



PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

State of New Jersey
Department of Human Services
Office of Program Integrity and Accountability
P.O. Box 700
Trenton, NJ 08625-0700

SARAH ADELMAN
Commissioner

TAHESHA L. WAY
Lt. Governor

DEBORAH ROBINSON
Director

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

OAL DKT NO. HSL 14271-23

AGENCY DKT. NO. 23-007

S.K.,

Petitioner,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

S.K., petitioner, pro se

Caroline Gargione, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent (Matthew J. Platkin, Attorney General of New Jersey, attorney)

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner, S.K., appealed his placement on the Central Registry of Offenders Against Individuals with Developmental Disabilities (Central Registry) by the Department of Human Services (Department or DHS) pursuant to N.J.S.A. 30:6D-73 and N.J.A.C. 10:44D. The Department substantiated allegations that S.K. abused C.K., an individual receiving services from the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), during his overnight shift on November 17 and 18, 2023, while employed at a group home.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Department notified petitioner, by letter dated October 24, 2023, that his name was placed on the Central Registry. Petitioner requested an appeal. The matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), where it was filed on December 13, 2023, to be heard as a contested matter. N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15; N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1 to -13. By Order dated February 2,

2024, the case was placed on inactive status pending resolution of related criminal charges. A consent confidentiality and protective order was entered on August 6, 2023, covering any DHS records provided by the respondent, in discovery or used as evidence, containing protected information under N.J.S.A. 30:4- 24.3, N.J.S.A. 30:6D-78, and the HIPAA Privacy Rule.

Deirdre Hartman-Zohlman, ALJ conducted the hearing on March 6 and 21, 2025, and April 11, 2025, at the Office of Administrative Law. The record remained open for the submission of written summations and closed on June 27, 2025. The Initial Decision was issued on July 29, 2025.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

From the testimony of witnesses and documentary evidence, The ALJ **FOUND** as **FACTS**, the following:

1. In November 2022 S.K. was employed as a direct-support professional (DSP) by Premiere Supports, LLC (Premiere), a company that operates group homes that provide housing for developmentally disabled individuals.
2. S.K. first began working for Premiere in 2017, left and worked for other companies, and returned to Premiere in 2022. Upon his return in 2022, S.K. was assigned to provide one-to-one direct supervision of C.K. in a residential group home.
3. One-to-one direct supervision requires S.K. to work only with C.K., including remaining within eyesight and within an arm's length of him. This is to protect the health, safety, and welfare of all the residents, including C.K., and the staff. When the resident is in their bedroom, the DSP can sit outside the room.
4. A DSP working as a one-to-one aide, must have a colleague watch the individual if they need to use the restroom or step away for any reason.
5. The DSP also has the responsibility to report any incidents, such as self-harm, an altercation with another resident, or abuse by a worker. Any incident must be documented by the DSP in their shift notes at the end of each shift.
6. C.K. is a developmentally disabled individual. He has been diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder, profound intellectual disability, impulse control disorder, heart murmur, sleep disorder, and a ventral septal defect. C.K. is non-verbal; however, he uses an iPad to communicate basic needs by pointing to words and pictures and he can make noise, including loud noises such as yelling and shouting. C.K.'s behaviors include aggression, improper eliminations, property destruction, self-injury, elopement, disrobing, and spitting. C.K.'s self-harm includes hitting, scratching until he bleeds, jumping, banging his head, hitting himself "hard" with his iPad, and running around unclothed. C.K. generally does not sleep through the night. His sleep is very irregular, and he can stay awake for days at a time.
7. C.K.'s one-to-one needs include activities of daily living, such as feeding, showering, dressing, using the bathroom, taking medicine, and going out into the community for

activities, such as the movies, shopping, or doctor appointments.

