427-26
OAL Dkt. No. EDU 18852-25
Agency Dkt. No. 367-10/25

New Jersey Commissioner of Education

Final Decision

A.G.-F. and N.F.,[1]

Petitioners,

v.

Board of Education of the Borough of Mountain Lakes, Morris County,

Respondent.

The record of this matter, the Initial Decision of the Office of Administrative Law (OAL), the exceptions filed by the petitioners pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 1:1-18.4, and the Mountain Lakes Board of Education's (Board) reply thereto, have been reviewed and considered.

Petitioners' child, O.G.F., was suspended from Briarcliff Middle School (Briarcliff) on September 10, 2025. Briarcliff's principal, Erik Carlson, notified N.F. that O.G.F. needed to be picked up from school. Upon arriving at the school, A.G.-F. and N.F. were asked to stay outside, but they entered the school anyway. N.F. proceeded to walk through the hallways, and the school issued a shelter-in-place announcement for students and staff. Petitioners exited the building approximately four minutes after entering. The confrontation escalated outside the building, with N.F. yelling at and following Carlson. Petitioners left the school, but N.F. returned later that afternoon and

[1] The original petition filed in this matter identified only A.G.-F. as the petitioner, and the case was captioned accordingly. An amended petition was later filed that added N.F. as a petitioner, but the caption was inadvertently not updated. To be clear, both A.G.-F. and N.F. are petitioners in this matter.

remained outside the building; the school issued a second shelter-in-place announcement. Later in the evening on September 10, 2025, Superintendent Brad Siegel sent an email to N.F., prohibiting him and A.G.-F. from entering Briarcliff.[2] N.F. responded to Siegel, stating, "When I have to be in that school, I will be."

On September 11, 2025, A.G.-F. appeared at Briarcliff and was asked to leave. She insisted that the school inform her of the suspension on official letterhead and stayed for several minutes outside the building, arguing with staff, before leaving. On September 12, 2025, Siegel sent an email to N.F., prohibiting both A.G.-F. and N.F. from all Mountain Lakes schools and campuses based on A.G.-F.'s defiance of the restrictions imposed the day before. Petitioners appealed.

The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) found that that both A.G.-F. and N.F. entered Briarcliff without authorization on September 10, 2025 and caused a disturbance. Accordingly, the ALJ concluded that the Board's decision to prohibit A.G.-F. and N.F. from Briarcliff was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. The ALJ also concluded that the Board's decision to ban N.F. from all district property was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable, based on his conduct. However, the ALJ found that the Board's decision to ban A.G.-F. from all district property was arbitrary and capricious. The ALJ noted that A.G.-F. never received the email prohibiting her from entering Briarcliff, so she was unaware that she might be violating any restrictions when she appeared there on September 11, 2025; furthermore, A.G.-F. did not attempt to enter Briarcliff on that date. In other words, A.G.-F. did not defy the restrictions imposed on her access to Briarcliff, despite Siegel's email indicating that she did, so the ALJ concluded that imposing a full ban based on her alleged defiance was arbitrary and capricious.

[2] The email was addressed to both A.G.-F. and N.F., but it was sent only to N.F.'s email address. N.F. testified that he did not tell A.G.-F. about the email.

In their exceptions, petitioners argue that all of the restrictions are arbitrary because they have no end date, no mandatory review date, no objective conditions for termination, and no consistent instructions governing ordinary parental activities such as pickup and dropoff, school events, and conferences. Petitioners take issue with the Board's characterization of events and maintain that although a short ban may have been warranted, their conduct did not warrant complete and permanent bans. Petitioners also contend that because the ALJ found that A.G.-F.'s conduct was less serious than N.F.'s, she should have been treated differently.

In response, the Board argues that the ALJ's role in this matter was to determine whether the Board's decision was arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable at the time it was made, which is a separate issue from her suggestion that the Board reexamine the restrictions periodically. The Board contends that even if A.G.-F.'s conduct was less serious than N.F.'s, it nonetheless warranted her ban from Briarcliff.

