

“Open competitive examination” means a test open to members of the public who meet the prescribed requirements for admission.

“Part time employee” means an employee whose regular hours of duty are less than the regular and normal workweek for that job title or agency.

“Permanent employee” means an employee in the career service who has acquired the tenure and rights resulting from regular appointment and successful completion of the working test period.

“Position” means the assignment of specific duties and responsibilities requiring the employment of one person.

“Promotion” means, in local service, an advancement in title, and in State service, an advancement to a title having a higher class code than the former permanent title.

“Promotional examination” means a test open to permanent employees who meet the prescribed requirements for admission.

“Provisional appointment” (PA) means employment in the competitive division of the career service pending the appointment of a person from an eligible list.

“Regular appointment” (RA) means the employment of a person to fill a position in the competitive division of the career service upon examination and certification, or the employment of a person to a position in the noncompetitive division of the career service.

“Removal” means termination of a permanent employee from employment for disciplinary reasons.

“Senior executive service” means positions in State service designated by the Board as having substantial managerial, policy influencing or policy executing responsibilities not included in the career or unclassified services.

“Spouse” means a husband, a wife, or a party to a civil union, in accordance with N.J.S.A. 37:1-1 and P.L. 2006, c. 103.

“State service” means employment for the State of New Jersey.

“Suspension” means temporary separation from employment for disciplinary reasons.

“Suspension on the record” means a suspension for disciplinary reasons imposed for record purposes only, without loss of pay, benefits or seniority.

“Title” means a descriptive name that identifies a position or group of positions with similar duties, responsibilities, and qualifications.

“Title scope” means a defined group of job titles used as a factor in determining eligibility for promotional examina-

tions. Title scope may also include educational, experience and other specific requirements.

“Title series” means titles involving the same kind of work and ranked according to level of difficulty and responsibility.

“Unclassified service” means those positions and job titles outside of the senior executive service, not subject to the tenure provisions of Title 11A, New Jersey Statutes or these rules unless otherwise specified.

“Unit scope” means a defined part of a governmental agency used as a factor in determining eligibility for promotional examinations.

“Working test period” means a part of the examination process after regular appointment, during which time the work performance and conduct of the employee is evaluated to determine if permanent status is merited.

Amended by R.1988 d.258, effective June 6, 1988.  
See: 20 N.J.R. 326(a), 20 N.J.R. 1183(a).

Added definitions “Closing date for examination”, “Filing date for examination”, “Title scope” and “Unit scope”.

Amended by R.1988 d.415, effective September 6, 1988.  
See: 20 N.J.R. 845(b), 20 N.J.R. 2255(a).

Added the definition “Department”.  
Amended by R.1992 d.416, effective October 19, 1992.  
See: 24 N.J.R. 2490(a), 24 N.J.R. 3715(a).

Revised definition “demotion”.  
Amended by R.2005 d.65, effective February 22, 2005.  
See: 36 N.J.R. 4566(a), 37 N.J.R. 586(a).

In “immediate family”, inserted “domestic partner” following “employee’s spouse”.  
Petition for Rulemaking: Notice of Receipt; General Rules and Department Organization Appeals, Discipline and Separations Suspensions on the Record.

See: 38 N.J.R. 1085(a).  
Amended by R.2006 d.386, effective November 6, 2006.  
See: 38 N.J.R. 2773(a), 38 N.J.R. 4690(a).

Added definition “Suspension on the record”.  
Amended by R.2007 d.244, effective August 20, 2007.  
See: 39 N.J.R. 1340(a), 39 N.J.R. 3499(a).

Added definition “Spouse”.  
Amended by R.2008 d.214, effective August 4, 2008.  
See: 40 N.J.R. 1400(a), 40 N.J.R. 4519(b).

In definition “Class code”, inserted “and local”.

**Law Review and Journal Commentaries**

Civil Service—Administrative Procedure—Counties—Municipalities.  
Judith Nallin, 134 N.J.L.J. No. 17, 50 (1993).

**Case Notes**

Former city police officer’s claim that the city and two officials violated the officer’s procedural due process rights in disciplining the officer survived summary judgment in part given fact issues as to whether the final disciplinary decision was made by the person authorized to do so for purposes of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5 and 4A:2-2.6; it was unclear whether the decision was made by the “appointing authority” under N.J.A.C. 4A:1-1.3. *Reilly v. City of Atl. City*, 427 F. Supp. 2d 507, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17208 (D.N.J. 2006).

Open competitive examination to residents for position of police chief violated the Civil Service Act, the Board’s own regulations, and the rule-making provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. *Matter of Police Chief (M2010P) South Orange Village*, 266 N.J.Super. 101, 628 A.2d 809 (A.D.1993).

"Local government service" includes employees of county prosecutor and sheriff's office (citing former rule N.J.A.C. 4:1-2.1). *Gudgeon v. County of Ocean*, 135 N.J.Super. 13, 342 A.2d 553 (App.Div.1975) certification granted 70 N.J. 138, 358 A.2d 185.

Enrollment in retirement system is neither immediate nor automatic (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-2.1). *Frew v. Bd. of Trustees Public Employees' Retirement System*, 8 N.J.A.R. 16 (1984).

#### 4A:1-1.4 Petition for promulgating, amending or repealing rules

(a) Any interested person may file a petition with the Commissioner to promulgate, amend or repeal a rule.

(b) A petition must include the reasons for the request.

(c) A petition for a new rule must include the substance or nature of the request, the proposed text of the new rule and the statutory authority under which the requested action may be taken.

(d) A petition for an amended rule must indicate any existing text to be deleted and include any new text to be added.

(e) The Commissioner shall, in writing, either deny the petition or approve the petition for processing.

(f) Notice of the petition and the Commissioner's decision shall be filed with the Office of Administrative Law pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:30-3.6.

### SUBCHAPTER 2. RECORDS

#### 4A:1-2.1 Department of Personnel access to appointing authority records and information

Appointing authorities shall provide Department of Personnel representatives free access to their premises and to requested records and information.

#### 4A:1-2.2 Public records

(a) The following Department of Personnel records shall be public:

1. An individual's name, title, salary, compensation, dates of government service and reason for separation;
2. Information on specific educational or medical qualifications required for employment;
3. Final orders of the Commissioner or Board; and
4. Other records which are required by law to be made, maintained or kept on file.

(b) Individual personnel records, except as specified in (a) 1 through 3 above, are not public records and shall not be released other than to the subject employee, an authorized representative of the employee, or governmental representatives in connection with their official duties.

(c) In addition to records designated as confidential pursuant to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 et seq., as amended and supplemented, any other statute, rule promulgated under the authority of any statute or Executive Order of the Governor, resolution of both houses of the Legislature, Rule of court, or any Federal law, Federal regulation or Federal order, the following records shall not be considered government records subject to public access pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 et seq., as amended and supplemented:

1. Appeal files in Merit System Board, Commissioner of Personnel and Division of Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action matters, including written submissions of the parties and all other related documentation used to make an administrative determination in these matters. However, final decisions of the Board and the Commissioner, including the bases for these decisions, shall be considered public records.

(d) See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.16 concerning examination records.

Amended by R.1992 d.416, effective October 19, 1992.  
See: 24 N.J.R. 2490(a), 24 N.J.R. 3715(a).

Revised (b); added new (c).

Amended by R.2008 d.214, effective August 4, 2008.

See: 40 N.J.R. 1400(a), 40 N.J.R. 4519(b).

Added new (c); and recodified former (c) as (d).

### SUBCHAPTER 3. ORGANIZATION

#### 4A:1-3.1 General provisions

(a) The Department of Personnel is constituted as a principal State Department consisting of the:

1. Commissioner of Personnel;
2. Merit System Board; and
3. Such subdivisions as the Commissioner may deem necessary.

#### 4A:1-3.2 Commissioner of Personnel

(a) The Commissioner of Personnel shall:

1. Serve as chairperson of the Merit System Board;
2. Serve as principal executive and request officer of the Department;
3. Maintain a management information system to implement Title 11A, New Jersey Statutes;
4. Establish necessary programs and policies for the State and local service;
5. Assist the Governor in personnel and labor relations;

- 6. Render final administrative decisions on appeals of classification, salary, layoff rights and State noncontractual grievances;
- 7. Establish and consult with advisory board representing political subdivisions, personnel officers, labor organizations and other appropriate groups;
- 8. Make required reports to the Governor and Legislature;
- 9. Approve appointments in the State and local service; and
- 10. Perform such other duties as prescribed by law and these rules.

**Case Notes**

Powers and duties; approval of classification plans. Gloucester Cty. Welfare Bd. v. N.J. Civ. Serv. Comm'n., 93 N.J. 384, 461 A.2d 575 (1983) and (dissenting opinions).

**4A:1-3.3 Merit System Board**

(a) The Merit System Board shall:

- 1. Hold a public meeting at least once each month, except August, at which three members shall constitute a quorum;
- 2. Render final administrative decisions on appeals and on other matters referred by the Commissioner, except for those matters listed in N.J.A.C. 4A:1-3.2(a)6 or delegated to the Commissioner;
- 3. Adopt rules for implementing Title 11A, New Jersey Statutes after public hearing, except that a public hearing

shall not be required for the adoption of emergency rules. See N.J.A.C. 1:30-4.5 for Office of Administrative Law emergency rule adoption procedures;

- 4. Interpret the application of Title 11A, New Jersey Statutes, to any public body or entity; and
- 5. Perform such other duties as prescribed by law and these rules.

Amended by R.1992 d.416, effective October 19, 1992.  
See: 24 N.J.R. 2490(a), 24 N.J.R. 3715(a).  
Revised (a)2.

**Case Notes**

Police officer hired after completing the required police training course under the alternate route authorized by a 1998 amendment to the Police Training Act, N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 through 52:17B-77.6, may be subject to a one-year probationary period prescribed by a municipal ordinance, during which the officer can be terminated without cause. Azzara v. Township of Waterford, 392 N.J. Super. 322, 920 A.2d 725, 2007 N.J. Super. LEXIS 120 (App.Div. 2007).

Autonomous political subdivisions; relationship of Civil Service Act to firemen. Oughton v. Board of Fire Comm'rs, etc., 168 N.J. Super. 434, 403 A.2d 69 (Law Div.1979) on reconsideration 178 N.J. Super. 633, 429 A.2d 1096 (Law Div.1980) affirmed in part, reversed in part 178 N.J. Super. 565, 429 A.2d 1059, certification denied 87 N.J. 367, 434 A.2d 1055.

Discretion of Civil Service Commission to hold open competitive exams. State v. State Supervisory Employees Association, 78 N.J. 54, 393 A.2d 233 (1978).

Jurisdiction. City of Hackensack v. Winner, 162 N.J. Super. 1, 392 A.2d 187 (App.Div.1978) mod. on other ground 82 N.J. 1, 410 A.2d 1146 (1980).

Power of local service employer to effect out of class temporary transfer. In re Appeal of Lembo, 151 N.J. Super. 242, 376 A.2d 971 (App.Div.1977).

**CHAPTER 2**

**APPEALS, DISCIPLINE AND SEPARATIONS**

**Authority**

N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2, 11A:1-2(e), 11A:2-6, 11A:2-11(h), 11A:2-13 et seq., 11A:4-15(c), 11A:7-1 et seq., 11A:8-4 and 52:14B-10(c); and 49 CFR Parts 382 et seq.

**Source and Effective Date**

R.2008 d.215, effective July 1, 2008.  
See: 40 N.J.R. 1402(a), 40 N.J.R. 4520(a).

**Chapter Expiration Date**

Chapter 2, Appeals, Discipline and Separations, expires on July 1, 2013.

**Chapter Historical Note**

Chapter 2, Appeals, Discipline and Separations, was adopted as R.1987 d.407, effective October 5, 1987. See: 19 N.J.R. 1013(a), 19 N.J.R. 1827(a). See, also, Title Historical Note prior to N.J.A.C. 4A:1.

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 66(1978), Chapter 2, Appeals, Discipline and Separations, was readopted as R.1992 d.414, effective September 22, 1992. See: 24 N.J.R. 2491(a), 24 N.J.R. 3716(a).

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 66(1978), Chapter 2, Appeals, Discipline and Separations, was readopted as R.1997 d.435, effective September 22, 1997. See: 29 N.J.R. 3102(a), 29 N.J.R. 4455(b).

Chapter 2, Appeals, Discipline and Separations, was readopted as R.2003 d.112, effective February 13, 2003. See: 34 N.J.R. 3570(a), 35 N.J.R. 1407(b).

Chapter 2, Appeals, Discipline and Separations, was readopted as R.2008 d.215, effective July 1, 2008. See: Source and Effective Date. See, also, section annotations.

**CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**SUBCHAPTER 1. APPEALS**

- 4A:2-1.1 Filing of appeals
- 4A:2-1.2 Stay and interim relief requests
- 4A:2-1.3 Adjournments
- 4A:2-1.4 Burden of proof
- 4A:2-1.5 Remedies
- 4A:2-1.6 Reconsideration of decisions
- 4A:2-1.7 Specific appeals

**SUBCHAPTER 2. MAJOR DISCIPLINE**

- 4A:2-2.1 Employees covered
- 4A:2-2.2 Types of discipline
- 4A:2-2.3 General causes
- 4A:2-2.4 Limitations on suspensions and fines
- 4A:2-2.5 Opportunity for hearing before the appointing authority
- 4A:2-2.6 Hearings before the appointing authority
- 4A:2-2.7 Actions involving criminal matters
- 4A:2-2.8 Appeals to Civil Service Commission
- 4A:2-2.9 Commission hearings
- 4A:2-2.10 Back pay, benefits and seniority
- 4A:2-2.11 Interest
- 4A:2-2.12 Counsel fees
- 4A:2-2.13 Removal appeals of certain law enforcement officers and firefighters

**APPENDIX**

**SUBCHAPTER 3. MINOR DISCIPLINE AND GRIEVANCES**

- 4A:2-3.1 General provisions
- 4A:2-3.2 Minor discipline appeal to appointing authority: State service
- 4A:2-3.3 Grievance appeal to appointing authority: State service
- 4A:2-3.4 Grievance procedure: Step One: State service
- 4A:2-3.5 Grievance procedure: Step Two
- 4A:2-3.6 Conduct and scheduling of hearings and grievance meetings: State service
- 4A:2-3.7 Appeals from appointing authority decisions: State service

**SUBCHAPTER 4. TERMINATION AT END OF WORKING TEST PERIOD**

- 4A:2-4.1 Notice of termination
- 4A:2-4.2 Time for appeal
- 4A:2-4.3 Board hearing

**SUBCHAPTER 5. EMPLOYEE PROTECTION AGAINST REPRISALS OR POLITICAL COERCION**

- 4A:2-5.1 General provisions
- 4A:2-5.2 Appeals

**SUBCHAPTER 6. RESIGNATIONS**

- 4A:2-6.1 Resignation in good standing
- 4A:2-6.2 Resignation not in good standing

**SUBCHAPTER 1. APPEALS**

**4A:2-1.1 Filing of appeals**

(a) All appeals to the Commissioner or Board shall be in writing, signed by the person appealing (appellant) or his or her representative and must include the reason for the appeal and the specific relief requested.

(b) Unless a different time period is stated, an appeal must be filed within 20 days after either the appellant has notice or should reasonably have known of the decision, situation or action being appealed.

(c) The appellant must provide any additional information that is requested, and failure to provide such information may result in dismissal of the appeal.

(d) Except where a hearing is required by law or these rules, or where the Commissioner or Board finds that a material and controlling dispute of fact exists that can only be resolved by a hearing, an appeal will be reviewed on a written record. In written record appeals:

1. Each party must serve copies of all materials submitted on all other parties; and
2. A party may review the file at the Department of Personnel during business hours.

(e) A party in an appeal may be represented by an attorney, authorized union representative or authorized appointing

authority representative. See N.J.A.C. 1:1-5.4 for contested case representation at the Office of Administrative Law.

Amended by R.1992 d.414, effective October 19, 1992.  
See: 24 N.J.R. 2491(a), 24 N.J.R. 3716(a).  
Added new (d)1.-2.

#### Law Review and Journal Commentaries

Civil Service — Disability Retirement — Police Seniority. Judith Nallin, 133 N.J.L.J. No. 13, 55 (1993).

#### Case Notes

Time in which fire fighter was required to appeal decision of township board of fire commissioners classifying fire fighters commenced when fire fighter learned of representations. *Matter of Tavani*, 264 N.J.Super. 154, 624 A.2d 75 (A.D.1993).

Appeals to Department of Personnel (DOP) and Merit System Board by police officer were timely. *Matter of Allen*, 262 N.J.Super. 438, 621 A.2d 87 (A.D.1993).

Removal of provisional juvenile detention officer from eligible list was improper without hearing by Merit System Board to resolve good faith factual disputes. *Matter of Wiggins*, 242 N.J.Super. 342, 576 A.2d 932 (A.D.1990).

Civil Service Comm'n acted within its discretionary powers to deny hearing and only allow petitioner to submit additional facts for review (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.1). *Honachefsky v. New Jersey Civil Service Comm'n*, 174 N.J.Super. 539, 417 A.2d 67 (App.Div.1980).

Employee's failure to appear at scheduled hearings on removal action supports employer's motion to dismiss appeal. *Maycheck v. Atlantic City Housing Authority*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 182.

No timely appeal to the Merit Systems Board. N.J.S.A. 11A:1-1 et seq. *Pryor v. Township of Morristown*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 18.

Time limits for appeal construed to have been met when petitioner was advised a letter sent prior to final notice of disciplinary action would act to reinstate her appeal (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.3). *Clark v. New Jersey Dep't of Agriculture*, 1 N.J.A.R. 315 (1980).

#### 4A:2-1.2 Stay and interim relief requests

(a) Upon the filing of an appeal, a party to the appeal may petition the Commissioner for a stay or other relief pending final decision of the matter.

(b) A request for a stay or interim relief shall be in writing, signed by the petitioner or his or her representative and must include supporting information for the request.

(c) The following factors will be considered in reviewing such requests:

1. Clear likelihood of success on the merits by the petitioner;
2. Danger of immediate or irreparable harm if the request is not granted;
3. Absence of substantial injury to other parties if the request is granted; and
4. The public interest.

(d) The filing of a petition for interim relief will not stay administrative proceedings or processes.

