    HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
    HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
                            Mr. Long, just for clarification, are we
                            Mr. Long, just for clarification, are we
    talking about DCFS when you say the state?
    talking about DCFS when you say the state?
    MR. LONG:
    MR. LONG:
        We're talking about the State of
        We're talking about the State of
    Louisiana has a contract with North
    Louisiana has a contract with North
    Atlantic -- well, they did up until
    Atlantic -- well, they did up until
    August 31st.
    August 31st.
    HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
    HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
        Okay.
        Okay.
        MR. LONG:
        MR. LONG:
            One of those buildings was the site that
            One of those buildings was the site that
        he inspected.
        he inspected.
        HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
        HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
        Which is the DCFS building?
```

        Which is the DCFS building?
    ```

MR. LONG:
Right.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay.
MR. LONG:
But there's 19 other buildings that they were providing security for.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay.
BY MR. LONG:
Q And now true or false, okay, did you notify the State of Louisiana that North Atlantic's license, you issued a cease and desist and that you would revoke their license?

A When they contacted us, yes, I did notify them.

Q So your sworn testimony is they called you, and then you told them what happened?

A We issued the \(C\) and \(D\) and then we began dispersing what are known as notices of nonuse.

Q What is that?
A It's a notice that goes to someone who is using the services of a company who is either suspended or revoked or not licensed in the first place.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1 & Q And how does that look? That looks a lot \\
\hline 2 & like Page 1 and Page 2; correct? Cease and desist \\
\hline 3 & order -- \\
\hline 4 & A No, it's actually -- \\
\hline 5 & Q -- Page 1 and Page 2, notice of \\
\hline 6 & revocation? \\
\hline 7 & A Actually, it's a different document that \\
\hline 8 & simply notifies the user of the services that the \\
\hline 9 & company in question was either not licensed or has \\
\hline 10 & been revoked or suspended and they have a 72-hour \\
\hline 11 & span of time in which to cease doing business at \\
\hline 12 & the site so that the consumer of the product can \\
\hline 13 & then have an opportunity to find another provider. \\
\hline 14 & Q So you did tell the State of Louisiana \\
\hline 15 & that you had revoked North Atlantic's license; \\
\hline 16 & right? \\
\hline 17 & A There are sites that North Atlantic had \\
\hline 18 & that are other than the State of Louisiana sites. \\
\hline 19 & They have \\
\hline 20 & Q You don't have authority other than \\
\hline 21 & Louisiana; do you? \\
\hline 22 & A I have authority over across the entire \\
\hline 23 & state and all parishes. \\
\hline 24 & Q Right. But you told the State of \\
\hline 25 & Louisiana that their license to operate in \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Louisiana had been revoked; correct?
A When the State of Louisiana contacted the -- the Procurement Office contacted us because they had become aware that North Atlantic's license had been issued a C and D and --

Q How would they become aware of that?
A Because the sites like Terrebonne Parish Courthouse or whatever the sites were were receiving the notices of nonuse from us.

Q Okay.
A And they contacted the state who they got the contract through to find out what their next steps were in ensuring that they still had continuous coverage at their sites.

Q Okay. So you sent a notice of nonuse to the state?

A Yes, we were sending the notices of nonuse to different entities that use the services, including local parish clients. They in turn contacted State Procurement. State Procurement reached out to us to find out what the status was with the license.

MR. LONG:
All right. One moment while I confer?
A Uh-huh.

MR. LONG:
Thank you. Please answer any questions
Mr. Crouch may have for you.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Just a few questions --
A Sure.
Q -- on Section 105 --
A Yes.
Q -- H, The Board shall appoint an
Executive Secretary to serve as Chief
Administrative Officer. Executive Secretary serves the players of the Board, blah, blah, blah, acts as
the Board's recording correspondence these
articulated duties or any other duties as directed by --

MR. LONG:
Objection. Is there any question here?
MR. CROUCH:
Yeah, there is. Yeah.
MR. LONG:
Okay.
BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Has the Board ever in your experience here restricted your duties to say, oh, no, no, no, you can't do that; you've got to call us and get
```

