

#### STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Steven Pinkney City of Jersey City, Department of Housing, Economic Development and Commerce

FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

CSC DKT. NO. 2020-1091 OAL DKT. NO. CSV 16007-19

ISSUED: SEPTEMBER 22, 2021 BW

The appeal of Steven Pinkney, Assistant Administrative Analyst, City of Jersey City, Department of Housing, Economic Development and Commerce, removal effective August 16, 2019, on charges, were heard by Administrative Law Judge Nanci G. Stokes, who rendered his initial decision on August 23, 2021. No exceptions were filed.

Having considered the record and the Administrative Law Judge's initial decision, and having made an independent evaluation of the record, the Civil Service Commission, at its meeting on September 22, 2021, accepted and adopted the Findings of Facts and Conclusion as contained in the attached Administrative Law Judge's initial decision.

#### **ORDER**

The Civil Service Commission dismisses the appeal based on appellant's failure to appear.

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 22ND DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021

Derve L. Webster Calib

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb

Chairperson

Civil Service Commission

Inquiries and Correspondence

Allison Chris Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
44 S. Clinton Ave.
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312



INITIAL DECISION
DISMISSAL

OAL DKT. NO. CSV 16007-19 AGENCY DKT. NO. 2020-1091

IN THE MATTER OF STEVEN PINKNEY, CITY OF JERSEY CITY, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING,

Steven Pinkney, petitioner, pro se

James LaBianca, Esq. Assistant Corporation counsel, appearing on behalf of respondent

Record Closed: August 19, 2021

Decided: August 23, 2021

BEFORE NANCI G. STOKES, ALJ:

### STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant, Steven Pinkney, appeals from the Final Notice of Disciplinary Action (FNDA) dated October 4, 2019, suspending him, and terminating his employment for violation of regulations and policies regarding insubordination, conduct unbecoming, neglect of duty, or other sufficient cause.

### PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL FINDINGS

Appellant, through union counsel, filed an appeal with the Civil Service Commission (Commission) challenging the disciplinary action.

On November 13, 2019, the Commission granted appellant's request for a hearing transmitting this case to the Office of Administrative Law, as a contested case under the Administrative Procedure Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15, and the act establishing the OAL, N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1 to -13, for a hearing under the Uniform Administrative Procedure Rules, N.J.A.C. 1:1-1.1 to -21.6.

Appellant declined further union representation in this case and obtained counsel on December 16, 2019. I conducted several telephone conferences, scheduled numerous hearings, and issued a Prehearing Order dated February 19, 2020. Appellant's counsel experienced delays due to COVD-19, and I adjourned the hearings.

On November 20, 2020, the appellant advised that his attorney would no longer represent him and that the OAL should forward all questions or correspondence to him. On December 15, 2020, I conducted a telephone conference with counsel and appellant, where it was clear that disputes arose on strategies to proceed in the case. I directed appellant's counsel to submit a substitution of attorney to indicate that the appellant would now be appearing <u>pro se</u>, which I received on December 16, 2020. Later conferences discussed appellant's desire to obtain a new attorney. Although appellant stated he had a new attorney that would attend a teleconference, he provided no name or other contact information. The OAL received no substitution of attorney or letter of representation.

Although appellant participated in several conference calls, in March 2021 he became non-responsive to emails and telephone calls. By email dated April 12, 2021, the OAL notified appellant and respondent's counsel of a telephone prehearing scheduled for April 26, 2021, at 3:00 p.m. Both parties failed to appear, and I relisted

the conference for April 28, 2021. The OAL notified the parties through email and reminded the appellant that his attorney must submit a letter of representation to participate in the telephone conference. On April 28, 2021, appellant again did not appear, but Jersey City did.

On April 28, 2021, I prepared an Amended Prehearing Order outlining the hearing date of August 9, 19, and 30, 2021. Exhibits were due on July 23, 2021. I also scheduled an additional telephone conference for July 20, 2021. On July 20, 2021, appellant again failed to appear. Appellant supplied no exhibits as instructed, but Jersey City did. Under my instruction, my assistant sent an email stating:

"Dear Parties.

Although Mr. Pinkney did not attend today's telephone conference, please be reminded that per the Amended Pre-hearing Order dated April 28, 2021, exhibits, exhibit lists and witness lists are due by July 23, 2021, electronically and a hard copy to the OAL with exhibit tabs. Jersey City produced exhibits and a witness list by cover letter February 8, 2021. Thus, Jersey City would only need to present an exhibit list and any supplemental materials it intends to rely upon.

Please note that the telephone conference will <u>not</u> be rescheduled. The hearings in this matter will commence on August 9, 19, and 30, 2021, as per the May 4, 2021 notice."

(emphasis in original).

Appellant did not submit exhibits as instructed by the Amended Prehearing Order, but Jersey City did. Appellant failed to appear at Zoom hearings scheduled on August 9 and 19, 2021. To date, the OAL received no explanation for nonappearance as required under N.J.A.C. 1:1-14.4. Jersey City was ready to proceed.

Given the circumstances and the failures of appellant, I FIND that appellant abandoned his request for a hearing and CONCLUDE that this case should be DISMISSED.

## <u>ORDER</u>

Based upon the foregoing, I ORDER that the appeal in this matter be and is hereby DISMISSED.

I hereby FILE my initial decision with the CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION for consideration.

This recommended decision may be adopted, modified, or rejected by the CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, which by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter. If the Civil Service Commission does not adopt, modify, or reject this decision within forty-five days and unless such time limit is otherwise extended, this recommended decision shall become a final decision in accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10.

Within thirteen days from the date on which this recommended decision was mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions with the DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF APPEALS AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, UNIT H, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, 44 South Clinton Avenue, PO Box 312, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312, marked "Attention: Exceptions." A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.

August 23, 2021	Name Stuke
DATE	NANCI G. STOKES, ALJ
Date Received at Agency:	August 23, 2021
Date Mailed to Parties:	August 23, 2021

# **DOCUMENTS RELIED ON**

- Amended Prehearing Order
- May 4, 2021 notice of hearings
- Email chains

6