

WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF REGULATION & LICENSING



Wisconsin Department of Regulation & Licensing Access to the Public Records of the Reports of Decisions

This Reports of Decisions document was retrieved from the Wisconsin Department of Regulation & Licensing website. These records are open to public view under Wisconsin's Open Records law, sections 19.31-19.39 Wisconsin Statutes.

Please read this agreement prior to viewing the Decision:

- The Reports of Decisions is designed to contain copies of all orders issued by credentialing authorities within the Department of Regulation and Licensing from November, 1998 to the present. In addition, many but not all orders for the time period between 1977 and November, 1998 are posted. Not all orders issued by a credentialing authority constitute a formal disciplinary action.
- Reports of Decisions contains information as it exists at a specific point in time in the Department of Regulation and Licensing data base. Because this data base changes constantly, the Department is not responsible for subsequent entries that update, correct or delete data. The Department is not responsible for notifying prior requesters of updates, modifications, corrections or deletions. All users have the responsibility to determine whether information obtained from this site is still accurate, current and complete.
- There may be discrepancies between the online copies and the original document. Original documents should be consulted as the definitive representation of the order's content. Copies of original orders may be obtained by mailing requests to the Department of Regulation and Licensing, PO Box 8935, Madison, WI 53708-8935. The Department charges copying fees. *All requests must cite the case number, the date of the order, and respondent's name as it appears on the order.*
- Reported decisions may have an appeal pending, and discipline may be stayed during the appeal. Information about the current status of a credential issued by the Department of Regulation and Licensing is shown on the Department's Web Site under "License Lookup." The status of an appeal may be found on court access websites at: <http://ccap.courts.state.wi.us/InternetCourtAccess> and <http://www.courts.state.wi.us/wscqa>.
- Records not open to public inspection by statute are not contained on this website.

By viewing this document, you have read the above and agree to the use of the Reports of Decisions subject to the above terms, and that you understand the limitations of this on-line database.

Correcting information on the DRL website: An individual who believes that information on the website is inaccurate may contact the webmaster at web@drl.state.wi.gov

STATE OF WISCONSIN
BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF REGULATION AND LICENSING

IN THE MATTER OF DISCIPLINARY	:	
PROCEEDINGS AGAINST	:	FINAL DECISION
	:	AND ORDER
BRIDGIT D. GEIGER,	:	LS0605153RSG
RESPONDENT.	:	

Division of Enforcement Case No. 06RSG001

The State of Wisconsin, Department of Regulation and Licensing, having considered the above-captioned matter and having reviewed the record and the Proposed Decision of the Administrative Law Judge, makes the following:

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, it is hereby ordered that the Proposed Decision annexed hereto, filed by the Administrative Law Judge, shall be and hereby is made and ordered the Final Decision of the State of Wisconsin, Department of Regulation and Licensing.

The rights of a party aggrieved by this Decision to petition the department for rehearing and the petition for judicial review are set forth on the attached "Notice of Appeal Information."

Dated this 14th day of June, 2007.

Celia M. Jackson, Secretary
Department of Regulation and Licensing

IN THE MATTER OF :
DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AGAINST : PROPOSED FINAL
: DECISION AND ORDER
:
BRIDGIT D. GEIGER, : LS0605153RSG
Respondent. :

TO: Mark T. Baganz
Attorney for Bridget D. Geiger
P.O. Box 1563
Brookfield, Wisconsin 53008-1563

Mark A. Herman
Attorney for Complainant
Division of Enforcement
1400 East Washington Avenue
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935

This proceeding was commenced by the filing of a Notice of Hearing and Complaint by the Department of Regulation and Licensing, Division of Enforcement, on May 15, 2006. A fact-finding hearing was held on October 6 and 27, 2006. Attorney Mark A. Herman appeared on behalf of the Complainant, Department of Regulation and Licensing, Division of Enforcement. Attorney Mark Baganz appeared on behalf of the Respondent Bridget D. Geiger. The Closing Arguments and Proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Orders were completed by January 30, 2007.

Based upon the evidence submitted at the hearing, the Administrative Law Judge recommends that the Department of Regulation and Licensing adopt the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order as the Final Decision and Order in this matter.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Respondent Bridgit D. Geiger, (“Respondent”) whose date of birth is September 17, 1968, and whose address of record with the Department of Regulation and Licensing (“Department”) is W239 N7105 Lynne Anne Lane, Sussex, WI 53089, holds a Wisconsin Private Security Person permit (# 108-8 133).