with members before you do this?
A No.
Q Okay. Is it pretty clear to your
employer that that's what you do?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Your authority to revoke that you
see in 601 --
A Yes.
Q -- has that ever been used before?
A Yes.
Q Did the Board as a result of that
utilization ever say, stop doing that?
A No.
Q So you operate at the direction, approval
of your boss, the Board?
A Yes.
Q You're the point of the spear, so to
speak?
A Yes.
MR. CROUCH:
No further questions.
MR. LONG:
Subject to calling in my Case in Chief,
your Honor, I have no further questions for
this witness.

```

I would ask that the sequestration order remain in effect.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
For the other witnesses.
MR. LONG:
For this witness here.
MR. CROUCH:
He's not sequestered. He's a --
MR. LONG:
Oh, he's the case agent. I withdraw my objection.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Are we ready for Mr. Rivers now?
MR. LONG:
It's still his case, your Honor.
MR. CROUCH:
No, we rested.
MR. LONG:
Okay. Well, then we'll call Mr. Rivers. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay. When Mr. Rivers comes in, let's make sure on the record that we've declared that he's a member of this Board, he's been present for the first half of this testimony prior to him being excluded; that he has in
his possession and has seen the exhibits and
is aware of all of the testimony prior to his sequestration.

MR. LONG:
Yes.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay. And that although he is a member of this Board, he's not voting on this particular license.

MR. LONG:

Yes.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

We all understand that?
MR. LONG:
Yes.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay. Bring him in. He's already been sworn.

MR. CROUCH:
Board Members, you've deferred everything that's on today's agenda, but we still have to have that brief executive session.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Executive session.
MR. CROUCH:

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
So noted.
MR. CROUCH:
It won't take long. Of course, that's coming from a lawyer.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
That's what you said yesterday. CROSS EXAMINATION OF RITCHIE RIVERS BY MR. LONG:

Q Please give your name and address for the record.

A Ritchie Rivers, 20088 Highway 16, Amite, Louisiana 70422 .

Q And what is your occupation?
A I own Rivers Security.
Q How long have you had Rivers Security?
A Approximately, 20 years.
Q All right. Directing your attention to -- I'm going to give you the same document that I gave the previous witness. And I want to direct your attention to a firearms certification form, which is --

A Let me grab my glasses.
Q Yes, sir. Go ahead. Let me direct your
```

attention to Page 7 of the packet, a firearms
training verification form of a Joshua Lands.
Joshua Lands was an employee of Rivers Security at
the time on August 11th, 2017; correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q At the time that of August 14th, the time
of the violation here, he was also an employee of
Rivers Security; correct?
A He worked part time for us, correct.
Q He was an employee; correct?
A Yes, sir, part time.
Q So you had records of his weapons
certification; correct?
A Yes.
MR. CROUCH:
Wait. Wait. Wait. One moment. Has he
been declared a hostile witness? You're cross
examining him. And if he's a hostile witness,
you can cross examine. Is that what you're
doing, Joe?
MR. LONG:
Well, obviously, I will ask the Hearing
Officer to allow me to lead him as a hostile
witness as he is a confidential informant for
the Board's reason why they fined and revoked

```
my client's license.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay.
MR. LONG:
He is aligned with an adverse party. He is a hostile witness.

MR. CROUCH:
I gotcha.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
For this hearing, Mr. Rivers is a hostile witness.

BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. And so you had his firearms certification records; correct?

A We had them in our office, correct.
Q And as a employer of a security company, you have a duty to make sure, if he's on an armed post, that he is certified with that weapon; correct?

A That's correct.
Q Was he on an armed post when he worked for you part time?

A Sometimes he was. Sometimes he wasn't.
Q On August 14th of 2018, was he working an armed post for you?
```

A I don't know. I couldn't answer that question without looking at our schedule.
Q How many employees did you have?
A We have a couple of hundred employees.
Q Okay. How many in your staff, not guards?
A Eight to ten.
Q Eight to ten. So you knew that Mr. Lands was out of certification and he was your employee; correct?
A I knew Mr. Lands's certification was expiring.
Q Right.
A And I know we did not work him after it was expired in an armed position.
Q Okay. So if August 14th fell on a Tuesday; correct?
A I'm not sure.
Q All right. We'll just represent to you that it was on a Tuesday, August 14th, 2018.
A Okay.
Q And August 11th was the last day he was certified with his weapon; right, from refresher training?
A According to this, he trained on --

```
```