(e) Each party must serve copies of all materials submitted on all other parties.

(f) Following a final administrative decision by the Commissioner or the Board, and upon the filing of an appeal from that decision to the Appellate Division of Superior Court, a party to the appeal may petition the Commissioner for a stay or other relief pending a decision by the Court in accordance with the procedures and standards in (b) and (c) above. See N.J. Court Rules 2:9-7.

(g) See N.J.A.C. 1:1-12.6 for interim relief rules on matters pending before the Office of Administrative Law.

Amended by R.1989 d.569, effective November 6, 1989.

See: 21 N.J.R. 1766(a), 21 N.J.R. 3448(b).

Changed title from "Interim relief."

Added new (f) and relettered old (f) as (g) with stylistic revisions.

#### 4A:2-1.3 Adjournments

(a) Any party requesting an adjournment of a hearing or other review must establish good and sufficient reason for such request. Such reason may include, but is not limited to:

1. Unavoidable appearance by an attorney for a party in any state or federal court; or
2. Illness of a party evidenced by an affidavit and a doctor's certificate.

(b) Where an adjournment is found not to be for good and sufficient reason, the Commissioner or Board may impose a fine or penalty.

(c) See N.J.A.C. 1:1-9.6 for Office of Administrative Law adjournment rules.

#### Case Notes

Appeal of suspension of deceased medical technician was dismissed without prejudice. *McCormick v. City of Gloucester*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 475.

Appeal dismissed due to retirement and resignation of employees (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.9). *Tyler et al. v. City of Paterson*, 2 N.J.A.R. 272 (1979).

#### 4A:2-1.4 Burden of proof

(a) In appeals concerning major disciplinary actions, N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.1 et seq., the burden of proof shall be on the appointing authority.

(b) In appeals concerning minor disciplinary actions, see N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3.7(f) for burden of proof standards.

(c) In all other Commissioner and Board appeals, the burden of proof shall be on the appellant.

Amended by R.1989 d.569, effective November 6, 1989.

See: 21 N.J.R. 1766(a), 21 N.J.R. 3448(b).

Added new (b) and relettered old (b) as (c).

## Case Notes

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 188) adopted, which determined that a correction officer's assertion that his gun was holstered at the scene of an altercation involving his son was not credible, based in part on his contradictory testimony during an unemployment hearing and also on the testimony of other witnesses; the correction officer, who failed to call the police regarding the altercation and brandished his service weapon at the scene, was properly terminated. *In re Porch*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 01307-07 (CSV 9567-06 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 574, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Although the appointing authority requested dismissal as it could not prove the sexual harassment charges against the Correction Sergeant without the cooperation of the sole witness, the Merit System Board could not ignore the seriousness of the accusation against a supervisor and was compelled to invoke its subpoena powers so that the witness, who was currently employed by the Department of Corrections, could be called to testify on remand. *In re LaPoint*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3585-06, Final Decision (April 25, 2007).

Police officer was reinstated when removed on hearsay evidence that was less than competent. *Rhodes v. Union City Police Department*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 643.

Assault upon a patient was not sufficiently proven to justify removal of therapy program assistant. *Berrien v. Department of Human Services*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 629.

Termination of training technician at developmental center was not justified absent evidence of endangering a client through neglect of duty. *Forde v. Hunterdon Developmental Center*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 577.

Suspension of public employee was not warranted when appointing authority failed to carry burden of proof on charge of insubordination. *Pennoh v. North Princeton Developmental Center*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 514.

Insufficient evidence precluded removal of corrections officer on charges of unbecoming conduct. *Parham v. Department of Corrections*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 439.

Charges of misconduct were insufficient to sustain suspension of corrections officer in absence of credible evidence in record. *Tyson v. Department of Corrections*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 419.

Removal of training technician was not warranted when sole witness to alleged beating of client was not credible. *Murray v. Department of Human Services*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 407.

Removal of nurse was not warranted absent credible proof of actual assault on patient. *Fontenot v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 291.

Prison worker's removal for insubordination not supported by sufficient evidence. *Balkaran v. Northern State Prison*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 256.

No preponderance of credible evidence that layoffs were in bad faith. *Edwards v. Department of Community Affairs Employee Layoffs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 29.

Charges in disciplinary proceedings against police officers with respect to sports betting were not sustained. *State Police v. Hall, Buhan*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 1.

Proof; patient abuse. *Rivera v. Woodbine Developmental Center*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 705.

Appointing authority Proved that employee was incompetent, inefficient, failed to perform her duties and conducted herself in a manner unbecoming a public employee. *Janowski v. Bergen County Department of the Judiciary*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 550.

Employee was entitled to all reasonable inferences from his evidence that layoff was in bad faith. *Beattie v. Camden County Department of Buildings and Operations*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 529.

There was not sufficient proof that guard was sleeping on duty. *Webster v. Burlington County Jail*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 389.

Evidence insufficient; neglect of duty or conduct unbecoming public employee. *Karl v. New Brunswick Police Department*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 199.

Failure to prove that correction officer was guilty of missing a call-in. *Mowenn v. New Jersey State Prison*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 545.

Discrimination or harassment not shown to have caused unsatisfactory evaluation; termination at end of probationary period. *Amin v. Department of Transp.*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 406.

Failure to adhere to documenting requirements; urine testing. *Riley v. Southern State Correctional Facility*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 385.

Order to submit urine specimens for drug testing was not justified. *Riley v. Southern State Correctional Facility*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 385.

Evidence did not show failure to report client abuse. *Grant v. North Princeton Developmental Center*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 332.

Failure of proof that employee was guilty of client abuse. *Locklear v. New Lisbon Developmental Center*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 197.

Failure of proof that employee disobeyed order. *Lott v. Woodbridge Developmental Center*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 141.

Abuse of client not proven. *Brent v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 82.

There was failure of proof that employee sought compensation improperly. *Cressinger v. Newark Board of Education*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 63.

Absent showing that inspector passed noncomplying vehicle suspension was unwarranted. *Inge v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 47.

Town failed to sustain burden of proof and removal was unwarranted. *Corso v. West New York*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 43.

Confession to drug use was not subject to independent corroboration and was cause for state trooper's dismissal. *State Police v. Naranjo*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 17.

It was not shown that employee was guilty of client abuse. *Hopkins v. New Jersey Department of Human Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 17.

Evidence; sleeping while on duty; removal not warranted. *Glenn v. Department of Corrections*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 918.

Evidence; intention to steal sneakers from impounded car; removal not warranted. *Walsh v. City of Vineland*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 833.

Evidence; inappropriate physical contact with a client; suspension not warranted. *Stewart v. Arthur Brisbane Child Treatment Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 827.

Evidence; physical abuse of a client; removal not warranted. *Mestres v. New Lisbon Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 823.

Failure of proof; layoff in bad faith; presumption that measures removing them were for reasons of economy. In the Matter of Layoffs of Certain Employees of Bergen Pines County Hospital, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 779.

Proof failed to show that employee resigned under duress or that her employer acceded to her efforts to rescind. *Torres v. Buttonwood Hospital*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 753.

Psychiatric technician's medical condition and history was not sufficient to deprive her of employment. *Smith v. Essex County Hospital Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 702.

Failure to prove that employee engaged in an act of client abuse. *Brooks v. Ancora Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 664.

Failure to show that officer was improperly bypassed for promotion to police captain. *Hannafey v. Middletownship*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 594.

Failure to sustain disciplinary charge. *Angiuoli v. New Lisbon Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 570.

Failure to obtain a second urine sample for retesting did not prevent removal of police officers. *Higgins v. Department of Corrections*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 525.

Evidence failed to establish abuse of client. *Woolridge v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 316.

Failure to prove that employee stuck his finger in client's eye. *Jones v. New Lisbon Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 291.

Failure to establish neglect of duty and/or conduct unbecoming a police officer. *Ogonowski v. Police Department, Atlantic City*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 264.

Failure of evidence to support charge of physical abuse of patient. *Van Doimen v. Greystone Park*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 223.

Failure to establish physical abuse of clients; removal not justified. *Hannah v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 195.

Failure to sustain burden of proof; suspension. *DeSantis v. New Jersey Training School*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 193.

Evidence was sufficient to find employee guilty of coercion and intimidation of a co-worker; removal. *Perrin v. N.J. Veteran's Memorial Home, Vineland*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 148.

Evidence was insufficient to find that officer struck juvenile; removal not justified. *Dorsey v. Department of Corrections, Atlantic City*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 92.

Evidence was insufficient to find that nurse struck two patients. *Baker v. North Princeton Developmental Center, State Dept. of Human Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 84.

Evidence was insufficient to find that care worker slapped a patient; removal. N.J.S.A. 11A:2-21. *Gholston v. North Jersey Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 82.

Evidence established abuse of patient. *Williams v. Marlborough Psychiatric Hosp., State Dept. of Human Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 66.

Evidence was insufficient to find inappropriate physical contact with inmate. *Sepulveda v. New Jersey Training School for Boys, Jamesburg*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 65.

Evidence established that employee abused resident; removal. *New Jersey Veterans' Memorial Home, Parimus v. Cotton*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 60.

Release at end of working test period; failure to meet burden of establishing bad faith. N.J.S.A. 11A:4-15, 4A:2-4.1. *Jackson v. Meadowview Hosp., Hudson County*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 49.

Inconsistencies in record precluded finding as to making of false and misleading official statements. *State Police v. Suarez*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 29.

Evidence was insufficient to justify removal. *Robinson v. Salem County*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 20.

Alleged misrepresentation of facts by police officer as to presence of radar unit in troop car was not substantiated. *State Police v. McClelland*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 19.

Evidence was insufficient to find that human services assistant mentally or physically abused patient. *Pierce v. Vineland Developmental Center, New Jersey Department of Human Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 15.

Witness standoff left false statement charge unsubstantiated and required police officer's exoneration. *State Police v. Crawford*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 9.

Evidence was sufficient to justify removal from employment. *Bigley v. Hunterdon Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 5.

False report charge was not substantiated and precluded dismissal of police officer. *State Police v. McGovern*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 1.

Failure to prove that employee engaged in patient abuse. *Walker v. Violend Developmental Center*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 91.

Evidence was sufficient to find abuse of patient and threatening supervisor. *Knight v. Trenton Psychiatric Hosp.*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 85.

Evidence was sufficient to find employee falsified his attendance record. *Edmonds v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 67.

Evidence was insufficient to support patient's allegation of physical abuse. *Almedia v. Atlantic County Department of Health Institutions*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 49.

Evidence established neglect of duty, willful violation of law, conduct unbecoming public employee and dishonest and immoral conduct. *Smith v. Municipal Court of the Township of Hamilton*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 37.

Release from position at end of extended working test period; failure to establish that employer acted in bad faith. *Nardone v. New Jersey Commission for the Blind Visually Impaired*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 35.

Evidence was sufficient to find that worker burned client with hot water and failed to fully report the injuries. *Witcher v. New Lisbon Developmental Center*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 31.

Evidence was sufficient to find technician punched a patient in the face. *Willis v. Trenton Psychiatric Hosp.*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 27.

Discharge at end of working test period; failure to establish that employer acted in bad faith. *O'Connor v. Health Services Center of Camden County*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 23.

Evidence was sufficient to find neglect of duties, insubordination, and unbecoming conduct. *McIver v. Newark Housing Authority*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 19.

Evidence was sufficient to find absenteeism and tardiness and deliberate and material false misrepresentation on employment application. N.J.S.A. 11A:4-10. *Essex County Jail v. Burchett*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 5.

Evidence was sufficient to find chronic, excessive and abusive absenteeism and lateness. N.J.S.A. 4A:2-2.3. *Daniels v. Evergreen Manor, Camden County*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 3.

Appellant failed to show that employer (Newark Free Public Library) acted in bad faith in denying her a fair evaluation of her work performance and releasing her at the end of her working test period based on claim that her services were unsatisfactory (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.10). *Davis v. Newark Public Library*, 9 N.J.A.R. 84 (1987).

Burden of proof rests with employee challenging economic layoff (citing former N.J.A.C. (4:1-5.10). *Tyler et al. v. City of Paterson*, 2 N.J.A.R. 272 (1979).

In an appeal from a disciplinary action, the burden of proof is on the appointing authority (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.10). *Clark v. New Jersey Dep't of Agriculture*, 1 N.J.A.R. 315 (1980).

**4A:2-1.5 Remedies**

(a) Seniority credit may be awarded in any successful appeal.

(b) Back pay, benefits and counsel fees may be awarded in disciplinary appeals and where a layoff action has been in bad faith. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.10. In all other appeals, such relief may be granted where the appointing authority has unreasonably failed or delayed to carry out an order of the Commissioner or Board or where the Board finds sufficient cause based on the particular case.

**Case Notes**

A wrongfully discharged employee was entitled to both vacation leave and sick leave credits. Rule invalid (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.5(a)). *Eaddy v. Dep't of Transp.*, 208 N.J.Super. 156, 505 A.2d 162 (App.Div.1986) appeal dismissed 105 N.J. 569, 523 A.2d 200.

Sufficient cause not demonstrated to award back pay where employee was not entitled to a permanent appointment based on successful completion of the working test period, but rather was simply entitled to a new four-month working test period. In re *Afalo*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4145-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 546, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Appellant suspended and subsequently removed from title of Senior Systems Analyst was reinstated to duties appropriate to his permanent title (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.5). *Valluzzi v. Bergen County*, 10 N.J.A.R. 89 (1988), adopted—Merit System Bd., App.Div. A-3269-87, 3/3/88.

**4A:2-1.6 Reconsideration of decisions**

(a) Within 45 days of receipt of a decision, a party to the appeal may petition the Commissioner or Board for reconsideration.

(b) A petition for reconsideration shall be in writing signed by the petitioner or his or her representative and must show the following:

1. The new evidence or additional information not presented at the original proceeding which would change the outcome and the reasons that such evidence was not presented at the original proceeding; or
2. That a clear material error has occurred.

(c) Each party must serve copies of all materials submitted on all other parties.

Amended by R.2006 d.271, effective July 17, 2006.  
See: 37 N.J.R. 4345(a), 38 N.J.R. 3016(b).

In (a), substituted "Within 45 days of" for "Upon the".

**Case Notes**

A motion for reconsideration of a final administrative decision must be made within the period provided for the taking of an appeal. *Matter of Hill*, 241 N.J.Super. 367, 575 A.2d 42 (A.D.1990).

Senior corrections officer was an employee on date when complaint which formed basis of harassment conviction was filed, for purposes of forfeiture statute. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 230 N.J.Super. 374, 553 A.2d 830 (A.D.1989), affirmed 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983.

Senior corrections officer's criminal conviction for harassing his immediate superior was one "involving or touching" his employment. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 230 N.J.Super. 374, 553 A.2d 830 (App.Div.1989) affirmed 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983.

**4A:2-1.7 Specific appeals**

(a) For specific appeal procedures see:

1. Awards in State service (N.J.A.C. 4A:6-6.10);
2. Classification (N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.9);
3. Discipline, major (N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2);
4. Discipline, minor (N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3);
5. Discrimination in State service (N.J.A.C. 4A:7-3.2 and 3.3);
6. Employment list removal for medical reasons (N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5);
7. Employment list removal for psychological reasons (N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.5);
8. Examinations (N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6);
9. Grievances (N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3);
10. Layoffs (N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6);
11. Overtime in State service (N.J.A.C. 4A:3-5.10);
12. Performance Assessment Review in State service (N.J.A.C. 4A:6-5.3);
13. Reprisals (N.J.A.C. 4A:2-5);
14. Resignations (N.J.A.C. 4A:2-6);
15. Salary (job reevaluation) in state service (N.J.A.C. 4A:3-4.3);
16. Sick leave injury in State service (N.J.A.C. 4A:6-1.7); and
17. Supplemental compensation on retirement in State service (N.J.A.C. 4A:6-3.4).

(b) Any appeal not listed above must be filed in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1.

Administrative correction to (a), with deletion of (a)11 and renumbering of old (a)12-18 to new (a)11-17.

See: 22 N.J.R. 165(a).  
Amended by R.2006 d.271, effective July 17, 2006.  
See: 37 N.J.R. 4345(a), 38 N.J.R. 3016(b).

Deleted “.1 et seq.” following N.J.A.C. references throughout; in (a)5, substituted “and 3.3” for “through 4A:7-3.4”; and in (a)11, deleted “et seq.” following N.J.A.C. reference.

#### Case Notes

Appeals to Department of Personnel (DOP) and Merit System Board by police officer were timely. *Matter of Allen*, 262 N.J.Super. 438, 621 A.2d 87 (A.D.1993).

## SUBCHAPTER 2. MAJOR DISCIPLINE

#### Cross References

Applicability of this subchapter to SES members, see N.J.A.C. 4A:3-2.9.

#### 4A:2-2.1 Employees covered

(a) This subchapter applies only to permanent employees in the career service or a person serving a working test period.

(b) Appointing authorities may establish major discipline procedures for other employees.

(c) When the State of New Jersey and the majority representative have agreed pursuant to the New Jersey Employer-Employee Relations Act, N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.3, to a procedure for appointing authority review before a disciplinary action is taken against a permanent employee in the career service or an employee serving a working test period, such procedure shall be the exclusive procedure for review before the appointing authority.

(d) When the State of New Jersey and the majority representative have agreed pursuant to the New Jersey Employer-Employee Relations Act, N.J.S.A. 34:13A-5.3, to a disciplinary review procedure that provides for binding arbitration of disputes involving a disciplinary action which would be otherwise appealable to the Board under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.8, of a permanent employee in the career service or a person serving a working test period, such procedure shall be the exclusive procedure for any appeal of such disciplinary action.

Amended by R.2006 d.271, effective July 17, 2006.  
See: 37 N.J.R. 4345(a), 38 N.J.R. 3016(b).

Added (c) and (d).

#### Case Notes

Department of Energy was not equitably estopped from returning employee to his permanent position as senior engineer when promotional examination was not given between date of his provisional appointment and date of demotion (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.8). *O'Malley v. Department of Energy*, 109 N.J. 309, 537 A.2d 647 (1987).

Doctrine of equitable estoppel inapplicable to allow provisional employee to retain position (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.8). *Omrod v. N.J. Dep't of Civil Service*, 151 N.J.Super. 54, 376 A.2d 554 (App.Div.1977) certification denied 75 N.J. 534, 384 A.2d 513.