Upon review, the Commissioner concurs with the ALJ that the Board's decision prohibiting A.G.-F. and N.F. from accessing Briarcliff, and prohibiting N.F. from accessing any district property, was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. The record demonstrates that both A.G.-F. and N.F. entered Briarcliff despite being asked not to, and they caused a disturbance. N.F. engaged in further disruptive behavior by returning to Briarcliff later that day. As thoroughly addressed by the ALJ, there was nothing arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable in the Board's imposition of ban in light of petitioners' failure to comply with Board policy for visitor access and staff requests at the time of the incident. Petitioners' exceptions to the contrary are not persuasive.[3]

[3] The Board did not take exception to the portion of the ALJ's decision concluding that the ban of A.G.-F. from all district property was arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. Accordingly, the Commissioner adopts that portion of the Initial Decision, for the reasons stated therein.

However, the Commissioner also agrees with the ALJ that a decision that was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable at the time it was made could become so through the passage of time without any review. Accordingly, the Board is directed to review the bans imposed on petitioners no later than its December 2026 regularly scheduled meeting. Should the Board wish to continue the bans, it shall notify petitioners of the reason(s) for continuing the ban(s) and the terms of the ban(s). The Commissioner does not express any opinion on what those terms may be, but directs the Board to consider ordinary parent activities and to provide instructions to petitioners regarding how to request access to district properties for activities such as student pickup and dropoff, dropoff of forgotten student belongings at school, school performances and events, parent-teacher conferences, Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings, and medical incidents. Furthermore, if the ban(s) continue, the Board shall review them again prior to the start of the 2027-2028 school year, and each school year subsequent, unless and until the bans are lifted.

Accordingly, the Initial Decision is adopted as the final decision in this matter, as modified herein, and the petition of appeal is hereby dismissed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.[4]



COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Date of Decision: October 22, 2026
Date of Mailing: October 23, 2026

[4] This decision may be appealed to the Appellate Division of the Superior Court pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 18A:6-9.1. Under *N.J.Ct.R.* 2:4-1(b), a notice of appeal must be filed with the Appellate Division within 45 days from the date of mailing of this decision.

State of New Jersey

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

INITIAL DECISION

OAL DKT. NO. EDU 18852-25

AGENCY DKT. NO. 367-10/25

A.G.-F.,

Petitioner,

v.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE BOROUGH OF MOUNTAIN LAKES, MORRIS COUNTY,

Respondent.

A.G.-F., petitioner, pro se

Vittorio LaPira, Esq., for respondent (Fogarty Hara LaPira & Cherry, attorneys)

Record Closed: July 9, 2026 Decided: July 24, 2026

BEFORE **ANDREA PERRY VILLANI**, ALJ:

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On September 10, 2025, the Board of Education of Mountain Lakes (Board), prohibited A.G.-F. from entering her son's middle school. The next day, A.G.-F. did not try to enter the school, but the Board claimed she did and arbitrarily banned her from all school property on September 12, 2025. Was the September 12, 2025 ban correct?

No. A Board's decision is not entitled to a presumption of correctness when such decision was arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. See Thomas v. Morris Twp. Bd. of Educ., 89 N.J. Super. 327, 332 (App. Div. 1965).

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 10, 2025, the Board prohibited A.G.-F. and her husband, N.F., from entering Briarcliff Middle School in Mountain Lakes.

On September 12, 2025, the Board prohibited A.G.-F. and N.F. from entering any school property in Mountain Lakes.

On October 30, 2025, A.G.-F. filed a Petition of Appeal and Request for Emergency Relief with the New Jersey Department of Education, Office of Controversies and Disputes.

On November 3, 2025, the New Jersey Department of Education, Office of Controversies and Disputes, transmitted the case to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for a hearing under the Administrative Procedure Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15, and the act establishing the OAL, N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1 to -23.

