

**BEFORE THE PERSONNEL BOARD OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA**  
**IN THE MATTER OF THE APPEAL OF**  
**ALEXANDER COXSON**

**ORDER**

**May 20, 2026**

This matter came before the Board based upon the dismissal of the Employee from his employment with the Alabama Department of Corrections (“DOC”). DOC dismissed the Employee on August 28, 2025, based upon charges contained in a letter dated August 19, 2025. This matter was assigned to Administrative Law Judge Randy C. Sallé, and a hearing was held on January 23, 2026. The Administrative Law Judge’s Recommended Order is now before the Board for consideration. The Board also had the benefit of oral argument.

DOC charges that the Employee violated the following: Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. A. 1. a. 1. – Absenteeism, unexcused absences, unreported absences, a pattern of absences or excessive absences; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. A. 1. a. 2. – Tardiness, not on the job ready for work at the beginning of the shift; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. A. 1. a. 8. – Violation of department rules; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. A. 1. b. 6. – Falsification of records: Application for Employment, timecard, doctor’s excuse, etc.; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. A. 1. b. 13. – Conduct unbecoming a state employee; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. B. 1. a. – Report to work on time and in a condition to perform their job properly, obtaining approval for any absence from work; Administrative

Regulation 250, Section V. B. 1. B. – Tardiness, failure to follow proper call-in procedures, and unexcused absences shall subject the employee to corrective action; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. B. 1. c. – Render full, efficient and industrious service; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. B. 1. h. – Observe all laws, rules and regulations; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. B. 1. i. – Uphold with integrity the public’s trust involved in their position; Administrative Regulation 250, Section V. B. 2. N. – Falsify or refuse to sign documents in connection with the application process, their job duties, performance evaluation or departmental AR, Standard Operating Procedure, or other departmental policy. DOC further charges that the Employee violated Administrative Regulation 220, B. 6 – Secure advance approval for sick leave requests for scheduled doctor’s visits; Administrative Regulation 220, B. 9 – Misuse/Abuse of sick leave; and Administrative Regulation 220, Q. – Call in Procedures. Lastly, DOC charges that the Employee violated Administrative Regulation 208, Annex E – 2 - Late for work (tardiness)/failure to follow proper call-in procedures; Administrative Regulation 208, Annex E – 20 – Failure to report to work (unexcused absence); and Administrative Regulation 208, Annex E – 30 – Intentionally falsifying data associated with agency records.

The Employee's prior disciplinary actions with DOC include:

- Written Reprimand on December 13, 2024, for being late for work and failure to follow proper call-in procedures.
- 5-days suspension on October 11, 2024, for failing to follow a supervisor’s instructions or non-compliance with policies and procedures; and disagreeable behavior, including a lack of cooperation or insubordination – refusal to sign performance appraisal or other ADOC official document.

- 2-days suspension on August 22, 2024, for failing to follow a supervisor's instructions or noncompliance with policies and procedures; disagreeable behavior, including lack of cooperations or insubordination – refusal to sign performance appraisal or other ADOC official document.
- 5-days suspension on July 4, 2024, for failure to report to work (unexcused absence).
- 3-days suspension on June 21, 2024, for failure to follow supervisor's instructions or noncompliance with policies and procedures. Failure to report to work (unexcused absence).
- 2-days suspension on June 20, 2024, for late for work (tardiness)/ failure to follow proper call-in procedures. Failure to report to work (unexcused absence).
- A warning on March 9, 2024, for non-compliance with policies and procedures. Refusal to sign performance appraisal or other ADOC official document. Disagreeable behavior, including lack of cooperation or insubordination.
- Warning on January 29, 2024, for late for work (tardiness)/ failure to follow proper call-in procedures. Failure to follow supervisor's instructions; non-compliance with policies and procedures. Failure to report to work (unexcused absence).
- Written Reprimand on January 1, 2024, for leaving assigned post and/ or workstation before the end of the shift/workday without permission from proper authority or relief and no serious consequences occur. Disagreeable behavior, including lack of cooperation or insubordination.

During the hearing, DOC presented evidence that on December 20, 2024, the Employee properly called in prior to his shift and stated that he would not be able to report for work due to two medical appointments. However, the Employee failed to provide medical documentation supporting that absence. On December 21, 2024, the Employee again called in and reported that he was sick and throwing up but stated that his return date

was unknown. The Employee then failed to call-in or report to work on December 22 and December 25, 2024. DOC attempted to contact the Employee numerous times, but all attempts were unsuccessful. DOC further presented evidence that the Employee returned to work on December 26, 2024, but failed to provide any medical documentation supporting his absences. On December 27, 2024, when the Employee was asked about his December 20, 2024 absence, the Employee indicated he was out on FMLA leave. Again, the Employee was late to work on December 27, 2024, and January 3, 2025, and also failed to report for work on February 16, 2025. The Employee failed to provide any medical documentation to support this absence.

DOC presented evidence that due to the Employee's prior attendance issues and disciplinary history, he had been instructed to provide a doctor's excuse each time he called out sick. Although the Employee claimed that some absences were protected by FMLA leave, the evidence showed that several absences were unrelated to his FMLA-approved condition and that he failed to provide documentation required under DOC policy.

The Administrative Law Judge, having observed and carefully considered the witnesses' demeanor, testimony, and all the documentary evidence, found the totality of the evidence established the Employee was appropriately dismissed and recommended the Board uphold the dismissal. The Board hereby adopts by reference the findings of fact and conclusions of law as found by the Administrative Law Judge as part of this Order, as if fully set forth herein.

The Board has carefully considered the Administrative Law Judge's Recommended Order. With the benefit of oral argument in this matter, the Board is of the opinion that the

decision of the appointing authority to dismiss the Employee is supported by the evidence and that termination is warranted.

It is therefore the Order of this Board that the decision of the appointing authority to dismiss the Employee is UPHELD.

  
LAURY B. MORGAN  
SECRETARY

  
FAYE NELSON  
CHAIR

  
EVAN M. THORNTON  
MEMBER

  
DAVID R. MELLON  
MEMBER

  
CAROLYN FAIR  
MEMBER

  
PHIL WEBB  
MEMBER