

Case Notes

Statements made in report of background check of police officer applicant. *Pollinger v. Loigman*, 256 N.J.Super. 257, 606 A.2d 1113 (A.D.1992).

Removal of applicant's name from open competitive list was improper; inability to communicate effectively in English. In the Matter of Bangar, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 500.

Disqualification; lack of job requirements. *City of Trenton v. Porzilli*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 172.

Inability to speak English warranted removal of name from eligible list. *Patel v. Division of Youth and Family Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 147.

Removal from eligibility list for position at college was justified by inability to communicate in English. *Shah v. William Paterson College*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 97.

4A:4-4.8 Disposition of a certification

(a) Upon receipt of a certification, an appointing authority shall take whichever of the following actions is appropriate when a permanent appointment is to be made:

1. Appoint the eligible whose name has been certified from the special reemployment list;
2. Appoint the eligible whose name has been certified from regular or police or fire reemployment lists; or
3. Appoint one of the top three interested eligibles (rule of three) from an open competitive or promotional list, provided that:
 - i. Disabled veterans and then veterans shall be appointed in their order of ranking from an open competitive list;
 - ii. If the eligible who ranks first on a promotional list is a veteran, then a non-veteran may not be appointed; and
 - iii. See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.15(i) for tie scores.

(b) The appointing authority shall notify the Department of Personnel of the disposition of the certification by the disposition due date in the manner prescribed by the Department. The disposition due date may be extended beyond the expiration date of the eligible list to fill current vacancies. Under no circumstances shall a disposition due date be extended beyond the expiration date of the eligible list when vacancies do not exist. An anticipated vacancy shall not be considered the same as an existing vacancy. The report of disposition of the certification shall include:

1. Name of the eligibles to be permanently appointed;
2. The effective date of the requested permanent appointments;
3. In local service, the appointee's salary;

4. A statement of the reasons why the appointee was selected instead of a higher ranked eligible or an eligible in the same rank due to a tied score;

5. In situations where an appropriate list is used, the title and functions of the appointee's employment; and

6. Any other requested information.

(c) Failure to dispose by the due date may result in constructive appointment or other remedial action as set forth in N.J.A.C. 4A:10-2.

(d) If the certification will result in the displacement of a provisional employee who has permanent status, and it is necessary to institute layoff procedures, the Department may, upon written request from the appointing authority, extend the time for disposing of the certification for an additional 45 days. See N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1 et seq. for layoff procedures.

(e) See N.J.A.C. 4A:10-2.2 for penalties for failure to appoint from a complete certification.

Amended by R. 1993 d.270, effective June 7, 1993.

See: 25 N.J.R. 1085(b), 25 N.J.R. 2509(a).

Revised (a)3iii.

Amended by R.1994 d.507, effective October 3, 1994.

See: 26 N.J.R. 2697(b), 26 N.J.R. 3941(a).

Administrative correction.

See: 31 N.J.R. 1186(a).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 37 N.J.R. 1540(b), 2703(a).

Amended by R.2006 d.104, effective March 20, 2006.

See: 37 N.J.R. 4351(a), 38 N.J.R. 1425(a).

In introductory paragraph (b), added language regarding extension of disposition due date.

Law Review and Journal Commentaries

Civil Service. Judith Nallin, 133 N.J.L.J. No. 14, 65 (1993).

Case Notes

The Civil Service Act and its accompanying regulations did not require that preliminary notices of disciplinary action be signed by both police director and IAD Commander because the Act and its regulations did not require two signatures for the filing of a complaint. *Grill v. City of Newark*, 709 A.2d 333, 311 N.J.Super. 149 (N.J.Super.L. 1997).

Stating reasons for administrative actions limits arbitrary determinations, enhances judicial review of agency decisions, and discloses correctable deficiencies to aid in guiding future conduct. *Local 518, New Jersey State Motor Vehicle Employees Union, S.E.I.U., AFL-CIO v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 262 N.J.Super. 598, 621 A.2d 549 (A.D.1993).

Law Division had jurisdiction over declaratory judgment action seeking statement of reasons why employees were not selected for promotion under the Civil Service Act. *Local 518, New Jersey State Motor Vehicle Employees Union, S.E.I.U., AFL-CIO v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 262 N.J.Super. 598, 621 A.2d 549 (A.D.1993).

Appointing administrative authority was not required by Civil Service Act or regulations to apprise unsuccessful qualified candidate of reasons for promoting lower-scoring eligible employee. *Local 518, New Jersey State Motor Vehicle Employees Union, S.E.I.U., AFL-CIO v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 262 N.J.Super. 598, 621 A.2d 549 (A.D.1993).

