STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of George Bailey
Cumberland County, Department of Corrections

CSR DKT. NO. 2018-3124
OAL DKT. NO. CSV 06489-18

DECISION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

ISSUED: DECEMBER 7, 2018 BW

The appeal of George Bailey, County Correction Officer, Cumberland County, Department of Corrections, removal effective April 17, 2018, on charges, was heard by Administrative Law Judge Dorothy Incarvito-Garrabrant, who rendered her initial decision on November 5, 2018 reversing the removal. Exceptions were filed on behalf of the appointing authority.

Having considered the record and the Administrative Law Judge's initial decision, and having made an independent evaluation of the record, the Civil Service Commission (Commission), at its meeting on December 5, 2018, accepted and adopted the Findings of Fact and Conclusion as contained in the attached Administrative Law Judge's initial decision.

Since the removal has been reversed, the appellant is entitled to mitigated back pay, benefits and seniority from April 17, 2018 to the actual date of reinstatement. *See N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-2.10. Additionally, the appellant is entitled to reasonable counsel fees pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-2.12.

This decision resolves the merits of the dispute between the parties concerning the disciplinary charges and the penalty imposed by the appointing authority. However, in light of the Appellate Division's decision, *Dolores Phillips v. Department of Public Safety*, Docket No. A-5581-01T2F (App. Div. Feb. 26, 2003), the Commission's decision will not become final until any outstanding issues

concerning back pay or counsel fees are finally resolved. In the interim, as the court states in *Phillips, supra,* if it has not already done so, upon receipt of this decision, the appointing authority shall immediately reinstate the appellant to his permanent position.

ORDER

The Civil Service Commission finds that the action of the appointing authority in removing the appellant was not justified. The Commission therefore reverses that action and grants the appeal of George Bailey. The Commission further orders that appellant be granted back pay, benefits, and seniority from April 17, 2018 to the actual date of reinstatement. The amount of back pay awarded is to be reduced and mitigated as provided for in *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-2.10. Proof of income earned and an affidavit of mitigation shall be submitted by or on behalf of the appellant to the appointing authority within 30 days of issuance of this decision.

The Commission further orders that counsel fees be awarded to the attorney for appellant pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-2.12. An affidavit of services in support of reasonable counsel fees shall be submitted by or on behalf of the appellant to the appointing authority within 30 days of issuance of this decision. Pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2-2.10 and *N.J.A.C.* 4A:2.12, the parties shall make a good faith effort to resolve any dispute as to the amount of back pay and counsel fees. However, under no circumstances should the appellant's reinstatement be delayed pending resolution of any potential back pay or counsel fee dispute.

The parties must inform the Commission, in writing, if there is any dispute as to back pay and counsel fees within 60 days of issuance of this decision. In the absence of such notice, the Commission will assume that all outstanding issues have been amicably resolved by the parties and this decision shall become a final administrative determination pursuant to *R.* 2:2-3(a)(2). After such time, any further review of this matter shall be pursued in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate Division.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON
THE 5TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2018

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb

Deirdré L. Webster Cobb
Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

attachment

State of New Jersey
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION
OAL DKT. NO. CSR 06489-18
AGENCY DKT. NO. N/A
2018-3124

IN THE MATTER OF GEORGE BAILEY,
CUMBERLAND COUNTY.

Peter Paris, Esq. for appellant, George Bailey (Law Office of David Beckett, attorneys)

Theodore Baker, Esq., Cumberland County Counsel for respondent, Cumberland County

Record Closed: September 21, 2018 Decided: November 5, 2018

BEFORE **DOROTHY INCARVITO-GARRABRANT**, ALJ:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Appellant, George Bailey, a Corrections Officer employed by Cumberland County, Department of Corrections (CCDOC or respondent) appeals from the determination of respondent that he be terminated, pursuant to a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action (FNDA), dated April 18, 2018, for violations of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(6) conduct unbecoming an employee; and other sufficient cause in violation of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(11), specifically Cumberland County Department of Corrections Discipline Policy 3.02A, a/k/a 84-17 C(11) conduct unbecoming an employee.

The appellant denies the allegations that he had inappropriate sexual contact with a former inmate. He also contends that he was inappropriately added to a list of identified officers, who may have had improper relationships with that inmate, and that he was added to that group after that inmate instituted a civil suit in the United States District Court for New Jersey against the respondent and its corrections officers and officials. As a result, he maintains he was targeted for termination with these false and unsubstantiated allegations.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 30, 2017, respondent issued a first Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action (PNDA) setting forth the charges and specifications against appellant. Following a departmental hearing February 2, 2018, the respondent issued a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action on April 18, 2018, sustaining the charges brought in the preliminary notice and terminating appellant from employment effective April 17, 2018. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal. The matter was transmitted to the Office of Administrative Law on May 4, 2018, for hearing as a contested case. N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to 15 and 14F-1 to 13.

On August 14, 2018, after the first day of the hearing, the Honorable Dorothy Incarvito-Garrabrant, ALJ, entered a Confidentiality Order, which was consented to by counsel for both appellant and respondent, to protect certain discovery and evidential material, which may contain sensitive and confidential information about the parties herein and third parties, which should not be disclosed to third parties, other litigants, or to the public.[1] three exhibits, one which was redacted in part and two which were not have been placed in a sealed envelope and transmitted with this decision.

[1] Counsel for the parties advised that other civil service disciplinary matters are pending before the (OAL) which involve this inmate and other corrections officers, arising from allegations of inappropriate conduct and relationships, among other charges.