2. The Respondent’s security person permit was first granted on June 6, 1998 and was, at the time of the hearing, current through August 31, 2006. [\[1\]](#)

3. On June 24, 2003, a criminal complaint was filed against the Respondent, alleging that she “did knowingly

obstruct an officer while such officer was doing any act in an official capacity and with lawful authority, contrary to Section 946.41 (1), Wisconsin Statutes.”

4. The allegations stated in the criminal complaint were based upon conduct that occurred on June 8, 2002. On that date, at approximately 1:00 a.m., the Respondent’s husband had crashed and rolled his vehicle in the parking lot of an elementary school.

5. Shortly after the accident, the Respondent received a call from her husband asking her to pick him up. The Respondent found her husband and his two companions on the road about a quarter mile from the scene. She smelled alcohol on the men as they had been out drinking earlier that evening.

6. Later that morning, the Respondent took her husband to a clinic for medical treatment for his injuries.

7. Between 8:30 a.m. and 8:45 a.m., the Respondent was contacted by the Waukesha County Sheriffs Department regarding the accident and the whereabouts of her husband.

8. In response to questions by the officer about the accident, the Respondent made false and misleading statements denying any knowledge of it or the whereabouts of her husband.

9. On November 6, 2003, the Respondent was convicted of a Waukesha County ordinance violation which prohibits the obstruction of a law enforcement officer.

10. The Respondent did not contact the Department to report that she had been convicted of the ordinance violation within forty-eight (48) hours of the judgment of conviction. The Respondent did not provide the Department with a copy of the judgment of conviction.

11. In August 2004, the Respondent submitted to the Department a partially completed renewal notice for her permit as a private security person.

12. The renewal notice contained a standard question asking whether the applicant had been convicted within the past two years of a felony, a misdemeanor or a violation of any state or local law (other than traffic) that is punishable by a forfeiture, or are charges pending? The question is followed by a parenthetical that states: “(If yes, provide information)”

13. The renewal notice contained a “yes” and “no” box by the question regarding convictions or pending criminal charges and a space for the Respondent’s signature below the question. The renewal notice also contained the following warning: “Making a false statement in connection with any application for permit is grounds for revocation or denial of that permit.”

14. The Respondent failed to answer the question regarding criminal convictions, or pending charges, and failed to sign the renewal notice by the question. The Respondent did not provide any information about her convictions.

15. Upon receipt of the Respondent’s renewal notice, the Department sent a letter, dated September 22, 2004, indicating that the application was being returned as incomplete. The letter also stated that a search of the Department of Justice, Crime Information Bureau records showed that the Respondent has a pending arrest for misdemeanor -resisting or obstructing an officer on June 2, 2002. The Respondent was directed to provide a copy of the criminal complaint and judgment of conviction and state why she failed to previously notify the Department of the conviction if she was convicted.

16. The Respondent returned the letter from the Department with the word “yes” on the first line circled. She also circled the words “local law” and “forfeiture” and inserted the words “municipal w/ forfeiture.” The Respondent did not provide a copy of the judgment of conviction.

17. The Respondent attached a handwritten note addressed to the Department staff which stated that she was providing her signature as requested and that the misdemeanor was reduced to a municipal charge and a forfeiture paid.

18. The Respondent did not provide an explanation as to why she did not notify the Department of the conviction;

she stated only that the criminal complaint was sent in the year prior with her firearms renewal.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The State of Wisconsin Department of Regulation and Licensing has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 440.26(6) and Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01 (intro).
2. The Respondent, by obstructing a law enforcement officer, violated a law the circumstances of which substantially relate to the practice of a private security person, contrary to Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2).
3. The Respondent, by failing to provide a copy of her judgment of conviction to the Department of Regulation and Licensing within forty-eight (48) hours of conviction, violated Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2).

ORDER

NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The private security person permit of the Respondent, **Bridgit D. Geiger**, (#108-8133), is hereby **REVOKED**.
2. The Respondent shall submit all indicia of licensure to the Department of Regulation and Licensing within thirty (30) days of the date of signing of this Order.
3. The Respondent shall pay costs of the Department of Regulation and Licensing in investigating and litigating this matter. Payment shall be made payable to the Wisconsin Department of Regulation and Licensing.
4. All payments and submissions to the Department of Regulation and Licensing shall be made mailed or delivered to:

Department Monitor
Department of Regulation and Licensing
Division of Enforcement
1400 East Washington Ave.
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708-8935
Telephone (608) 261-7904
Fax (608) 266-2264

OPINION

The Department may deny an application for renewal, limit, suspend or revoke a credential, or reprimand a credential holder upon proof that the credential holder has engaged in conduct reflecting adversely on professional qualification. Conduct reflecting adversely on professional qualification includes, but is not limited to, any of the following:

- (2) Violating, or aiding and abetting the violation of, any law the circumstances of which substantially relate to the practice of a private detective or private security person. Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2)

The administrative rule requires an applicant who has been convicted of a felony, misdemeanor or ordinance violation to notify the Department within 48 hours after the judgment of conviction and provide information from which the Department can determine if the violation is substantially related to the practice of a private security person.