Minimal requirements for making a valid appointment: when appointment is final. *Thomas v. McGrath*, 145 N.J.Super. 288, 367 A.2d 898 (App.Div.1976), reversed per curiam 75 N.J. 372, 382 A.2d 1121 (1978).

Initial Decision (2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 59) adopted, which concluded that a police officer did not meet his burden of showing that the rationale stated for not promoting him to sergeant on two separate occasions was pre-textual; it was not the appointing authority's burden to be more specific in identifying the information, namely the individuals promoted did not have serious or sustained disciplinary records worse than the officer, but it was the officer who had the burden of showing specific irregularities in the reason given for the bypasses that would have made them pre-textual. In re *Bradley*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5837-02, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 354, Final Decision (March 14, 2007).

Police captain fails to establish he was impermissibly bypassed for selection of police chief. *Shaffery v. Middletown Township*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 299.

Fire captains properly bypassed; exercise of discretion provided under the "rule of three" and not political discrimination. *Bulger v. Town of Harrison*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 509.

4A:4-4.9 Date of appointment

(a) An eligible shall not be appointed and begin work after the expiration date of the eligible list except:

1. When the eligible is on military leave, or, in the case of promotional appointments, is on an approved leave of absence. Persons returning from military leave or an approved leave of absence may begin work upon their return to active service.

2. When there is limited revival or statutory extension of an employment list, except that no appointment shall be made beyond the statutory extension date; or

3. When the certification is made just prior to the expiration of the eligible list, in which case the date of appointment and the date the eligible begins work shall be no later than the disposition due date.

Amended by R.1996 d.98, effective February 20, 1996.
See: 27 N.J.R. 4049(a), 28 N.J.R. 1201(b).

In (a)3 substituted "be no later than" for "coincide with".

4A:4-4.10 Certification of additional eligibles

If, after accepting employment, an eligible cannot begin work within three weeks or such other reasonable time as specified by the appointing authority, the appointing authority may consider the eligible unavailable and request that the Department certify additional names.

SUBCHAPTER 5. WORKING TEST PERIOD

4A:4-5.1 General provisions

(a) The working test period is part of the examination process designed to permit an appointing authority to deter-

mine whether an employee can satisfactorily perform the duties of the title.

(b) All regular appointments to a title in the career service shall be subject to a working test period, except:

1. Appointments from special, police and fire and regular reemployment lists;

2. Appointments to a comparable or lower related title in lieu of layoff; or

3. Appointments to titles previously held on a permanent basis within current permanent continuous service.

4. For lateral title changes, see N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.6(b).

(c) During the working test period, an employee shall perform the duties of the title for which appointment was made.

(d) An employee who is serving a working test period shall not be eligible for a promotional examination from that title.

Case Notes

Employee who worked out of title during working test period and did not perform the duties of the position was not entitled to permanent status (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-13.1 and 13.2). *Cipriano v. Dep't of Civil Service*, 151 N.J.Super. 86, 376 A.2d 571 (App.Div.1977).

Actual completion of a working test period is a basic condition of permanent employment (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-6.4). *Cipriano v. Dep't of Civil Service*, 151 N.J.Super. 86, 376 A.2d 571 (App.Div.1977).

Working out of title during working test period. *Cipriano v. Department of Civil Service*, 151 N.J.Super. 86, 376 A.2d 571 (App.Div.1977).

CETA hired police officers. Att'y Gen. F. O. 1977-No. 25 (see footnote).

Initial Decision (2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 825) adopted, which found that a clerical worker was properly removed at the end of her working test period where she was absent for an astounding 50 days, blatantly disregarded sick-leave procedures, and failed to give adequate notice that she would not be coming to work. In re *Barnes*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3764-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 540, Final Decision (January 30, 2008).

Initial Decision (2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 35) adopted, which found that the probationary or working test period under N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.1 is part of the testing process and an employee must demonstrate competency to discharge the duties of the position without further training; only upon a showing of bad faith under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.3 will an employer's decision to release an employee be scrutinized. In re *Mabson*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2164-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1101, Final Decision (March 8, 2006).

