



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Alejandra Pazmino and Daneiri Vigil, Supervisor 1 MVC (PS9784T), Motor Vehicle Commission	:	FINAL ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
CSC Docket Nos. 2026-278 and 2026-1067	:	Examination Appeals
	:	
	:	

ISSUED: December 17, 2025 (SLK)

Alejandra Pazmino and Daneiri Vigil appeal the determinations of the Division of Agency Services (Agency Services) that they did not meet the continuous permanent service requirement for the Supervisor 1 MVC (PS9784T), Motor Vehicle Commission promotional examination. These appeals have been consolidated due to common issues presented.

The examination at issue was announced open to employees in the competitive division who had an aggregate of one year of continuous permanent service as of the February 21, 2025, closing date in any competitive title. The experience requirements were five years of experience applying, disseminating, interpreting and analyzing regulatory information, one year of which must have been as a lead worker performing one or a combination of the following functions: review and analysis of driver records; driver testing; damage and/or insurance claim evaluations or adjustment work; receipt, review, analysis/evaluation and/or response to customer inquiries and/or complaints; vehicle safety/compliance inspection, performing varied vehicle inspections; or other similar work areas related to the administration of motor vehicle regulations. Further, an Associate's degree or 60 course credits from an accredited college or university could have substituted for two years of the above experience. However, this substitution was not to be applied towards meeting the lead worker requirement. A total of 162 employees applied to the subject examination and 104 were determined eligible. Various certifications were issued containing the names of the eligibles and their dispositions are not yet due. The list expires on October 29, 2027.

A review of agency records indicates that Pazmino was appointed to the noncompetitive title, Technician MVC, on October 26, 2019 and to the competitive title, Senior Technician MVC, on March 9, 2024. Additionally, agency records indicate that Vigil was appointed to the noncompetitive title, Technician Trainee, on January 1, 2019; to the noncompetitive title, Technician MVC, on July 20, 2019; and subsequently appointed to the competitive title, Senior Technician MVC, on March 9, 2024. Therefore, as the appellants were first appointed to the competitive division on March 9, 2024, which was less than one year prior to the subject examination's February 21, 2025, closing date, Agency Services determined that they were both ineligible as they lacked the required amount of permanent status in the competitive division as of the closing date.

On appeal, while Pazmino acknowledging that she lacks the required continuous permanent service by approximately two weeks, she contends that there was an inconsistent application of this requirement. Specifically, she presents eligible, M.H., who was appointed as a Senior Technician MVC in December 2024 and eligible A.F., who was appointed to Senior Technician MVC on the same date that she was who were determined eligible.

Vigil also believes that there was an inconsistent application of the continuous permanent service requirement as she states that there are several eligibles who were promoted to Senior Technician MVC on the same date as her and shared the same probationary period.¹ Further, she states that these eligibles did not have prior lead worker experience.²

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.6(a) requires, in pertinent part, that applicants have one year of continuous permanent service for an aggregate of one year immediately preceding the closing date in a title or titles to which the examination is open. *N.J.A.C. 4A:4-6.3(b)* provides that the appellant has the burden of proof in examination appeals.

In this matter, the record indicates that the appellants were first permanently appointed to titles in the competitive division on March 9, 2024, which is less than one year prior to the February 21, 2025, examination closing date. Therefore, Agency Services correctly determined that they were ineligible for the subject examination since they lacked the one year required permanent service in a competitive division title. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.6(a)*.

¹ Vigil does not specifically identify the individuals.

² Additionally, Vigil indicates that if education was substituted for two years of experience, she notes that she has an Associate's degree. However, the announcement indicates that education cannot substitute for the lead worker requirement. Regardless, Vigil was not determined ineligible for lacking one year of lead worker experience.

Concerning the appellants' claim that the continuous permanent service rule was applied inconsistently, the record indicates that in April 2019, the Technician MVC title was reallocated to the noncompetitive division on an interim basis and then permanently reallocated to the noncompetitive division in 2022. However, anyone who was appointed to the Technician MVC title prior to the April 2019 reallocation to the noncompetitive division retained their competitive division promotional right after the reallocation and met the subject examination continuous permanent service requirement. However, applicants like the appellants, who were appointed to Technician MVC after the April 2019 reallocation, did not obtain competitive promotional rights until they were subsequently appointed to competitive titles, which in the case of the appellants was not until March 9, 2024, when they were appointed to the competitive title, Senior Technician MVC.

Referring to other candidates who were appointed to Senior Technician MVC after March 2024, but prior to the examination closing date who still were determined eligible, as stated above, if they were appointed to Technician MVC prior to the April 2019 reallocation to the noncompetitive division, they met the continuous permanent service requirement. Further, concerning the lead worker experience requirement, candidates certify that their applications are accurate. Whether it is out-of-title experience or non-State service, this agency is not an investigatory agency, and it credits applicable service based on an applicant's certification that they have accurately represented their experience. Consequently, if such candidates represented that they performed one year of applicable lead worker experience prior to the subject examination closing date based on any combination of their prior work experience, they met the lead worker requirement for the examination. It is incumbent upon the appointing authority to determine, if applicable, at the time of appointment consideration, whether a candidate has provided false or inaccurate information. Under that circumstance, it may request the removal of such candidate from the eligible list pursuant to *N.J.A.C. 4A:4-4.7* and take any other action it deems appropriate.

Referring to M.H., while Pazmino seems to believe that M.H. was determined to have met the lead worker experience based on non-State service, which she questions since she claims it cannot be verified as the company closed,³ the record indicates that M.H. was determined to have met the lead worker requirement based on other State service work as certified by M.H. Also, M.H. met the continuous permanent service requirement based on being appointed as a Technician MVC on October 28, 2017, which was a competitive title at the time.

³ Although unlikely in this matter based on the nature of the required lead worker experience, if an applicant had applicable lead worker experience based on non-State service, the mere fact that the company closed would not require that such service cannot be credited as applicable experience is based on an applicant's certification of their experience and not upon this agency verifying such experience with an employer.

Concerning A.F., A.F. met the lead worker requirement based on being appointed to Senior Technician MVC on March 9, 2024, which is a lead worker title. Additionally, A.F. met the continuous permanent service requirement by being appointed as a Technician MVC on September 1, 2018, which was a competitive title at that time.

Accordingly, the record indicates that the determinations of the continuous permanent service requirement as well as the lead worker requirement were uniformly applied to all applicants. Finally, it is noted that even if other candidates were admitted in error, this error would not justify admitting the appellants to the subject examination, as the appellants did not meet the continuous permanent service requirement.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that these appeals be denied.

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 17TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025



Allison Chris Myers
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Dulce A. Sulit-Villamor
Director and Chief Regulatory Officer
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Office of the Chair/Chief Executive Officer
Civil Service Commission
P.O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Alejandra Pazmino (2026-278)
Daneiri Vigil (2026-1067)
Division of Agency Services
Records Center