



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. 2026-1793

Request for Reconsideration

ISSUED: June 10, 2026

Alexandre Gabler requests reconsideration of the Civil Service Commission’s (Commission) decision in *In the Matter of Alexandre Gabler, Greystone Park Psychiatric Hospital, Department of Health* (CSC, decided December 17, 2025). That decision is incorporated herein.

On reconsideration, the petitioner states that he never questioned how P.D. became reachable on certification OS240159. Rather, he questioned what happened to the names on the certification between himself, listed first, and P.D., listed fifth, to make P.D. eligible for appointment and how much real consideration the appointing authority gave to those other eligibles.<sup>1</sup> In addition, the petitioner insists he has standing to appeal an appointment – P.D.’s – that negatively affects his working conditions and prevents him from receiving the appropriate treatment he is due from the appointing authority. He also states that P.D.’s provisional appointment impaired Greystone Park Psychiatric Hospital (GPPH) so much that the New Jersey Department of Health (DOH) had to pay a contractor hundreds of thousands of dollars to complete the work P.D. had been provisionally appointed to perform at GPPH. Further, the petitioner reiterates his 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*. Additionally, the petitioner argues that, keeping in mind that final orders of the Commission are public record, the Commission is obligated to be fair and

<sup>1</sup> The record reflects that the petitioner received the results of certification OS240159 through an Open Public Records Act request.

balanced and to avoid “doxxing” an appellant. He notes that Commission decisions are found with a simple Google search of an appellant’s name. To someone not directly involved in the appeal reading the decision, it appears that he is making “many unfounded and ridiculous accusations.” For an appellant who is a job applicant or who wants to possibly join an organization in the future, the “one-sided” manner in which the Commission writes and releases written decisions can cause real harm and negatively affect appellants. The petitioner posits that this is not a fair way to handle the process.

## CONCLUSION

*N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-1.6(b) provides that a petition for reconsideration shall be in writing signed by the petitioner or the petitioner’s representative and must show the following: (1) the new evidence or additional information not presented at the original proceeding, which would change the outcome and the reasons that such evidence was not presented at the original proceeding; or (2) that a clear material error has occurred. A review of the record reveals that reconsideration is not justified.

The petitioner states that he was questioning what happened to the names on certification OS240159 between himself, listed first, and P.D., listed fifth, to make P.D. eligible for appointment. In reply, the petitioner received a permanent appointment to the title of Supervisor Information Technology from certification OS240159. Further, as reflected in the certification results, the second and fourth listed eligibles were bypassed, and the third listed eligible was removed. While the petitioner may question how much real consideration the appointing authority gave to these eligibles, he has no standing to appeal their bypass or removal. To the extent that the petitioner continues to believe that P.D. is negatively affecting his working conditions and preventing him from receiving the appropriate treatment he is due from the appointing authority, such issues should be pursued through the appropriate grievance procedures, *see N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-3.1, or with the State Ethics Commission, as appropriate, as noted in the prior decision. Similarly, the petitioner’s concerns over the DOH having to pay a contractor hundreds of thousands of dollars should be pursued through appropriate grievance procedures. The petitioner’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, to reiterate, no longer viable, and the petitioner received a permanent appointment to the title of Supervisor Information Technology from certification OS240159. Finally, the Commission rejects any suggestion that it “doxxed” the petitioner in the prior decision. Rather, the decision fairly described his arguments and explained why the appeal was denied. Therefore, the instant reconsideration request does not present either new information to change the outcome or that a clear material error has occurred. Accordingly, the standard for reconsideration has not been met.

**ORDER**

Therefore, it is ordered that this request for reconsideration 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 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JUNE, 2026



---

Mary Cruz  
Acting Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

Shannon L. Dalton  
Director  
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs  
Civil Service Commission  
Written Record Appeals Unit  
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