



STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of Jennifer Rodriguez,
Supervisor 1 MVC (PS9784T), Motor
Vehicle Commission

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

CSC Docket No. 2026-1100

Examination Appeal

ISSUED: July 1, 2026 (HS)

Jennifer Rodriguez requests permission to submit a late application for the promotional examination for Supervisor 1 MVC (PS9784T), Motor Vehicle Commission.

The announcement for the subject examination issued on February 1, 2025 with a closing date of February 21, 2025. It was open to employees in the competitive division who had an aggregate of one year of continuous permanent service as of the closing date in any competitive title and possessed 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. An Associate's degree or 60 course credits from an accredited college or university could be substituted for two years of the noted experience, but this substitution could not be applied towards meeting the lead worker requirement. The eligible list promulgated on October 30, 2025 with the names of 106 eligibles, 74 of whom remain active. The appellant did not submit an application.

In her appeal to the Civil Service Commission (Commission), filed October 28, 2025, the appellant writes:

Did not apply for [the PS9784T examination] because the last day to file was in February which would mean I was ineligible at the time of filing. However, when the list came out, I saw that [eight] other employees who were promoted at the same time as I was to Senior Technician [MVC] passed and were on the list. If they were allowed to take the test, I would like the opportunity to take the test as well.

In support, the appellant submits copies of the eligible lists for Senior Technician MVC (PS0875T), which promulgated on December 14, 2023 and expires on December 13, 2026, and the eligible list for Supervisor 1 MVC (PS9784T). She highlights 12 individuals who appear on both lists and proffers that she has raised “eligibility inconsistencies.” Additionally, she provides an updated resume and highlights her retail management experience and Bachelor’s degree. The appellant requests a reevaluation of her qualifications and the eligibility of the individuals noted.

CONCLUSION

N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.1(e) provides, in pertinent part, that applications for promotional examinations shall be submitted no later than 4:00 P.M. on the announced application filing date.

N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1(b) provides, in pertinent part, that an 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.

The appellant has the burden of proof in this matter. *See N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-1.4(c).

Upon review, the Commission declines to permit the appellant to file a late application. Initially, the instant appeal is untimely. In this regard, the announcement’s closing date was February 21, 2025, yet the appeal was not filed until over eight months later on October 28, 2025. *See N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-1.1(b). Even so, there is no basis for relief. Essentially, the appellant is requesting that she be allowed to file late because she has changed her opinion as to her own eligibility after seeing certain other employees appear on the resulting eligible list. However, this is not a substantive reason to allow a late application. The appellant had a three-week window of time in February 2025 to review the announcement, and it was her responsibility to apply at that time if she believed she was eligible. Moreover, the appellant was free to apply whether other employees did so or not. It is also worth noting that 74 eligibles remain active on the eligible list. Accordingly, there is not a sufficient basis in the record to allow the appellant to file a late application.

Since it has been determined that there is no sufficient basis to allow the appellant to file a late application, she lacks standing to question the eligibility of the 12 individuals she highlights who appear on both the Senior Technician MVC

(PS0875T) and Supervisor 1 MVC (PS9784T) lists. But even assuming such standing exists, the appellant's argument that the 12 individuals she has identified may have been admitted in error, or, similarly, her potential miscalculation about her own ineligibility,¹ is flawed because, per the announcement, an applicant needed to possess one year of continuous permanent service as of the closing date in any competitive title and the complete open competitive requirements. In other words, admission to the examination was not specifically tied to service in the title Senior Technician MVC. Thus, the appellant's ability to merely point to 12 names common to the two lists is not in fact substantive evidence of any "eligibility inconsistencies," and the Commission has not been presented with a persuasive reason as to why those eligibility determinations need to be reopened or revisited.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this request 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 1ST DAY OF JULY, 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: Jennifer Rodriguez
Records Center
Division of Agency Services

¹ The Commission is making no judgment as to whether the appellant would or would not have satisfied the eligibility requirements as her experience is not being reviewed.