



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

**FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION
OF THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the Matter of A.M.S., Police Officer
(S9999A), Township of Pennsauken

Medical Review Panel Appeal

CSC Docket No. 2021-170

ISSUED: MAY 3, 2021 (AMR)

A.M.S. appeals her rejection as a Police Officer candidate by the Township of Pennsauken and its request to remove her name from the eligible list for Police Officer (S9999A) on the basis of psychological unfitness to perform effectively the duties of the position.

This appeal was brought before the Medical Review Panel (Panel) on January 15, 2021 which rendered its Report and Recommendation on January 22, 2021. No exceptions were filed by the parties.

The report by the Panel discusses all submitted evaluations. The Panel concluded that the test results and procedures and the behavioral record, when viewed in light of the Job Specification for Police Officer, indicate that the appellant is psychologically fit to perform effectively the duties of the position sought, and therefore, the action of the appointing authority should not be upheld. Accordingly, the Panel recommended that the appellant be reinstated to the eligible list.

CONCLUSION

The Job Specification for the title of Police Officer is the official job description for such municipal positions within the Civil Service system. The specification lists examples of work and the knowledge, skills and abilities necessary to perform the job. Examples include the ability to find practical ways of dealing with a problem, the ability to effectively use services and equipment, the ability to follow rules, the ability to put up with and handle abuse from a person or group, the ability to take the lead or take charge, knowledge of traffic laws and ordinances, and a willingness

to take proper action in preventing potential accidents from occurring. Police Officers are responsible for their lives, the lives of other officers and the public. In addition, they are entrusted with lethal weapons and are in daily contact with the public. They use and maintain expensive equipment and vehicle(s) and must be able to drive safely as they often transport suspects, witnesses and other officers. A Police Officer performs searches of suspects and crime scenes and is responsible for recording all details associated with such searches. A Police Officer must be capable of responding effectively to a suicidal or homicidal situation or an abusive crowd. The job also involves the performance of routine tasks such as logging calls, recording information, labeling evidence, maintaining surveillance, patrolling assigned areas, performing inventories, maintaining uniforms and cleaning weapons.

Having considered the record, including the Job Specification for Police Officer and the duties and abilities encompassed therein, and the Panel's Report and Recommendation issued thereon, and having made an independent evaluation of the same, the Civil Service Commission accepts and adopts the findings and conclusions as contained in the Panel's Report and Recommendation.


ORDER

The Civil Service Commission finds that the appointing authority has not met its burden of proof that A.M.S. is psychologically unfit to perform effectively the duties of a Police Officer and, therefore, the Civil Service Commission orders that her name be restored to the subject eligible list. Absent any disqualification issue ascertained through an updated background check conducted after a conditional offer of appointment, the appellant's appointment is otherwise mandated. A federal law, the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 *U.S.C.A.* § 12112(d)(3), expressly requires that a job offer be made before any individual is required to submit to a medical or psychological examination. *See also* the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's *ADA Enforcement Guidelines: Preemployment Disability Related Questions and Medical Examination* (October 10, 1995). That offer having been made, it is clear that, absent the erroneous disqualification, the aggrieved individual would have been employed in the position.

Since the appointing authority has not supported its burden of proof, upon the successful completion of her working test period, the Civil Service Commission orders that the appellant be granted a retroactive date of appointment to August 10, 2020, the date she would have been appointed if her name had not been removed from the subject eligible list. This date is for salary step placement and seniority-based purposes only. However, the Civil Service Commission does not grant any other relief, such as back pay or counsel fees, except the relief enumerated above.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 28th DAY OF APRIL, 2021



Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: A.M.S.
Michael J. DiPiero, Esq.
Joseph V. Palumbo, Sr.
Division of Agency Services