8. In November 2022, C.K. resided in a group home with three other residents. C.K. was the only resident requiring one-to-one supervision.
9. On November 16, 2022, and into the morning of November 17, 2022, S.K. was working as the one-to-one DSP for C.K. from 11:00 p.m. until 9:00 a.m. There were two additional DSPs in the house and three other residents until 6:00 a.m. At 6:00 a.m. one of the DSPs left, leaving only S.K. and one other DSP with the four residents.
10. Alhassan Barrie has also worked as a DSP for C.K. since 2017.
11. At approximately 9:00 a.m. on November 17, 2022, Barrie began his shift at the group home. His shift was from 9:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m., taking over from S.K. as the one-to-one DSP for C.K. There is an overlap in the shifts of between ten and fifteen minutes.
12. When Barrie arrived at the group home, all the other residents were out of the house. S.K. was in a playroom, not C.K.'s bedroom, with C.K. with the door closed and they were "chatting." C.K. was already dressed for the day.
13. Prior to leaving that morning, S.K. and Barrie spoke. S.K. did not note any challenging behaviors with C.K. during the overnight shift. At this time, S.K. left the group home and proceeded to his other employment.
14. C.K. then went into his room and Barrie sat outside his door. About an hour later, C.K. indicated that he needed to use the bathroom. Barrie followed C.K. into the bathroom, and when C.K. pulled down his pants Barrie saw a mark on C.K.'s right thigh. C.K. then removed his shirt and attempted to get into the shower. C.K. often attempted this behavior. At this time, Barrie observed a mark on C.K.'s right shoulder. Barrie did not allow C.K. to enter the shower. The marks were "very unusual."
15. The bruising was not consistent with any marks that C.K. had previously caused to himself.
16. Because of the unusual bruising, Barrie tried to contact each of the overnight staff, including S.K., and sent photographs of C.K. to ask if they were aware of the bruising. All of the overnight workers responded that they were unaware of the bruising. Barrie then contacted the house manager, Charisma Ritter, who came to the house.
17. Staff are mandated to report any bruises on a client to their supervisor.
18. Ritter worked for Premier from 2016 through 2024. She was a director at Premiere for her final two years. As director she oversaw supervisors, as well as DSPs, and was involved with fiscal, budgeting, payroll, regulations, and compliance issues in the group homes. Each group home has a supervisor. In November 2022 Ritter was the supervisor in charge of the group home where C.K. resided. S.K. was one of the DSPs under Ritter's supervision.

19. When Ritter arrived at the group home, she observed the bruising on C.K. She searched C.K.'s bedroom and discovered a broom handle under the bed.¹ C.K. does not have items in his room other than a bed and two dressers. He does not have toys or a radio per his individual support plan.
20. The house manager called the program director and C.K.'s parents. Thereafter, Barrie and Ritter took C.K. to the emergency room of the local hospital, where he was evaluated and released. C.K.'s parents arrived while they were at the hospital. C.K. was diagnosed with traumatic ecchymosis (bruising) of the left and right shoulder and contusion of the face. (R-1.) Upon leaving the hospital, Barrie, Ritter, and C.K.'s parents went with C.K. to the police station.
21. Photographs taken at the police station show a large bruise on C.K.'s right shoulder, bruising on his left shoulder, a mark near his right eye,² and scratches on his back.³
22. When Barrie was at the police station he was asked if he saw a broomstick in C.K.'s room. Barrie was "shocked" to be asked this question because when Barrie was in C.K.'s room at the beginning of his shift he never saw a broomstick in the room.
23. While at the police station, Ritter walked C.K.'s parents out to their car and S.K. was there and stated, "I'm sorry, I'm sorry, can I just speak to her," meaning C.K.'s mother. C.K.'s mother did not want to speak with S.K. and Ritter advised him of same.

¹ Ritter testified that when she found the broomstick in C.K.'s room shortly after arriving at the group home and searching C.K.'s room, she showed the broomstick to Barrie. This is inconsistent with an earlier statement attributed to Ritter which stated that the broomstick was observable upon entering the room. It was also inconsistent with the testimony of Barrie, who testified that when he was at the police station he was asked if he saw a broomstick in C.K.'s room. Barrie was "shocked" to be asked this question because when Barrie was in C.K.'s room at the beginning of his shift he never saw a broomstick in the room. I do not find this inconsistency material.

² Barrie stated that he first saw the mark on C.K.'s face while looking at the photographs during his testimony.

³ There are no police photographs or any mention of any bruising on C.K.'s thigh as initially reported by Barrie.