Q Right. So if we back off the 13th, the 12th, and 11th, that would have been on a weekend; right?
A Yes.
Q Your employees don't work on the weekends; do they?
A We have employees who work on weekends.
Q Do you know if Lands was working on the weekend?
A I don't know.
Q So on August 10th, which was a Friday, you made no effort to get his weapons certification up to date; did you?
A No, he wasn't expired if he was working for us.
Q How long does it take to get scheduled for refresher training?
A I have an in-house firearms instructor. It doesn't take very long.
Q So within a day or two, you can get them certified?
A I can get it done the same day, if need be.
Q Okay. But on August 10th, the day before he expired, you made no effort to get him

```
```

certified; did you?
A I had no reason to.
Q He was an armed guard for you on
August 11th, 2017; right?
A On August 11th?
Q Yeah.
A I'm not sure if he worked or not.
Q But I'm saying --
A He was working for our company.
Q On 2017, you sent him to go get firearms
training; right?
A Yes.
Q So, obviously, he was going to work an
armed post; right?
A Yes, sir. We -- that's why we certified
him, to work an armed post.
Q So on August 10th, he's still your
employee and you --
A August 10th of '17?
Q Of '18.
A Uh-huh.
Q That's 364 days after he got his
training.
A That's correct.
Q Did you contact your instructor to get

```
him refresher training?
MR. CROUCH:
Let me object, your Honor. This line of questioning has nothing to do with whether or not the employee, that his certification resulted in this revocation was working for Mr. Rivers. He was not on that day. He was working for the company whose license is revoked.

So this testimony about whether or not Mr. Rivers got his certification up or not and before all of this happened is irrelevant. MR. LONG:

Okay. It goes to bias, Judge. It goes to this witness's bias against North Atlantic, that he had the same employee, he had the same duty to get him refresher training. He did nothing, and then he told the Director that Mr. Lands was uncertified.

And he is the reason we are here today. So his motive is relevant.

MR. CROUCH:
I --

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
I'm going to sustain Mr. Crouch's
```

objection.
Mr. Long, I'm going to ask you to, with the questions you already have on the record, move on, if where you're going is whose responsibility is it to make sure the certification is updated. That's where we're headed.
MR. CROUCH:
And one final comment, your Honor. If his purpose of the testimony is to show bias, lay the foundation for that biased testimony, your Honor.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Mr. Rivers, did you have the security contract for any of these state buildings before North Atlantic took over the contracts?
A I had several state contracts.
Q With the same buildings that North
Atlantic had taken?
A Possibly some of them. I mean, I don't go over them every day.
Q Right. So they were the low bidder and they had outbid you for this business; isn't that right?
A I think the contract that you're talking

```
about, we had served our three years there. So we didn't have the opportunity to bid that. We were out.

Q Why did you not have an opportunity to bid it?

A There was a bid placed earlier, I think, with statewide contracts where the agency did not have to go out for rebid. It was a contract that covered different state agencies. And that's the contract that he had.

Q Were you precluded from issuing a bid on the statewide contract?

A I didn't bid that contract. No, I didn't.

Q No, you -- right. But you weren't precluded from it; were you?

A I could have if I'd like, but I did not.
Q Correct. But you had lost business to North Atlantic; correct?

A No. No, sir, I hadn't. I lost business because the end of my three years was up with the contract.

Q Okay. Tell me about when you met with Mr. Blache and told him about this guard being out of certification.
```

A It was a phone call. My supervisor called and said that he said received a call for Mr. Lands, who said he's contacted North Atlantic and told him his firearms training was expiring.
Q You're telling me you talked to a guy who talked to Mr. Lands?
A Yeah, that's --
Q Third --
A -- exactly --
Q Third-hand hearsay?
A My supervisor received a call from Mr. Lands.
Q Who is your supervisor?
A Thor Plumee.
Q Spell it please.
A $\quad T-h-o-r ~ P-l-u-m-e-e$.
Q All right. And you're saying that Mr. Plumee relayed a conversation that --
A He received a call from Mr. Lands --
Q Right.
A -- who stated that his firearms training was going to be expiring.
Q When was that call?
A I don't recall the date, some time before his training expired.

```
```

Q Was it three weeks before the training expired?
A I wouldn't think it was that long. I'd say a week or so.
Q Who pays --
A I'm not sure.
Q Who pays for the firearms training?
A We pay up front for our guards.
Q Right. So he calls his supervisor and says, my firearms registration is up?
A And my exact words to my supervisor before he worked an armed post for us, make sure he's trained with a firearm.
Q Okay. So you just said, make sure he's not on an armed post unless he's certified?
A Make sure he's trained for an armed post.
Q Okay. And what would you expect your supervisor to do when a guard calls him up and says, I need refresher training? What do --
A He would look at his dates. He would look at our schedule and see when he works and see if he can get him trained before he worked a post.
Q To your knowledge, did Thor Plumee try to do that?
A I -- from -- from best of my

```
```

