STATE OF WISCONSIN

۲

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *	: *
	*
JEANNE DUPUIS,	*
	*
Appellant,	*
	* RULING ON ISSUE
v `.	* FOR HEARING
	*
Secretary, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH	*
AND SOCIAL SERVICES	*
	*
Respondent.	*
	*
Case No. 90-0219-PC	*
	*
* * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* *

This matter is before the commission to resolve a dispute between the parties concerning the proper statement of issues for hearing. Appellant proposes the following statement of issue:

Whether appellant was wrongfully denied her right to restoration and/or reinstatement.

Respondent proposes this statement of issue:

1. Whether or not respondent's failure to restore appellant at Wisconsin Resource Center was an illegal action or an abuse of discretion.

2. Whether respondent's failure to reinstate appellant at Wisconsin Resource Center was an illegal action or an abuse of discretion.

In support of her statement of the issues, appellant contends as follows:

By framing the issue in terms of Dupuis' right to restoration or reinstatement only at the WRC, DHSS implies that Dupuis' rights are limited to to that institution. The language of the administrative rules does not establish such a limitation.

Dupuis' right to restoration or reinstatement is not limited to a position at the WRC. Dupuis contends that either the DHSS, or the Department of Corrections, or both, had the mandatory obliga-

DuPuis v. DHSS Case No. 90-0219-PC Page 2

> tion to restore her to a position as a Nurse Clinician III or to any other classification for which she was eligible. However, in the unlikely event that she does not prevail on the issue that she had restoration rights, she also contends that she had reinstatement rights to any Nurse Clinician III position, or to any other classification for which she was eligible, at the DHSS, or the Department of Corrections, or both, and that those agencies acted illegally in refusing to reinstate her.

> > * * *

In this case, there has been no dispute that the WRC did, in fact, have a vacant nurse clinician position at the time Dupuis sought to return to the WRC. However, Dupuis' restoration rights theoretically went beyond the specific institution of the WRC; until the facts are presented at hearing, it is premature to excessively limit the statement of the issue.

In support of its statement of the issue, respondent contends as follows:

As was indicated at the time of the prehearing conference, the Appellant was only considered for reinstatement at the Wisconsin Resource Center since that is where she inquired regarding reemployment.

In the Commission's opinion, it is inappropriate to frame the issue in a way that might in effect resolve the contentions appellant is seeking to raise in advance of the hearing and before the parties have an opportunity to present evidence¹. In so concluding, the commission is expressing no opinion on whether appellant had any rights that went beyond WRC, or whether any request or inquiry regarding reinstatement might be, or should have been interpreted by respondent as, running to other positions outside WRC. Rather, the decision to utilize appellant's statement of the issue is based on the intent of not prematurely curtailing any of appellant's theories that underlie her appeal.

¹The conference report, dated April 29, 1991, does not reflect any indication that WRC was the only place where appellant inquired regarding reinstatement.

DuPuis v. DHSS Case No. 90-0219-PC Page 3

ς.

,

ORDER

The following issue is established for hearing:

Whether appellant was wrongfully denied her right to restoration and/or reinstatement.

, 1991 Dated:__ uli 25 STATE PERSONNEL COMMISSION lin LAURIE R. MCCALLUM, Chairperson AJT/gdt/2 DONALD R. MURPH one

GERALD F. HODDINOTT, Commissioner