A credential holder who has been convicted of a felony, misdemeanor or ordinance violation as defined in s. 440.26(4m), Stats., shall send to the department within 48 hours after the judgment of conviction or the judgment finding that the person committed the violation, a copy of the complaint or other information which describes the nature of the crime or conviction and the judgment of conviction in order that the department may determine whether disciplinary action must or should be taken against the credential holder. Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2)

The allegations in this proceeding are that the Respondent, Bridgit D. Geiger, committed two violations of Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2). The first allegation involved the violation of a law, the circumstances of which are substantially related to the practice of a private security person. The second allegation involved the failure to report that conviction to the Department within 48 hours after the judgment of conviction was entered.

OPERATIVE FACTS

The law violation at issue in this proceeding stems from a one-vehicle traffic accident involving the Respondent's husband. The basic facts are that in the early hours of June 8, 2002, the Respondent's husband was driving at a high rate of speed, turned into a circular driveway in the parking lot of an elementary school and lost control of his vehicle. The vehicle struck a light pole and flipped onto the ground on the passenger side. The Respondent's husband had been out drinking with his friends early that evening. The Respondent received a phone call from her husband shortly after the accident asking her to come get him. The Respondent found her husband and his companions about one-quarter mile from the scene of the accident. The Respondent then drove the men to her residence. An argument ensued between the Respondent and her husband about calling the police to report the accident and seeking medical attention. The Respondent's husband did not seek medical treatment until approximately eight (8) hours after the accident. Blood alcohol and breathalyzer tests need to be conducted within three (3) hours of consumption in order to obtain a reliable reading.

Shortly before 8:00 a.m. on the day of the accident, the Waukesha County Sheriff detective arrived at the scene and examined the vehicle. After determining who owned the vehicle, the detective tried to reach the Respondent or her husband without success. Another officer was eventually able to contact the Respondent on her cell phone. In response to questions about the accident, the Respondent told the officer that she was on her way to work; that she had no idea that her husband's vehicle had been damaged, and that it had been in their driveway that morning. The Respondent also told the officer that she would try to get a hold of her husband and have him call the Sheriff's Department. When the officer attempted to call back a few minutes later with follow-up questions, the Respondent did not answer her cell phone.

The evidence presented showed that when the Respondent spoke with the officer she already knew that her husband had been in an accident because she argued with him about it. Additionally, at the time that the Respondent received a call from the officer she was not on her way to work; she was taking her husband to a clinic for medical treatment. And contrary to her statement to the officer that she would try to get a hold of her husband, he was, in fact, in the car with his wife while she was talking to the officer. The evidence further showed that neither the Respondent nor her husband called the Sheriff's Department after taking care of his medical needs.

After the Respondent's husband was treated for his injuries, he contacted his friends, (St. Clair and Krueger), who were in the vehicle during the accident. He asked them to meet with him at a local restaurant. The Respondent was also present at the meeting. The Respondent told the men that she had been contacted by the Waukesha County Sheriff's Department, and that she had not called them back. The Respondent's husband then stated, "*What are we going to do?*" He continued, "*We could all say that we were not driving.*" When his companions indicated that they would not tell the

Sheriff's Department this story, the Respondent's husband suggested that, "*we could say Josh (Krueger) was driving.*" Again, both St. Clair and Krueger indicated that they would not lie and urged the Respondent's husband to call the police. After the meeting ended at approximately 12:45 p.m., the Respondent and her husband contacted the Waukesha County Sheriff's Department, almost twelve (12) hours after the accident, and went in to be questioned.