recollection, I think he had him scheduled for a class on that Friday.
Q And what happened?
A I think you all trained him before then.
Q Are we talking about August 10th of 2018?
A I'm not sure of the date, but it -- I think you all had him trained on the 15th?
Q Yes.
A What day was that?
Q The 15th was a Wednesday.
A We had him scheduled for a Friday.
Q The next Friday?
A That same week on Friday.
Q Okay. But in the meantime, did you tell Mr. Blache all that information that you knew that he was expired and that you had plans to get him retrained?
A When $I$ received a call, and as a Board member, that a guard has -- he told Mr. Plumee that he called North Atlantic, and they told him to go to work anyway whether he was trained or not, then I think that's my responsibility as a Board member to pick up the phone and call Mr. Blache and give him that information.
Q You don't know if Mr. Lands actually

```
called North Atlantic or not; do you?
A Oh, I couldn't tell you. I can only tell you what he said to my supervisor.

Q You can't tell me that either because you didn't hear what he said to your supervisor; right?

A I trust my supervisor.

Q Right. You trust your supervisor told you what Lands told you that he actually called. But in the end, none of those people except Lands knows the truth; right?

A I think we all know he went to work on Monday and he wasn't trained to have a gun.

Q Right. But now, we know why the Director knew that Lands was three days out of certification.

MR. LONG:

No further questions.

DIRECT EXAMINATION OF RITCHIE RIVERS BY MR. CROUCH:

Q Mr. Rivers, just one question. You are a member of this Board; correct?

A That's correct.

Q And when you discover behavior that you know to be in violation of the law or the rules, don't you have a duty to report that to the
```

Executive Director for investigation?

```
Executive Director for investigation?
    A That's exactly what I just said and
    A That's exactly what I just said and
that's exactly what I done.
that's exactly what I done.
    MR. CROUCH:
    MR. CROUCH:
            Gotcha. No further questions.
            Gotcha. No further questions.
    RE-CROSS EXAMINATION OF RITCHIE RIVERS
    RE-CROSS EXAMINATION OF RITCHIE RIVERS
    BY MR. LONG:
    BY MR. LONG:
    Q And the requirement is that it be in
    Q And the requirement is that it be in
    writing and you sign it so that we can get it. It
    writing and you sign it so that we can get it. It
    can't be anonymous; isn't that right?
    can't be anonymous; isn't that right?
    A I wouldn't say it was anonymous at all.
    A I wouldn't say it was anonymous at all.
    I picked up the phone. He knew exactly who he was
    I picked up the phone. He knew exactly who he was
    talking to.
    talking to.
    Q But the law requires you to --
    Q But the law requires you to --
    A You said no further questions. Okay.
    A You said no further questions. Okay.
Are we back in questions or are we done with
Are we back in questions or are we done with
    questions?
    questions?
    Q No, this is rebuttal. Please sit down.
    Q No, this is rebuttal. Please sit down.
    A Okay.
    A Okay.
    Q Okay.
    Q Okay.
    MR. CROUCH:
    MR. CROUCH:
        It's actually redirect.
        It's actually redirect.
        MR. LONG:
        MR. LONG:
            Yeah, it's redirect. Thank you.
            Yeah, it's redirect. Thank you.
    MR. CROUCH:
```

    MR. CROUCH:
    ```

Okay.
BY MR. LONG:
Q All right. The point is, you're an officer of this Board. You're sworn to uphold these laws. And these laws require you to put your complaint in writing so that we know who our accuser is; right?

A Okay.
Q And you didn't do that; did you?
A As I told you, I called Mr. Blache.
MR. LONG:
Thank you. Nothing further.
MR. CROUCH:
Nothing.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Rivers, I have one question. Is
Mr. Lands still employed part-time by your company?

A Not to my knowledge. I'm -- well, I don't know. I can't answer that question honestly. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay. That's -- I just wanted to know. MR. LONG:

That's it, sir. I would remove any sequestration order on Mr. Rivers and I would
```

have no objection to him attending the rest of
the hearing.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Rivers, you may resume your seat, but
you won't be able to vote as we discussed before.
MR. LONG:
Carli Mateer, please?
DIRECT EXAMINATION OF CARLI MATIER
BY MR. LONG:
Q Ms. Mateer, quickly, could you tell -you were already sworn. Could you tell the Board your name and what you do for a living?
A My name is Carli Mateer. I am the Office Manager at North Atlantic Security.
Q All right. And so you have been
intimately familiar with all these interactions with the Board; correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q All right. And you've heard all the testimony here?
A Correct. Yes, sir.
Q All right. Tell me about the email chain that you got between Mr. Blache's staff and you regarding the names of these other eight guards

```
that they allege were out of certification.
A It was given to -- the first email was given to one of the supervisors, and she actually does -- she's actually in the field in Louisiana. Our company is actually out of Mississippi. So she reached out to me to get the information.