Ordinarily, permanent civil service employees can be discharged or demoted only for cause, and they have pre-termination appeal and hearing rights; however, provisional employees can be terminated at any

time at the discretion of the employer. *Melani v. County of Passaic*, 345 A.2d 579.

#### 4A:2-2.2 Types of discipline

(a) Major discipline shall include:

1. Removal;
2. Disciplinary demotion; and
3. Suspension or fine for more than five working days at any one time.

(b) See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.9 for minor disciplinary matters that are subject to a hearing, and N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3 for all other minor disciplinary matters.

(c) The length of a suspension in a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action, a Board decision or a settlement, when expressed in “days,” shall mean working days, unless otherwise stated.

Amended by R.2006 d.271, effective July 17, 2006.

See: 37 N.J.R. 4345(a), 38 N.J.R. 3016(b).

In (a)2, added “and” at the end; in (a)3, substituted a period for a semi-colon at the end; deleted (a)4 and (a)5; and added (b) and (c).

#### Case Notes

Employee did not demonstrate that Department of Labor's request to reallocate career position of Director to SES was made in bad faith and without complying with statutory procedures governing disciplinary proceedings. *Matter of Baykal*, 707 A.2d 467, 309 N.J.Super. 424.

Ordinarily, permanent civil service employees can be discharged or demoted only for cause, and they have pre-termination appeal and hearing rights; however, provisional employees can be terminated at any time at the discretion of the employer. *Melani v. County of Passaic*, 345 A.2d 579.

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 746) adopted, which concluded that a county correctional officer was properly removed from office for sleeping while on duty, the first time when the officer was stationed in a hospital room in the early morning with a shackled inmate and the second time when the officer was assigned to a dorm in the county correctional facility where inmates were seen milling around him. The danger to himself and others was so blatantly obvious and his explanations so lacking in credibility that it was clear that the officer did not understand the nature of the job he was in, and these two incidents were so egregious in nature as to warrant his immediate removal. In re *O'Mullan*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12226-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1091, Final Decision (December 17, 2008).

Removal from position of supervising sheet metal worker with public school district on grounds of (1) misrepresentation of facts of his criminal history on his job application and (2) abuse of authority by instructing subordinates to remove school district property for personal gain, was modified to six-month suspension where (1) school district did not prove that the alleged “crime” was in fact a crime and not a disorderly persons offense but (2) while that there was no policy concerning the disposal of scrap metal, it was abundantly clear that a public employee should not be able to profit when disposing of materials belonging to the appointing authority. That contractors were allowed to keep the salvaged proceeds for the sale of scrap they collected was inconsequential since the terms of a contract with an outside vendor may be clearly different from the responsibilities of employees with regard to appointing authority property. In re *Delli Santi*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11901-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1088, Civil Service Comm'n Decision (September 24, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 745) adopted, which concluded that a police officer was properly removed from office for conduct unbecoming and other sufficient cause for allegedly going on a family vacation and being at a work site for his landscaping business while, in both instances, he was on extended sick leave and did not have permission of his supervisor, particularly since the General Order which described the police department's sick-leave policy was very specific where it stated that an officer on sick leave must remain ". . . at his home unless he receives a Supervisor's permission to leave." In re Wright, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11929-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1090, Final Decision (September 24, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 742) adopted, which concluded on conflicting testimony that a Judiciary Account Clerk 2 who was charged with unlawfully taking child support payments totaling \$2,000 and refraining from depositing the cash in a state account, was properly removed notwithstanding the clerk's largely unblemished prior record. Although the clerk was a 20-year employee and her prior record included only a six-day suspension, removal was the proper penalty since it went without saying that the theft of funds fell short of that which the public has a right to expect, especially in the court system. In re Shabazz-Allen, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3592-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1055, Final Decision (September 24, 2008).

Police officer who had justifiably arrested a citizen for drunk and disorderly behavior but then detained the citizen in municipal jail for an unreasonable amount of time for improper and retaliatory reasons, was properly removed from office where he had previously received a 120 working day suspension and the offending conduct reflected an egregious abuse of discretion and authority. While the discretion given to police officers to determine length of detention was meant to include consideration of factors such as a detainee's combative conduct while in custody and the availability of a responsible adult to whom a detainee can be released, the length of the arrestee's detention was directly related to the police officer's desire to frustrate and aggravate the arrestee's wife in retaliation for her negative vote as a member of a zoning board of adjustment against the police officer's wife's variance application. In re Sharin, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4705-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1225, Final Decision (September 24, 2008).

Even if a nursing home institutional attendant was legitimately ill and falsified a doctor's note only to avoid being sent home and missing more work, the attendant's conduct warranted removal; the attendant was responsible for a vulnerable population and held a position of trust, i.e., the maintenance of patient records (modifying 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 358). In re Bundy, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 724-08, Final Decision (July 16, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 360) adopted, which concluded that removal of a city laborer employed for 19 years was proper because he tested positive on a random drug test, after having executed a Letter of Conditional Employment agreement; the agreement was a condition of the laborer's return to employment after admitting to a drug problem and undergoing rehabilitation, and the positive drug test was within 90 days of his return. In re Hayward, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 03287-08, Final Decision (July 16, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 287) adopted, which concluded that mitigating circumstances existed to reduce a correction officer's penalty for failing to conduct half-hour inmate counts, resulting in a delay in the discovery of a fatally ill inmate; removal was not justified where the officer was a new transferee with only five days on the job who had never served a third shift nor worked in an administrative segregation unit and thus did not have sufficient training to have been assigned to such a sensitive position. In re Washington, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5886-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 715, Merit System Board Decision (June 11, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 224) adopted, which concluded that removal was warranted for a laborer who had a lifting restriction preventing him from performing the essential functions of the position and who was found, despite his testimony to the contrary, to have frequently refused to perform job requirements. In re Delgado,

OAL Dkt. No. CSV 9697-07 (CSV 11940-05 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 721, Final Decision (May 21, 2008).

In determining the proper penalty for a public employee's infraction, several factors must be considered, including the seriousness of the underlying incident, the concept of progressive discipline, when appropriate, and the employee's prior record. In re Pettiford, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 8801-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 719, Merit System Board Decision (May 21, 2008).

As a law enforcement officer, a Correction Officer is held to a higher standard than a civilian public employee. In re Pettiford, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 8801-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 719, Merit System Board Decision (May 21, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 293) adopted, which concluded that an eight-day suspension was warranted for a police officer's failure to obey an order to holdover and work overtime and failure to communicate through regular channels; the police officer had worked 42 hours during the three previous days. In re Hannibal, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12920-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 607, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 194) adopted, which concluded that removal of a senior correction officer was warranted, notwithstanding a largely unblemished record, after the officer ignored directives barring familiarity and dealings between correction officers and inmates and smuggled in voluminous amounts of food for an inmate; the officer's misconduct was so severe that progressive discipline was bypassed. In re Battle, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 06489-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 578, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 227) adopted, which concluded that a correction officer's removal was proper based on a positive drug test for marijuana; although no witnesses with personal knowledge were found on remand to testify regarding the drug testing procedure and chain of custody, the documentary evidence was sufficient to meet the appointing authority's burden of proof. In re Brown, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12280-06 (CVS 8874-04 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 602, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Unrefuted positive test result for drug use has uniformly been held by the Merit System Board to warrant removal from employment for law enforcement employees. In re Brown, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12280-06 (CVS 8874-04 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 602, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 221) adopted, which concluded that a sign maker's separation from employment in the city's public works department was proper for inability to perform essential duties under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)3; the sign maker's loss of function due to an injury was permanent, causing an inability to perform about a third of the duties, the city had accommodated the employee by allowing time for recovery and light or limited duty, and the city did not have permanent light or limited duty available. Under these circumstances, a resignation in good standing, rather than removal, was appropriate in order to avoid stigma to the employee. In re Drake, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 8579-07 (CVS 8618-06 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 526, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 222) adopted, which found that the city was well within its rights to request a water works laborer to return to work until providing additional medical documentation to further verify his medical condition, and when the employee did not return to work, the city properly considered the absences unauthorized and the employee to have abandoned his position, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-6.2(b) and (c). However, the employee did get the documentation to the city and thus his actions were not so grave as to warrant termination; instead, a 60-day suspension was appropriate. In re Boyd, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 8836-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 625, Merit System Board Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 188) adopted, which emphasized that law enforcement officers, including correction officers, are

held to the highest standards of conduct, as they are vested with powers and responsibilities not held by other public employees. In re Porch, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 01307-07 (CSV 9567-06 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 574, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 200) adopted, which concluded that a county maintenance repairer was properly removed after pleading guilty to receipt of stolen property and breach of the peace, given the employee's previous six-month suspension and the sensitive areas in which maintenance repairers must work. In re Ditchkus, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10252-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 587, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 191) adopted, which concluded that termination was proper for a public works laborer who was informed after surgery that he must be at full capacity to work and thereafter did not call in sick on a daily basis or provide a doctor's note specifying the date he could return to full duty. The progressive penalties required for termination of a civil service employee pursuant to *West New York v. Bock*, 38 N.J. 500 (1962), were sufficient where the laborer had received multiple warnings of termination over the years due to excessive absenteeism; although the previous disciplinary actions were minor and there were none from March 2004 until Sept. 2006, the impact on the city's small public works department was major and enhanced suspensions would have only penalized the city. In re Pressley, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4501-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 503, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 197) adopted, which concluded that a building maintenance worker, who drove a township motor vehicle while under the influence of alcohol, resulting in suspension of his driver's license for two years, was properly removed; assuming that the employee was disabled by alcoholism, the township had repeatedly accommodated him despite previous offenses and there was no township employment available for him that did not require a driver's license. In re Overton, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 8542-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 525, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 43) adopted, which concluded that a laborer charged with 57 occasions of absenteeism without notice to superior or good cause was improperly terminated where the county failed to impose progressive discipline prior to removal. In re Porter, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1146-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 347, Merit System Board Decision (March 16, 2007).

Appointing authority's attempt to impose punishment at a later date for excessive absences previously addressed in a letter of reprimand was improper; reviving a stale charge in an attempt to impose a greater penalty at a later date is improper, and double punishment for the same offenses will be rejected. In re Porter, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1146-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 347, Merit System Board Decision (March 16, 2007).

Where police officer had been charged with performing his security duty without his duty belt and holster on, ALJ's recommendation to modify a 10-day suspension to a five-day suspension was proper since officer's actions did not rise to the level of willful defiance and were more akin to indifference or negligence; such actions were not worthy of a major discipline, especially in light of the officer's prior disciplinary history. In re Stewart, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12227-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 601, Final Decision (February 27, 2008).

Where police officer had been charged with revealing confidential information when he wrongfully posted a director's memorandum addressing access to city buildings to outsiders, ALJ's recommendation to reverse a five-day suspension and dismiss the charge was improper. The posting of the memorandum, though harmless, was still a violation of a police department regulation and it was clear that the memorandum contained official orders that should not have been disseminated to the public without approval. However, given the innocuous nature of the officer's actions, and the factual circumstances presented, an official written reprimand was the appropriate penalty. In re Stewart, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12227-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 601, Final Decision (February 27, 2008).

Where police officer had been charged with neglect of duty for failing to submit an administrative submission to his commanding officer disclosing that he had received a subpoena to appear in municipal court for testimony, ALJ's recommendation to modify a one-day suspension to a written warning was improper and the one-day suspension was reinstated. It is a fundamental principle of the workplace, especially in a paramilitary organization, that rules and regulations are to be followed, and a police officer cannot be permitted to pick and choose which rules and regulations he or she will adhere to. Given the police department's admission that the policy was not strictly adhered to, the imposition of a minor discipline for the infraction was proper. In re Stewart, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12227-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 601, Final Decision (February 27, 2008).

Where a pumping station operator with a county municipal utilities authority was charged with taking his fifteen-minute break in excess of one hour and fifteen minutes with a company vehicle without authorization, removal of the employee was improper and a four-month suspension was the proper penalty. The employee was a 17-year employee whose disciplinary record only evidenced one major disciplinary action, a 15-day suspension, and several minor disciplinary actions; while the employee's actions adversely affected the public's perception of the utilities authority, the employee's conduct was not of such an egregious nature as to justify a penalty of removal regardless of any mitigating factors. In re Stallworth, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2297-07, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1020, Merit System Board Decision (December 19, 2007).

Removal of county correction officer on grounds that she intentionally threw a pair of scissors at an inmate, causing cuts to his left middle finger and thumb, that she failed to report the incident to a supervisor and failed to have the inmate's injuries treated by medical personnel, was modified to a 90-day suspension where officer had been employed by the county since November 1990 and her disciplinary record evidenced 11 minor disciplines and a disciplinary demotion. The present infractions were not so inherently egregious that they warranted the officer's removal in light of her long record of service and disciplinary history and the fact that the most serious allegation, namely that she intentionally threw the scissors at the inmate, was withdrawn. In re Golden, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12214-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1035, Merit System Board Decision (December 5, 2007).

Removal of correction officer, and not 60-day suspension, was proper where employee had a short employment tenure and prior major discipline; moreover, the activation of a false fire alarm is a serious offense especially given the heightened security concerns in a correctional facility and the risk to the safety of the other officers and inmates (officer yelled and set off fire alarm when he was denied permission to contact his son's daycare center after being ordered to work overtime). In re Bell, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3527-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 771, Final Decision (August 9, 2006).

Suspension of 120 working days, rather than 90 working days, was the appropriate penalty where the employee's decision to report to work while having a blood alcohol level above the prescribed amounts placed the employee and others in potential danger and could have led to more severe consequences had he been assigned to drive on the day in question; although the employee's disciplinary history did not evidence any formal discipline, the employee had three prior incidents involving alcohol and one incident involving marijuana since he began working for the county in 1997. In re Eastlack, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 270-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 206, Final Decision (January 25, 2006).

Initial Decision (2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 402) adopted, which emphasized that the concept of progressive discipline does not mean that all possible measures must be taken; instead, an examination of the frequency, number, and continuity of the employer's warnings, reprimands, counseling and other measures, without necessarily including suspensions, indicates the progression of discipline (chronic lateness case). In re Jackson, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 01869-04, 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1074, Final Decision (September 7, 2005).

Initial Decision (2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 402) adopted, which found that language of a disciplinary settlement agreement, providing that the settlement would not be used as a precedent in any other matter, did not

foreclose the use of the prior discipline to decide whether there had been progressive discipline. In re Jackson, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 01869-04, 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1074, Final Decision (September 7, 2005).

Employee suspended for 10 days from position as account clerk for failure to deposit money (\$700,000) within 48-hour period required by N.J.S.A. 40A:5-15 and late deposit by mail of \$355,000; 10-day suspension upheld and \$500 fine imposed. Kennedy v. City of Burlington, 11 N.J.A.R. 20 (1988).

#### 4A:2-2.3 General causes

(a) An employee may be subject to discipline for:

1. Incompetency, inefficiency or failure to perform duties;
2. Insubordination;
3. Inability to perform duties;
4. Chronic or excessive absenteeism or lateness;
5. Conviction of a crime;
6. Conduct unbecoming a public employee;
7. Neglect of duty;
8. Misuse of public property, including motor vehicles;
9. Discrimination that affects equal employment opportunity (as defined in N.J.A.C. 4A:7-1.1), including sexual harassment;
10. Violation of Federal regulations concerning drug and alcohol use by and testing of employees who perform functions related to the operation of commercial motor vehicles, and State and local policies issued thereunder; and
11. Other sufficient cause.

Amended by R.1990 d.308, effective June 18, 1990.

See: 22 N.J.R. 1015(b), 22 N.J.R. 1915(a).

Added misuse of public property, including motor vehicles.

Amended by R.1994 d.618, effective December 19, 1994.

See: 26 N.J.R. 3507(a), 26 N.J.R. 5000(a).

Amended by R.1995 d.415, effective August 7, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 1837(a), 27 N.J.R. 2884(a).

Added (a)10, and recodified former (a)10 as (a)11.

#### Case Notes

Appellate court's reversal of the Merit System Board's (MSB's) decision to remove a public employee from her job was in error as the appellate court impermissibly imposed its own judgment as to the proper penalty when the MSB's penalty was not illegal, unreasonable, nor shocking to any sense of fairness; the MSB's decision to remove the employee for waving a cigarette lighter retrieved from her purse in the face of a five-year-old child in a room containing oxygen tanks recognized legitimate public policy reasons for not retaining the employee since she lost the trust of her employer. In re Herrmann, 192 N.J. 19, 926 A.2d 350, 2007 N.J. LEXIS 721 (2007).

Appellate court erred by treating the principle of progressive discipline as a mandate of law and rejecting a Merit System Board's opinion terminating a police officer for sleeping on the job. In re Carter, 191 N.J. 474, 924 A.2d 525, 2007 N.J. LEXIS 702 (2007).

As a county employee, an accountant, had been proven incompetent, the Merit System Board erred in reversing his termination and in imposing a six-month suspension; an accountant who could not prepare

a bank reconciliation was of no value to a county treasurer's office, and a suspension would not make him competent, since he always maintained that he performed his work properly. Klusaritz v. Cape May County, 387 N.J. Super. 305, 903 A.2d 1095, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 231 (App.Div. 2006).

In circumstances where an employee cannot competently perform the work required of his position, termination rather than progressive discipline is the appropriate action. Klusaritz v. Cape May County, 387 N.J. Super. 305, 903 A.2d 1095, 2006 N.J. Super. LEXIS 231 (App.Div. 2006).

A public employee cannot be dismissed for failure to submit to a procedure violative of his state and federal constitutional rights. Reames v. Department of Public Works, City of Paterson, 310 N.J. Super. 71, 707 A.2d 1377 (A.D. 1998).

Off-duty firefighter's utterance of racial epithet at on-duty police officer during traffic stop constituted conduct unbecoming both firefighter and public employee. Karins v. City of Atlantic City, 706 A.2d 706, 152 N.J. 532 (N.J. 1998).

Merit System Board of State Department of Personnel did not have exclusive jurisdiction for prosecution of forfeiture action against senior corrections officer. State v. Lee, 258 N.J. Super. 313, 609 A.2d 513 (A.D.1992).

