

Circuit Court for Prince George's County  
Case No. C-16-CV-23-002676

UNREPORTED  
IN THE APPELLATE COURT  
OF MARYLAND

No. 190

September Term, 2024

---

IN THE MATTER OF EDMOND  
SAINT-JEAN

---

Nazarian,  
Reed,  
Harrell, Glenn T., Jr.  
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

---

PER CURIAM

---

Filed: November 1, 2024

\*This is a per curiam opinion. Consistent with Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

Edmond Saint-Jean, appellant, appeals from an order issued by the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County affirming a decision of the Maryland State Board of Education (the State Board), which required him to pay \$3,367.00 in restitution for unearned wages. Appellant does not raise any issues in his brief. For the reasons that follow, we shall affirm.

Appellant, a music teacher working for the Prince George’s County Public Schools (PGCPS), was alleged during the 2020-2021 school year to have not reported to the schools to which he had been assigned, and to have accepted compensation for hours he had not worked. Following an investigation, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) for PGCPS issued a recommendation to the Prince George’s County Board of Education (the local Board) that appellant be suspended from his position as a teacher for a period of 10 days for misconduct, willful neglect of duty, insubordination, violating the employee code of conduct, and violating the local Board’s policy on fraud, waste, and abuse. The CEO also recommended that appellant be required to pay restitution in the amount of \$6,823.13 for 16 days he had allegedly worked but failed to report to one of his two school assignments.

Appellant filed a timely appeal to the local Board, who appointed a hearing examiner. Following a full evidentiary hearing, the hearing examiner concluded that appellant had not engaged in misconduct, willful neglect of duty, or insubordination. The hearing examiner did find, however, that appellant had violated the employee code of conduct and the Board’s policy on fraud, waste, and abuse by accepting compensation for work that he had not been assigned to do. Based on these findings, the hearing examiner determined that there was insufficient evidence to support the CEO’s recommendation that appellant be suspended without pay, but that there was sufficient evidence to support his

recommendation for restitution. Thereafter, the local Board accepted, in part, the hearing examiner's recommendations and issued an amended order denying the CEO's recommendation that the Board suspend appellant without pay. The Board also found that appellant had violated its policy on fraud, waste, and abuse. However, it only ordered him to pay \$3,367.00 in restitution based on evidence that the school system had played a role in his having been confused about where he was supposed to be working.

Appellant appealed the local Board's decision to the State Board, which affirmed, finding that "the local board's decision was not arbitrary, unreasonable, or illegal." He then filed a petition for judicial review in the circuit court, which in turn affirmed the State Board's decision. This appeal followed.

In reviewing an administrative agency's decision, "we look 'through the circuit court's . . . decision[ ], although applying the same standards of review, and evaluate[ ] the decision of the agency.'" *People's Couns. for Baltimore Cnty. v. Loyola Coll. in Md.*, 406 Md. 54, 66 (2008) (citation omitted). We "will not disturb an administrative decision on appeal if substantial evidence supports factual findings and no error of law exists." *Long Green Valley Ass'n v. Prigel Fam. Creamery*, 206 Md. App. 264, 273-74 (2012) (quotation marks and citation omitted).

In his brief, appellant does not raise any specific issues or make any arguments as to why the State Board erred. Instead, he has simply attached the post-hearing memorandum that he filed after his hearing before the hearing examiner. But that memorandum does not discuss the issues of restitution, or whether appellant violated the Board's policy on fraud, waste, and abuse. Rather, the memorandum only argues that

appellant did not commit misconduct or willful neglect of duty, and therefore, that the “CEO of PGCPS ha[d] failed to present sufficient evidence to support the recommendation for suspension.” But ultimately appellant was not suspended or found to have engaged in misconduct, willful neglect of duty, or insubordination. Thus, even if we assume that appellant is attempting to raise the issues that he raised in the memorandum on appeal, those issues are unrelated to the State Board’s final order requiring appellant to pay restitution. Consequently, we need not address the merits of that order on appeal. *See Diallo v. State*, 413 Md. 678, 692-93 (2010) (noting that arguments that are “not presented with particularity will not be considered on appeal” (quotation marks and citation omitted)).

Although appellant clearly disagrees with the State Board’s decision, it is not our responsibility to “attempt to fashion coherent legal theories” on his behalf. *Konover Prop. Tr., Inc. v. WHE Assocs., Inc.*, 142 Md. App. 476, 494 (2002). Rather, it is his burden on appeal to demonstrate that the Board committed prejudicial error. Because he has not met that burden, we shall affirm.

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT  
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE’S  
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO  
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**