Over the last few months since May, I've asked for guard lists, I've asked for training information. And it's been really hard as far as because we've had these big contracts. And I'm not sure if any of your office staff may have, you know, tried to call with ten plus people trying to get training verification and their request via email.

So when I did that, a lot of times it wouldn't come back in a timely fashion. So that's kind of where this email went. When I sent back to Cassie, our supervisor, it had the email of the information that \(I\) had readily available to give to Mr. Fabian.

Q As far as your understanding, who has the duty to send the updated firearms records to the Board? Is that the -- is that the firearms instructor's duty? Is that your duty? Or is it both of your duties?
```

A It's the firearms instructor.
Q All right. Do they $C C$ you on when the firearms instructors send the certification to the board, do you know that the Board has received that information?
A No.
Q All right. And we're talking about Page 102, which is Revised Statute 37:3284. This is the training of security officers. And you relied on this statute to make sure that your security officers were compliant; right?
MR. CROUCH:
Objection. He's leading.
MR. LONG:
Okay. Well, that question, I'll rephrase
it.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Do you know this statute?
A Not by heart.
Q Okay. Do you have a copy of it at your office?
A Yes.
Q When you have a question about how the requirements for training officers, is this the document you look at?

```

A Yes, sir.
Q All right. Directing your attention to C on Page 102, what is the sanction for failure to complete the required training within the prescribed time period for the officer?

A Failure to complete the required training within the prescribed time period may preclude future consideration for a license for a period of one year.

Q Go to D2 and read that to the Board, please.

A Upon a registrant's completion of any training required, the license instructor shall furnish to the Board a documented training verification form of such completion signed by a licensed instructor within 15 calendar days from the training.

Q Do you find this statute to be frustrating because you don't know when the instructor sends it?

MR. CROUCH:
I object. I object to whether she finds
it frustrating or not. It's a state law.
If she has a question about the law, ask
her attorney. But \(I\) object to her having an
opinion or not about whether a state statute
is frustrating or not.
MR. LONG:
Your Honor, the statute, as it applies
right now --
MR. CROUCH:

Speaks for itself.
MR. LONG:
-- has a huge loophole on it. These owners of businesses don't know when the firearms instructors send the certification to the Board. And it should be addressed and it's relevant to their jobs as Board members. MR. CROUCH:

Your Honor, the mechanism for correcting problems with a statute is not before this Board. It's before the legislature, that pointy building downtown.

We can't resolve that today. The law speaks for itself. The language speaks for itself.

MR. LONG:
I think I've made my point, your Honor. HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Okay. I'm going to sustain Mr. Crouch's
objection in terms of relevance, but I'm also going to provide that for Ms. Mateer's edification that it's probably beyond the scope of her personal knowledge as to our legislature's intent or lack thereof or who goes forward to argue these statutes in front of our legislature; just that she's aware that they exist and they are in her office. MR. LONG:

Right. Offering Page 102 as evidence, Revised Statute 37:3284.

Mr. Crouch, any objection?
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Mr. Crouch, do you object? Do you have an objection as to the statute being offered as an exhibit?

MR. CROUCH:
Certainly not.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
All right.
MR. LONG:
Very good.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Now what happened once you got noticed that these, Mr. Lands, Mr. Sears, and these
so-called eight other security guards were out of refresher training or out of compliance? What steps did you take to inform the Board that -- you know, what was your status?

A I contacted our employees to see where they went to training. A lot of them, my supervisor in Louisiana already knew. So I was able to contact those training facilities and get copies of their training certificates.

Q And then what did you do with those copies?

A I forwarded them to Mr. Blache.
Q What day did you forward those copies?
A On the 14th, the same day that we were issued the cease and desist.

Q All right. Did you receive the cease and desist before or after you sent the copies to him?

A Actually, I was not copied on the original email, so I don't know the time frame.