The hearing in this matter was held on August 2, August 30, and September 4, 2018. At the time of the hearing, due to the time constraints and scheduling of the hearing, the parties discussed and agreed that the initial decision would be submitted on November 5, 2018. The parties filed post-hearing briefs and the record closed on September 21, 2018.[2]

FACTUAL DISCUSSION

Testimony

For Respondent

Jennifer Cantoni (Cantoni)[3] is a forty-two-year-old woman, who admitted to being a heroin addict since she was eighteen years old.[4] Cantoni's heroin addiction caused her to be repeatedly incarcerated in the Cumberland County Jail, and for a short sentence in New Jersey State Prison, for most of the last twenty-four years. Cantoni stated that her heroin use caused her to commit and be convicted of multiple criminal acts of shoplifting and drug and paraphernalia possession. (CCDOC-1.) Cantoni admitted that her life-long drug addiction and heroin use has led to health and loss of memory issues. Cantoni testified that she has suffered, family, social, legal, and financial problems, as a result of her drug addiction and use. Cantoni admitted she prostituted herself to support her drug addiction. She only recollected being free from drug use after completing a one-

---

[2] Appellant and respondent consented to the admission of an additional exhibit labeled P-2, which was provided with appellant's closing brief. This exhibit was a copy of multiple text messages from and to the inmate involved in this proceeding and a separate correction officer, who was previously employed by respondent. The parties argued the relevance of these messages in their closing summations. P-2 was admitted into evidence and given the weight deemed appropriate by the undersigned ALJ.

[3] Cantoni was accompanied in this proceeding by her social worker and Mark Natale, Esq., the attorney representing her in her litigation filed in the U.S. District Court against respondent and several officers under Docket No. 1:17-cv-07893. (CCDOC-3.) By consent of all parties, Mr. Natale was permitted to be present throughout the proceedings, although he did not participate.

[4] At the time of her testimony in this matter, August 2, 2018, Cantoni was in a residential rehabilitation program at Integrity House in Newark, New Jersey. She had been released to that facility from the Cumberland County Jail as a result of her cooperation with investigators in this and related matters involving other correction officers. During her testimony, Cantoni denied being under the influence of any drugs, alcohol, or substances, which would impair her ability to understand what she was doing or her ability to testify.

year treatment program in Michigan in 1999. She began using heroin again within one year of that treatment.

Most of Cantoni's incarcerations were in the Cumberland County Jail. Cantoni related that her incarcerations started when she was eighteen. Female inmates are assigned to the "A-pod" unit at the jail, and are separated from male inmates. Over the course of her incarcerations, she became a "trustee" worker. A trustee worker was permitted to leave the unit and do jobs like cleaning the warden's office or assignments in the admissions office. Cantoni stated that she was not supervised while doing her trustee work. Cantoni also stated that there were officers who supervised the trustees. She then stated that she was not supervised, when cleaning the Warden's office. Cantoni denied that she manipulated any of the officers to be selected as a trustee worker. She stated that she was selected because "[she] was trustworthy." Cantoni testified that she tried to become friends with the officers to get cigarettes, food, and money in jail from them.

Cantoni stated that she first encountered appellant when she was working as a trustee in CCDOC jail. She believed she first met him about five years after she began serving sentences in the jail. Her first recollection was seeing him in about 2000 talking to other officers. Appellant supervised Cantoni once while she was required to go outside the jail to clean the windows. Cantoni testified she knew his name and who he was. Cantoni stated that appellant recognized her name a couple of years after she began going to jail because he called her by it, while she was in the jail. When asked if there was any physical contact with appellant in the jail, Cantoni indicated there was not. She further stated that he did not give her any contraband while she was in jail. Cantoni thought they were friends while she was incarcerated in jail.

Cantoni testified that in 2008 or 2009 she had her first contact with appellant. It was outside of jail. It occurred at 2nd Street in Millville. Cantoni said this is an area known for prostitution. Appellant picked her up and they went back to appellant's house where they had sex, for which he paid her. Cantoni stated she believed that appellant knew who she was, when he picked her up in Millville; however, she could not remember if he knew her name on this occasion. She believed his house was down the street from the jail in

Bridgeton. She did not recall the address, house, or street. She stated she remembered that his daughters' room was really pretty. She stated that appellant had twin daughters. Cantoni said that she was pretty sure the appellant drove a red SUV, but she was not sure if it was red or blue. Cantoni could not remember if he drove her back to Millville or not after their liaison.

She had learned in the jail that appellant had a transportation company that he owned.

Within two years, sometime between 2002-2005, Cantoni had her next contact with appellant. This was outside of jail. Cantoni stated that appellant called her. Appellant picked her up and took her to the same house. Robert Brownlow (Brownlow) was at the appellant's house doing construction. Cantoni knew Brownlow socially. While appellant and Cantoni were having sexual relations, appellant called Brownlow into the room and asked if he wanted to have sex with them. Cantoni stated she just gave him sad eyes to discourage him from joining in, and Brownlow declined the offer. Cantoni stated she knew Brownlow because he was a drug user. She knew Brownlow from jail.

The third contact between Cantoni and the appellant was at the Days Inn in Vineland. Appellant came to the Days Inn with a friend to buy lawn equipment from Cantoni's friend, Robert Kobash (Kobash), who had a lawn care business. Cantoni alleged that appellant paid Kobash three bricks of heroin for the lawn equipment. They made arrangements for her to go to appellant's house and have sex with him. Cantoni could not remember the date. She stated anywhere from 2001 to 2006 or 2007.

The fourth encounter occurred at her friend Lisette's apartment on Walnut Road. Cantoni needed money for heroin because she was sick and in withdrawal. Appellant came to the apartment and demanded oral sex, for which he would pay her $20. She was too sick, and he refused to give her the money for the heroin before he received the oral sex. Appellant ended up leaving with his money.

Cantoni and appellant had no other encounters outside of jail. Cantoni was subsequently sentenced to CCDOC jail again. During this jail term she saw appellant. He was still supervising the trustees.

Cantoni's son's father, Jimmy Pittman, met appellant in 2010 in jail.[5] He worked for the appellant in jail on a maintenance detail. Pitttan told Cantoni that appellant showed Pittman and others pictures of her birthmark, which is located on her lower back. Cantoni testified that she never saw the pictures and did not know they had been taken.

Cantoni admitted she never reported the incidents with appellant or the allegations about the picture to anyone at CCDOC. Cantoni was interviewed by Internal Affairs investigators Ortiz and Holbrook in 2016. Cantoni testified that, before speaking to them, she knew it had to be about another officer, Ellis, with whom she was involved in a relationship. When they called she testified that she knew Ellis was the only thing they could be calling me about. She did not mention appellant during that interview.

Ellis then went to the prosecutor's office about the picture and appellant. Subsequently, Cantoni gave an interview to the prosecutor's office on September 29, 2016. (CCDOC-2.) Relative to this interview, Cantoni testified that she was unable to tell them everything because she "was so messed up."