VIOLATION OF LAW SUBSTANTIALLY RELATED TO PRACTICE

The Complainant maintains that the circumstances of the Respondent's law violation are substantially related to the practice of a private security person. This Administrative Law Judge agrees. Obstructing a law enforcement officer is inconsistent with the practice of a private security person. A private security person is defined as a "private police, guard or person who stands watch for security purposes." *Wis. Admin. Code § RL 30.02(13)(a)*. It is axiomatic that a person who acts as "private police" must not intentionally give false or misleading information to the "public" police who are conducting an official investigation. Protecting and maintaining public safety including the reporting of observations of possible criminal conduct to law enforcement officers, are basic functions of a private security person. Members of the public have an expectation that security guards, who serve in a capacity akin to "private police", will be truthful and cooperative, particularly with respect to interactions with other law enforcement agencies.

The framework for analyzing whether the circumstances of a law violation are substantially related to professional practice was articulated by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin. The Court suggested that one approach is to conclude that a violation is substantially related as a matter of law. *See Law Enforce. Stds. Bd. v. Lyndon Station, 101 Wis. 2d 472, 492 (1981)* ("*common sense*" dictated that convictions for falsifying traffic tickets were substantially related to the position of a police chief). A second approach is to examine the elements of a crime and determine if the elements constitute circumstances that are substantially related to the circumstances of a position. *Gibson v. Transp. Comm., 106 Wis. 2d 22, 26 (1983)*. A third approach is to consider the general circumstances of the violation to determine what propensities and personal qualities were demonstrated by the violator, and to determine whether or not these qualities are inconsistent with the expectations of responsibility associated with the job. *County of Milwaukee v. LJRC, 139 Wis. 2d 805, 828 (1987)*.

Applying this analysis to the evidence presented, it is clear that the circumstances of the Respondent's law violations are substantially related to the practice of a private security person. The Waukesha ordinance adopts the criminal charge of obstructing an officer found in Wis. Stat. § 946.41. The elements of this offense are: (1) that the defendant knowingly gave false information to an officer *or* that the defendant obstructed an officer; (2) that the officer was doing an act in an official capacity; (3) that the officer was doing an act with lawful authority; and (4) that the defendant intended to mislead the officer in the performance of his or her duty. *Wisconsin Criminal Jury Instruction 1766 and 1766 and 1766A*. The evidence shows that when the Respondent was first contacted by the Sheriff's Department, she gave false and misleading statements to the officer in an attempt to impede the investigation of the accident. The Respondent was fully aware that her husband had been in a traffic accident and his whereabouts when she spoke with the officer, although she denied both. She was not forthright, honest or helpful; she lied to the officer who was conducting an official investigation. By not being truthful and cooperative with the lawful investigation, she impeded the officer's ability to obtain information and evidence in a timely manner, such as a blood alcohol test, from her husband.

The Respondent's conduct goes against the fundamentals of the security profession. Violation of law for obstructing a law enforcement officer is the antithesis to the practice of a private security person. Accordingly, when comparing the circumstances and the elements of the crime there can be little doubt that the Respondent's conviction for obstructing an officer is substantially related to her practice as a private security person.

The Respondent's conduct also reveals shows an unbecoming personal character trait – the propensity to be

untruthful. A propensity to lie is a trait that cannot be tolerated in the security profession. The Complainant has argued that private security persons may be placed in situations where they may witness crimes that are investigated by law enforcement officers. They may often participant in incidents where they intervene to prevent a crime; this is especially true for security guards who hold firearms permits, the discharge of which could result in death or serious injury. One can easily imagine an armed security person discharging a firearm in the course of intervening in a situation, and in such circumstances the veracity of their statements will be crucial. The candor and truthfulness of a private security person is an essential quality for those who are entrusted with the privilege of holding such credential.

FAILURE TO NOTIFY THE DEPARTMENT OF VIOLATION OF LAW WITHIN 48 HOURS

The evidence at hearing shows that the Respondent failed to inform the Department of her conviction within 48 hours, as required under Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2). In fact, the Respondent did not disclose her conviction to the Department until almost eleven months after the pending charges had matured into a conviction, and then only with the prompting of a Department employee. On November 23, 2003, when the Respondent was convicted based upon the allegations in the amended complaint, she made no attempt to notify the Department or to submit a copy of the judgment of conviction. Instead, the evidence showed that when the Respondent received the renewal notice for her private security permit in 2004, she failed to answer the question which asks whether a credential holder has been convicted within the past two years of a felony, misdemeanor or violation of any state or local law. This question appears on the bottom half of renewal form and contains a “yes” and “no” box, with a space for Respondent’s signature below the question. The renewal notice also requires the applicant to submit information about the conviction and contains the following warning: “Making a false statement in connection with any application for permit is grounds for revocation or denial of that permit.” The Respondent left that box unchecked and the signature line completely blank when she mailed in her renewal application.