Q But you know it was the same day?
A Yes, it was the same day.
MR. LONG:
All right. Answer any questions
Mr. Crouch may have.
CROSS EXAMINATION OF CARLI MATEER
```

BY MR. CROUCH:
Q Ma'am, I'm sorry. You have a very soft
voice and I did not hear your name. So could you
tell me what your name is?
A Carli Mateer.
Q Carli. May I call you Carli?
A Yeah.
Q Okay. You have a copy of the statute in
your office; correct?
A Uh-huh.
Q How about the rules?
A I'm sure we do.
Q You sure?
A Uh-huh.
Q Do you ever consult them?
A Usually, we go to the website.
Q Okay. But you do consult them?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Let me ask you something. This
guy, Mr. Lands --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- was he wearing your uniform on the
14th?
A I'm sure he was.
Q So he was working for you?

```

A Yes.
Q He wasn't working for Mr. Rivers. He was working for you; correct?

A For North Atlantic.
Q Yeah. Okay. Those two highlighted sections right there, could you read those for me into the record?

MR. LONG:
What page is that, please?
MR. CROUCH:
It's in the rules?
A It's Title 46 RLIX.
MR. CROUCH:
It's the last section, I think.
MR. BLACHE:
Section 9.
MR. LONG:
Can you cite the statute for me, please?
MR. CROUCH:
Sure.
MR. LONG:
What is it?
MR. BLACHE:
I'll tell you in one second. It is --
MR. LONG:
    I'd like to read it.

MR. BLACHE:
It is Chapter 9, Section 103C.
MR. LONG:
Chapter 9?
MR. BLACHE:
Yes.
MR. LONG:
Revised Statute 9?
MR. CROUCH:
No. No. No, it's the rules.
MR. LONG:
All right.
MR. CROUCH:
It's the Administrative Rules --
MR. LONG:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
-- Section 903 --
MR. BLACHE:
C.

MR. CROUCH:
Yes, it's a chart. There it is right in
front of you. That's it.
MR. LONG:

Okay. Go ahead. Thank you. Yes, sir. BY MR. CROUCH:

Q Read the highlighted section for me into the record.

A Licensee's failure to have registrant in their employ trained within prescribed time period. If registrant is not trained within 14 days after the deadline date, administrative fines accumulate at a daily rate not to exceed \(\$ 500\).

Q Who is the licensee that that regulation is talking about?

A The employer.
Q Correct. So you, as Mr. Lands's employer, is responsible for seeing that his certification is correct?

A Uh-huh.
Q Okay. And the certification was out on the 14 th; is that correct?

A Uh-huh.
Q All right. What are your job duties with the company?

A We actually have four states that we do business in. I do licenses in all four states, 220ish employees. So we keep up with that. I help answer phone calls. I help with human resources.
```

I do a little bit of everything.
Q How long have you been with the company?
A Since November of 2017.
Q Are you the sole person responsible for seeing that all of these employees are properly licensed and that their prior certifications are current?
A Depending on the state, I work with the supervisors. But for the most part, keeping up with information is my responsibility.
Q How about Louisiana?
A For Louisiana, I consult with the supervisors, but the documentation is my responsibility.
Q So the documentation and seeing that these employees are properly certified in their firearms certification is clearly the responsibility of a licensee. And as the representative of the licensee, it falls to you to see to it; is that correct?
A Yes, sir.
MR. CROUCH:
I have no further questions.
BY MR. LONG:
Q Ms. Mateer, you were directed to a

```


A That's how I understand it.
MR. LONG:
No further questions.
MR. CROUCH:
I have no further questions.
MR. LONG:
You may sit down.
Your Honor, at this time, North Atlantic
rest. We would ask for argument only.
MR. CROUCH:
Give me a moment. We have no rebuttal. We're ready for argument.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay. We will have closing arguments. MR. CROUCH:

Members of the Board, Madam Chairman, Referee, a pretty darn famous trial lawyer about 38 years ago told me, as a young lawyer, as a baby lawyer, he said if the facts are against you, argue the law; if the law is against you, argue the facts; and if they're both against you, just make a lot of noise. And I'm afraid that this has come down to the licensee just trying to make a lot of noise.

The undisputed fact is that this
individual, Mr. Lands, on the 14th of August was on a post pursuant to a contract given to the company. And it's the company's responsibility to see that his firearms certification is current. It was not. Those are undisputed facts. And that is the bedrock of the revocation of this license.