Cantoni testified that during that interview she was using heroin and scared. Cantoni admitted she told the investigators that she had not used heroin and was not under the influence during the interview. That was a lie. She alleged that she did not mention appellant during the interview because she was so confused at the time. It was only after Ellis talked to Cantoni about talking to the prosecutor's office that she did it. Cantoni testified that she asked Ellis "[w]ho do I talk about?" to which Ellis said tell it all. Cantoni only made the allegations against appellant after Ellis, got in trouble for their relationship and he urged her to talk about the other officers.

[5] Cantoni and Pittman's son was placed for adoption.

Cantoni testified that her drug use has "messed my brain up." She stated she remembers what occurred, but does not remember everything.

Cantoni acknowledged she is suing respondent and officers in federal court. (CCDOC-3.) Cantoni admitted that her drug use has damaged her body and her memory. She cannot recall dates and places. She engaged in prostitution activities regularly to support her drug habit.

In February 2017, Cantoni was interviewed by prosecutor's office by Investigator Cuff. Cantoni revealed she lied in the original interview because she was under the influence of heroin at that time. She told Cuff how she beat the drug tests she took.

Cantoni further testified that in jail she learned how to manipulate people. She had to lie part of the time as part of the prostitution and drug use lifestyle. Cantoni insisted she has never lied under oath.

Other than the incidents she testified to, she did not have any other contact with the appellant.

Michael Palau (Palau), Captain Cumberland County Department of Corrections, testified that he has been employed by the CCDOC for thirty-five years. He is the daily operations Captain. He testified that in or about 1995, recruits were trained by him in house. This was called agency training and was different from academy training. Palau stated that all recruits and officers were trained in policies and procedures prohibiting the fraternization and familiarity with inmates and ex-inmates. Palau testified that officers are prohibited from engaging in any relationships with inmates or ex-inmates. This was to ensure their credibility.

In 2000-2001, Warden Glen Saunders promulgated a new policy consistent with this prohibition. The officers acknowledged receipt of the policy through sign in sheets. CCDOC Policy 4.13 dealt with being unduly familiar with or fraternizing with inmates and ex-inmates. (CCDOC-4.) CCDOC 4.18 is the policy, which prohibits officers from engaging in unlawful activities. (CCDOC-5.) That policy was incorporated into and

replaced by CCDOC 4.22, which also provides that an officer cannot become overly familiar with inmates or ex-inmates. (CCDOC-6.)

Palau testified that he "assumed" appellant got all of the policies and procedures, but could not absolutely verify it because it appeared at least one sign in sheet was missing. However, appellant had actual notice of these policies because he had been involved in a previous Internal Affairs investigation. In that investigation, one of appellant's drivers in his transportation business parked a vehicle in the Captain's spot at the jail. The driver was a former inmate and was at the jail for a visit with an inmate. Appellant was charged with being unduly familiar with an ex-inmate. This charge was dismissed; however, this gave appellant actual notice of the policy in 2011.

Ernest Cuff, Jr., (Cuff), Chief of Staff, Cumberland County Prosecutor's Office, testified that he has been employed by the prosecutor's office for thirteen years. He was assigned to investigate accusations made by Cantoni. Cuff stated that this occurred after a declination to charge Ellis was issued. After that occurred, Ellis' attorney Daniel Rosenberg, Esq. provided information of wrongdoing by other officers, including the appellant.

Cuff investigated Cantoni's allegations about appellant. Appellant was one of thirteen officers identified by Cantoni for prohibited conduct. Relative to appellant, Cuff interviewed Cantoni, Pittman, Brownlow, who was incarcerated at Bayside State Prison, and had a telephone interview with Kobash. Cuff testified that Brownlow died in September 2017. Cuff had recorded his interview with Brownlow in Bayside. (CCDOC-7.)

Cuff stated that Cantoni was reluctant to hurt Ellis and his job. They had been in a relationship for seven to eight years. Cantoni admitted to Cuff that she is "manipulative," resulting from years of her lifestyle. As the officers became more familiar with her, she became more manipulative towards them.

Cantoni said that appellant was "another pig." Cuff stated that he asked her questions to verify her story about appellant. She could not describe appellant's house,

except to state that he had twin daughters with nice bedrooms. She never saw the pictures that appellant took and shared with Pittman. She was unaware appellant had taken any pictures of her.

Cantoni and Pittman had a child together. Cantoni stated that Kobash sold lawn equipment to appellant in return for three bricks of heroin. Cuff stated this was not corroborated.

Brownlow was a carpenter by trade. He worked at appellant's house. On one occasion, appellant got a phone call and left the residence. Appellant came back with Cantoni. Appellant offered for Brownlow to have sex with Cantoni and him. Brownlow declined the offer. Cantoni was a friend of Brownlow's fiancé. According to Cuff, Cantoni's and Brownlow's stories matched up about this incident.

Brownlow told Cuff that appellant had power with CCDOC. Appellant had inmates beat up other inmates. Cuff stated that this was not corroborated.

Cuff interviewed Pittman. Pittman told Cuff that appellant showed him a picture of Cantoni's tattoo and birthmark on her rear. Pittman could not name any other inmates who saw the photograph.

Cuff interviewed Kobash on the telephone. Kobash had been in a relationship with Cantoni. He called Cantoni a "liar." Kobash stated that he never sold any lawn equipment to appellant in exchange for heroin. A guy named Adam, who he had met in CCDOC and who had been a drug dealer, bought the equipment for cash. Kobash stated that appellant was not there when he sold the lawn equipment and did not know about the sale. Kobash stated that it is hard to tell the truth from lies when it comes to Cantoni.

There were no criminal charges against appellant. Cuff did not get phone records or any pictures after the criminal charges were declined. He never saw the alleged photograph.

Robert Brownlow, (Brownlow), died in September 2017. He was interviewed by Cuff on March 8, 2017, at the Southern State Correctional Facility. Brownlow knew Cantoni. His fiancé and Cantoni were friends before Cantoni became a prostitute to support her heroin addiction. Brownlow worked on appellant's maintenance detail in the CCDOC. Browlnow stated that he did work at appellant's home beginning in 2008. He identified the location of appellant's home and described it. He worked at the home prior to a garage being constructed there.