Initial Decision (2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 608) adopted, which found that in order to be considered a good faith decision, the decision to terminate an employee at the end of the working test period must be formed based upon actual observations of the employee's performance of the duties of the position, and must be an honest assessment as to whether the employee will be able to satisfactorily and efficiently perform those duties if the appointment becomes permanent; if the decision to terminate is not based upon actual observations of performance, or, if it is made based upon dishonest motives, bias, prejudice or self-interest, or is made with ill will toward the employee or because of some furtive design, it must be set aside. In re *Abdelrahim*,

OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2229-05, 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1251, Final Decision (November 22, 2005).

Initial Decision (2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 608) adopted, which found that a nurse's aide was released in good faith following his working test period due to the frequency of his absences during that period; there was no evidence of bad faith. In re Abdelrahim, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2229-05, 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1251, Final Decision (November 22, 2005).

Dismissal of employee at end of working test period for unsatisfactory performance was warranted, despite employee's claims that decision to dismiss her was made in bad faith. Schopf v. New Jersey Department of Labor, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 853.

Release of family service specialist at end of working test period was not improper when based in part on comments of co-employees. Nwosu v. Department of Human Services, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 436.

Working test period justified school security guard's removal for incompetency. Hogan v. Vineland Board of Education, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 400.

Food service worker on approved medical leave was entitled to additional working test period. Singletary v. Bergen Pines County Hospital, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 370.

Laborer granted new working test period because job requirement of commercial driver's license not documented in progress report or final report. Niosi v. Department of Public Works, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 238.

Release of drug abuse counselor at end of working test period; lack of veracity, good communication skills, punctuality and reliability. Memmot v. Department of Health, Twp. of Freehold, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 118.

Correction officer properly released at end of working test period. Muhammad v. Department of Corrections, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 609.

Probationary employee failed to show that he was released in bad faith. Lindsley v. Department of Buildings and Grounds, Monmouth County, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 604.

Deficiency in both quality and quantity of work; release at end of working test period. Brown v. Department of Labor, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 362.

Demotion justified; performance did not substantially improve during three-month test period. Smith v. Jersey City Housing Authority, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 381.

Termination of hospital attendant at end of working test period was justified. Vaidier v. Mercer County Geriatric Center, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 94.

Release of probationary police officer; working test period. Burchardt v. Union Township Police Department, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 618.

Release of assistant engineer at end of his working test period justified. De Botton v. Borough of Fair Lawn, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 579.

Release at end of work test period was not justified. Hall v. Newark Housing Authority, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 432.

Removal at end of working test period for unsatisfactory services was not in bad faith. Amin v. Department of Transportation, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 406.

Release at end of working test period was not in bad faith. Capone v. State-Operated School District of Jersey City, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 395.

No showing of bad faith; termination at end of employee's working test. Capone v. State-Operated School Dist. of City of Jersey City, Hudson County, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 395.

Removal at end of working test period was not action taken in bad faith. Aller v. Department of Labor, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 390.

Decision to remove at the conclusion of working test period was not formulated in bad faith. Aller v. Department of Labor, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 390.

Termination of officer was in bad faith. Bowers v. Irvington Township Police Department, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 55.

Good faith; termination at the end of a working test period. Davis v. Department of Transportation, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 769.

Suspension and release at end of working test period. Evelina v. William Paterson College of New Jersey, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 738.

Release from position at the end of working test period was justified. Meyrick v. Hunterdon County Sheriff's Office, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 692.

No error in release at the end of working test period. Edington v. Treasury Department, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 673.

Release after working test period; not bad faith. Phillips v. New Jersey Department of Human Services, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 602.

Department of Transportation improperly used a working test period as a basis for terminating inspector's employment. Andres v. N.J. Department of Transportation, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 481.

Employee released in good faith at end of working test period. Johnson v. Vineland Developmental Center, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 363.

Bad faith termination of recruit because of unsatisfactory working test period. Smith v. Northern State Prison, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 342.

Release at end of extended working test period; not justified. Vegotsky v. Office of Administrative Law, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 162.

Release at end of working test period; failure to demonstrate bad faith. Downs v. Marlboro Psychiatric Hosp., 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 94.

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. 4:1-13.7). Davis v. Newark Public Library, 9 N.J.A.R. 84 (1987).

4A:4-5.2 Duration

(a) The working test period shall not include any time served by an employee under provisional, temporary, interim or emergency appointment. The working test period shall begin on the date of regular appointment. See N.J.A.C. 4A:1-1.3 for definition of regular appointment.