Now, all of this stuff about whether it's an authorized weapon or whether it's not an authorized weapon, to accept the argument of Mr. Long is to accept an absurd conclusion. If I send a guard out there who is not certified to carry a firearm, well, that's just a \(\$ 50\) fine. But if he goes out there unauthorized, oh, my gosh, we can revoke the license without an unauthorized firearm. That's an absurd result. The law and the rules have to be read in pari materia.

And there is no question in my mind that if you go out there as an uncertified guard on an armed post, whatever weapon you're carrying is an unauthorized weapon because you're not authorized to carry any weapon on that post.

Consequently, the action taken by Mr. Fabian on your behalf was perfectly
appropriate. And I would point out that there is an incredible difference between whether or not a guy is carrying a 40 block or a 45 cowboy gun is less important than whether or not the guy is certified to carry a gun at all.

I can't imagine companies allowing people as their employees to go out and carry weapons on guard posts that are not pristine in their qualifications and their licensure. The exposure to liability is just enormous, and it keeps -- it would keep me awake at night, but it happens.

I want to reiterate, it is undisputed that Mr. Lands was on duty on behalf of this company and his firearms certification was expired. I don't think you need to know any more than that. Thank you. MR. LONG:

Now you know why we need a hearing. You can't just revoke somebody's license without them having a chance to face their accusers and get the evidence and explain to you that this is not what Mr. Blache tried to represent. This is not a company that is a
bad corporate citizen. This is a company that had two guards uncertified. One of them was three days late and it fell on a Friday. And so Saturday, Sunday, Monday, the 14 th, as soon as my company found out about it, they got him trained up the next day. They pulled the other guard off and he no longer works for the company.

That's what a good corporate citizen does. That's what you guys would do. You realize you can't be perfect. You've got a lot of guards, a lot of moving pieces, and sometimes they fall through. But when they fall through, what does a responsible corporate citizen do? They take responsibility and they fix it.

And that's what we did. We took responsibility. The ones that -- the guards he said weren't certified, we gave them the records. Even though we didn't have them, we went out and got them, sent them to the Board and said, you're not right. These eight guards, they are certified. The two you're talking about, we'll take the hit on that, but we get them fixed or we'll take them off the
post. And that's what we did.
But what happened here? Did you guys get a chance to hear the facts of the case before the revocation occurred? No, you didn't. He filed it the same day. He did the investigation. He contacted us. He gave erroneous information to our company and then he proposed a \(\$ 9,500\) fine based on all those guards that he said weren't certified that were certified.

The two that were not certified, we'll take the hit on it. But now, he's trying to torture the language of the state statutes and say that an unauthorized any weapon is any weapon that you don't have registration on. No. Words mean what they mean. And right here, it says, if you're not registered, it's a \(\$ 50\)-dollar fine. That's not grounds for revocation. All right.

North Atlantic is dead in Louisiana. All right. We lost a \(\$ 2\) million contract with the state because they filed a notice of revocation without talking to you first and without getting your permission to revoke the license. This was not an emergency situation.

He could have ordered us to pull the guard off the site, noticed a hearing, let us come in and explain our case just like we had today, and then you guys can sit as a jury and you can say, was it reasonable what they did, do they deserve a penalty. Yeah, we deserve a penalty, but we don't deserve revocation for sure.

Imagine being in our shoes. One guard is three days late and they take your company away. That's the scariest thing I ever heard, and that's the power of the state. You all are on this Board because of your expertise as security professionals. You know what's fair and what's not fair.

To torture the language that the Director has done here, to say that a man who is out of refresher training is going to cost you your company and all your contracts in the state of Louisiana, the punishment does not fit the crime. You've heard the facts. I don't need to belabor them. You know how the Director found out about this man. We're still at fault. We take responsibility. He was three days late on his certification.

But why? Why are we picking on Lands here? Because we had a \(\$ 2\) million contract with the state covering 20 buildings. My client is from Mississippi. He came in here and took business away from other companies, and they didn't like it. And now, he's out of business in Louisiana. Is that fair on the evidence that you heard?

Please. This was an illegal revocation. The law says he has to have four votes before he can revoke a license. I don't know what's been going on before, but it's not the law. Okay. Don't justify what you've done before because no one ever called it to your attention.

You all don't have a full-time lawyer to educate you on the statute. You're relying on the Director's expertise to do that for you. His reading of the law is wrong.

The plain reading of the law says, you've got to have a Board meeting before you can revoke anybody. You can dispense with the hearing requirement when it's an egregious act. But his definition of an egregious act is when you're three days late on your
refresher training, it's like carrying an unauthorized weapon, even though our client was certified with a 38 caliber. He missed his refresher training.