He was working at appellant's home when appellant received a telephone call and left. Appellant came back with Cantoni and they went into the bedroom. Appellant offered to have him join them having sex. After seeing Cantoni's look, Brownlow declined to have sex with them. Brownlow felt bad for Cantoni.

While in jail, Brownlow heard appellant tell other officers that Cantoni would have sex with them if they were interested.

Eventually, Brownlow refused to do any construction work for appellant because appellant refused to pay him for the work. He believed that appellant held this against him and made sure he did not get assigned to any work details when he was back in jail. Brownlow stated that appellant was a "dirty officer," who had the power to have inmates beat up by other inmates. However, Brownlow also stated that although appellant was bad, he was against the inmates having contraband or giving it to the inmates.

Brownlow stated that he also saw appellant pick up another former inmate in Millville, when she was prostituting herself to support her heron habit.

According to records, Brownlow was arrested and convicted of drug related charges and other criminal charges numerous times in Salem and Cumberland Counties. (J-1 through J-4.)

For Appellant

George Bailey, appellant, a corrections officer with the CCDOC, testified that he worked in this capacity for approximately twenty-one years. He is the officer in charge of maintenance. He supervises the maintenance crew. The maintenance crew is selected by him with referrals for certain inmates coming from other officers. He characterized his supervisory style as hard but fair to the inmates. He did not have a practice of being friendly or familiar with the inmates in or out of jail.

Appellant testified that he owns and drives a red 1999 Chevy Tahoe SUV. He drove it to work and parked it at the jail. In response to questioning about the fact that Cantoni said he picked her up in a red SUV, appellant testified that inmates can see the officer's cars parked in the lot from windows at the jail. Appellant denied he ever picked Cantoni up in his truck. Appellant stated that he does not have twin daughters. However, he does have daughters that are one year apart. Cantoni could have heard that in the jail. Appellant only supervised Cantoni once.

Appellant denied having contact with Cantoni outside of the jail. He denied ever having sex with her. He never purchased any lawn equipment from Kobash. He never had inmates beat up other inmates. Appellant denied that Brownlow ever worked on his house. He never invited Brownlow to have sex with him and Cantoni. Appellant testified that he knew that if he had a relationship with Cantoni in or out of jail, it would be a violation of policy. Appellant denied having any photograph of Cantoni and testified that Pittman lied.

Appellant's transportation business is for medical transportation. His business works for a company called Logisticare. In 2011, an issue arose with one of appellant's employees. A separate manager had done the hiring for the business. They did fingerprint background checks and if they came back clean, then the person could drive for the business. One of the driver's parked at the jail in the Captain's spot. Appellant was told by his superiors about it because it was one of his transportation vehicles. This is how appellant became aware that the person was a former inmate. The charges against him, which arose from this incident, were dismissed.

CREDIBILITY

Credibility is the value that a finder of the facts gives to a witness's testimony. It requires an overall assessment of the witness's story in light of its rationality, internal consistency and the manner in which it "hangs together" with the other evidence. Carbo v. United States, 314 F.2d 718, 749 (9th Cir. 1963). "Testimony to be believed must not only proceed from the mouth of a credible witness but must be credible in itself," in that "[i]t must be such as the common experience and observation of mankind can approve as probable in the circumstances." In re Perrone, 5 N.J. 514, 522 (1950). A fact finder "is free to weigh the evidence and to reject the testimony of a witness . . . when it is contrary to circumstances given in evidence or contains inherent improbabilities or contradictions which alone or in connection with other circumstances in evidence excite suspicion as to its truth." Id. at 521–22; see D'Amato by McPherson v. D'Amato, 305 N.J. Super. 109, 115 (App. Div. 1997). A trier of fact may reject testimony as "inherently incredible" and may also reject testimony when "it is inconsistent with other testimony or with common experience" or "overborne" by the testimony of other witnesses. Congleton v. Pura-Tex Stone Corp., 53 N.J. Super. 282, 287 (App. Div. 1958). Similarly, "'[t]he interest, motive, bias, or prejudice of a witness may affect his credibility and justify the . . . [trier of fact], whose province it is to pass upon the credibility of an interested witness, in disbelieving his testimony.'" State v. Salimone, 19 N.J. Super. 600, 608 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 10 N.J. 316 (1952) (citation omitted). The choice of rejecting the testimony of a witness, in whole or in part, rests with the trier and finder of the facts and must simply be a reasonable one. Renan Realty Corp. v. Cmty. Affairs Dep't, 182 N.J. Super. 415, 421 (App. Div. 1981).

After reviewing the evidence, I make the following **FINDINGS of FACT:**

Cantoni's rendition of the facts were implausible and unbelievable as they relate to this appellant. Her statements were inconsistent and contradictory. In this regard, Cantoni would have this tribunal believe that she was knowingly and voluntarily telling the truth as the key witness for respondent in this matter. However, Cantoni made admissions during her testimony, which subverted her credibility. Cantoni admitted that

she is manipulative as a result of being a drug addict, heroin user, and prostitute for most of her adult life. She stated that she had a habit of lying as a result of her lifestyle.

More importantly, Cantoni admitted to having health issues and memory loss issues because of her daily usage of heroin for approximately twenty years. The effects of these issues were visible during her testimony. Cantoni's physical appearance and movements showed a physical degradation from her years of heroin use. During testimony, she could not remember dates, years, or time frames. Cantoni would have this tribunal believe that while actively engaged in heroin use, under the influence of heroin, or in the throws of withdrawal, she could remember the details about her encounters with appellant. However, while remembering these events the oldest of which was in 2002, and the most recent of which was allegedly in 2008, ten to sixteen years ago, she could not remember any specific details. She could not recall what appellant's house looked like. She did not state what his bedroom looked like. She did not mention any physical characteristics of appellant which would substantiate her allegations. She stated to Cuff that appellant drove her home after each encounter only after she threatened to tell on him. However, she testified that he did not drive her back to her house. She could not remember how she got home. She said his truck was "red or blue." This lack of detail and inconsistencies made her testimony unbelievable. Her use of knowledge about appellant's daughters or the general location of his house near the jail could easily have been information acquired by her in jail from other officers or inmates. Simply put, none of the information she attempted to utilize to support her story about the appellant was intimate or intimately related to his home, where nearly all of the sexual encounters took place. Cantoni's extent of drug use and loss of memory give pause when weighing her credibility and determining if her testimony is reliable. Her deficits and continued criminal activity are particularly debilitating to her credibility.