(b) The length of the working test period, except as provided in (c) through (e) below, shall be as follows:

1. In local service, a period of three months of active service, which may not be extended.

2. In State service, a period of four months of active service, which the Commissioner may extend on request of an appointing authority for an additional two months. Such request should be submitted to the Department of Personnel at least five working days before the end of the four month period. The appointing authority shall notify

the employee of the extension in writing on or before the last day of the four month period.

i. Regularly appointed employees serving in intermittent titles shall serve a working test period of 88 work days, which, upon the request of the appointing authority, may be extended by the Commissioner for an additional 44 work days. For purposes of this subsection, any part of a day shall constitute a work day.

ii. An employee serving in an intermittent title who is furloughed prior to completing the working test period, shall resume the working test period upon return from furlough.

(c) When notice of termination is served following the last day of the working test period pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.1(c), the working test period shall end on the date of service of the notice.

(d) Persons appointed to entry level law enforcement, correction officer, juvenile detention officer and firefighter titles shall serve a 12-month working test period. A law enforcement title is one that encompasses use of full police powers, but shall not include the local service competitive title of Police Assistant. See N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.7A. Persons appointed in local service to the competitive title of Police Assistant shall serve a three-month working test period.

1. In local service, law enforcement officers who are required by N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 et seq. (Police Training Act) to complete a police training course shall not begin their working test period until notification is received by the appointing authority from the Police Training Commission of the successful completion of the police training course. However, major disciplinary procedures applicable to employees serving in a working test period (see N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2) shall also be applicable to such officers from the date of appointment until completion of police training. Upon successful completion of the working test period, the date of appointment from the eligible list shall be recorded as the date of regular appointment.

i. Law enforcement officers who have successfully completed the police training course prior to appointment shall begin their working test period on the date of regular appointment.

2. Appeals from failure to successfully complete the police training course shall be in accordance with procedures established by the Police Training Commission. See N.J.A.C. 13:1-11.

(e) An approved leave of absence including a furlough extension leave or a voluntary furlough shall extend the completion of the working test period for a period of time equal to that leave or voluntary furlough.

1. A paid leave of absence for a correction officer or juvenile detention officer for the purpose of training required by N.J.S.A. 52:17B-68.1 shall not extend the

length of the working test period unless the course in which the appointee is enrolled is scheduled to end after the one year period.

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

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

In (d): added "juvenile detention officer."

In (d)1: added text, "However ... regular appointment." Added 1. to subsection (e) regarding a paid leave of absence.

Amended by R.1993 d.270, effective June 7, 1993.

See: 25 N.J.R. 1085(b), 25 N.J.R. 2509(a).

Revised (b)2.

Amended by R.1995 d.12, effective January 3, 1995.

See: 26 N.J.R. 4126(a), 27 N.J.R. 145(a).

Amended by R.2006 d.104, effective March 20, 2006.

See: 37 N.J.R. 4351(a), 38 N.J.R. 1425(a).

In introductory paragraph (d), added " , but shall not include the local service competitive title of Police Assistant," reference to N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.7A and the last sentence.

Case Notes

Appointing authority properly removed a correction officer for his failure to complete the requisite police academy training after three opportunities to do so; the authority was under no obligation to provide endless opportunities for training and the officer was on notice that he was charged with failing to complete the academy since that specification appeared on the Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action and was later sustained. In re Dickerson, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11065-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1084, Final Decision (September 10, 2008).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 316) adopted, which concluded that any slight delays in transmitting the request to extend an employee's working test period were certainly not indicative of bad faith on the part of the appointing authority, where the employee was released at the end of the extended working test period. In re Villecca, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2978-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 710, Final Decision (June 25, 2008).

Employee with permanent title of Children's Supervisor who accepted a position as a Human Services Specialist I with the county appointing authority when the county privatized its Children's Shelter was never laid off; the county rescinded its planned layoff, as all affected employees had accepted alternate employment within the county, and the employee's new position was a provisional appointment, pending promotional examination procedures. In re Garcia, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11932-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 595, Merit System Board Decision (May 7, 2008).

New four-month working test period was granted in the title of Assistant District Parole Supervisor based on the totality of the circumstances, including the employee's satisfactory performance during the majority of the working test period and the lack of opportunity to remedy performance deficiencies brought to the employee's attention during the latter part of the working test period; the procedural irregularity caused by the fact that the working test period start date was not the same as the regular appointment date was not enough to justify granting permanent status to the employee under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.1(c). In re Bellini, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3584-02, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 209, Final Decision (January 25, 2006).