It's undisputed that a 38 caliber is an authorized weapon. His reading, that is, Mr. Blache's reading is incorrect. An unauthorized weapon is what? It's a machine gun, it's a flame thrower, it's a hand grenade, it's a knife. It's a weapon that the Board does not authorize a guard to use. It's not because he's three days late on the refresher training.

We urge the Board to use your common sense and your fairness to all parties that come before the Board and rescind this revocation, fine North Atlantic a reasonable amount of money, what you think is reasonable under the facts that you have heard today after we had our opportunity to be heard. We thank all of you for your time. MR. CROUCH:

One very brief comment I would point out to you is that Section 601 of the rules where licenses can be revoked in advance of a
hearing is coupled with insurance. If your insurance lapses and if there's unauthorized use of a weapon or carrying of a weapon, those are equally egregious acts. I wonder why. I wonder why.

I wonder if the insurance company knew that you sent a guard out there armed and his certification had lapsed and there is a problem, do you think the insurance company is going to go -MR. LONG:

Excuse me, your Honor. I apologize, your Honor, but this was beyond the scope of my argument. It was beyond the scope of the evidence.

He's bringing up things outside the evidence and outside of an argument. And fairness requires me to respond to this if you're going to let him talk about it.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay. Mr. Crouch, I'm going to cut the closing arguments off.

MR. CROUCH:
As of right now?
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

Yes.
MR. CROUCH:

10/4.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:

And in -- with the indulgence of Madam Chairperson, I'm going to ask you, Mr. Long, before you leave the room today to go through with the court reporter your exhibits and I'm going to give you the same request that \(I\) gave Mr. Crouch, go through and redact these social security numbers off of these forms. And on your email, if you would take off Ms. Mateer's identifying information, her phone number, and her email and things to preserve your -- to preserve her privacy and whoever your record goes to.

MR. LONG:
Well, I'll get her consent to waive it. I'll do that for you.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Well, I'll give you ten days to do that. Just make sure the ones you want to introduce, the court reporter has identified -MR. LONG :
Yes, ma'am.

HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
-- and you redact the socials?
MR. LONG:
We'll do it.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Okay.
MR. CROUCH:
Yeah, let's just exchange documents
before the end of today.
MR. LONG:
Yes, sir. I'll get with you.
MR. CROUCH:
Okay. I believe that concludes the hearing.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
HEARING OFFICER MURRAY:
Yes?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Board Members, I don't know if you have any questions about what you've heard today or if you're ready to proceed in voting on this revocation? All in favor of voting on the revocation today, please let us know by raise of hands or roll call and let us know or would
you like to continue this to get more
information or to think in terms of what you've heard today? You've heard an awful lot of information today.

So my question to this Board is, shall we proceed in voting today? I need a motion to -- I'll make a motion whether we proceed to vote today. No -- anybody willing to proceed to vote today? I would take that as -MR. PELLEGRIN:

I personally would like an opportunity to discuss it amongst the Board.

CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay. Well, then we'll -MR. PELLEGRIN:

Just the Board members.
MR. LONG:
Your Honor, \(I\) would ask, if I may, a lot of information was here, \(I\) would ask that we come back at a reasonable time to get the Board's ruling, give you an opportunity to meet in executive session to discuss the evidence, to discuss the case, what a fair penalty would be, if any. I don't think it's fair for \(y^{\prime}\) all just to have to do it off the
```

top of your head right now. There's a lot of evidence here. They would never make a jury rule right off the top of their heads. They allow the jury to get together and confer. CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you, Mr. Long.
MR. LONG:
That's what we would like as well.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Thank you, Mr. Long. MS . LANDRY:
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Well, $I$ think we're all in agreement. May I have a continuance? We make a motion that we continue this hearing, that we take the information that you've provided to us under advisement and we will get back to you. MR. LONG:
Thank you, Judge.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Do I get a --
MR. WILLIAMS:
I'll second.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

```

There you go. It's been first and it's been seconded. We're going to continue this matter. We will get back with you with the date and time that we will review this and let you know the date and time that you need to respond to us.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Okay.
MR. LONG:

Are we excused, your Honor?
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Yes, sir, you are.
MR. LONG:

Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:
Meeting is adjourned. And I -- wait. I make a motion that we go into executive session.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Second.
CHAIRWOMAN PIERRE:

Second. It's been moved and seconded and we'll go into executive session.
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