Issue of forfeiture of public employment by turnpike utility worker did not have to be first addressed by administrative agency to determine whether there was any relationship between crimes committed and employment duties. State v. Baber, 256 N.J. Super. 240, 606 A.2d 891 (L.1992).

Turnpike utility worker's convictions for failure to deliver drugs to police and for simple assault upon two police officers were offenses "involving or touching" his job so as to justify forfeiture of employment. State v. Baber, 256 N.J. Super. 240, 606 A.2d 891 (L.1992).

Order directing forfeiture of public employment may be incorporated in sentence of criminal convictions. State v. Baber, 256 N.J. Super. 240, 606 A.2d 891 (L.1992).

Forfeiture of public employment, for conviction of failure to file gross income tax return was not a bill of attainder. Ayars v. New Jersey Dept. of Corrections, 251 N.J. Super. 223, 597 A.2d 1084 (A.D.1991).

Forfeiture of public employment for conviction for failure to file gross income tax return did not violate double jeopardy. Ayars v. New Jersey Dept. of Corrections, 251 N.J. Super. 223, 597 A.2d 1084 (A.D.1991).

Dismissal was appropriate sanction for refusal by correction officers to submit to mandatory drug testing. Caldwell v. New Jersey Dept. of Corrections, 250 N.J. Super. 592, 595 A.2d 1118 (A.D.1991), certification denied 127 N.J. 555, 606 A.2d 367.

When public employee is convicted of petty disorderly persons offense, analysis of nexus between crime and employment is required to determine if there is sufficient relationship between the two to warrant harsh penalty of forfeiture. Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

When public employee is convicted of petty disorderly persons offense, connection between conviction and employment will have to be examined initially by governmental department in which employee works, then by appropriate administrative agencies, and employee will retain right to appeal to appellate division. Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

Employees who are convicted of petty disorderly persons offense and recognize that their offense does touch and involve their employment can for good cause request county prosecutor or Attorney General to petition sentencing court for waiver of resultant forfeiture of public employment. Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

Even in cases in which public employee does not obtain formal waiver of forfeiture of public employment resulting from conviction of petty disorderly persons offense, department should consider whether punishment of forfeiture fits crime. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

Inquiry into whether offense by public employee involves and touches on public employment to extent of meriting forfeiture of employment requires careful examination of facts and evaluation of various factors. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

Offense committed by public employee would not be considered not to involve or touch employment, so as to support forfeiture of public employment, based on fact that offense does not take place during employment hours or on employment grounds. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

Evidence supported determination that criminal conviction for harassing immediate superior warranted forfeiture of public employment. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983 (1990).

Whether public employee's conviction involves or touches employment does not depend upon whether criminally proscribed acts took place within immediate confines of employment's daily routine. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 230 N.J.Super. 374, 553 A.2d 830 (A.D.1989), affirmed 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983.

Senior corrections officer's criminal conviction for harassing his immediate superior was one "involving or touching" his employment as a senior corrections officer. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 230 N.J.Super. 374, 553 A.2d 830 (A.D.1989), affirmed 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983.

Department of Energy was not equitably estopped from returning employee to his permanent position as senior engineer when promotional examination was not given between date of his provisional appointment and date of demotion (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-1.1). *O'Malley v. Department of Energy*, 109 N.J. 309, 537 A.2d 647 (1987).

Tenure of public officer governed by Civil Service Commission; broad discretion conferred upon appointing authority regarding grounds for removal (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-6.9). *State v. DeMarco*, 107 N.J. 562, 527 A.2d 417 (1987).

Off-duty police officer, involved in fatal accident which was basis for his conviction of death by auto, disqualified from unemployment compensation effective the date of his suspension pending discharge (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.9). *Connell v. Board of Review*, 216 N.J.Super. 403, 523 A.2d 1099 (App.Div.1987).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 873) adopted, which concluded that 12-year senior juvenile detention officer used excessive force against a 12-year-old juvenile detainee and was guilty of conduct unbecoming a public employee justifying removal from his position. It was readily apparent from viewing a surveillance video that the officer became angry and intended to enact some type of retribution against the juvenile for hitting him on the nose; the officer knew the floor of the "day room" was concrete yet he dangled the juvenile over it risking serious harm to him if he fell and hit his head, and he knew the juvenile suffered from ADHD and was "excitable" and yet persisted with his conduct that contributed to further agitation and fear. In re Heigler, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4448-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1057, Final Decision (December 17, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 613) adopted, which concluded on conflicting testimony that a township police officer was properly removed on charges that he unnecessarily engaged in a physical altercation in a bar, which he instigated, and subsequently engaged in conduct aimed at preventing his identification in the incident, such as shielding his license plate from view, leaving the premises before the authorities arrived, and ignoring a message from a superior officer regarding the incident. Moreover, it could not be ignored that the police

officer was a relatively short-term employee, having been employed for approximately four years at the time of the incident. In re Hawkins, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4469-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1222, Final Decision (December 3, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 842) adopted, which concluded on conflicting testimony that conduct of an employee in forcefully grabbing patient around her neck and walking her down the hallway while striking her on her back was so egregious and unacceptable that the employee should be removed from her position as a human services assistant at a developmental center. In re Dempster, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2356-08 (CSV 2944-07 On Remand), 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1211, Final Decision (November 6, 2008).

Correction sergeant at youth correctional facility was properly removed from office on charges that on three occasions, sergeant attended his township's council or board of education meetings while he reported on his timesheet and in the log books that he was at work for the entire shift, and he received compensation for the entire shift. Although the sergeant attempted to justify this egregious and dishonest behavior by suggesting that other employees were "covering for" him, the log books showed that the sergeant was on duty and, in the event of an emergency or unusual incident, superior officers would have had inaccurate information as to who was on duty; moreover, there was no evidence that the sergeant received any supervisory approval for these reciprocal arrangements on the dates in question. In re La Pierre, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 462-08, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1224, Final Decision (October 22, 2008).

Correction sergeant at youth correctional facility was suspended from office for six months on charges that he was elected to his township's board of education, but he failed to notify his employer of his outside activity, as required by the appointing authority's code of ethics. Despite sergeant's contention that an April 2003 note from him to a personnel officer advised that he had been so elected, the sergeant did not testify as to the authenticity of this document, and there was no evidence presented to demonstrate that the document was actually created in 2003 and submitted to the appointing authority; without such testimony or evidence, this document was essentially meaningless, as it just as likely could have been created by the sergeant immediately in advance of the hearing. Moreover, even if genuine, such brief correspondence, on a one-time basis, did not fulfill the sergeant's obligations under the appointing authority's code of ethics or its policy regarding political activity. In re La Pierre, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 462-08, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1224, Final Decision (October 22, 2008).

Correction sergeant at youth correctional facility was suspended from office for six months on charges that sergeant during his shift observed an abandoned vehicle in the staff parking area, and he failed to report this observation to the ranking correction lieutenant, the shift commander, or the correction sergeant who relieved him at the end of his shift. Although the sergeant's offense touched upon the security of the facility, and it should have been promptly reported and addressed, in light of his prior minor disciplinary record, a six-month suspension was sufficient. In re La Pierre, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 462-08, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1224, Final Decision (October 22, 2008).

While the Civil Service Commission cannot tolerate the continued employment of an employee who is in constant contact with a vulnerable population and who reports to duty while under the influence of alcohol, nevertheless the Commission is hesitant to deprive an employee of his property interest in his employment solely on the basis of a test that reflected a blood alcohol content (BAC) reading of .011%, which an expert testified equated to one-half of an alcoholic beverage, at 11:25 a.m., the time of the BAC test. The case was remanded to the OAL in order that the expert could present his expert opinion regarding what the employee's BAC would have been when he reported to duty at 6:25 a.m., and the employee was to be given the opportunity to cross-examine the expert regarding his opinion and to present testimony from his own expert on the extrapolation issue. In re Dare, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 548-08, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1227, Remand Decision (October 8, 2008).

Correction sergeant's use of the term "fag" in an argument with a fellow employee violated the State Policy as it was a demeaning term

based on gender and sexual orientation, and a 10 working day suspension was appropriate. Although the sergeant had only one prior minor disciplinary suspension, her conduct was unacceptable and warranted major discipline. Her behavior was especially egregious given that she was a law enforcement superior officer; a correction sergeant, like a municipal police officer, holds a highly visible and sensitive position within the community and the standard for an applicant includes good character and an image of utmost confidence and trust. In re Carter-Green, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4272-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1221, Final Decision (September 10, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 361) adopted, which concluded that a correction officer committed no infraction by failing to submit written proof of her family emergency because the emergency was that the officer's young daughter was locked out of the house, a situation that would not generate written proof. In re Irizarry, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 03298-07, Final Decision (Aug. 27, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 314) adopted, which concluded, *inter alia*, that an employee charged with excessive absenteeism presented no basis to find that the appointing authority violated FMLA rights in connection with her absences to care for her son when he was suspended from school; the record did not contain sufficient evidence substantiating the suspensions, supporting the pediatrician's opinion, and relating the school suspensions to the son's psychological/emotional problems. In re Paoella, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 118-08, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 707, Final Decision (June 11, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 317) adopted, which concluded that undisputed testimony established that a sanitation department laborer used reasonable force to defend himself when a co-worker pushed him; thus, the 10-day suspension of the laborer was not justified. In re Greene, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5322-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 501, Merit System Board Decision (May 21, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 290) adopted, which concluded that dismissal was justified where an assistant water treatment plant operator failed a drug test, after having signed a last-chance agreement; the failure of a public employee to abide by the terms of a last-chance agreement constitutes sufficient cause for dismissal. In re McBride, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10111-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 585, Final Decision (May 21, 2008).

Working day suspension of 120 days rather than removal was appropriate where a police officer's deficiencies, while serious, were in one area only, that of report preparation, and the officer was otherwise able to successfully execute the duties of police officer (adopting in part and modifying in part 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 290). In re Linthicum, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10251-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 703, Merit System Board Decision (May 21, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 219) adopted, which concluded that county policy mandated removal of an equipment operator who refused to provide a second sample during a drug test, considering his drug test record; the presence or absence of random selection for the testing in question had not been demonstrated with persuasive scientific evidence, and even if so found, absence of randomness would not, on the present record, have forestalled application of the rules directing termination. In re Riggins, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4788-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 555, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 218) adopted, which concluded that city failed to meet its burden of proof that a police lieutenant, assigned as desk supervisor, neglected his duty by failing to maintain order and control over a subordinate officer when a detective entered the precinct in a disorderly manner looking for a relative who was under arrest; the lieutenant did all that he could to subdue the ranting and raving of the detective. In re Mercado, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 7901-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 518, Merit System Board Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 223) adopted, which found that conduct unbecoming a police officer included engaging in outside employment while on sick leave and failing to obtain approval for, and

making a false statement to an Internal Affairs investigator about, the outside employment; removal was neither unduly harsh nor disproportionate. In re Howard, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 9338-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 627, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Matter remanded because an incident report completed to document an employee's refusal to submit to a drug screening and for the purpose of pursuing discipline was not a routine report admissible under N.J.R.E. 803(c)(6); the supervisor who completed the report did not testify. In re Richardson, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5339-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 502, Merit System Board Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 192) adopted, which concluded that 10-day suspension for unbecoming conduct was proper where the ALJ found, on conflicting testimony, that a cook employee refused four direct orders from her supervisors and openly dared them to charge her with insubordination. In re Johnson-McCall, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4825-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 560, Final Decision (April 9, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 80) adopted, which found that termination of a police aide for failure to timely and satisfactorily respond to a 911 call was warranted where the aide neglected to refer and prioritize a domestic violence call to the dispatcher. In re Flagler, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1302-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 527, Final Decision (April 9, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 104) adopted, which concluded that termination was proper for a university cleaning employee who was found, on conflicting testimony, to have threatened another employee, while off-campus and off-duty, and to have made false charges against a supervisor; although the phrase "conduct unbecoming," is not defined in the New Jersey Statutes or in the New Jersey Administrative Code, as noted by the New Jersey Supreme Court, the phrase is an elastic one, and has been defined as "any conduct which adversely affects . . . morale or efficiency . . . [or] which has a tendency to destroy public respect for municipal employees and confidence in the operation of municipal services." In re Ufomba, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 00440-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 572, Final Decision (March 26, 2008).

Suspension of 10 days was warranted, where there was no dispute that the county employee served on the advisory board of a community group that was seeking county approval of a proposed redevelopment project on county property; despite repeated warnings by supervisors, the employee continued to make contact with other public and private officials in his capacity as a Senior Planner with the county in an attempt to further the goals of the community group. The employee's activities constituted conduct unbecoming a public employee, misuse of county property, and violation of the Local Government Ethics Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:9-22.5. In re Reid, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2045-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1044, Final Decision (January 17, 2007).

Tax collector's refusal to comply with new business hours; cause for suspension without pay. *Newfield Borough v. Moynihan*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CAF) 2.

Incompetence and poor judgement exhibited by Casino Control Commission's Chief of Staff with respect to employee buyouts and meal recompensation merited three-month suspension without pay and demotion. In the Matter of Papp, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CCC) 1.

Lack of specificity in assignment defeats employer's suspension action for neglect of duty. *Stevenson v. Burlington County Mosquito Control Commission*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 702.

Removal of utilities employees due to unbecoming conduct and falsification of records affirmed. *Phillips and Williams v. Deptford Township Municipal Utilities Authority*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 695.

Probationary firefighter removed after testing twice for drug use and signing certifications authenticating testing procedures. *McHugh v. City of East Orange Fire Department*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 692.

Building engineer's appropriate action to solve building's mechanical problems inappropriate subject for removal. *Clark v. Northern State Prison*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 686.

Excessive absences justify classified employee's removal. *Cesaretti v. Atlantic County*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 680.

Corrections officer terminated for over-familiarity with inmate. *Anderson v. East Jersey State Prison*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 675.

Suspension of hospital attendant due to excessive absenteeism modified. *Shapiro v. Burlington County*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 673.

Suspension of correction officer for unbecoming conduct due to falsification of time records affirmed. *Rodriguez v. Cumberland County*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 671.

Removal of juvenile detention officer for excessive absenteeism affirmed. *King v. Cumberland County*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 664.

Demotion of correction sergeant due to failure to follow policies regarding removal of inmate affirmed. *Gianni v. Albert C. Wagner Youth Correctional Facility*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 661.

Termination of human services technician for physical abuse of patient reduced to suspension. *Farmer v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hospital*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 660.

Employee's workload backlog not grounds for suspension if work pace within reasonable levels within agency. *Teel v. Mercer County Board of Social Services*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 657.

Supervisor's threat of assault justifies suspension. *Viteritto v. Northern State Prison*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 655.

Suspension and removal of police officer due to unbecoming conduct, insubordination and assault affirmed. *Schreck v. Township of Woodbridge Police Department*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 645.

Suspension of sergeant for unbecoming conduct due to inappropriate use of force against resident affirmed. *Mullins v. New Jersey Training School for Boys, Jamesburg*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 643.

Excessive absences justify youth worker's removal. *Evans v. Mercer County Youth Detention Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 637.

Removal of building maintenance worker for excessive absenteeism due to work-related injury inappropriate. *Allison v. Trenton Housing Authority*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 633.

Suspension of Safety Specialist due to chronic or excessive lateness affirmed. *Williams v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 632.

Employee's physical abuse of institutional client justifies removal. *Vinson v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 630.

Removal of Maintenance Repairer based on erroneous information not justified. *Peters v. Hackensack Housing Authority*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 628.

Removal due to refusal to cooperate with alcohol testing affirmed. *Parham and Day v. Department of Transportation*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 621.

Removal of laborer due to persistent misconduct affirmed. *O'Brick v. Township of Pennsauken, Department of Public Works*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 617.

Nurse's removal for backdating facility report on client modified. *Milbourne v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 614.

Lack of evidence defeats appointing authority's disciplinary charges. *Jensen v. North Princeton Developmental Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 612.

Junior officer's disobedience warrants suspension for unbecoming conduct. *Heigler v. Gloucester County, Office of Sheriff*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 607.

Removal of truck driver for causing disturbance on state property affirmed. *Grimaldi v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 604.

Choking institutionalized juvenile justifies technician's removal for client mistreatment. *Fouco v. Woodbine Developmental Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 601.

Removal of clerk typist due to excessive absenteeism and unauthorized use of property unwarranted. *Crumidy v. Middlesex County Board of Taxation*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 596.

Removal for neglect of duty due to absence reduced to three month suspension. *Coppola v. Township of Gloucester, Department of Recreation*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 593.

Public employee failing to report for assignment and repeatedly failing to comply with supervisor's directives justifies removal. *Bright v. Arthur Brisbane Child Treatment Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 586.

Removal of clerk typist due to absenteeism modified to suspension. *Viereck v. City of Gloucester City, Department of Administration*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 573.

Suspensions and removal of institutional attendant for use of insulting language modified. *Whitehead v. Monmouth County*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 569.

Removal of service officer for neglect of duty remanded. *Avanti v. Department of Military and Veteran's Affairs*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 564.

Failure to seek treatment but continuing to arrive to work while intoxicated justifies removal of security guard. *Joseph v. Jersey City State College*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 561.

Hospital technician's inaction resulting in danger to others justifies removal. *Polansky v. Hunterdon Developmental Center*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 549.

Removal of sheriff's officer for failure to submit to psychological exam appropriate. Villani v. Passaic County Sheriff's Department, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 533.

Unexplained tardiness insufficient grounds for removal. Good v. Northern State Prison, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 529.

Suspension of correction officer due to alleged sexual harassment and verbal abuse dismissed. Hammond v. Monmouth County Sheriff's Office, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 525.

Failure to follow chain of command before releasing test results to personnel agency justifies verbal reprimand over suspension. Hartmann v. Department of Law and Public Safety, Division of Police, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 519.

Suspension of sheriff's officer for neglect of duty affirmed. Thomas v. Passaic County Jail, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 517.

Bookkeeper's suspension for conduct unbecoming public employee not justified. Volpe v. Bureau of Parole, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 448.

Police officer's suspension for insubordination and unbecoming conduct modified. Thigpen v. City of East Orange Police Department, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 446.

Hearing officer's suspension for neglect of duty and conduct unbecoming public employee affirmed. Morley v. Department of Labor, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 442.