Merit System Board directed the Division of Human Resource Information Services to reevaluate DOP practice of approving regular appointment dates that were not consistent with working test period start dates, resulting in uncertainties concerning the ending date of an employee's working test period and the time within which notice must be served under N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4.1(c). In re Bellini, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3584-02, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 209, Final Decision (January 25, 2006).

Working test period extended 30 days to compensate for four weeks of approved leave and vacation. *Regrut v. Warren County*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 460.

Working test period for public employee was extended by approved leave of absence. *Wilczynski v. Water Pollution Control*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 378, reversed 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 300.

Food service worker on approved medical leave was entitled to additional working test period. *Singletary v. Bergen Pines County Hospital*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 370.

Supervisor was entitled to two-month extension of second working test period. *McClellan v. Department of Community Affairs*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 19.

4A:4-5.3 Progress reports

(a) The appointing authority shall prepare a progress report on the employee at the end of two months and a final report at the conclusion of the working test period. If the Commissioner has extended the working test period in State service pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.2(b)2, the appointing authority shall also prepare a progress report at the end of five months and a final report at the conclusion of the extended working test period.

(b) For entry level law enforcement, correction officer and firefighter titles, the appointing authority shall prepare a progress report on the employee at the end of six months and a final report at the conclusion of the working test period.

(c) The appointing authority shall furnish the employee with a copy of all reports.

(d) In State service, the appointing authority shall:

1. Retain all reports for an employee in his or her individual personnel file;
2. When an employee is being separated or returned to his or her permanent title due to unsatisfactory performance, submit to the Department of Personnel, within five days following the last day of the working test period, copies of all progress reports and the final report and the written notice of separation or return to his or her permanent title;
3. Retain all progress reports and related material for the length of an employee's service and for six years following his or her separation from State service, if applicable; and
4. Retain for auditing any other records so identified by the Department of Personnel.

(e) In local service, the appointing authority shall furnish working test period progress reports to the Department of Personnel upon request.

Amended by R.1993 d.270, effective June 7, 1993.
See: 25 N.J.R. 1085(b), 25 N.J.R. 2509(a).

Revised (c); added new (d) and (e).

Case Notes

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 316) adopted, which concluded that the absence of a justification letter along with the employee's fifth-month progress report did not constitute a showing of bad faith entitling the terminated employee to a new working test period;

the employee was counseled numerous times about her deficiencies. In *re Villecca*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 2978-06, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 710, Final Decision (June 25, 2008).

Social Service Aide was entitled to a new working test period because, in failing to provide the aide with timely written notification of his deficiencies through the progress reports required by N.J.A.C. 4A:4-5.3, the appointing authority denied him a fair evaluation of his work performance and the authority's release of the aide for deficiencies in job performance that were not adequately brought to his attention through the required progress reports evidenced a lack of good faith. In *re Maldonado*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 07337-04, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 396, Initial Decision (June 6, 2008), adopted (Civil Service Comm'n July 30, 2008).

Evaluation of probationary police officer's performance during working test period was deficient. *Love v. Irvington Township Police Department*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 482.

Failure to give employee written progress report during working test period; bad faith. *Sokolowsky v. Township of Freehold Dept. of Code Enforcement*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 155.

Employee was entitled to new working test period. *Richardson v. Department of Corrections, New Jersey State Prison*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 63.

4A:4-5.4 Working test period appeals

(a) An employee may be separated for unsatisfactory performance at the end of the working test period. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4 for procedures.

(b) An employee may be disciplined during the working test period. See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2 and 3 for procedures.

Case Notes

Initial Decision (2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 39) adopted, which concluded that a licensed practical nurse was properly removed during her working test period after she prepared medication for a patient that was approximately 10 times in excess of the prescribed dosage and then, just two days later, administered medication to another patient that was approximately four times in excess of the prescribed dosage; the hospital was entitled to assume that the nurse possessed the appropriate competencies for her position and was not required to provide her with additional training during the working test period. In *re Wrede*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5372-05 (CSV 7936-04 On Remand), 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1117, Final Decision (March 22, 2006).

Improperly terminated public employee with some work deficiencies was entitled to new working test period instead of permanent appointment to position. *Saleem v. Department of Citizen Services*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 204.

4A:4-5.5 Restoration to eligible list or former title

(a) An employee who, either during or at the end of a working test period, resigns in good standing or is separated due to unsatisfactory performance may, upon request, be restored to an eligible list, if the Commissioner determines that the employee is suitable for appointment to another position.