24. S.K. received a telephone call on November 17, 2022, advising him that he was immediately suspended from his employment with Premiere pending an investigation into the C.K. matter. He was subsequently terminated by letter dated January 24, 2023.

S.K.'s testimony

S.K. denied any knowledge of C.K.'s injuries. He stated that there were three staff and four residents in the house on the night of November 16, 2022. He stated that they worked as a team, although he acknowledged that he was responsible for one-to-one supervision of C.K.

S.K. testified that he has problems with Charisma Ritter, the manager of the house. The problems were the result of S.K. being vocal about not enough staff in the house. When S.K. would voice concerns, Ritter would "have a problem with him." He stated that staff used to take turns working with C.K. because he is so difficult. Because of his complaints there were three DSPs in the house on November 17, 2022, until 6:00 a.m. At 6:00 a.m. on November 17, 2022, one of the DSPs was getting ready to leave the residence. That would have left only two DSPs and four residents. S.K. pleaded with the DSP to stay and watch C.K., who was sleeping, so that he could shower and dress the three other residents while the third DSP was in the kitchen making breakfast.

S.K. stated that staff arriving to take over are supposed to do checks and a debriefing to make certain each resident is okay. S.K. stated that Barrie was supposed to do this. S.K. stated that when he left C.K., there were no bruises on him, and he had no idea how he received the bruises. S.K. stated that there was nothing unusual that occurred with C.K. on his shift.

Upon leaving his other employment, S.K. went directly back to C.K.'s group home and he learned that C.K. had been taken to the police. S.K. then proceeded to the police station and waited in the parking lot. When Ritter, C.K., and C.K.'s mom came out of the police station, S.K. stated that he was trying to explain "his own side of the story," but C.K.'s mother did not want to speak to him. The police came out to the parking lot and asked why S.K. was there. He again stated that he wanted to "explain his side of the story," but he did not give a statement and thereafter left.

Credibility analysis

A fact finder is obligated to weigh the credibility of witnesses. Credibility is the value given to a witness' testimony. It is best described as that quality of testimony or evidence that makes it worthy of belief. "Testimony to be believed must not only proceed from the mouth of a credible witness but must be credible in itself. It must be such as the common experience and observation of mankind can approve as probable in the circumstances." In re Estate of Perrone, 5 N.J. 514, 522 (1950) (citations omitted).

A credibility determination requires an overall assessment of the witness' story "in light of its rationality or internal consistency and the manner in which it hangs together with other evidence." Carbo v. United States, 314 F.2d 718, 749 (9th Cir. 1963). The fact finder should also consider the witness' interest in the outcome, or any motive or bias. The fact finder may reject testimony because it is inherently incredible, improbable, inconsistent with common experience, contradicted by other testimony, or overborne by other testimony. Congleton v. Pura-Tex Stone Corp., 53 N.J. Super. 282, 287 (App. Div. 1958).

The witnesses for the DHS testified in a professional and straightforward manner. There was no bias detected towards petitioner, nor any reason set forth to question the trustworthiness of the information provided. There were inconsistencies in the record as to the discovery of the broomstick and also as to the color of the bruising on C.K. T h e A L J did not find the differing descriptions to be material.

S.K. is the only witness with a motive to be untruthful. While I believe much of his testimony, t h e A L J did not believe that S.K. had no knowledge of C.K.'s injuries when he left the house on November 17, 2022. The ALJ believed his testimony that he went to the police station on the afternoon of November 17, 2022, as corroborated by Ritter. However, the ALJ found his action of going to the police station, stating that "he is sorry," and requesting to tell "his side of the story" to be indicative of an awareness of the bruising on C.K. Additionally, his claims of workplace issues with Ritter being the basis of a conspiracy against him were not convincing to the ALJ.