Suspension of employee not justified when appointing authority fails to establish any misconduct. Long v. New Lisbon Environmental Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 440.

Employee's failure to comply with administrative order warrants removal. Leftridge v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 438.

Removal of institutional attendant for abusive absenteeism and lateness justified. Kralle v. Red Oak Manor, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 435.

Removal of employee for encouraging a patient to strike another patient was justified. Hill v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 433.

Suspension for chronic or excessive absenteeism and lateness justified. Gonzalez v. City of Newark, Department of Water and Sewer Utility, Division of Sewers and Water Supply, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 430.

Removal for conduct unbecoming public employee justified. Galloza-Orama v. New Lisbon Development Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 428.

Removal for conduct unbecoming public employee not justified. Chandler v. Jersey City State College, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 426.

Release of telephone operator for unsatisfactory services justified. Bahary v. Department of Buildings and Grounds, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 423.

Corrections employee's misuse of state property justifies removal. Williams v. COTA-Department of Corrections, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 418.

Employee given authorized absences suffers removal for unauthorized absences after extension denied. Weil v. Atlantic County Department of Public Safety, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 413.

Removal of corrections officer for undue familiarity and conduct unbecoming an employee affirmed. Ventola v. Northern State Prison, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 408.

Removal from Aviation Mechanics eligibility list justified. Tullo v. State Department of Law and Public Safety, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 405.

Male corrections officer's sexual harassment of female officer justifies suspension. Reed v. Department of Corrections, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 403.

Suspensions modified and removal of correction officer for excessive absenteeism affirmed. Parks v. Atlantic County Adult Detention Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 395.

Insufficient proof defeats charges supporting suspension of security guard for falsification. Ortiz v. State Department of Transportation, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 393.

Falling asleep on duty justified removal of cottage technician. Burton v. Woodbine Developmental Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 391.

Suspension of employee for failing to follow procedures justified. Steinmetz v. New Lisbon Developmental Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 389.

Teacher's aide violating inmate contact rules while working in prison suffers removal. Rose v. East Jersey State Prison, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 385.

City driver's refusal to participate in drug testing justifies termination. Reames v. Department of Public Works, City of Patterson, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 376.

Termination of employee for violating Drug-Free Workplace Policy is justified. Myers v. Jersey City Housing Authority, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 374.

Employee misstating and falsifying accident injury suffers extended suspension. Montiero v. Vineland Developmental Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 367.

Police officer's suspension for conduct unbecoming justified. Lewis v. City of East Orange Police Department, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 364.

Intoxicated on-duty police officer terminated. Robinson v. City of Wildwood Police Department, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 360.

Police officer failing to activate siren upon high speed pursuit suffers suspension. Ring v. Department of Public Safety of the Township of South Orange, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 351.

Nurse's aide's use of physical force to restrain patient not patient abuse. King v. Morrisview Nursing Home, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 342.

Final warning notice triggers suspension for previously chronically absent employee lately absent due to accident injuries. Hoffman v. Hudson County Department of Public Safety, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 337.

Removal of maintenance engineer for unbecoming conduct and neglect of duty modified to suspension. Gann v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hospital, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 326.

No suspension for assault on state property when employee reasonably responding to being assaulted. Fritsch v. Forensic Psychiatric Hospital, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 323.

Removal of employee for excessive absenteeism and neglect of duty justified. DelGrosso v. Atlantic County Adult Detention Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 321.

Electrician properly demoted for dangerous wiring. Brown v. Vineland Developmental Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 315.

2. In lieu of a suspension, when the appointing authority establishes that a suspension of the employee would be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare; or

3. Where an employee has agreed to a fine as a disciplinary option.

(d) An employee may pay a fine of more than five days salary in a lump sum or through installments. Unless otherwise agreed to by the employee, an installment may not be more than five percent of the gross salary per pay for a fine under \$500.00; 10 percent of gross salary per pay period for a fine between \$500.00 and \$1,000; or 15 percent of gross salary per pay period for a fine over \$1,000.

(e) An appointing authority may impose a suspension on the record when the appointing authority and the employee, or, where the employee is covered by a collective negotiations agreement, the employee's majority representative, agree in writing that, for purposes of progressive discipline,

the employee will receive a suspension on the record and that it will have the same force and effect for purposes of future disciplinary actions as a suspension actually served by the employee.

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 30 N.J.R. 3103(a), 30 N.J.R. 3552(a).

Petition for Rulemaking: Notice of Receipt; General Rules and Department Organization Appeals, Discipline and Separations Suspensions on the Record.

See: 38 N.J.R. 1085(a).

Amended by R.2006 d.386, effective November 6, 2006.

See: 38 N.J.R. 2773(a), 38 N.J.R. 4690(a).

In (b), inserted the last sentence; and added (e).

#### Case Notes

Dismissal of police officer was supported by officer's intentional avoidance of communication with police chief prior to taking unauthorized vacation; officer's conduct was so egregious as to warrant suspension of greater than six months, and civil service rules require dismissal of employee whose offense dictates such suspension. *Cosme v. Borough of East Newark Tp. Committee*, 304 N.J.Super. 191, 698 A.2d 1287 (A.D. 1997).

Traffic signal repairer removed for falsifying application for employment with regard to criminal convictions. *Florenzo v. Bergen County Department of Public Works*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 22.

Police officer who lost police radio through carelessness was appropriately fined. *Przybyszewski v. Gloucester Township Police Department*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 623.

**4A:2-2.5 Opportunity for hearing before the appointing authority**

(a) An employee must be served with a Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action setting forth the charges and statement of facts supporting the charges (specifications), and afforded the opportunity for a hearing prior to imposition of major discipline, except:

1. An employee may be suspended immediately and prior to a hearing where it is determined that the employee is unfit for duty or is a hazard to any person if permitted to remain on the job, or that an immediate suspension is necessary to maintain safety, health, order or effective direction of public services. However, a Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action with opportunity for a hearing must be served in person or by certified mail within five days following the immediate suspension.

2. An employee may be suspended immediately when the employee is formally charged with a crime of the first, second or third degree, or a crime of the fourth degree on the job or directly related to the job. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.7.

(b) Where suspension is immediate under (a)1 and (a)2 above, and is without pay, the employee must first be apprised either orally or in writing, of why an immediate suspension is sought, the charges and general evidence in support of the charges and provided with sufficient opportunity to review the charges and the evidence in order to respond to the charges before a representative of the appointing authority. The response may be oral or in writing, at the discretion of the appointing authority.

(c) The employee may request a departmental hearing within five days of receipt of the Preliminary Notice. If no request is made within this time or such additional time as agreed to by the appointing authority or as provided in a negotiated agreement, the departmental hearing may be considered to have been waived and the appointing authority may issue a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action.

(d) A departmental hearing, if requested, shall be held within 30 days of the Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action unless waived by the employee or a later date as agreed to by the parties. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13 for hearings regarding removal appeals by certain law enforcement officers and firefighters.

(e) Appeals concerning violations of this section may be presented to the Civil Service Commission through a petition for interim relief. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.2.

Amended by R.1989 d.569, effective November 6, 1989. See: 21 N.J.R. 1766(a), 21 N.J.R. 3448(b).

Added new (e).

Amended by R.1992 d.414, effective October 19, 1992.

See: 24 N.J.R. 2491(a), 24 N.J.R. 3716(a).

Revised (a).

Special amendment, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).

See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

In (d), inserted the last sentence; and in (e), substituted "Civil Service Commission" for "Commissioner".

**Law Review and Journal Commentaries**

Discrimination—Collateral Estoppel—Police Officers. *Judith Nallin*, 138 N.J.L.J. No. 1, 49 (1994).

**Case Notes**

Former city police officer's claim that the city and two officials violated the officer's procedural due process rights in disciplining the officer survived summary judgment in part given fact issues as to whether the final disciplinary decision was made by the person authorized to do so for purposes of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5 and 4A:2-2.6; it was unclear whether the decision was made by the "appointing authority" under N.J.A.C. 4A:1-1.3. *Reilly v. City of Atl. City*, 427 F.Supp.2d 507, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 17208 (D.N.J. 2006).

The requirement of holding departmental hearing within 30 days of service of preliminary notice of disciplinary action against career service public employee was not jurisdictional, and thus, an appointing authority may proceed with disciplinary charges even if it fails to conduct a departmental hearing within the statutorily mandated period. *Goodman v. Department of Corrections*, 367 N.J.Super. 591, 844 A.2d 543.

Ordinarily, permanent civil service employees can be discharged or demoted only for cause, and they have pre-termination appeal and hearing rights; however, provisional employees can be terminated at any time at the discretion of the employer. *Melani v. County of Passaic*, 345 A.2d 579.

Adequate consideration given provisions of Law Against Discrimination. *Ensslin v. Township of North Bergen*, 275 N.J.Super. 352, 646 A.2d 452 (A.D.1994), certification denied 142 N.J. 446, 663 A.2d 1354.

Procedural irregularities at departmental level; cured by hearing at agency level. *Ensslin v. Township of North Bergen*, 275 N.J.Super. 352, 646 A.2d 452 (A.D.1994), certification denied 142 N.J. 446, 663 A.2d 1354.

Waiver of hearing. *Ensslin v. Township of North Bergen*, 275 N.J.Super. 352, 646 A.2d 452 (A.D.1994), certification denied 142 N.J. 446, 663 A.2d 1354.

Departmental hearing required within thirty days of preliminary notice of disciplinary action. *Ensslin v. Township of North Bergen*, 275 N.J.Super. 352, 646 A.2d 452 (A.D.1994), certification denied 142 N.J. 446, 663 A.2d 1354.

Due process rights of corrections officers who were dismissed for failure to comply with mandatory drug test order were violated. *Caldwell v. New Jersey Dept. of Corrections*, 250 N.J.Super. 592, 595 A.2d 1118 (A.D.1991), certification denied 127 N.J. 555, 606 A.2d 367.

Lack of entitlement to post termination hearing. *Grexa v. State*, 168 N.J.Super. 202, 402 A.2d 938 (App.Div.1978).

Due process: right to post termination hearing (statutory). *Nicoletta v. No. Jersey District Water Supply Commission*, 77 N.J. 145, 390 A.2d 90 (1978). Concurring and dissenting opinions.

Right to hearing. *Cunningham v. Dept. of Civil Service*, 69 N.J. 13, 350 A.2d 58 (1975).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 228) adopted, which concluded that the appointing authority had the right to impose an indefinite suspension without pay under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5(a)2 on a correction of officer until June 26, the date when the officer pleaded guilty to downgraded charges, rather than only until March 7, the date when the County Prosecutor chose to downgrade the indictable offense, as the downgrade was specifically conditioned on a guilty plea. *In re Paris*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12208-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 708, Final Decision (June 11, 2008).

Hearing de novo on appeal to Merit System Board corrected alleged inadequate notice. *Coley v. Rowan College*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 4.

Absence of timely hearing required dismissal of disciplinary charges. *Marjarum v. Hamilton Township Division of Police*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 143.

Failure to comply with appropriate regulations in seeking to discipline employee. *Hamilton v. Camden Housing Authority*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 85.

Failure to provide employee with notice of dismissal; acts following meeting were not void pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-15. *McManus v. Housing Authority of the City of Englewood*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 747.

Preliminary notice of disciplinary action met minimum discovery requirements. N.J.S.A. 40A:14-147, 11A:2-13. *Gabbianelli v. Monroe Township Police Department*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 79.

#### 4A:2-2.6 Hearings before the appointing authority

(a) The hearing shall be held before the appointing authority or its designated representative.

(b) The employee may be represented by an attorney or authorized union representative.

(c) The parties shall have the opportunity to review the evidence supporting the charges and present and examine witnesses. The employee shall not be required to testify, but an employee who does testify will be subject to cross-examination.

(d) Within 20 days of the hearing, or such additional time as agreed to by the parties, the appointing authority shall make a decision on the charges and furnish the employee either by personal service or certified mail with a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13 for the issuance of a Final Notice in removal appeals by certain law enforcement officers and firefighters.

Special amendment, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).

See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

In (d), inserted the last sentence.

#### Case Notes

Due process. *Carr v. Sharp*, C.A., 454 F.2d 271 (1971).

Requirement of exhaustion of administrative remedies. *City of New Brunswick v. Speights*, 157 N.J.Super. 9, 384 A.2d 225 (Co.1978).

Res judicata: delay in hearing; limits on de novo hearing. *In re Darcy*, 114 N.J.Super. 454, 277 A.2d 226 (1971).

Receipt of second copy of final notice of disciplinary action did not extend time for filing appeal. *Russ v. Human Services Department*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 647.

Public employee voluntarily and deliberately planned his nonappearance at hearing and was not entitled to further hearing. *Cue v. Camden County*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 131.

#### 4A:2-2.7 Actions involving criminal matters

(a) When an appointing authority suspends an employee based on a pending criminal complaint or indictment, the employee must be served with a Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action. The notice should include a statement that N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2 may apply to the employee, and that the employee may choose to consult with an attorney concerning the provisions of that statute.

1. The employee may request a departmental hearing within five days of receipt of the Notice. If no request is made within this time, or such additional time as agreed to by the appointing authority or as provided in a negotiated agreement, the appointing authority may then issue a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action under (a)3 below. A hearing shall be limited to the issue of whether the public interest would best be served by suspending the employee until disposition of the criminal complaint or indictment. The standard for determining that issue shall be whether the employee is unfit for duty or is a hazard to any person if permitted to remain on the job, or that an immediate suspension is necessary to maintain safety, health, order or effective direction of public services.

2. The appointing authority may impose an indefinite suspension to extend beyond six months where an employee is subject to criminal charges as set forth in N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5(a)2, but not beyond the disposition of the criminal complaint or indictment.

i. Where an employee who has been indefinitely suspended enters Pre-Trial Intervention (PTI) or has received a conditional discharge, the criminal complaint or indictment shall not be deemed disposed of until completion of PTI or until dismissal of the charges due to the employee's satisfaction of the conditions in a conditional discharge, as the case may be.

ii. An appointing authority may continue an indefinite suspension until completion of PTI or until satisfaction of the conditions imposed in a conditional discharge. If an appointing authority chooses not to continue an indefinite suspension during the PTI period or during the period of conditional discharge, it may restore the employee to employment or initiate disciplinary action against the employee.

3. Where the appointing authority determines that an indefinite suspension should be imposed, a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action shall be issued stating that the employee has been indefinitely suspended pending disposition of the criminal complaint or indictment.

(b) When a court has entered an order of forfeiture pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2, the appointing authority shall notify the employee in writing of the forfeiture and record the

forfeiture in the employee's personnel records. The appointing authority shall also forward a copy of this notification to the Department of Personnel.

1. If the criminal action does not result in an order of forfeiture issued by the court pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2, the appointing authority shall issue a second Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action specifying any remaining charges against the employee upon final disposition of the criminal complaint or indictment. The appointing authority shall then proceed under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5 and 2.6.

(c) Where an employee has pled guilty or been convicted of a crime or offense which is cause for forfeiture of employment under N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2 but the court has not entered an order of forfeiture, the appointing authority may seek forfeiture by applying to the court for an order of forfeiture. The appointing authority shall not hold a departmental hearing regarding the issue of the applicability of N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2. If the court declines to enter an order of forfeiture in response to the appointing authority's application, the appointing authority may hold a departmental hearing regarding other disciplinary charges, if any, as provided in (b)1 above.

Amended by R.1989 d.569, effective November 6, 1989.  
See: 21 N.J.R. 1766(a), 21 N.J.R. 3448(b).

In (a)1: added text, "The standard ... public services."  
Amended by R.1992 d.414, effective October 19, 1992.  
See: 24 N.J.R. 2491(a), 24 N.J.R. 3716(a).

Revised (a).  
Public Notice: Notice of Receipt of a Petition for Rulemaking.  
See: 29 N.J.R. 5333(a).  
Amended by R.2000 d.433, effective October 16, 2000.  
See: 32 N.J.R. 2275(a), 32 N.J.R. 3870(a).

Rewrote (b) and (c).  
Amended by R.2006 d.271, effective July 17, 2006.  
See: 37 N.J.R. 4345(a), 38 N.J.R. 3016(b).  
Added (a)2i and (a)2ii.

**Case Notes**

Forfeiture of public office was not unconstitutional. *State v. Timoldi*, 277 N.J.Super. 297, 649 A.2d 872 (A.D.1994), certification denied 142 N.J. 449, 663 A.2d 1356.

Merit System Board of State Department of Personnel did not have exclusive jurisdiction for prosecution of forfeiture action against senior corrections officer. *State v. Lee*, 258 N.J.Super. 313, 609 A.2d 513 (A.D.1992).

Whether public employee's conviction involves or touches employment does not depend upon whether criminally proscribed acts took place within immediate confines of employment's daily routine. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 230 N.J.Super. 374, 553 A.2d 830 (A.D.1989), affirmed 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983.

Senior corrections officer's criminal conviction for harassing his immediate superior was one "involving or touching" his employment. *Moore v. Youth Correctional Institute at Annandale*, 230 N.J.Super. 374, 553 A.2d 830 (A.D.1989), affirmed 119 N.J. 256, 574 A.2d 983.

Automatic termination of correction sergeant based on conviction for crime of dishonesty affirmed. *Christian v. Department of Corrections, Northern State Prison*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 636.

Arrest for possession of illegal drugs provides grounds for blood test and removal. *Pickett v. Department of Corrections*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 546.

Corrections officer's illegal purchase of ammunition justifies removal. *Nelsen v. East Jersey State Prison*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 347.

Corrections officer with drugs in car suffers removal even though criminal action acquits. *Reinhardt v. East Jersey State Prison*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 166.

School district employee removed for arrest on charges of possessing illegal drugs. *Hargrove v. State Operated School District of Newark*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 112.

Corrections officer was not entitled to back pay for period of suspension pending resolution of criminal charges. *Auberzinsky v. Cumberland County Sheriff's Department*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 372.

Public works truck driver dismissed after conviction for offense involving minor child. *Furde v. Hamilton Township Department of Public Works*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 262.

No entitlement to continued employment in sensitive position for employee facing criminal and narcotics charges. *Spellman v. Township of Parsippany-Troy Hills Police Department*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 214.

Where corrections officer's off-duty simple assault on supervisor related to on-duty events, assault constituted insubordination and conduct unbecoming a public employee and warranted dismissal. *Melillo v. Department of Corrections, East Jersey State Prison*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 184.