1. The Commissioner may consider:

- i. Whether the list can be certified to another appointing authority;

- ii. The recommendation of the employee's former appointing authority; and
- iii. Any other relevant factors.

2. Any employee who has been removed for disciplinary reasons shall not be restored to an eligible list.

3. Any employee who has filed an appeal pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-4 shall have his or her request for restoration held in abeyance pending the appeal.

(b) An employee who is laid off during the working test period shall be restored to the eligible list from which he or she was appointed.

(c) A permanent employee serving a working test period in another title shall continue to accrue seniority in his or her permanent title for the duration of the working test period. See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-1.9 for procedures on restoration to a former title.

Amended by R.1989 d.570, effective November 6, 1989.
See: 21 N.J.R. 2429(a), 21 N.J.R. 3451(a).

Added new (b) and relettered old (b) as new (c).
Amended by R.1990 d.553, effective November 19, 1990.
See: 22 N.J.R. 2629(a), 22 N.J.R. 3482(b).

Provision insures that permanent employee accrues seniority in permanent title during working test period in another title.

SUBCHAPTER 6. EXAMINATION AND SELECTION DISQUALIFICATION AND APPEALS

4A:4-6.1 Examination and selection disqualification

(a) A person may be denied examination eligibility or appointment when he or she:

1. Lacks the job requirements;
2. Is ineligible, by law, for employment in the title;
3. Is physically or psychologically unfit to perform effectively the duties of the title. However, an injury incurred in the armed forces shall not be considered a disqualification unless the Commissioner considers the condition incapacitating;
4. Has failed to pass examination procedures;
5. Has been removed from the public service for disciplinary reasons after an opportunity for a hearing;
6. Has made a false statement of any material fact or attempted any deception or fraud in any part of the selection or appointment process;
7. Has a prior employment history which relates adversely to the title; or
8. Has failed to pay the required application processing fee in a timely manner, or for open competitive exami-

nation, has failed to provide documentation of exemption from the application processing fee in a timely manner; or

9. Other sufficient reasons.

(b) Except where precluded by law, a person who is disqualified pursuant to (a)5 and 7 above may, for good cause, be admitted to an examination and, with the appointing authority's concurrence, certified for appointment.

(c) Any action specified in this section shall be effective upon receipt of written notice of disqualification.

Amended by R.1993 d.270, effective June 7, 1993.

See: 25 N.J.R. 1085(b), 25 N.J.R. 2509(a).

Added new (a)8; redesignated (a)8 to (a)9.

Law Review and Journal Commentaries

Arrests—Civil Service—Police. Judith Nallin, 133 N.J.L.J. No. 6, 57 (1993).

Case Notes

Arrest justifies removal of applicant's name from eligibility list where circumstances surrounding arrest adversely relate to the employment sought, and agency must state specifically its reasons for removal. *Tharpe v. City of Newark Police Dept.*, 261 N.J.Super. 401, 619 A.2d 228 (A.D.1992).

Remand was required where administrative record from Merit System Board did not disclose basis for Board's equation of police officer candidate's personality traits with finding that candidate was mentally unfit. *Matter of Vey*, 124 N.J. 534, 591 A.2d 1333 (1991).

Removal of provisional juvenile detention officer from eligible list because of prior employment history was improper without hearing by Merit System Board. *Matter of Wiggins*, 242 N.J.Super. 342, 576 A.2d 932 (A.D.1990).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 318) adopted, which concluded that removal of applicant's name from the eligibility list for Human Service Specialist I was warranted because the applicant could not communicate in English sufficiently to perform the functions of the position. In re *Sheth*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5771-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 507, Final Decision (May 21, 2008).

Modification of removal to resignation in good standing was warranted where employee underwent successful rehabilitation after arrest on drug charges. *Beachum v. Vineland City Board of Education*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 312.

Fact that drug screening guidelines were not strictly followed during unannounced screening did not require removal of positive test result from state police recruit's record. In the *Matter of the Appeal of Wayne Paterno*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (POL) 5.

Removal of dismissed provisional police officer's name from eligibility list was justified by poor past performance. *Grafje v. Hudson County Sheriff*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 476.

Advanced information about contents of promotional examination disqualified public employee from eligibility for promotion. *Motiani v. State Department of Transportation*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 121.

Removal of assistant engineer traffic's name from list for senior engineer traffic appropriate; employee attempted to get knowledge about examination. *Motiani v. State Department of Transportation*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 121.

Removal from eligibility list for fire lieutenant not warranted. *Brown v. City of Gloucester*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 464.