Cantoni's allegation about the lawn equipment exchange between Kobash and appellant, at which she declared she was present, was completely suspect. Kobash denied the entire event and that appellant even knew about it. Even Cuff stated there was no corroborating evidence for this. Cantoni was adamant in her interview that she never did drugs with the officers she has made allegations against.

In sum, Cantoni was not a credible witness relative to her allegations about this appellant.

Furthermore, Cantoni's version of the facts has changed become more detailed and sensational over time. Cantoni admitted that in her first interview with Internal Affairs, she never mentioned appellant. In Cantoni's interview on September 29, 2016, with Investigator Tucker, she never mentioned appellant. In this interview Cantoni's responses were as follows:

Tucker: Ok. So during the time that you have um, been in out of um, the Cumberland County Jail facility, did um, you become associated with certain, um Correction Officers?
Cantoni: Yes.
Tucker: Ok. And those type of associations, did they lead to um, relationship outside of the jail?
Cantoni: Yes.
Tucker: Ok. Now specifically um, can you tell me um, just their names at this point. Who um, if anyone you had a ah, relationship with at the Cumberland County Jail?
Cantoni: Um, B.P., ah, E.O., ah, J.G., C.R. [Redacted by this tribunal. Initial's used for confidentiality.][6]
Tucker: That's four individuals, correct?
Cantoni. Yes.

(CCDOC-2 at p.3, lns. 5-17.)

Toward the conclusion of the interview, Cantoni provided the following:

Tucker: Ok, I'm just going over my notes, I think we're about ah, finished. Um, besides what we discussed um, is there anyone else that you could think of that you had a relationship with that we didn't talk about.
Cantoni: No.

(CCDOC-2 at p. 27,lns.7-11.)

[6] Appellant is not one of the identified officers.

Additionally, on February 7, 2017, Cantoni was interviewed by Cuff. Cantoni for the first time identified thirteen officers with whom she had inappropriate contact. (CCDOC-1). Cantoni even claimed that there were additional officers that she was involved with for a "one-time here and there thing." However, she could not remember their names. This disclosure coincides with her institution of litigation in the United States District Court of New Jersey under case number: 1:17-cs-07893 against respondents and its corrections officers.

On October 25, 2017, an Amended Complaint was filed in that litigation. Appellant was not one of the defendants sued in the original complaint. Appellant became a named defendant in the Amended Complaint's caption. However, his first name is misidentified. The allegations against appellant are as follows. In paragraph 56 of the Complaint, appellant is identified as having "naked pictures of Jennifer without her knowledge or consent." The complaint at paragraph 57 goes on to state that the appellant "showed these pictures to numerous guards and inmates without Jennifer's knowledge or consent."

In paragraph 75, the complaint further alleges that only three officers, including Ellis, regularly harassed and abused Cantoni "through unwanted touching and sexually inappropriate comments." Appellant is not mentioned in this paragraph.

In paragraph 85, the complaint alleges that only four officers had "met with Jennifer for sex for money while she was not in jail." Appellant is not one of the four officers. In fact, it is not alleged anywhere in the complaint that appellant had any sexual relations with Cantoni. In fact, it only alleges that appellant, wrongfully showed the photographs to other officers and inmates in the jail.[7]

Similar to these inconsistent statements, Cantoni's versions of the facts in her interviews and testimony are inconsistent. For example, Cantoni stated that when he picked her up at the Walnut Road apartments he took her back to his house to have sex in exchange for money. This was the occasion during which he asked Brownlow if he wanted to join them having sex. However, during her testimony, Cantoni alleged when

[7] Appellant has been dismissed from the complaint because of the statute of limitations.

she was at the Walnut Road apartments she had called appellant to come to the apartment because she needed money for heroin. She was in withdrawal. Cantoni testified that when she could not perform oral sex because of being sick, appellant left with his money. Cantoni's descriptions are clearly inconsistent. However, they are consistent with the fact that years of heroin use have caused Cantoni to have memory loss and certainly confusion.

During her interview with Cuff, Cantoni called appellant a "pig" and stated that when she next saw him while she was in jail he was a "jerkoff," in her interview with Cuff; thus, broadcasting her feelings toward appellant and showing her motive. Cantoni has an interest is a successful result to the federal litigation.

In sum, Cantoni's rendition of the facts did not have a ring of truth. The discrepancies in appellant's testimony and changing renditions of the facts made appellant's testimony unreliable and unbelievable. It may be that Cantoni's allegations against other officer's are more plausible and credible. However, as to this appellant, the inconsistencies, memory loss, admitted daily heroin use for twenty years, lack of documentary evidence, and lack of details in the material facts and circumstances make her rendition of the facts suspect and her testimony not credible. Cantoni's statements are not corroborated by any other credible testimony or statements in this proceeding.

Judicial rules of evidence do not apply to administrative agency proceedings, except for rules of privileges or where required by law. N.J.R.E. 101(a)93); DeBartolomeis v. Bd. of Review, 341 N.J. Super. 80, 82 (App. Div. 2001); N.J.S.A. 52: 14B-10(a); and N.J.A.C. 1:1-15(c).

Hearsay are statements other than ones made by the declarant while testifying at a hearing, offered into evidence to prove the truth of the matter asserted. N.J.R.E. 801(c). Hearsay is usually not admissible because it is deemed untrustworthy and unreliable, (N.J.R.E. 802), unless it falls within an exception set forth in N.J.R.E. 803 or 804. However, hearsay is admissible in an administrative proceeding such as this one subject to the "residuum rule," which mandates that the administrative decision cannot be predicated on hearsay alone. Weston v. State, 60 N.J. 36 (1972).

> [A] fact-finding or legal determination cannot be based upon hearsay alone. Hearsay may be employed to corroborate competent proof, or competent proof may be supported or given added probative force by hearsay testimony. But in the final analysis for a court to sustain an administrative decision, which affects the substantial rights of a party, there must be a residuum of legal competent evidence in the record to support it. Id. at 51.