Corrections officer's conviction for obstruction of justice and driving while under the influence justifies 78-day suspension. *Scott v. Burlington County Jail*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 171.

Criminal convictions result in summary forfeiture of school custodian's position. *Turner v. State-Operated School District of the City of Newark*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 146.

State corrections officer terminated for firing gun during off-duty argument. *Dunns v. Department of Corrections*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 108.

Park maintenance worker forfeits position due to conviction for disorderly persons offense involving dishonesty. *Alsheimer v. County of Middlesex*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 7.

Conviction on plea of guilty to drug offense warranted correction officer's termination. *Ricks v. Department of Corrections*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 441.

Filing of criminal charges directly relating to employment warranted indefinite suspension of safety specialist. *Washington v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 336.

Indefinite suspension of police officer pending disposition of criminal indictment was not warranted absent evidence that public interest would be served. *Nagy v. Borough of Carteret*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 224.

Correction officer's termination justified; shooting of companion with stun gun. *Curry v. Burlington County Jail*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 92.

Conviction on plea of guilty to charge of conspiring to sell a false document of age was cause for forfeiture of correction officer's public employment. *State Department of Corrections v. Gomez*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 77.

Suspension; pendency of criminal charges. *Abdunafi v. East Jersey State Prison*. 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 653.

Suspension and removal of public employee convicted of a crime was justified. *DeLeone v. Essex County*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 544.

Automatic forfeiture of employment upon conviction. *Hudson County v. Seinfeld*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 516.

Suspension pending disposition of criminal complaint was in the public's interest. *Lordi v. Woodbridge Township*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 540.

Automatic forfeiture of employment upon conviction. *City of Bayonne Department of Public Works v. Timoldi*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 511.

Indefinite suspension was justified pending disposition of criminal charges. *Gonzalez v. Essex County Welfare Board*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 451.

Conviction on federal drug-related charges effected a forfeiture of positions. *Roman v. Atlantic City Police Department*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 250.

Automatic forfeiture of public employment upon criminal conviction of the third degree under N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2. *Coxson v. Newark Board of Education*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 129.

Pharmacist suspended indefinitely without pay pending disposition of criminal charges. *Grillo v. Bergen Pines County Hospital*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 81.

Guilty plea; however consideration of mitigating factors warranted the maximum suspension rather than permanent removal. *Walcott v. City of Plainfield*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 65.

Suspension pending resolution of criminal charges was appropriate; however, termination was not justified. *Walcott v. City of Plainfield*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 65.

Indictment justified suspension of welfare supervisor. *Jersey City Welfare Board v. Miller*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 55.

Forfeit of public employment; conviction of drug and alcohol-related offenses. *Greystone Park Psychiatric Hospital*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 14.

Termination; conduct unbecoming a public employee; physical attack by two employees on another employee. *Bryson v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 1.

Hospital employee was entitled to back pay, seniority and benefits following dismissal of indictment. *Gillard v. Trenton Psychiatric Hospital*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 730.

Employee forfeited employment upon pleading guilty to criminal charges. *Martin v. North Princeton Developmental Center*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 675.

Police officer automatically forfeited position; criminal conviction. *Lehman v. Woodbridge Township Police Department*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 599.

Indefinite suspension pending disposition of sexual assault charges. *Vengenock v. Salem County*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 558.

Six-month suspension was warranted for conviction of a motor vehicle violation. *Turner v. Department of Higher Education*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 440.

Public employment; convictions of third-degree crimes. N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2. *Williams v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hosp., State Dept. of Human Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 421.

Convictions forfeited public employment. *Williams v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hospital*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 421.

Suspended employee did not resign by failure to report dismissal of criminal charges. *McCray v. Department of the Treasury*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 363.

Possession of controlled dangerous substance warranted removal. *Hickman v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hospital*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 356.

Indefinite suspension of employee pending disposition of criminal charges was proper. *Simeone v. Woodbridge Township Department of Public Works*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 340.

Continuation of suspension of correction officer until disposition of criminal charges ordered. *Rivera v. New Jersey Training School for Boys—Jamesburg*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 219.

Guilty plea constituted a forfeiture of position. *Watkins v. Bergen Pines County Hospital*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 768.

Issue of whether suspension was in the public interest was rendered moot by resignation. *Coleman v. Dept. of Public Works, Borough of Ringwood*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 510.

Guard was properly suspended pending outcome of charges. *Alton v. Newark Board of Education*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 478.

Suspension of youth worker was warranted pending disposition of criminal charge. *Moore v. Division of Youth and Family Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 433.

County employee forfeited her office as a result of conviction. *Starling v. Essex County Citizen Services, Division of Welfare*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 431.

Indefinite suspension of police officer was warranted. *Beck v. City of Trenton*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 411.

Forfeit of position; criminal conviction. *Rivera v. City of Bridgeton*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 311.

Indefinite suspension; criminal charges. *Smith v. Essex County Judiciary*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 271.

Indefinite suspension; disposition of charges. *Naro v. The Fire Division of the Department of Public Safety of the City of Trenton*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 211.

School bus driver disqualified from school employment due to drug offense. *Kovalak v. New Jersey State Department of Education*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDU) 456.

School superintendent dismissed due to unbecoming conduct. In the Matter of the Tenure Hearing of Robert R. Vitacco, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (EDU) 449.

Acquitted school custodian was entitled to back pay but agreement with counsel for reimbursement of attorney fees was not binding on the school board. *Griffin v. Board of Education of the City of Paterson*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDU) 882.

#### 4A:2-2.8 Appeals to Civil Service Commission

(a) An appeal from a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action must be filed within 20 days of receipt of the Notice by the employee. Receipt of the Notice on a different date by the employee's attorney or union representative shall not affect this appeal period.

(b) If the appointing authority fails to provide the employee with a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action, an appeal may be made directly to the Commission within a reasonable time.

(c) The appeal shall be substantially similar in format to the Major Disciplinary Appeal Form illustrated in the subchapter Appendix, incorporated herein by reference, and the employee shall provide a copy of the appeal to the appointing authority. The employee shall attach to the appeal a copy of the Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action and, unless (b) above is applicable, the Final Notice of Disciplinary Action. The appeal shall also include the following information:

1. The name, title, mailing address and telephone number of the appointing authority representative to whom the notices were provided;
2. The employee's name, mailing address and telephone number; and
3. The action that is being appealed.

(d) The employee should also include a statement of the reason(s) for the appeal and the requested relief.

(e) Failure of an employee to provide the information specified in (c) above shall not result in dismissal of the appeal, but shall delay processing of the appeal until the required information is provided, and may result in a reduced back pay award pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.10(d)4.

(f) See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13 for removal appeals by certain law enforcement officers and firefighters.

Amended by R.1995 d.416, effective August 7, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 1837(b), 27 N.J.R. 2884(b).

In (a), added the provision governing receipt of notice by the employee's attorney or union representative.

Amended by R.1998 d.518, effective November 2, 1998.

See: 30 N.J.R. 2325(a), 30 N.J.R. 3935(a).

Added (c) through (e).

Special amendment, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).

See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

Section was "Appeals to Merit System Board". In (b), substituted "Commission" for "Board"; and added (f).

#### Case Notes

Director of county board of social services possessed final authority regarding the board's personnel and discipline decisions, as required for municipal liability under § 1983 based upon former county employee's First Amendment retaliation claims. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; N.J.Admin. Code tit. 4A, §§ 2-2.8, 2-3.2. *Marrero v. Camden County Board of Social Services*, 164 F.Supp.2d 455 (D.N.J. 2001).

Administrative code section providing the receipt of Final Notice of Disciplinary Action on a different date by the employee's attorney or union representative shall not affect the appeal period did not conflict with the legislative intent of the Civil Service Act. *Mesghali v. Bayside State Prison*, 334 N.J.Super 617, 760 A.2d 805 (N.J.Super.A.D. 2000).

Remand to Commission for supplemental hearing. Dept. of Law and Public Safety v. Miller, 115 N.J.Super. 122, 278 A.2d 495 (App.Div.1971).

Receipt of second copy of final notice of disciplinary action did not extend time for filing appeal. *Russ v. Human Services Department*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 647.

Terminated employee did not file an objection to the employer's action in terminating her employment within reasonable period of time. *Gibbons v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 491.

Charges against psychiatric hospital worker would be dismissed where alleged victim left the state and could not be located. *Godwin v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hosp.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 96.

#### 4A:2-2.9 Commission hearings

(a) Requests for a Commission hearing will be reviewed and determined by the Chairperson or the Chairperson's designee.

(b) Major discipline hearings will be heard by the Commission or referred to the Office of Administrative Law for hearing before an administrative law judge, except that an appeal by certain law enforcement officers or firefighters of a removal shall be heard as provided in N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13. Minor discipline matters will be heard by the Commission or referred to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing before an administrative law judge for an employee's last suspension or fine for five working days or less where the aggregate number of days the employee has been suspended or fined in a calendar year, including the last suspension or fine, is 15 working days or more, or for an employee's last suspension or fine where the employee receives more than three suspensions or fines of five working days or less in a calendar year. See N.J.A.C. 1:1 for OAL hearing procedures.

1. Where an employee has pled guilty to or been convicted of a crime or offense which is cause for forfeiture of employment under N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2, but the court has not issued an order of forfeiture, the Commission shall not refer the employee's appeal for a hearing regarding the applicability of N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2 nor make a determination on that issue. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.7.

2. Where a court has entered an order of forfeiture, and the appointing authority has so notified the employee, but the employee disputes whether an order of forfeiture was actually entered, the Commission may make a determination on the issue of whether the order was actually entered. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.7.

3. Notwithstanding (b)1 and 2 above, the Commission may determine whether an individual must be discharged from a State or local government position due to a permanent disqualification from public employment based upon the prior conviction of a crime or offense involving or touching on a previously held public office or employment, provided, however, that the Attorney General or county prosecutor has not sought or received a court order waiving the disqualification provision. See N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2(d) and (e).

(c) The Commission may adopt, reject or modify the recommended report and decision of an administrative law judge. Copies of all Commission decisions shall be served personally or by regular mail upon the parties.

(d) The Commission may reverse or modify the action of the appointing authority, except that removal shall not be substituted for a lesser penalty.

Amended by R.1995 d.417, effective August 7, 1995.  
See: 27 N.J.R. 1838(a), 27 N.J.R. 2885(a).

In (a), substituted the Commissioner or the Commissioner's designee for the Board as the party that does the review.

Amended by R.2000 d.433, effective October 16, 2000.  
See: 32 N.J.R. 2275(a), 32 N.J.R. 3870(a).

In (b), amended the N.J.A.C. reference in the introductory paragraph, and added 1 through 3.

Amended by R.2006 d.271, effective July 17, 2006.  
See: 37 N.J.R. 4345(a), 38 N.J.R. 3016(b).

In (b), added the second sentence.

Special amendment, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).

See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

Section was "Board hearings". Substituted "Commission" for "Board" throughout; in (a), substituted "Chairperson or the Chairperson's" for "Commissioner or Commissioners"; and in the introductory paragraph of (b), inserted ", except that an appeal by certain law enforcement officers or firefighters of a removal shall be heard as provided in N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13".

#### Case Notes

Civil Service Commission's duty to review findings of administrative law judge prior to acceptance or rejection of judge's recommendations (citing former rule N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.4). In the Matter of Morrison, 216 N.J.Super. 143, 523 A.2d 238 (App.Div.1987).

Removal hearing—employee service record must be in evidence (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.9). In the Matter of Parlow, 192 N.J.Super. 247, 469 A.2d 940 (App.Div.1983).

Entitlement to hearing as matter of fundamental fairness. Cunningham v. Dept. of Civil Service, 69 N.J. 13, 350 A.2d 58 (1975).

Deputy fire chief was entitled to appeal seven-day suspension as "major disciplinary action," notwithstanding appointing authority's argument that since deputy's normal work schedule was to work one 24-hour shift and then have three 24-hour tours off duty, with the 24-hour tour of duty being divided into two 12-hour shifts, therefore the deputy was effectively suspended for only two 24-hour tours of duty or a four-day suspension during the seven calendar day suspension. The five-day standard for major disciplinary action refers to five working days of not more than 40 hours of pay and since the deputy was suspended for 48 hours, his suspension was considered a major disciplinary action equal to six days and entitled him to a hearing on the discipline. In re Crowder, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2998-08, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1053, Final Decision (October 22, 2008).

Based on a library assistant's disciplinary record, including a recent 10-day suspension, and the nature of the incident, in which the assistant was argumentative and loud to the public information officer, resulting in the officer asking the assistant to leave her office five times before he finally left, a 30-day suspension, rather than 15 days as recommended by the ALJ, was the appropriate penalty. In re Daughtry, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10171-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 586, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Removal of a high school security guard for chronic or excessive absenteeism and violation of Consent Order was modified to a resignation in good standing, where the employee's absences were due to her disability, domestic violence incidents, and/or child care concerns; although the employee may not have provided timely documentation for her absences, she did eventually present documentation. In re Sanders, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11115-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 591, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Removal modified to resignation in good standing for a nursing home Institutional Attendant whose medical condition rendered her incapable

of performing the essential lifting functions of the position; in light of the fact that the employee's problems were not specifically performance related or based on misconduct, and were based instead on a documented medical condition, the disciplinary penalty of removal was unduly harsh. In re Clarke, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4495-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 551, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Where police officer was charged with violating order to attend a pistol range for weapons qualifications by failing to attend or notify his supervisor of his absence, ALJ's imposition of eight-day suspension (forfeiture of eight vacation days) was improper and penalty was increased to a 120 working day suspension. It was implausible that an experienced police officer could have mistakenly thought that the mandatory firearms training conducted twice per year under the guidelines of the State Attorney General would be optional for him, and in light of the officer's extensive disciplinary record, his actions were egregious and worthy of a severe sanction, placing him on notice that any future infraction might lead to his removal from employment. In re Martin, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1303-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 528, Final Decision (January 16, 2008).

Six-month suspension rather than 20-day suspension was appropriate for a police sergeant found on conflicting testimony to have blamed a totally emotional and distraught woman for causing her son's death, used profanity towards her, and punched the woman, who was half his size. In re Ricciardi, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1851-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1043, Final Decision (April 25, 2007).

Initial Decision (2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 795) adopted, which concluded that 10-day and 20-day suspensions were justified for a correction officer's two unexcused absences after the officer's sick leave was exhausted, despite the officer's family issues; furthermore, in the determination of the appropriate penalty, the Merit System Board is not bound by the provisions of a collective bargaining agreement. In re Bahm, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 00468-05, Final Decision (December 20, 2006).

Receipt of second copy of final notice of disciplinary action did not extend time for filing appeal. Russ v. Human Services Department, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 647.

County sheriff's officer was required by settlement agreement to submit to psychiatric examinations. Petescia v. County of Essex, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 388.

#### 4A:2-2.10 Back pay, benefits and seniority

(a) Where a disciplinary penalty has been reversed, the Commission shall award back pay, benefits, seniority or restitution of a fine. Such items may be awarded when a disciplinary penalty is modified.

(b) Where a municipal police officer has been suspended based on a pending criminal complaint or indictment, following disposition of the charges the officer shall receive back pay, benefits and seniority pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:14-149.1 et seq.

(c) Where an employee, other than a municipal police officer, has been suspended based on a pending criminal complaint or indictment, following disposition of the charges the employee shall receive back pay, benefits and seniority if the employee is found not guilty at trial, the complaint or indictment is dismissed, or the prosecution is terminated.

1. Such items shall not be awarded when the complaint or indictment is disposed of through Conditional Dis-

charge, N.J.S.A. 2C:36A-1, or Pre-Trial Intervention (PTI), N.J.S.A. 2C:43-12 et seq.

2. Where disciplinary action has been taken following disposition of the complaint or indictment, such items shall not be awarded in case of removal. In case of suspension, where the employee has already been suspended for more than six months pending disposition of the complaint or indictment, the disciplinary suspension shall be applied against the period of indefinite suspension. The employee shall receive back pay for the period of suspension beyond six months, but the appointing authority may for good cause deny back pay for the period beyond the disciplinary suspension up to a maximum of six months.

(d) Back pay shall include unpaid salary, including regular wages, overlap shift time, increments and across-the-board adjustments. Benefits shall include vacation and sick leave credits and additional amounts expended by the employee to maintain his or her health insurance coverage during the period of improper suspension or removal.

1. Back pay shall not include items such as overtime pay and holiday premium pay.

2. The award of back pay shall be reduced by the amount of taxes, social security payments, dues, pension payments, and any other sums normally withheld.

3. Where a removal or suspension has been reversed or modified, an indefinite suspension pending the disposition of criminal charges has been reversed, the award of back pay shall be reduced by the amount of money that was actually earned during the period of separation, including any unemployment insurance benefits received, subject to any applicable limitations set forth in (d)4 below.

4. Where a removal or a suspension for more than 30 working days has been reversed or modified or an indefinite suspension pending the disposition of criminal charges has been reversed, and the employee has been unemployed or underemployed for all or a part of the period of separation, and the employee has failed to make reasonable efforts to find suitable employment during the period of separation, the employee shall not be eligible for back pay for any period during which the employee failed to make such reasonable efforts.

i. "Underemployed" shall mean employment during a period of separation from the employee's public employment that does not constitute suitable employment.

ii. "Reasonable efforts" may include, but not be limited to, reviewing classified advertisements in newspapers or trade publications; reviewing Internet or on-line job listings or services; applying for suitable positions; attending job fairs; visiting employment agencies; networking with other people; and distributing resumes.

iii. "Suitable employment" or "suitable position" shall mean employment that is comparable to the employee's permanent career service position with respect to job duties, responsibilities, functions, location, and salary.

iv. The determination as to whether the employee has made reasonable efforts to find suitable employment shall be based upon the totality of the circumstances, including, but not limited to, the nature of the disciplinary action taken against the employee; the nature of the employee's public employment; the employee's skills, education, and experience; the job market; the existence of advertised, suitable employment opportunities; the manner in which the type of employment involved is commonly sought; and any other circumstances deemed relevant based upon the particular facts of the matter.

v. The burden of proof shall be on the employer to establish that the employee has not made reasonable efforts to find suitable employment.

