



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Alexandre Gabler,
Greystone Park Psychiatric Hospital,
Department of Health

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

CSC Docket No. 2025-2847

Administrative Appeal

ISSUED: December 17, 2025 (HS)

Alexandre Gabler appeals the appointment of P.D. to the title of Supervisor Information Technology and requests other relief.

In his appeal to the Civil Service Commission (Commission), postmarked June 19, 2025, the appellant states that he appeals P.D.'s permanent appointment to the title of Supervisor Information Technology, effective August 12, 2024, at Greystone Park Psychiatric Hospital (GPPH); P.D.'s movement in the first quarter of 2025 from GPPH to the Division of Mental Health Services, Department of Health (DOH), without a job posting; and the continued "unwarranted influence and special treatment" P.D. continues to retain at GPPH and within the DOH. The appellant's specific complaints and allegations are described below:

- P.D. received a provisional appointment, pending open competitive examination procedures, to the title of Supervisor Information Technology at GPPH, effective September 25, 2021, and remained a provisional employee for more than one year. *N.J.S.A. 11A:4-13b*.
- P.D. and D.B., a former Supervisor Information Technology concocted a plan starting in 2022 so that P.D. would hardly ever have to work onsite at his "official reporting location" at GPPH. Specifically, the plan was to get GPPH and DOH to hire a contractor from Computer Aid, Inc. (CAI) to serve in the role of the Supervisor Information Technology at GPPH instead of P.D. Subsequently, a

contractor was hired by GPPH/DOH at a great expense to taxpayers of more than \$200,000 per year. Once the contractor was situated at GPPH on October 11, 2022, P.D. immediately stopped teleworking two days per week. He then started teleworking “[four] days per week from his ‘official reporting location’ at [GPPH] and working at an ‘alternative worksite’ [four] days per week,” thus violating the telework rules from October 11, 2022 throughout the first quarter of 2025.

- There has been “manipulation” of P.D.’s scheduled salary step increases. Specifically, when he received his provisional appointment to the title of Supervisor Information Technology, P.D. started at a salary of \$92,166.63 (salary range R30, step three) instead of \$84,177.83 (salary range R30, step one).
- Starting October 11, 2022, the CAI contractor F.V. was essentially performing the job that P.D. was being paid for at GPPH. Although P.D. was almost completely absent from his “official reporting location” between October 2022 and June 2024, he continued to complete employee timesheets and performance evaluations as if he were present and actively involved in the day-to-day activities of his assigned staff. In frustration after almost two years of doing P.D.’s job and in conjunction with his continued and constant absence, F.V. resigned on June 12, 2024.
- It is “questionable” that on the March 18, 2024 certification (OS240159) from the Supervisor Information Technology (S0872D) list, both the appellant, ranked first, and P.D., ranked fifth, received permanent appointments, effective August 12, 2024.
- The definition section of the job specification for Supervisor Information Technology provides, among other things, that the incumbent supervises and directs the operation of a network support unit (mainframe and/or client server environment) of at least five employees responsible for development, implementation, and maintenance of multi-network, multi-user local area networks, metropolitan area networks, or wide area networks. However, the appellant has only been assigned two employees, only one of which holds an information technology title.
- It would have been physically impossible for P.D.’s supervisor to properly evaluate P.D. during his working test period from August 12, 2024 to December 12, 2024 because he was absent from his

“official reporting location” at GPPH at least four days per week during that time.

- Several anonymous members of GPPH’s senior administration have told the appellant in confidence that since P.D.’s provisional appointment on September 25, 2021, whenever his working arrangement was brought up or questioned they immediately got pushback from the DOH Central Office. Sometimes, this consisted of veiled threats. It is an “open secret” at DOH that P.D.’s close relative holds an influential and high position at the DOH Division of Mental Health Services. The understanding amongst administration both at GPPH and DOH, especially within the Division of Mental Health Services, is that P.D. is not to be touched and that he is “protected.”
- On January 13, 2025, GPPH/DOH unnecessarily hired another contractor from CAI without the appellant’s involvement in the hiring, selection, or interview process for said contractor.
- P.D. moved his appointment in the competitive division from GPPH to the Division of Mental Health Services, DOH, in the first quarter of 2025 without any Civil Service posting and while there was an active and valid Supervisor Information Technology eligible list (S0872D) still with seven names on it that expires on March 13, 2027.
- P.D.’s first quarter 2025 move coincided with when he started using the functional title of Director of Information Technology, Division of Mental Health Services. He is still currently signing the timesheets for six information technology employees at GPPH and conducting their performance evaluations. He has no regular in-person contact with any of these staff members. However, the appellant holds the same title; was also permanently appointed on August 12, 2024; and is onsite at GPPH daily. The new CAI contractor R.B. is serving as the *de facto* Director of Information Technology at GPPH and sometimes signing documents with that title. P.D. is continuing to retain influence and control over the information technology department at GPPH through this outside contractor, while he simultaneously has taken over the information technology department of the entire DOH Division of Mental Health Services. Senior GPPH and DOH administration are allowing it to occur and are even encouraging the situation.