The Uniform Administrative Procedure Rules governing administrative agency proceedings codify this doctrine by requiring that "some legally competent evidence must exist to support each ultimate finding of fact to an extent sufficient to provide assurances of reliability and to avoid the fact or appearance of arbitrariness." N.J.A.C. 1:1-15.5(c). In assessing hearsay evidence, it should be accorded "whatever weight the judge deems appropriate taking into account the nature, character and scope of the evidence, the circumstances of its creation and production, and, generally, its reliability. N.J.A.C. 1:1-15.5(a).

Furthermore, N.J.R.E. 804 provides in pertinent part as follows:

> (a) Definition of unavailable. Except when the declarant's unavailability has been procured or wrongfully caused by the proponent of declarant's statement for the purpose of preventing declarant from attending or testifying, a declarant is "unavailable" as a witness if declarant:
>
> ***
>
> (4) is absent from the hearing because of **death,** physical or mental illness or infirmity, or other cause, and the proponent of the statement is unable by process or other reasonable means to procure the declarant's attendance at trial... [Emphasis Added].

Brownlow was unavailable to testify in this proceeding because he died in September 2017. The Brownlow statements recorded by Cuff during his investigation on March 8, 2017, are admissible hearsay statements. (CCDOC-7.) The record of

Brownlow's criminal convictions and periods of incarceration are relevant and admitted evidence. (J-1 through J-4.)

However, similar to Cantoni's statements, his allegations are unsubstantiated by any corroborating credible testimony or documentary evidence. Similar to Cantoni, Brownlow's extent of drug use gives pause when weighing his credibility and determining if his testimony is reliable. His continued criminal activity is particularly debilitating to his credibility. Cuff found no evidence to corroborate Brownlow's allegations that appellant had inmates beat up other inmates in the CCDOC jail. Without appellant's opportunity to cross-examine Brownlow relative to his credibility, his relationships with Cantoni and the appellant, whether he was using heroin at the time he alleges he saw Cantoni at the appellant's house, etc., I **FIND** that Brownlow's statements have little weight and are unreliable. I **FIND** that no residuum of competent evidence existed to give credibility to Brownlow's hearsay statements and these statements did not credibly substantiate Cantoni's testimony.

FINDINGS OF FACT

After carefully reviewing the exhibits and documentary evidence presented during the hearing, and after having had the opportunity to listen to testimony and observe the demeanor of the witnesses, I **FIND** the following to also be relevant and credible **FACTS** in this matter:

Appellant was a corrections officer, who has been employed by CCDOC in that capacity for approximately twenty-one years. Appellant was the officer in charge of maintenance and as part of his duties was responsible for supervising the maintenance work detail. Appellant occasionally supervised female trustee workers. Cantoni was often assigned as a trustee worker. Cantoni met appellant while she was incarcerated in CCDOC facility and assigned as a trustee to clean outside the jail building.

Cantoni is a forty-two year old female, who has been a drug addict and heroin user for nearly all of her adult life. Since age eighteen, Cantoni has used heroin daily and was during the past twenty-two years only "clean" for one year in 1999. As a result of her drug use, Cantoni has been repeatedly incarcerated over the last twenty-two years in the

CCDOC jail. She has been convicted of shoplifting, drug and paraphernalia possessions numerous times. She prostituted herself regularly to support her heroin habit. As a result of her time in jail, her drug addiction and usage, and her lifestyle, Cantoni has admittedly become manipulative and a liar. Additionally, Cantoni has suffered health issues and memory loss, as a result of her heroin usage.

Cantoni had a relationship for seven or eight years with a corrections officer named Ellis. This relationship was discovered and Cantoni was interviewed. Text messages between Ellis and Cantoni show they were engaged in an ongoing sexual relationship. Ellis was clearly concerned that Cantoni had been interviewed about him and that she had kept letters from him, which she was supposed to have destroyed, and which were in the investigators' possession. On March 4, 2017, Cantoni sent text messages to Ellis and wrote: "You used me to get back at people and now you're giving me you (sic) ass to kiss...lol! Its (sic) all good! I should have known better." (P-2 at p. 41.) Cantoni was willing to do anything to help Ellis. She was clearly motivated by their relationship to help Ellis. (P-2.) Cantoni's allegations against appellant are suspect as a result of this relationship as evidenced in the text messages.

When the investigation into Ellis began and Cantoni was interviewed, she did not mention the appellant. Thereafter, when she was interviewed by investigator Tucker of the Cumberland County Prosecutor's Office, on September 29, 2016, she did not mention the appellant, despite Tucker's repeated questions about who all the officers, with whom she had had a relationship in jail and outside of jail, were.

It is not until the third interview on February 7, 2017, conducted by Cuff, that Cantoni finally alleged that appellant had sexual relations with her for money on at least two occasions at his home, that he demanded oral sex from her once at her friend's apartment on Walnut Road when she was in active withdrawal and could not perform the act, and that appellant paid three bricks of heroin for her friend, Kobash's, lawn equipment. These allegations were made approximately seven months before she filed an amended complaint in federal court adding appellant to the list of defendants. In that amended complaint, she only alleged that he had disseminated a naked picture of her to other correction officers and inmates. Unlike the allegations against the other defendant

officers, Cantoni did not allege in any complaint that, knowing she was a former inmate, appellant had an inappropriate sexual relationship with her. Similar to the sensational development of claims against appellant, the list of officers who engaged in sexual relationships with Cantoni, grew with each interview she gave. This coincided with her increasing prospects for damages in the federal litigation.

In relation to the allegations against appellant, no credible testimony or documentary evidence was produced to support the allegations. No individual was produced to testify they had seen the photograph. No photograph was seen by anyone, except allegedly Pittman. No photograph of Cantoni was produced during this proceeding or discovered in the investigation conducted by the prosecutor's office. No phone records showing communications between Cantoni and the appellant were produced. Kobash specifically denies being paid three bricks of heroin by appellant for lawn equipment. Kobash was paid in cash. He admitted he probably used the cash to buy heroin because he was using at the time. This made Kobash's statement believable.