5. An employee shall not be required to mitigate back pay for any period between the issue date of a Civil Service Commission decision reversing or modifying a removal or reversing an indefinite suspension and the date of actual reinstatement. The award of back pay for this time period shall be reduced only by the amount of money that was actually earned during that period, including any unemployment insurance benefits received.

6. Should a Civil Service Commission decision reversing or modifying a removal or reversing an indefinite suspension subsequently be stayed, an individual shall be required to mitigate an award of back pay from the date of the stay through the date of actual reinstatement, in accordance with (d)4i through v above.

7. If an employee also held other employment at the time of the adverse action, the back pay award shall not be reduced by earnings from such other employment. However, if the employee increased his or her work hours at the other employment during the back pay period, the back pay award shall be reduced by the earnings from such additional hours.

8. A back pay award is subject to reduction by any period of unreasonable delay of the appeal proceedings directly attributable to the employee. Delays caused by an employee's representative may not be considered in reducing the award of back pay.

9. A back pay award is subject to reduction for any period of time during which the employee was disabled from working.

10. Funds that must be repaid by the employee shall not be considered when calculating back pay.

(e) Unless otherwise ordered, an award of back pay, benefits and seniority shall be calculated from the effective date

of the appointing authority's improper action to the date of the employee's actual reinstatement to the payroll.

(f) When the Commission awards back pay and benefits, determination of the actual amounts shall be settled by the parties whenever possible.

(g) If settlement on an amount cannot be reached, either party may request, in writing, Commission review of the outstanding issue. In a Commission review:

1. The appointing authority shall submit information on the salary the employee was earning at the time of the adverse action, plus increments and across-the-board adjustments that the employee would have received during the separation period; and

2. The employee shall submit an affidavit setting forth all income received during the separation.

(h) See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13 for situations in which certain law enforcement officers or firefighters have appealed a removal that has been reversed or modified.

Amended by R.1992 d.414, effective October 19, 1992.

See: 24 N.J.R. 2491(a), 24 N.J.R. 3716(a).

Redesignated part of existing text in (a) to (d); added new (b)-(c); redesignated existing (b)-(d) to (e)-(g).

Amended by R.1997 d.435, effective October 20, 1997.

See: 29 N.J.R. 3102(a), 29 N.J.R. 4455(b).

Inserted new (d)4; and recodified existing (d)4 as (d)5.

Amended by R.2008 d.215, effective August 4, 2008.

See: 40 N.J.R. 1402(a), 40 N.J.R. 4520(a).

Rewrote (d)3 and (d)4; added new (d)5 through (d)9; and recodified former (d)5 as (d)10.

Special amendment, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).

See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

Substituted "Commission" for "Board" and "Civil Service Commission" for "Merit System Board" throughout; and added (h).

#### Case Notes

On a backpay claim where a State employee has been removed from employment due to his or her own misconduct but is later reinstated, the availability of substitute employment is relevant to the establishment of a failure-to-mitigate defense by the appointing agency, and the employee's failure to seek substitute employment during separation is not a sufficient basis to deny the claim without any consideration of the availability of such employment. *O'Lone v. Department of Human Services*, 357 N.J. Super. 170, 814 A.2d 665.

Regulation applies in those circumstances where employee has been completely exonerated of the criminal charges, yet there is basis for disciplinary suspension despite employee's exoneration. *Walcott v. City of Plainfield*, 282 N.J. Super. 121, 659 A.2d 532 (A.D.1995).

Merit System Board's adoption of rules regarding back pay for police officers during periods of nondisciplinary suspension requires public notice of anticipated action. *DelRossi v. Department of Human Services (Police)*, 256 N.J. Super. 286, 606 A.2d 1128 (A.D.1992).

Police officer was not entitled to back pay and benefits during period of nondisciplinary suspension resulting from criminal charges. *DelRossi v. Department of Human Services (Police)*, 256 N.J. Super. 286, 606 A.2d 1128 (A.D.1992).

Merit System Board must exercise power to award back pay for periods of nondisciplinary suspension through rule making. *DelRossi v.*

*Department of Human Services (Police)*, 256 N.J. Super. 286, 606 A.2d 1128 (A.D.1992).

Merit System Board's role in determining whether to award back pay for periods of disciplinary suspension is adjudicatory. *DelRossi v. Department of Human Services (Police)*, 256 N.J. Super. 286, 606 A.2d 1128 (A.D.1992).

Corrections officers who were dismissed for violation of mandatory drug test order were not entitled to award of back pay as remedy for due process violations at pretermination hearings. *Caldwell v. New Jersey Dept. of Corrections*, 250 N.J. Super. 592, 595 A.2d 1118 (A.D.1991), certification denied 127 N.J. 555, 606 A.2d 367.

Where discharge of employee was in error, back pay could be awarded (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.5). In the Matter of *Williams*, 198 N.J. Super. 75, 486 A.2d 858 (App.Div.1984).

Determination of back pay—prior disciplinary record not a consideration (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.17). *Steinal v. City of Jersey City*, 193 N.J. Super. 629, 475 A.2d 640 (App.Div.1984) affirmed 99 N.J. 1, 489 A.2d 1145 (1985).

Since removal from position of supervising sheet metal worker with public school district was modified to a six-month suspension, employee was entitled to mitigated back pay, benefits, and seniority. In re *Delli Santi*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11901-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1088, Civil Service Commission Decision (September 24, 2008).

Imputed mitigation subtracted from former city firefighter's back pay award. In re *Abdul-Haqq*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 9385-03, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 720, Final Decision (June 11, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 228) adopted, which concluded that the appointing authority had the right to impose an indefinite suspension without pay under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5(a)2 on a correction officer until June 26, the date when the officer pleaded guilty to downgraded charges, rather than only until March 7, the date when the County Prosecutor chose to downgrade the indictable offense, as the downgrade was specifically conditioned on a guilty plea. In re *Paris*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12208-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 708, Final Decision (June 11, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 228) adopted, which concluded that while the appointing authority had the right to impose an indefinite suspension without pay under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5(a)2 from Dec. 14, 2005 until June 26, 2006, the date when the correction officer pleaded guilty in municipal court to downgraded charges, back pay was due the officer under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.10(c)2 for the period of the indefinite suspension that exceeded six months, i.e., from June 14, 2006 to July 30, 2006. In re *Paris*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 12208-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 708, Final Decision (June 11, 2008).

Suspended employee not entitled to back pay and benefits for accepting plea agreement. *Ward v. Department of Labor*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 180.

Firefighter entitled to back pay for period of suspension while awaiting outcome of criminal indictment. *Naro v. Trenton Fire Department*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 234.

Reinstatement of guard at correctional facility was required when he did not intentionally trip or kick inmate. *Finley v. Wagner Youth Correctional Facility*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 676.

Agency awarding employee back pay was entitled to offset un-employment benefits as long as state was reimbursed. *Bellamy v. Essex County Hospital*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 652.

Public employee was entitled to back pay for period of indefinite suspension that was improper, incorrect and invalid. *Gonzalez v. Essex County*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 200.

Medical expenses to be paid after improper reduction in force action. *Takakjian v. Fairview Borough Board of Education*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (EDU) 184.

Employee was entitled to back pay following acquittal. *Scouler v. Housing Services and Code Enforcement, City of Camden*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 40.

Employee not entitled to back pay for period of suspension even if she successfully completed intervention program. *Amison v. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 568.

Employee was entitled to back pay for period of suspension pending disposition of criminal charges. *Kelly v. City of Camden*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 537.

Initial suspension from employment violated due process; later valid removal; no entitlement to back pay. *Brantley v. New Jersey State Prison*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 37.

Employee entitled to reinstatement and back pay. N.J.S.A. 11A:1-1 et seq. *Holmes v. Essex County*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 65.

Appellant, removed from employment and later reinstated with back pay, denied counsel fees; appellant entitled to award of 30 vacation days (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.5). *Harrington v. Dep't of Human Services*, 11 N.J.A.R. 537 (1989).

Appellant suspended and subsequently removed from title of Senior Systems Analyst reinstated to duties appropriate to his permanent title; appointing authority failed to support charges of falsifying residency address, falsely signing affidavit with intent to defraud county and failing to complete assignments timely and correctly (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.14). *Valluzzi v. Bergen County*, 10 N.J.A.R. 89 (1988), adopted—*Merit System Bd., App.Div. A-3269-87, 3/3/88*.

**4A:2-2.11 Interest**

(a) When the Commissioner or Board makes an award of back pay, it may also award interest in the following situations:

1. When an appointing authority has unreasonably delayed compliance with an order of the Commissioner or Board; or
2. Where the Board finds sufficient cause based on the particular case.

(b) Where applicable, interest shall be at the annual rate as set forth in New Jersey court rules, R.4:42-11.

(c) Before interest is applied, an award of back pay shall be reduced in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.10(d)2 and 3.

Administrative Correction.  
See: 26 N.J.R. 198(a).

**4A:2-2.12 Counsel fees**

(a) The Civil Service Commission shall award partial or full reasonable counsel fees incurred in proceedings before it and incurred in major disciplinary proceedings at the departmental level where an employee has prevailed on all or substantially all of the primary issues before the Commission.

(b) When the Commission awards counsel fees, the actual amount shall be settled by the parties whenever possible.

(c) Subject to the provisions of (d) and (e) below, the following fee ranges shall apply in determining counsel fees:

1. Associate in a law firm: \$100.00 to \$150.00 per hour;
2. Partner or equivalent in a law firm with fewer than 15 years of experience in the practice of law: \$150.00 to \$175.00 per hour; or
3. Partner or equivalent in a law firm with 15 or more years of experience in the practice of law, or, notwithstanding the number of years of experience, with a practice concentrated in employment or labor law: \$175.00 to \$200.00 per hour.

(d) If an attorney has signed a specific fee agreement with the employee or employee's negotiations representative, the attorney shall disclose the agreement to the appointing authority. The fee ranges set forth in (c) above may be adjusted if the attorney has signed such an agreement, provided that the attorney shall not be entitled to a greater rate than that set forth in the agreement.

(e) A fee amount may also be determined or the fee ranges in (c) above adjusted based on the circumstances of a particular matter, in which case the following factors (see the Rules of Professional Conduct of the New Jersey Court Rules, at RPC 1.5(a)) shall be considered:

1. The time and labor required, the novelty and difficulty of the questions involved, and the skill requisite to perform the legal service properly;
2. The fee customarily charged in the locality for similar legal services, applicable at the time the fee is calculated;
3. The nature and length of the professional relationship with the employee; and
4. The experience, reputation and ability of the attorney performing the services.

(f) Counsel fees incurred in matters at the departmental level that do not reach the Civil Service Commission on appeal or are incurred in furtherance of appellate court review shall not be awarded by the Commission.

(g) Reasonable out-of-pocket costs shall be awarded, including, but not limited to, costs associated with expert and subpoena fees and out-of-State travel expenses. Costs associated with normal office overhead shall not be awarded.

(h) The attorney shall submit an affidavit and any other documentation to the appointing authority.

(i) If settlement on an amount cannot be reached, either party may request, in writing, Commission review.

(j) See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.13 for situations in which certain law enforcement officers or firefighters have appealed a removal.

Amended by R.2001 d.424, effective November 19, 2001.  
See: 33 N.J.R. 2725(a), 33 N.J.R. 3280(a), 33 N.J.R. 3895(a).

Rewrote (a) and (c); added new (d) through (g), and recodified existing (d) and (e) as (h) and (i).

Special amendment, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).

See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

Substituted "Civil Service Commission" for "Merit System Board" and "Commission" for "Board" throughout; and added (j).

#### Case Notes

After considering both N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.12(e) and N.J. Ct. R. Prof. Conduct 1.5(a), counsel for an official at a mental health residential facility was entitled to an hourly fee of \$250, given the complexity of the case and the amount of skill required to adequately represent his client, who was subject to discipline for failing to develop an intervention plan to deal with a patient's behavioral disorder, and that patient died, as counsel had to be alert to the potential implications for his client of the testimony put forth by each of the various witnesses; further, the court did not think it could seriously be disputed that attorneys of a similar background and experience as counsel herein would customarily charge an equivalent or greater amount for their services in this type of case. In re Malone, 381 N.J. Super. 344, 886 A.2d 181, 2005 N.J. Super. LEXIS 340 (App.Div. 2005).

Merit System Board had the statutory authority to make an award to township police officer for counsel fees incurred in connection with police department hearing which had preceded officer's appeal to the Merit System Board, regarding officer's claim for reinstatement; the departmental hearing was an integral part of the civil service process. Burris v. Police Department, Township of West Orange, 769 A.2d 1112 (2001).

Regulation mandating the award of counsel fees was intended to apply in cases where disciplinary charges did not arise out of employee's lawful exercise of powers in furtherance of official duties. Marjarum v. Township of Hamilton, 336 N.J. Super. 85 (A.D. 2001).

Statute and its accompanying regulation, allowing Merit System Board to award fees to employee who has prevailed on all or substantially all of the primary issues, authorized fee award to police officer. Oches v. Township of Middletown Police Dept., 155 N.J. 1, 713 A.2d 993 (N.J. 1998).

Municipal employee whose removal was mitigated to six-month suspension by Merit System Board was not entitled to award of counsel fees as prevailing party under regulation. Walcott v. City of Plainfield, 282 N.J. Super. 121, 659 A.2d 532 (A.D. 1995).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 613) adopted, which concluded that while the appointing authority had withdrawn some of the charges against a township police officer, the Merit System Board had sustained the other serious charges against the officer resulting in his removal from office, and the officer's request for counsel fees lacked merit since he had not prevailed on all or substantially all of the primary issues of his appeal. In re Hawkins, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4469-05, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1222, Final Decision (December 3, 2008).

Correction officer was not entitled to counsel fees although the penalty against the officer was modified from removal to a 60-day suspension; the officer did not prevail on all or substantially all of the primary issues in the appeal because two of the charges against the officer were sustained and major discipline was imposed. In re Pettiford, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 8801-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 719, Merit System Board Decision (May 21, 2008).

Charge of possession of controlled, dangerous substance was not supported by credible evidence and required public employee's reinstatement after removal. Ramos v. Department of Corrections, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 413.

Removal of plant operator not justified; charges against him were indefinite and inconsistent with job requirements. Onori v. City of Burlington Department of Public Works, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 53.

Police officer was entitled to reimbursement of the expenses of his defense when allegations against the officer were dismissed. Black v. Lakehurst Borough Police Department, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 35.

Reasonable and partial attorney fee award. Gill v. State Dept. of Health, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 142.

Reprimand and ten days' suspension would be reversed and attorney fees would be awarded. Neal v. Police Dept., City of New Brunswick, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 52.

Officer was entitled to unmitigated back pay but was not entitled to attorney fees or interest. N.J.S.A. 11A:11-5. Franklin v. City of Atlantic City, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 71.

Appellant, removed from employment and later reinstated with back pay, denied counsel fees; appellant entitled to award of 30 vacation days (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-5.6). Harrington v. Dep't. of Human Services, 11 N.J.A.R. 537 (1989).

#### 4A:2-2.13 Removal appeals of certain law enforcement officers and firefighters

(a) For purposes of this section:

1. "Law enforcement officer" or "officer" is defined as an individual employed as a permanent, full-time member of a State, county, or municipal law enforcement agency who is statutorily empowered to act for the detection, investigation, arrest, conviction, detention, or rehabilitation of persons violating the criminal laws of this State and statutorily required to successfully complete a training course approved by, or certified as substantially equivalent to such an approved course, by the Police Training Commission. See N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 et seq. With the exception of the Juvenile Justice Commission, which is covered by this definition, the Department of Law and Public Safety shall not be considered a law enforcement agency for purposes of this definition.

2. "Firefighter" is defined as a full-time, paid firefighter employed by a public fire department as provided in N.J.S.A. 40A:14-200.

3. "Appellant" refers to a "law enforcement officer" or "firefighter" as defined in (a)1 and 2 above.

4. "Removal," "removal date," "and "removal effective date" shall mean the first date on which the law enforcement officer or firefighter is separated from employment without pay.

(b) If the law enforcement officer or firefighter requests a departmental hearing regarding his or her removal in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5, the appointing authority shall conduct a hearing within 30 days of the removal's effective date, unless:

1. The officer or firefighter agrees to waive his or her right to the hearing; or

APPENDIX

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW/CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION  
LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER & FIREFIGHTER REMOVAL APPEAL FORM

Use this form to submit an appeal of removal of a law enforcement officer or firefighter to the Office of Administrative Law and Civil Service Commission

**1.** Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: ( ) - \_\_\_\_\_  
 (City) (State) (Zip Code)  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**2.** Will you be represented by a lawyer or union representative at the hearing?  YES  NO  
 If yes, complete the following:  
 Representative Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Union or Law Firm: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: ( ) - \_\_\_\_\_  
 (City) (State) (Zip Code)  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**3.** Give a copy of this form and attachments to your Personnel Officer/Employer Representative  
 Employing Agency Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Personnel Officer's/Employer Representative's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Telephone: ( ) - \_\_\_\_\_  
 (City) (State) (Zip Code)  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**4.** Appointing Authority Representative for Appeal, if known  
 Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (City) (State) (Zip Code)  
 Telephone: ( ) - \_\_\_\_\_ Fax #: ( ) - \_\_\_\_\_  
 Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**5.** Attach the following:  
 Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action  
 Final Notice of Disciplinary Action

**6.**Date of incident subject to removal: \_\_\_\_\_  
Date employee served with Final Notice of Disciplinary Action: \_\_\_\_\_

**Note:** Your appeal will not be processed unless this appeal form **with attachments** is completed, signed and submitted to the Office of Administrative Law **and** the Civil Service Commission. A copy of this appeal **must** also be served upon the appointing authority (your employer). You must submit this appeal to both the Office of Administrative Law and the Civil Service Commission within twenty (20) days after you receive the Final Notice of Disciplinary Action. If your appeal is not submitted within twenty (20) days, it will be dismissed. You must seek alternate employment; failure to do so may reduce the back pay award.