Based upon a review of evidence admitted during the hearing, and having had the opportunity to review the demeanor of and observe the witnesses who testified during the proceeding, **THE ALJ FOUND** as further **FACTS** the following:

1. There were three staff and four residents in the house on the night of November 16, 2022, into the morning of November 17, 2022. Sometimes staff would work as a team, although S.K. was solely responsible for one- to-one supervision of C.K.
2. S.K. had previously complained of problems with Ritter, the manager of the house. The problems were the result of S.K. being vocal about not enough staff in the house. When S.K. would voice concerns, Ritter would "have a problem with him."
3. Because of his complaints, there were three DSPs in the house on November 17, 2022, until 6:00 a.m. At 6:00 a.m. on November 17, 2022, one of the DSPs was getting ready to leave the residence. That would have left only two DSPs and four residents. S.K. pleaded with the DSP to stay and watch C.K., who was sleeping, so that he could shower and dress the three other residents while the third DSP was in the kitchen making breakfast.
4. Staff arriving to take over DSP responsibilities are supposed to do checks and a debriefing to make certain each resident is okay. Barrie should have done so with C.K. before S.K. left the home.
5. Upon leaving his other employment, S.K. went directly back to C.K.'s group home and he learned that C.K. had been taken to the police. S.K. then proceeded to the police station and waited in the parking lot. When Ritter, C.K., and C.K.'s mom came out of the police station, S.K. stated that he was trying to explain "his own side of the story," but C.K.'s mother did not want to speak to him. The police came out to the parking lot and asked why S.K. was there. He again stated that he wanted to "explain his side of the story," but he did not give a statement and thereafter left.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The well settled policy of the State of New Jersey is to protect individuals with developmental disabilities. N.J.S.A. 30:6D-73. As part of its measures to protect such individuals, the New Jersey Legislature created the central registry to identify caregivers who have wrongfully injured individuals with developmental disabilities and to prevent such caregivers from working with such vulnerable individuals. N.J.S.A. 30:6D-73(a), (d); N.J.S.A. 30:6D-77; N.J.A.C. 10:44D-1.3.

An offending caregiver's name will be placed on the central registry if they are found to have abused or neglected a developmentally disabled individual and acted with the requisite level of intent to cause or potentially cause injury. N.J.A.C. 10:44D-4.1; N.J.S.A. 30:6D-77(b).

Abuse is defined as "wrongfully inflicting or allowing to be inflicted physical abuse, sexual abuse, or verbal or psychological abuse or mistreatment by a caregiver upon an individual with a developmental disability." N.J.S.A. 30:6D-74; N.J.A.C. 10:44D-1.2. To be placed on the registry "in the case of a substantiated incident of abuse, the caregiver shall have acted with intent, recklessness, or careless disregard to cause or potentially cause injury to an individual with a developmental disability." N.J.S.A. 30:6D-77(b)(1). In the situation of abuse, the statutes and regulations define the mental states of intent, recklessness, and careless disregard to cause or potentially cause injury to an individual with a developmental disability as follows:

1. Acting intentionally is the mental resolution or determination to commit an act.
2. Acting recklessly is the creation of a substantial and unjustifiable risk of harm, to others by a conscious disregard for that risk.
3. Acting with careless disregard is the lack of reasonableness and prudence in doing what a person ought not do or not doing what ought to be done.
[N.J.S.A. 30:6D-77(b); N.J.A.C. 10:44D-4.1(b).]

The DHS bears the burden of establishing an allegation of abuse by a preponderance of the credible evidence. Atkinson v. Parsekian, 37 N.J. 143, 149 (1962). Evidence is said to preponderate "if it establishes 'the reasonable probability of the fact.'" Jaeger v. Elizabethtown Consol. Gas Co., 124 N.J.L. 420, 423 (Sup. Ct. 1940) (citation omitted). The evidence must "be such as leading a reasonably cautious mind to the given conclusion." Bornstein v. Metro. Bottling Co., 26 N.J. 263, 275 (1958). Precisely what is needed to satisfy this burden necessarily must be judged on a case-by-case basis.

In the case *sub judice*, there were no eyewitnesses to the event(s) that caused the injuries to C.K. However, the significant bruising on C.K., immediately following S.K.'s overnight one-to-one shift with C.K. demonstrates bruising consistent with physical force and inconsistent with C.K.'s self-harm behaviors. The bruising is confirmed by Barrie on the morning of November 18, 2022, and in the documentation from the emergency room and photographs at the police station. S.K. was the direct one-to-one support for C.K. during this time. While S.K. denied any involvement in causing the bruises or knowledge of its cause, his testimony was not credible.