- On July 1, 2025, P.D. submitted a new and improper request to have GPPH and the DOH retain a CAI contractor for the 2026 fiscal year from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026.

Additionally, the appellant states that he is concerned about possible reprisal by the appointing authority and other members of the senior administration at GPPH and the DOH.

CONCLUSION

The allegations that P.D. was involved in a plan to hire a contractor to facilitate his violation of the telework rules from October 11, 2022 to first quarter 2025; that P.D.'s salary was improperly set at salary range R30, step three upon his September 25, 2021 provisional appointment to the title of Supervisor Information Technology; that contractor F.V. performed P.D.'s job from October 2022 to June 2024 while P.D. continued to improperly complete employee timesheets and performance evaluations; that P.D., ranked fifth, questionably received a permanent appointment from the March 18, 2024 certification (OS240159) on August 12, 2024; that the appointing authority improperly passed P.D. in his working test period in December 2024; and that P.D. improperly moved from GPPH to the Division of Mental Health Services in first quarter 2025 have not been timely brought. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1(b)* (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). Nevertheless, the following is noted for informational purposes. With respect to P.D.'s step three salary placement, agency records indicate that a salary adjustment was duly requested and approved. Regarding the disposition of certification OS240159, the appellant was appointed and has no standing to challenge P.D.'s appointment. In any event, agency records indicate that there were no appointments below P.D.'s rank. With the third listed eligible being removed, P.D. was reachable for appointment. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-4.8(a)3*. Concerning P.D.'s movement from GPPH to the Division of Mental Health Services, agency records indicate that P.D. transferred in the same title; thus, there were no posting requirements. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1*.

The appellant's complaint that P.D. was in a provisional appointment that lasted beyond the 12-month period noted in *N.J.S.A. 11A:4-13b* is no longer viable since, as of August 12, 2024, that was no longer the case. *See In the Matters of Alexandre Gabler, Librarian 3 (M0424E), Elizabeth Library* (CSC, decided May 22, 2024), *aff'd on reconsideration* (CSC, decided February 5, 2025).

The appellant's assertion that he is not supervising the minimum number of employees contemplated by the job specification for his title is essentially a complaint that the duties of his position are not conforming to the approved job specification for the title assigned to his position. As such, the appellant may wish to request a position classification review. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.9*.

The appellant's complaints that P.D. is signing timesheets for six information technology employees at GPPH and conducting their performance evaluations without regular in-person contact; that contractor R.B. is serving as the *de facto* Director of Information Technology at GPPH and sometimes signing documents with that title; that P.D. is continuing to retain influence and control over the information technology department at GPPH through the contractor; and that on July 1, 2025, P.D. submitted a new and improper request to have GPPH and the DOH retain a contractor are in the nature of grievances. As such, they have been prematurely presented directly to the Commission. Instead, the appellant must utilize the appropriate grievance procedures to pursue these issues. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-3.1.*

Regarding the appellant's claim that P.D. is unduly benefiting from his connection to a close relative holding an influential and high position, the appellant may wish to bring these concerns before the State Ethics Commission.

The appellant indicates that he is concerned about reprisal. *N.J.S.A. 11A:2-24* provides:

An appointing authority shall not take or threaten to take any 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. An employee who is the subject of a reprisal action by an appointing authority for the lawful disclosure of information may appeal such action to the Civil Service Commission.


See also, N.J.A.C. 4A:2-5.1(a). Thus, if the appellant believes that the appointing authority has taken a reprisal action against him, or has threatened him with such action, he may file the appropriate appeal. *See N.J.A.C. 4A:2-5.2.* However, the appellant has not presented any evidence, or even claimed, that the appointing authority has engaged in any reprisal actions against him. Accordingly, the Commission will not act at this time on the appellant's general concern that the appointing authority *may in the future* take a reprisal action against him as the issue is not ripe for adjudication. *See In the Matter of Alexandre Gabler, Librarian 3 (PM4239C), Woodbridge Library (CSC, decided February 2, 2022).*

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this appeal 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: Alexandre Gabler
Melissa Ballard-Cabra
Ann Marie Kopczynski
Division of Agency Services
Division of Human Resource Information Services
Records Center