**SIGNATURE****EMPLOYEE/EMPLOYEE REPRESENTATIVE****DATE**

**Mail to:** Office of Administrative Law  
33 Washington Street  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

**AND**

Civil Service Commission  
Attention Hearings Unit-Unit H  
P.O. Box 312  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0312

**Hand**

**Deliver:** Civil Service Commission  
3 Station Plaza  
44 South Clinton Avenue  
Trenton, NJ

**AND**

Office of Administrative Law  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
33 Washington Street  
Newark, New Jersey

mmg

Special new rule, R.2009 d.221, effective June 10, 2009 (to expire July 1, 2010).  
See: 41 N.J.R. 2720(a).

1. Minor discipline appeals of permanent employees in the career service or persons serving a working test period. Appointing authorities may establish procedures for other employees.

2. Grievance appeals of any employees in the career or unclassified services.

(f) Grievance procedures shall not be used to address any matter for which there is another specific type of appeal to the Commissioner or Board.

(g) These rules shall not be utilized to review a matter exclusively covered by a negotiated labor agreement.

Amended by R.1989 d.569, effective November 6, 1989.

See: 21 N.J.R. 1766(a), 21 N.J.R. 3448(b).

Added new (c) and relettered old (c)-(f) as (d)-(g), with no change in text.

**Case Notes**

Minor disciplinary actions insufficient basis for independent removal action. *Range v. Newark Board of Education*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 700.

Petition dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. *Harrison v. Buttonwood Hospital*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 250.

**4A:2-3.2 Minor discipline appeal to appointing authority: State service**

(a) Where departmental minor discipline appeal procedures are established by a negotiated agreement, such agreement shall be the applicable appeal process.

(b) Employees not covered by a negotiated agreement or covered by an agreement that does not address a minor discipline appeal process shall request a departmental hearing within five days of receipt of a notice of discipline or such additional time as may be agreed to by the appointing authority.

1. The departmental hearing shall be conducted within 30 days of such request unless adjourned by the consent of the parties.

2. The burden of proof shall be on the appointing authority.

3. The department shall make a final written disposition of the charges within 20 days of the hearing on Appeal of Minor Discipline Action form, unless the parties have consented to a time extension. The lack of response by the department within this period shall be considered a denial of the appeal.

(c) See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3.6 for conduct and scheduling and 4A:2-3.7 for appeal to the Board.

**Case Notes**

Director of county board of social services possessed final authority regarding the board's personnel and discipline decisions, as required for municipal liability under § 1983 based upon former county employee's

First Amendment retaliation claims. U.S.C.A. Const.Amend. 1; 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983; N.J.Admin. Code tit. 4A, §§ 2-2.8, 2-3.2. *Marrero v. Camden County Board of Social Services*, 164 F.Supp.2d 455 (D.N.J. 2001).

**4A:2-3.3 Grievance appeal to appointing authority: State service**

(a) Where departmental grievance procedures are established by a negotiated agreement, such agreement shall be the applicable appeal process.

(b) An employee not covered by a negotiated agreement or covered by an agreement that does not address a grievance appeal process shall utilize the appeal procedures in this subchapter.

(c) When a grievance directly concerns and is shared by more than one grievant, the grievants may appeal as a group to the first level of supervision common to the grievants.

(d) A department may consolidate two or more grievances on the same issue and process them as a group grievance. All grievants shall be promptly notified of this action.

(e) An employee may amend a grievance during the initial step at which it is processed. Such amendment may only be made for the purpose of clarification and shall not be utilized to change the nature of the grievance or to include additional items.

(f) The burden of proof shall be on the employee.

**4A:2-3.4 Grievance procedure: Step One: State service**

(a) A grievance shall be presented in writing on the Department of Personnel grievance form to the office or individual designated by the department to process the matter. It must be filed within 30 calendar days from either the date on which the alleged act occurred or the date on which the grievant should reasonably have known of its occurrence. Efforts should be made to resolve the matter informally.

(b) All grievances shall:

1. Specify the particular act or circumstance being grieved;

2. State the requested remedy; and

3. Indicate whether the employee is representing himself or herself or the name of the employee's counsel or agent.

(c) The office or individual receiving the grievance shall notify the employee of the scheduled hearing or grievance meeting date within seven days of receipt of the grievance. Such hearing or grievance meeting shall be conducted within 30 days of receipt of the grievance, unless an additional time period is agreed to by the parties.

(d) A written decision shall be rendered within 14 days after the conclusion of the hearing or grievance meeting.

(e) Lack of response by the department within the periods set forth in (c) and (d) above, unless the parties have consented to a time extension, shall be considered a negative response.

**4A:2-3.5 Grievance procedure: Step Two**

(a) A grievant may appeal to the Department head or his or her designee within 10 calendar days of:

1. Receipt of the written decision at Step One; or
2. A lack of timely response by the department. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3.4(e).

(b) The appeal shall be accompanied by material presented at Step One and any written records or decisions from Step One.

(c) The department shall notify the employee of the scheduled hearing or grievance meeting date within 10 days of receipt of the grievance.

(d) A written decision shall be rendered within 21 days after the conclusion of the hearing or grievance meeting.

(e) Lack of response by the department within the periods set forth in (c) and (d) above, unless the parties have consented to a time extension, shall be considered a denial of the grievance appeal.

**4A:2-3.6 Conduct and scheduling of hearings and grievance meetings: State service**

(a) A grievant shall be entitled to at least one hearing on a grievance prior to the conclusion of Step Two, unless the grievance is satisfactorily resolved at Step One. In addition, a department, at its option, may also schedule a grievance meeting at either Step One or Step Two of the grievance process.

(b) A department may advance a grievance to Step Two of the grievance process. Timely notice of this action shall be supplied to the grievant.

(c) If bad faith is found by the Board, the employee shall be entitled to a new full or shortened working test period and other appropriate remedies. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.5.

**Case Notes**

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 316) adopted, which concluded that an employee failed to demonstrate that the decision to release her at the end of her working test period was made in bad faith; in a probationary employee's appeal of termination, the only issue is whether the appointing authority exercised good faith in determining that the employee was not competent to satisfactorily perform the duties of the position. In re Villecca, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2978-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 710, Final Decision (June 25, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 316) adopted, which explained that if the appointing authority's decision to release an employee at the end of the working test period is based on actual observations of the employee's performance of the duties of the position, and is an honest assessment as to whether the employee will be able to satisfactorily and efficiently perform those duties, it must be considered to have been formed in good faith. In re Villecca, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2978-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 710, Final Decision (June 25, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 217) adopted, which concluded that a probationary Supervising Family Service Specialist 2 should be afforded a new working-test period rather than demoted, based on credibility determinations, the employee's satisfactory ratings during five years as a provisional supervisor, and the timing of the unsatisfactory reports, which only began to surface after the employee's return from emergency leave and his filing of a hostile work environment claim. In re Afolo, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4145-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 546, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Where the Merit System Board did not find that an employee was entitled to a permanent appointment based on the successful completion of the employee's working test period, but rather that the employee was simply entitled to a new working test period, sufficient cause was not demonstrated to award back pay. In re Afolo, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4145-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 546, Final Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 189) adopted, which concluded that a clerk typist had presented no evidence that her release at the end of the working test period was based on anything other than her performance, and thus failed to sustain burden of showing bad faith. The only requirement to justify release at the end of the working test period is good faith. In re Ehrenkranz, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4026-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 545, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1028) adopted, which concluded that a Motor Vehicle Commission service center employee, who was terminated at the end of the working test period, failed to carry the burden of proof of bad faith where, despite the employee's conflicting testimony, the appointing authority provided detailed documentation indicating that most of the employee's errors were of a serious nature and required extra work by co-workers. Moreover, despite an extended working test period and additional remedial instruction, the employee showed no improvement in the ability to handle crucially important tasks, indicating that the appointing authority had more than adequate justification for terminating the employee. In re Acosta, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 227-06, Final Decision (January 31, 2007).

Untrustworthiness and instability justified return of bridge operator to former position of maintenance worker. Howarth v. Department of Transportation, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 636.

Release of probationary public works repairer was justified for failure to obtain required commercial driver's license. Kreudl v. Department of Public Works, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 584.

Termination at end of working test period was justified when building service worker's monthly probationary progress reports were unsatisfactory. Hamilton v. Essex County Hospital Center, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 580.

SUBCHAPTER 5. EMPLOYEE PROTECTION AGAINST REPRISALS OR POLITICAL COERCION

**4A:2-5.1 General provisions**

(a) An appointing authority shall not take or threaten to take any reprisal action against an employee in the career, senior executive or unclassified service in retaliation for an employee's lawful disclosure of information on the violation of any law or rule, governmental mismanagement or abuse of authority.

(b) An appointing authority shall not take or threaten to take any action against an employee in the career service or an employee in the senior executive service with career status based on the employee's permissible political activities or affiliations. This subchapter shall also apply to State service employees in the unclassified service who do not serve in policy-making or confidential positions.

**Case Notes**

Failure of municipal employee to exhaust administrative remedies warranted dismissal of his claim alleging violations of administrative code section prohibiting person from being appointed under title not appropriate to the duties to be performed and section prohibiting reprisal. Ferraro v. City of Long Branch, 314 N.J.Super. 268, 714 A.2d 945 (N.J.Super.A.D. 1998).

Job title elimination done in bad faith if politically motivated. Kirshbaum v. Camden County, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 197.

Layoff; proof of political motivation. Pikolycky v. Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 685.

Layoff of supervisor; not based on retaliation or political retribution. 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 569.

"Whistleblower" medical director justifiably dismissed. Mendoza v. Wagner Youth Correctional Facility, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 135.

Agency employee voluntarily resigned from his position. Sandell v. Department of Law and Public Safety, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 705.

**4A:2-5.2 Appeals**

(a) An employee may appeal a reprisal or political coercion action to the Board within 20 days of the action or the date on which the employee should reasonably have known of its occurrence.

(b) The appeal must be in writing and specify the basis for appeal.

(c) The Commissioner shall review the appeal and request any additional information, or conduct any necessary investigation.

(d) The Board shall decide the appeal on a review of the written record or such other proceeding as it deems appropriate.

(e) Where improper reprisal or political coercion is established, the Board shall provide appropriate protections and remedies to the employee.

**Case Notes**

Acts of reprisal for public disclosure of information on abusive use of State cars. *Cryan v. Human Services Department*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 275.

## SUBCHAPTER 6. RESIGNATIONS

**Subchapter Historical Note**

Petition for Rulemaking.  
See: 39 N.J.R. 4867(a).

**4A:2-6.1 Resignation in good standing**

(a) Any permanent employee in the career service may resign in good standing by giving the appointing authority at least 14 days' written or verbal notice, unless the appointing authority consents to a shorter notice.

(b) The resignation shall be considered accepted by the appointing authority upon receipt of the notice of resignation.

(c) A request to rescind the resignation prior to its effective date may be consented to by the appointing authority.

(d) Where it is alleged that a resignation was the result of duress or coercion, an appeal may be made to the Board under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1.

**Case Notes**

Resignation may be rescinded prior to effective date upon appointing authority's approval (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.12). *Manusco v. No. Arlington Boro.*, 203 N.J.Super. 427, 497 A.2d 238 (App.Div.1985).

Refusal to accept rescission of resignation prior to its effective date constituted abuse of discretion. *Harmon v. Monmouth County Board of Social Services*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 541.

Police officer's resignation not in good standing for untimely resignation modified. *Polidoro v. City of New Jersey Police Department*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 239.

Employee suffering personal problems considered resigned in good standing. *DiMattia v. Department of Transportation*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 215.

Chronically absent employee granted resignation in good standing. *Caldwell v. Forensic Psychiatric Hospital*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 134.

Merit System Board approved removal of employee for unsatisfactory attendance, but modified her termination status from resignation not in good standing to resignation in good standing, where employee's absence followed denial of her request for indefinite leave of absence due to illness. *Bell v. Mid-State Correctional Facility*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 839.

Removal of clerk typist based upon five-day absence without approval of her supervisor was not warranted, and she would be treated as if she had resigned in good standing. *Neuschafer v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 766.

Resignation proposed by employee's union representative as alternative to discipline was not coerced. *Kwasniewski v. Probation Division*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 597.

Resignation in good standing was more appropriate than removal when injury was cause of training failure. *Gottlieb v. Monmouth County Sheriff*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 573.

Highway maintenance worker with bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome resigned in good standing by reason of an inability to perform job duties. *Kromenacker v. Department of Transportation*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 275.

Public employee who was convicted of offense involving theft from employer forfeited her position. *Gurenlian v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 599.

Failure to return to duty for five consecutive business days following leave of absence; resignation in good standing. *Apoldite v. Dept. of Treasury*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 459.

Unapproved absence was justified; resignation in good standing. *DeBlasio v. Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 398.

Discharge would be classified as having resigned in good standing. *DeBlasio v. Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 398.

Appeal of resignation not in good standing was moot. *Scott v. Department of Human Resources*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 339.

Removal modified to resignation in good standing. *Harwell v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 679.

Removal modified to resignation in good standing. *Ensslin v. Township of North Bergen*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 674.

Resignation considered as one in good standing. *Swinney v. Sheriff's Department, Camden County*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 614.

Settlement agreement; technician allowed to resign in good standing. *Di Lard v. Ancora Psychiatric Hospital*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 159.

Employee was not entitled to rescind his resignation. *Schaan v. Gloucester County Bd. of Social Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 152.

Sanitary inspector resigned under distress and refusal to allow him to rescind his resignation was unreasonable. *Manzo v. Jersey City Div. of Health*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 117.

Attempt to change resignation to a medical leave of absence; resignation would be changed from not-in-good standing to good standing. *Cheeseman v. Bayside State Prison*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 41.

Merit Service Board had no jurisdiction to hear an appeal from employee who voluntarily resigned her position. *Tatum v. John L. Montgomery Medical Home*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 45.

**4A:2-6.2 Resignation not in good standing**

(a) If an employee resigns without complying with the required notice in N.J.A.C. 4A:2-6.1, he or she shall be held as having resigned not in good standing.

(b) Any employee who is absent from duty for five or more consecutive business days without the approval of his or her superior shall be considered to have abandoned his or her position and shall be recorded as a resignation not in good standing. Approval of the absence shall not be unreasonably denied.

(c) An employee who has not returned to duty for five or more consecutive business days following an approved leave

of absence shall be considered to have abandoned his or her position and shall be recorded as a resignation not in good standing. A request for extension of leave shall not be unreasonably denied.

(d) Where an employee is resigned not in good standing under (a), (b), or (c), the employee shall be provided with notice and an opportunity for a departmental hearing under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5, and Final Notice and a right to appeal to the Board under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.8. An employee shall be in unpaid status pending the departmental decision. Should an employee seek to return to employment pending the departmental decision, a review under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.5(b) shall be conducted prior to continuation of the unpaid status.

(e) Where the resignation is reversed, the employee shall be entitled to remedies under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.10.

(f) The appointing authority or the Board may modify the resignation not in good standing to an appropriate penalty or to a resignation in good standing.

Public Notice on Resignation not in good standing.

See: 22 N.J.R. 3407(b).

Amended by R.1992 d.414, effective October 19, 1992.

See: 24 N.J.R. 2491(a), 24 N.J.R. 3716(a).

Revised (b)-(c).

#### Case Notes

While appointing authority met its burden in establishing that a secretarial assistant 1 (non-stenographic) failed to return to work for five or more consecutive days after an approved leave of absence following her carpal tunnel surgery, discipline of a resignation not in good standing was modified to a 15-day suspension where there was a complete breakdown of communication between the employee and the appointing authority. The employee's supervisor failed to return the employee's calls, did not contact the employee when she failed to return to work, and did not communicate to the employee that a light duty plan was developed for her. The employee failed to state her needs to her supervisor, failed to find out if light duty was available and the details of any such accommodation, and failed to be more diligent in contacting the appointing authority with her medical needs and requirements. In re Cannuli, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4533-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1059, Civil Service Comm'n Decision (September 10, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 220) adopted, which concluded that a licensed practical nurse (LPN) was properly terminated under the designation of resignation not in good standing based on unauthorized absenteeism for five or more days, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-6.2; the LPN had previously been disciplined numerous times for absenteeism, and in this instance the chronic absences critically affected the infirmary's ability to function. In re Uhland, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 08226-02, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 583, Final Decision (April 23, 2008).

Initial Decision (2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 666) adopted, which concluded that a psychiatric hospital employee's conduct fell within the definition of a resignation not in good standing under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-

6.2(c) because whatever the employee believed about the length of her leave, she filed two sets of papers putting the end date prior to her return, did not go to the doctor until after the day she said she thought she was due back at work, and delayed several weeks in filing documentation that might have affected the hospital's willingness to take her back; however, balancing the need for adequate staffing in the facility with the employee's lack of prior discipline, a 90-day suspension rather than resignation was warranted. In re Bazile, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 00478-07, Final Decision (November 21, 2007).

Initial Decision (2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 43) adopted, which concluded that a laborer was improperly removed for unauthorized excessive absenteeism, including two incremental five working day consecutive periods, where the county failed to impose progressive discipline prior to termination. In re Porter, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1146-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 347, Merit System Board Decision (March 16, 2007).

Resignation pursuant to valid settlement agreement affirmed. Fuller v. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 688.

Employee offering medical evidence for leave of absence defeats employer's resignation not in good standing action. Wright v. Burlington County Juvenile Detention Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 555.

Storekeeper's abandonment of position justifies resignation not in good standing. Aikens v. Riverfront State Prison, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 422.

Employee's unreliable work history and absence without approval justifies employer's resignation not in good standing. Roberts v. Thomas Edison State College, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 382.

Progressive discipline supports suspension over resignation not in good standing when employee fails to report for duty. Hargis v. Forensic Psychiatric Hospital, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 335.

Unreasonable denial of medical leave precludes employer's removal action for abandoning position. Gilmore v. Veteran's Memorial Home, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 332.

Practical nurse's resignation not in good standing for job abandonment modified to resignation in good standing. Miles v. Woodbridge Developmental Center, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 222.

Resignation not in good standing for absence from duty modified to resignation in good standing. Bogar v. Department of Human Resources, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 189.

Removal of laborer for abandonment of position modified to resignation in good standing. Niosi v. Department of Public Works, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 161.

Nurse's refusal to work due to unsubstantiated knee injury justified implied resignation not in good standing. Gregg v. Woodbine Developmental Center, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 594.

Clerk who failed to provide timely medical documentation for extension of medical leave resigned not in good standing. Littlejohn v. Division of Medical Assistance and Health Services, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 471.