It is hard to accept the Respondent’s claim that she inadvertently missed the question. She had responded “yes” to a question about pending charges in her firearms permit renewal in 2003. It would seem reasonable to expect that the Respondent would have heightened vigilance when completing the renewal form in 2004. There is only one narrative question on the renewal form. The evidence showed that the question was not answered until the Respondent received a letter from the Department returning her renewal application as incomplete, and notifying her that the Crime Information Bureau records showed she had a pending criminal charge.

The Respondent’s propensity not to be truthful and candid about her conviction was also shown by the manner in which she responded to letter from the Department asking her to complete the renewal form. The Respondent’s initial communication with the Department consisted of circling “yes” on the Department’s letter and writing “municipal with a forfeiture.” The Respondent did not provide any details about her conviction. The Respondent never submitted a copy of the judgment of conviction as requested. At hearing the Respondent’s demeanor and explanation for failing to notify the Department of her conviction was unpersuasive. She testified that she thought she “had done that already with the renewals and sending in the amended complaint.” However, the Respondent did not tell the Department that the complaint had matured into a judgment of violation until approximately nearly a year after the fact, and only after being asked by the Department. Ironically, it was this propensity for a lack of candor and truthfulness that caused the Respondent to be convicted of obstructing a law enforcement officer in the first place.

ACTUAL NOTICE REQUIRED

The Respondent contends that the Department’s position that notification must be made within 48 hours is nothing

more than “form over substance.” The Complainant responds, and this Administrative Law Judge agrees, that the distinction is meaningful; the disclosure of a “criminal charge,” whether actual or constructive, is not equivalent to the disclosure of a “judgment of conviction.” The operative difference is that a criminal complaint is a charging document, not a final adjudication; the regulation requires disclosure of the judgment of conviction by the credential holder. Important public policy reasons exist for the criminal conviction notification requirement. In many instances, persons who are convicted of crimes may pose a risk to public safety and may not be suitable for licensure.

Additionally, the Department does not have the resources to determine if criminal charges result in judgments of conviction. There are far too many licensees to monitor to undertake the tracking of pending criminal charges. According to the Complainant, nearly 5,700 licensees renewed their private security guard permits in August of 2004 alone. The Department has limited staff and resources, and the costs of regulating a profession are borne by that profession. As a result, the administrative regulation, which was approved by the legislature, appropriately shifted the responsibility of notifying the Department of law violations to those who are in the best position to provide this information to the Department, the credential holder who has personal knowledge of his or her conviction and ready access to their own criminal records.

EQUITABLE DEFENSES

The Respondent raised several equitable arguments in support of her behavior. First, the Respondent argues that the doctrine of estoppel applies to this proceeding. However, there has been no showing of fraud or abuse of power by the Department in granting the renewal of her permit that would justify the application of this doctrine. The Respondent’s secondary argument is that she detrimentally relied on the Department’s action in renewing her firearm and private security person permits. This argument is specious because the Respondent actually received a benefit by the renewal of her permit in that she was authorized to work as a private security person. In correspondence to the Respondent, the Department indicated that a determination would be made at a later date concerning her application for renewal after the information has been received.

The record shows that the Respondent has been afforded ample due process to address her deficient notification, including an opportunity for a hearing. Had the Respondent cooperated with the Department and been candid and truthful in the first place, she may have avoided or mitigated any disciplinary consequences. Finally, the argument about the sufficiency of the evidence is not valid as the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that the Respondent has violated Wis. Admin. Code § RL 35.01(2); by violating a law the circumstances of which are substantially related to the practice of a private security person, and failing to report that violation to the Department within 48 hours.

RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINE

The purpose for professional discipline is three-fold: (1) to promote the rehabilitation of the licensee; (2) to protect the public; and (3) to deter other licensees from engaging in similar conduct. *State v. Aldrich* 71 Wis. 2d 206, 209 (1976). Based upon a consideration of the factors, revocation of the Respondent’s license is recommended in this case.

The evidence at hearing does not show that the Respondent was rehabilitated by the penalties received for obstructing an officer. There never was a *mea culpa* by the Respondent. She was adjudicated as having obstructed an officer, and she paid a forfeiture. Yet, at hearing, the Respondent testified untruthfully while under oath. Her testimony simply cannot be reconciled with her previous statements to the Waukesha County Sheriffs Department. For example, when asked about her statements to the office as to the whereabouts of her husband on the morning of the accident, she testified as follows:

“Q. And when contacted by telephone by the police at approximately nine a.m., you did not hand the phone to your husband who was sitting right beside you, correct?”