Cantoni cannot recall accurate dates or years for the events with appellant. She is not sure in which years these alleged encounters happened. Cantoni cannot recall basic details about appellant's home. She cannot consistently recall how she returned home after these alleged encounters. She provided inconsistent statements during the various interviews about the events, confusing what occurred where. The scant details Cantoni provided to substantiate her rendition of the facts, such as the color of appellant's car, the fact that he owned a transportation company, or that he had daughters who lived with him, could have easily been learned in the CCCDOC jail, in which she admitted she manipulated the officers.

No testimony or statements credibly corroborated Cantoni's allegations against this appellant.

Appellant did not engage in a sexual relationship with Cantoni. Appellant did not pay Cantoni for sex. Appellant did not pick up Cantoni in Millville in his 1999 red Chevy Tahoe in any year. Appellant did not exchange three bricks of heroin for Kobash's lawn equipment. No evidence was produced to show that appellant took or showed any

photographs of Cantoni naked and engaged in sex with him to other officers or inmates. No evidence was produced to show that appellant directed inmates to beat up other inmates.

On March 30, 2017, respondent issued a PNDA setting forth the charges and specifications against appellant. Following a departmental hearing February 2, 2018, the respondent issued the FNDA on April 18, 2018, sustaining the charges brought in both preliminary notices and terminating appellant from employment.

LEGAL ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Appellant's rights and duties are governed by laws including the Civil Service Act and accompanying regulations. A civil service employee who commits a wrongful act related to his or her employment may be subject to discipline, and that discipline, depending upon the incident complained of, may include a suspension or removal. N.J.S.A. 11A:1-2, 11A:2-6, 11A:2-20; N.J.A.C. 4A2-2.

The appointing authority shoulders the burden of establishing the truth of the allegations by 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). Stated differently, the evidence must "be such as to lead a reasonably cautious mind to a given conclusion." Bornstein v. Metro. Bottling Co., 26 N.J. 263, 275 (1958); see also Loew v. Union Beach, 56 N.J. Super. 93, 104 (App. Div. 1959).

Appellant's status as a correction's officer subjects him to a higher standard of conduct than ordinary public employees. In re Phillips, 117 N.J. 567, 576-77 (1990). They represent "law and order to the citizenry and must present an image of personal integrity and dependability in order to have the respect of the public." Township of Moorestown v. Armstrong, 89 N.J. Super. 560, 566 (App. Div. 1965), certif. denied, 47 N.J. 80 (1966). Maintenance of strict discipline is important in military-like settings such as police departments, prisons and correctional facilities. Rivell v. Civil Serv. Comm'n,

115 N.J. Super. 64, 72 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 50 N.J. 269 (1971); City of Newark v. Massey, 93 N.J. Super. 317 (App. Div. 1967). Refusal to obey orders and disrespect of authority cannot be tolerated. Cosme v. Borough of E. Newark Twp. Comm., 304 N.J. Super. 191, 199 (App. Div. 1997).

> The need for proper control over the conduct of inmates in a correctional facility and the part played by proper relationships between those who are required to maintain order and enforce discipline and the inmates cannot be doubted. We can take judicial notice that such facilities, if not properly operated, have a capacity to become "tinderboxes."

Bowden v. Bayside State Prison, 268 N.J. Super. 301, 305-06 (App. Div. 1993), certif. denied, 135 N.J. 469 (1994).

N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(6)

Appellant was charged with "conduct unbecoming a public employee." N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(6). "Conduct unbecoming a public employee" is an elastic phrase that encompasses conduct that adversely affects the morale or efficiency of a governmental unit or that has a tendency to destroy public respect in the delivery of governmental services. Karins v. City of Atl. City, 152 N.J. 532, 554 (1998); see also In re Emmons, 63 N.J. Super. 136, 140 (App. Div. 1960). It is sufficient that the complained-of conduct and its attending circumstances "be such as to offend publicly accepted standards of decency." Karins, 152 N.J. at 555 (quoting In re Zeber, 156 A.2d 821, 825 (1959)). Such misconduct need not necessarily "be predicated upon the violation of any particular rule or regulation, but may be based merely upon the violation of the implicit standard of good behavior which devolves upon one who stands in the public eye as an upholder of that which is morally and legally correct." Hartmann v. Police Dep't of Ridgewood, 258 N.J. Super. 32, 40 (App. Div. 1992) (quoting Asbury Park v. Dep't of Civil Serv., 17 N.J. 419, 429 (1955)).

The basis for the charge of conduct unbecoming a public employee was appellant's unduly familiar and inappropriate relationship with Cantoni, who was a former

inmate. This charge was based on Cantoni's allegations that, knowing she was a former inmate, appellant hired her as a prostitute and had sexual relations with her on three separate occasions, shared a picture of her he surreptitiously took while they were having sex in 2008, and that he purchased lawn equipment from her friend in exchange for three bricks of heroin. For the reasons set forth above, Cantoni's testimony was not credible and unsubstantiated relative to the allegations she made against the appellant. No credible evidence was produced to substantiate these allegations.

As a corrections officer, appellant was held to a higher standard of conduct. The public respects officers for discovering, reporting, and championing the truth in circumstances of wrongdoing and while they are satisfying their duties. Had the egregious conduct alleged herein been supported, substantiated, and proven, it would violate this standard. However, the testimony and admitted evidence produced in this proceeding are insufficient to terminate appellant from his twenty-one -year career. Mere allegations do not warrant his termination of service.

Therefore, I **CONCLUDE** that appellant's behavior did not rise to a level of conduct unbecoming a public employee, in violation of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(6). I **CONCLUDE** that respondent has not met its burden of proof on this issue.

Appellant has also been charged with violating other sufficient cause in violation of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(11), specifically Cumberland County Department of Corrections Discipline Policy 3.02A, a/k/a 84-17 C(11) conduct unbecoming an employee.

Cumberland County Department of Corrections Discipline Policy 3.02A, a/k/a 84-17.

84-17, as amended, provides in pertinent part as follows:

> In any disciplinary matter, reference must always be made to the collective bargaining agreement covering the disciplined employee, relevant Department of Personnel Rules, appropriate Department bulletins or memoranda, the Handbook of Information and Rules for Employees of New

> Jersey Department of Corrections, and/or the Law Enforcement Personnel Rules and Regulations.