THE ALJ CONCLUDED the testimony and evidence is consistent and preponderates that the bruising on C.K.'s shoulders was caused during S.K.'s overnight shift on November 17, 2022, when S.K. was working as the DSP for C.K. **THE ALJ** further **CONCLUDED** that S.K.'s actions or inactions fall within the scope of the CRA for neglect and/or abuse of C.K., as a developmentally disabled individual.

THE ALJ CONCLUDED that respondent, the DHS, has demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that S.K. actions rise to the level of abuse as defined in N.J.A.C. 10:44D-1.2. **THE ALJ** further **CONCLUDED** that S.K. acted with careless disregard for the well-being of C.K., resulting in an injury to an individual with a developmental disability, justifying that his name be listed on the central registry.

THE ALJ'S ORDER

For the reasons set forth above, **THE ALJ ORDERED** that S.K.'s petition opposing the placement of his name on the Central Registry of Offenders Against Individuals with Developmental Disabilities be **DENIED**.

THE ALJ FILED an initial decision with the **DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY** for consideration. This recommended decision may be adopted, modified or rejected by the **DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**, who, by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter.

The **ALJ FILED** this Initial Decision with the **DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY** for consideration. This recommended decision may be adopted, modified or rejected by the **DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PROGRAM INTEGRITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**, who by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter. Within thirteen days from the date on which this recommended decision was mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions with the **ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS COORDINATOR**, in the Office of Program Integrity and Accountability.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

Exceptions:

No exceptions were received from the respondent.

The following exceptions were received from the petitioner:

1. "I, the petitioner and other employees at night shift leave the group home at 9:00 a.m and we were relieved by first shift employees. There was nothing wrong with C.K when we left the building and when Mr. Barrie and two other first shift employees came to relieve us. There is a procedure for incoming employees to look around the building and clients to make sure everybody is ok or employer materials are not missing. That also includes the clients. The client (C.K) was active in the living room during the morning hours when the first shift (Mr. Barrie and two others) took over. And there was a fifteen (15) minutes overlapping period to relieve us. This was not taken into consideration at the ruling.

2. There was no independent verifiable evidence/information on the court records that pointed directly to me that I committed the alleged crime. Such records, like biometric on the broomstick, eye witnesses and the medical report.
3. There were many discrepancies, contradictions and inconsistencies with some of the witnesses' statements on the court record. Even the judge identified these on page 5 (broomstick). On page 6 of the court order, Mr. Barrie (witness) contradicted himself on item footnote number three(3). In addition, there were also discrepancies with the FaceTime call: While Ritter (Manager) was claiming that C.K was on a face time call with his shirt off to his mom, C.K mother clearly stated that his son was wearing a shirt and describing the shirt color.
4. On page 9 and item 5 of the court order stated that I went back to the group home and the police station: The reason why I went back to the group home was because I had calls from the manager (Ritter) saying in her voice mail about the C.K incident. When I tried to return her call, she didn't answer. And she replied via text that she had network service issues. Therefore, I went to the group home and I was told they went to the police station. At the police station, I also called her on the phone, but she didn't answer. Since I saw the company van outside at the police station, I concluded that they were there-so I waited outside of the police station in my car. When C.K, his mother, Barrie and Ritter came out of the police station, that was the time I tried to talk to them about the incident-because you want to get a better understanding about the incident and my side of it. I never apologized or neither says I'm sorry as entered on the judgment on page 6, item 23.

From the above in mind I am asking for your office to reconsider or reject this court order. Because of the lack of physical evidence, contradictions, discrepancies of witnesses and I am very innocent about the incident. I am a young man with a minor kid and have good moral character in society and just love helping people.”

Replies to Petitioner’s Exceptions:

1. Upon reporting to his shift, and after looking around the house and C.K.’s bedroom, Mr. Barrie testified that he found S.K., in the extra bedroom/play room with C.K. - behind a closed door – already showered and fully clothed. Mr. Barrie did in fact look around the house and at its clients. Mr. Barrie in fact, performed the pre-shift procedure, described in S.K.’s exception.

Testimony from Mr. Barrie stated that there was no formalized body check of clients performed at the group home at the end of each shift involving the on-coming and the out-going shifts. There were no body diagrams routinely completed at shift changes, in the group home.