A. He was not sitting right beside me.

Q. He wasn't?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Where was he?

A. Walking into the clinic.” Tr. p. 290:14-22.

The Respondent's testimony at hearing was also contradicted by her statements and that of her husband which were previously given to the law enforcement officers. The Respondent's husband wrote, "While driving to the clinic my wife's cell phone rang. I found out later it was you (Waukesha County Deputy Sheriff Potter)." Ex. 3, pp. 4-5. Similarly, the Respondent's own signed statement provides the following:

“At approximately 8:40 - 8:45 we left to go to the walk in clinic to have his head looked at. On the way there - I received a call from Deputy Potter... I said... I would have my husband call him back when we arrived at the clinic...”

Q: Why did you tell Deputy Potter on the phone that you would have to get ahold of your husband, where was he?

A: He was in the car with me.” Ex. 2, pp. 1-3

Rather than admit at hearing that her husband was in the car when she spoke to the officer, the Respondent continued to give false and misleading testimony at hearing. The Respondent's propensity for duplicitous testimony also appears in her explanation about why she did not call law enforcement about her husband's accident. The Respondent testified that, "I was not aware that they (law enforcement) were not called." Tr. p. 283:10-15. Yet, her husband's companions (St. Clair and Krueger) indicated that she told them when they met a local restaurant that she had not called the police. The police statement reflects that before the Respondent and her husband ever left for the clinic, and before the Respondent ever spoke to Waukesha County Sheriff's officer, she had argued with her husband because he was not willing to call the Sheriff's Department. The Respondent knew very well that the police had not been called. In a prior statement when the Respondent was asked about the delay, she answered as follows:

“Q: Why did it take 12 hours to get in touch with the police about the accident and the injury?”

A: We were scared.” Ex. 2, p.3

This testimony shows not only that Respondent was not testifying truthfully while under oath, but that she has not abandoned her pattern of giving misleading information to authorities in order to minimize consequences to her husband or herself. During the hearing it appeared to this Administrative Law Judge that the Respondent was attempting to "coach" the testimony of a sworn witness. The Respondent was observed shaking her head and communicating by facial expression to a witness as he was answering questions. This conduct was similar to the description of the "lunch meeting" with her husband's companions when they were told what they should tell the police about the accident. By suggesting that the witnesses tell the Waukesha County Sheriff's Department that someone else was driving, they were in effect being "coached" to be untruthful. However, the Respondent testified under oath in these proceedings that, "I attended the luncheon, but no; he did not ask them to lie to the police." Tr. pp. 292: 3-4. The direct contradictions between the Respondent's testimony at hearing, the testimony of others, and her conduct at the hearing are disturbing.

The interests of public protection warrant the imposition of a severe discipline against the Respondent. The Respondent's propensity to give false or misleading information to law enforcement officers and other government officials undermines the safety and welfare of the public. It was shown that the Respondent not only lied about the conduct of family members, she continued to lie under oath in an effort to minimize the consequences of her own actions. She was not truthful with the local police during their investigation of her husband's traffic accident. She was not truthful when attempting to renew her credentials. The Respondent has shown through her actions that when faced with the choice of protecting her own interests or obeying the law, she will favor herself or her family, to the point of actually breaking the law. The Department would be remiss if it allowed the Respondent to hold a private security permit, knowing full well her propensity to lie, cover up and make misleading statements in violation of the law. One of fundamental purposes for professional discipline is to protect the public.

Finally, the revocation of the Respondent's credential as a private security person will serve an important deterrent effect for those who may be tempted to engage in similar conduct. There are instances when the Department must send a strong message to credential holders; this case is one of those instances. Those credential holders who have criminal convictions that are substantially related to their profession and fail to report their judgment of conviction in a timely manner should know that this conduct is serious and unacceptable. Hopefully, this disciplinary action may also serve as a "wake-up" call regarding the importance of candor and truthfulness, particularly for the Respondent since she is employed as a law enforcement officer by other law enforcement agencies.

For these reasons, it is recommended that the Department adopt the proposed Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Order thereby revoking the Respondent's permit as a private security person.

Dated this 11th day of May, 2007.

Colleen M. Baird
Administrative Law Judge
Office of Legal Counsel
Department of Regulation and Licensing
P.O. Box 8935
Madison, WI 53708
(608) 266-1815

[\[1\]](#) The information in the Department database for credential holders indicates that Ms. Geiger's permit has been renewed since the date of the hearing and is current and active through August 30, 2008.