C(11) Conduct Unbecoming an Employee

Cumberland County Department of Corrections Code of Ethics, Article 13: Prohibited Conduct, provides in pertinent part as follows:

> ... The Corrections Officer will never discriminate by the dispensing of special favors or privileges to anyone, whether for remuneration or not, and never accept for himself/herself or his/her family, favors or benefits under circumstances which might be construed by reasonable persons as influencing the performance of he/her official duties. With the above in mind, no Corrections Officer, except in the discharge of duty, may knowingly associate with person engaging, allegedly engage in, or have a prior a prior history of engaging in unlawful activities. ... [Emphasis added].

Cumberland County Department of Corrections Policy 4.18, relating to over familiarization/fraternizing with inmates lists twelve improper activities and provides in pertinent part as follows:

> Employees shall not have a personal relationship with inmates and should not act in anyway that may cause that perception. Improper activities may include, but are not limited to the following:
>
> ...9. Dating or pursuing a personal relationship with inmates either inside or Outside (sic) of the facility; ...
>
> The policy covers inmates, ex-inmates, friends of inmates, family of inmates or ex-inmates. No staff can socialize with anyone in these categories. Any relationship that started in the jail would be strictly prohibited. Any appearance of a relationship would be sufficient cause for disciplinary action.

Policy 4.18 was updated and incorporated into Cumberland County Department of Corrections Policy 4.22., relating to over familiarization/fraternizing with inmates, which

became effective on June 30, 2016. It also lists twelve improper activities and provides in pertinent part as follows:

> Employees shall not have a personal relationship with inmates and should not act in any way that may cause that perception. Improper activities may include, but are not limited to the following:
>
> ...9. Dating or pursuing a personal relationship with inmates either inside or outside of the facility; ...
>
> The policy covers inmates, ex-inmates, friends of inmates, family of inmates or ex-inmates. No staff can socialize with anyone in these categories. Any relationship that started in the jail would be strictly prohibited. Any appearance of a relationship would be sufficient cause for disciplinary action.

Here, the testimony and evidence presented are insufficient to satisfy the requirement that there was even an appearance of a relationship between the appellant and Cantoni. Cantoni's testimony was not credible. No reliable evidence was produced to substantiate Cantoni's claims.

Therefore, I **CONCLUDE** that appellant's behavior did not rise to a level of conduct unbecoming a public employee, in violation of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(11), specifically Cumberland County Department of Corrections Discipline Policy 3.02A, a/k/a 84-17 C(11) conduct unbecoming an employee and Article 13 of the Code of Ethics and policies 4.18 and 4.22. I **CONCLUDE** that respondent has not met its burden of proof on these issues.

N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(12) Other Sufficient Cause

Finally, appellant has also been charged with violating N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(12), "Other sufficient cause." Other sufficient cause is an offense for conduct that violates the implicit standard of good behavior that devolves upon one who stands in the public eye as an upholder of that which is morally and legally correct. As detailed above, the Cantoni's allegations are unsubstantiated. Her testimony was not credible and her rendition of the facts in light of her life-long drug addiction and heroin use are completely

suspect. As such, I **CONCLUDE** that the respondent has failed to meet its burden of proof on this issue. I **CONCLUDE** that appellant's actions did **NOT** violate N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.3(a)(12).

Accordingly, I **CONCLUDE** that respondent has failed to meet its burden proof on all charges made against the appellant. The administrative decision is **REVERSED**.

ORDER

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the disciplinary action entered in the Final Notice of Disciplinary Action, dated April 18, 2018, of the Cumberland County Department of Corrections against appellant, George Bailey, is hereby **REVERSED**. Appellant, George Bailey's, appeal is **GRANTED**. It is further **ORDERED** that all charges against the appellant are **DISMISSED**. It is **ORDERED** that appellant, George Bailey, be returned to his employment as a corrections officer with respondent, Cumberland County Department of Corrections.

I hereby **FILE** my initial decision with the **CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION** for consideration.

This recommended decision may be adopted, modified or rejected by the **CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION**, which by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter. If the Civil Service Commission does not adopt, modify or reject this decision within forty-five days and unless such time limit is otherwise extended, this recommended decision shall become a final decision in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40A:14-204.

Within thirteen days from the date on which this recommended decision was mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions with the **DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF APPEALS AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS, UNIT H, CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION, 44 South Clinton Avenue, PO Box 312, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312**, marked "Attention: Exceptions." A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.

November 5, 2018
DATE

DOROTHY INCARVITO-GARRABRANT, ALJ

Date Received at Agency: November 5, 2018

Date Mailed to Parties: November 5, 2018.

lam

APPENDIX

LIST OF WITNESSES

For Appellant:

George Bailey, Appellant

For Respondent:

Jennifer Cantoni

Michael Palau, Captain CCDOC

Ernest Cuff, Jr., Chief of Staff Cumberland County Prosecutor's Office

Robert Brownlow (deceased)

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Joint:

J-1 Inmate Summary Report for R. Brownlow Cumberland County Run date 8/31/18 @14.59.05

J-2 Inmate Summary Report for R. Brownlow Cumberland County Run date 8/31/18 @ 14.55.58

J-3 Inmate Summary Report for R. Brownlow Run Salem County date 8/31/18 @ 15.03.04

J-4 Inmate Summary Report for R. Brownlow Cumberland County Run date 8/31/18 @ 14.57.56

For Appellant:

P-1 Cantoni Interview dated 3/20/1 - **Subject to confidentiality - Order placed in sealed envelope.**

P-2 Cantoni-Ellis Text Messages - **Subject to confidentiality - Order placed in sealed envelope.**

For Respondent:

CCDOC-1	Cantoni Criminal Record Documents
CCDOC-2	Cantoni Interview 9/29/16 - **Subject to confidentiality - Order placed in sealed envelope.**
CCDOC-3	US Federal Dist. Court Complaint dated 10/25/17
CCDOC-4	Policy 4.13
CCDOC-5	Policy 4.18
CCDOC-6	Policy 4.22
CCDOC-7	Recording Brownlow Statement to Cuff #1