Testimony from Ms. Ritter, the supervisor of the group home, testified that there were no mandatory body checks of clients done by either the on-coming or the out-going shifts when DSPs hand over their charges at shift change.

S.K. said during his testimony that Mr. Barrie “should” look under C.K.’s clothing at shift change, but did not cite any policy, procedure, or practice of the group home that would indicate that such a practice was ever followed or enforced. Nor, did S.K. state that he routinely did so, himself.

The shift change-over procedures were discussed extensively during the hearings - in S.K.'s own testimony, Mr. Barrie's, and Ms. Ritter's testimony. None of the procedures - described in that testimony, as being in place - revealed that "there was nothing wrong with C.K." at shift change. C.K. had already been showered and dressed by S.K. when he was handed over to Mr. Barrie. The bruising was discovered shortly thereafter, when Mr. Barrie escorted C.K. to the bathroom.

2. The standard of proof required in an Administrative Law hearing is "by a preponderance of the credible evidence." Circumstantial evidence is allowed. The report from the examining doctor was described (Respondent's Exhibit 1, page 8—an original copy was never requested by S.K.). A photo of the broomstick was produced (and was available to the appellant to independently procure a "biometric on the broomstick"). The ALJ noted in the Initial Decision that there were no eyewitnesses in the Initial Decision; S.K. did not call any on his behalf. The other two DSPs present in the group home were available to the appellant to call as witnesses, but not questioned by S.K. The ALJ's analysis of each witness's credibility is described in the Initial Decision and is convincing. That the "discrepancies," mentioned by S.K. were cited with notations in the decision is evidence that they had been weighed and considered by the ALJ.
3. The ALJ specifically cited to the discrepancies as part of the Initial Decision. They were notated and discussed in the credibility portion of the decision. The presence of a shirt during C.K.'s face time call was discussed during testimony at the hearing.
4. The page 6, item 23 citation from the Initial Decision is found under the Discussion and Findings of Fact section. The ALJ stated on page 2 of the ID that the "information was derived from the testimony of witnesses and documentary evidence." The quote used by the ALJ was from the testimony of Ms. Ritter. [Transcript 4/11/25,p.65,lines 9-10] S.K. was present during the testimony, acting as his own attorney; he made no objections, at the time. He had no follow up questions at the end of Ritter's testimony, and in his own testimony, which followed Ritter's; he made no correction of the statement, in describing his visit to the police station. The interaction at the police station is not mentioned as evidence or motivation in the Initial Decision, but more as a part of the timeline for the investigation.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 1:1-18.1(f) and based upon a review of the ALJ's Initial Decision and the entirety of the OAL file (including exhibits, transcripts, and written exceptions from the petitioner); I concur with the Administrative Law Judge's findings and conclusions. The ALJ had the opportunity to assess the credibility and veracity of the witnesses; I defer to the ALJ's opinions concerning these matters, based upon the reasoned observations, as extensively described in the Initial Decision. **I CONCLUDE and AFFIRM** that S.K. had the sole responsibility to monitor C.K. under one-to-one supervision, by remaining within eyesight and within an arm's length of him during the overnight shift of November 16 to the morning of November 17, 2022. C.K. was found that morning with bruising consistent with physical force and inconsistent with C.K.'s self-injurious behaviors. **I CONCLUDE and AFFIRM** that S.K. caused the physical abuse to C.K. and that S.K. acted with careless disregard for C.K.'s safety.

I **CONCLUDE and AFFIRM** that DHS has sustained its burden of proving, by a preponderance of the credible evidence, that the actions of S.K. rose to the level of neglect as defined in N.J.A.C. 10:44D-1.2. I **CONCLUDE and AFFIRM** that S.K. acted with careless disregard for the well-being of C.K.; thereby, justifying that S.K.'s name be entered onto the Central Registry.

Pursuant to N.J.A.C 1:1-18.6(d), it is the Final Decision of the Department of Human Services that **I ORDER** the placement of S.K.'s name on the Central Registry of Offenders against Individuals with Developmental Disabilities.

Date: 09/02/2025

Deborah Robinson

Deborah Robinson, Director
Office of Program Integrity and Accountability