On November 12, 2025, I heard oral argument on A.G.-F.'s request for emergency relief. The next day, November 13, 2025, I denied A.G.-F.'s request for emergency relief and scheduled the case for a hearing on a non-emergent basis.

On January 27, 2026, March 30, 2026, and April 16, 2026, I conducted the hearing. On May 15, 2026, the parties submitted briefs. On July 9, 2026, with the consent of both parties, I conducted a mediation in an effort to reach a global resolution of this and other cases filed by A.G.-F. and N.F. The mediation was unsuccessful, and I closed the record.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS OF FACT

On September 10, 2025, the Board notified A.G.-F. and her husband, N.F., that their twelve-year-old son, O.G.F., was suspended from Briarcliff Middle School because he allegedly said, "I am going to shoot up the school." A.G.-F. and N.F. maintain that the child actually said, "I'm going to crash out."

Earlier on September 10, 2025, the Principal of Briarcliff Middle School, Erik Carlson, investigated the incident. Carlson interviewed a student witness who reported: some boys and O.G.F. were arguing in class about who smells bad; the teacher told them, "This kind of conversation belongs in the nurse's office"; O.G.F. repeatedly asked the teacher if he should go to the nurse's office, but the teacher ignored him; O.G.F. then said, if someone doesn't answer me, "I'm going to shoot up the school." Carlson interviewed three other student witnesses who said they heard O.G.F. say he would shoot up the school. Carlson interviewed O.G.F. in the presence of his case manager and a counselor. O.G.F. confirmed everything about the incident except the part about shooting up the school. O.G.F. reported that he said, "I'm going to crash out."

Carlson convened a meeting with the Threat Assessment Team. The Team included Carlson, Marissa Fleming, School Counselor, Kerry DiGiacinto, Director of Special Services, and Barbara Giuliano, School Resource Officer (SRO). The team concluded that O.G.F. should be evaluated. Carlson did not believe that O.G.F. was a threat, but the team collectively decided they could not make that determination without further assessment. They decided that O.G.F. should receive a psychiatric evaluation. Carlson explained that schools typically require psychiatric clearance when a child may be a danger to himself or others.

As noted above, SRO Giuliano was present at the threat assessment meeting. She was there as a liaison for the police department. She explained that it is her role as SRO to report incidents to the police. During the meeting, Giuliano texted Mountain Lakes police officer Detective Sean Torres about the allegation. Minutes later, Torres and Sergeant Dan Cacciabeve arrived at the school to find out what was going on.

In the meantime, Carlson called N.F. to tell him O.G.F. was suspended and must be picked up from school. N.F. immediately became angry, accused Carlson of lying, and said more than once, "I expected this from you people." N.F. testified that he was angry because last year students made similar false allegations against O.G.F.. N.F. maintains that the school – and Carlson in particular – did not properly investigate those allegations.

SRO Giuliano was waiting in the main office. She overheard the phone call, which was "a heated conversation" that included yelling. Shortly after, the officers arrived, and she told them about the phone call. They discussed how to transfer O.G.F. to his parents. When Carlson returned, Giuliano and Carlson agreed that the officers would stand back while Giuliano and Carlson walked O.G.F. out of the building. The officers suggested escorting O.G.F. directly to a hospital for evaluation, which Carlson refused, stating that would be a "disaster."

Within minutes, N.F. and A.G.-F. arrived at the school. As soon as Carlson heard they were outside, he walked O.G.F. to his locker to get his belongings. N.F. repeatedly rang the bell from outside. Someone in the office told him it would be a few minutes while O.G.F. went to his locker. DiGiacinto, who was also in the office, remarked to the officers: "I could also see him ringing the bell off the wall if your cars are outside." One of the officers responded, "Yea, we parked right out front. We didn't hide."

Indeed, N.F. was extremely upset when he arrived at the school with A.G.-F. and saw three police cars there for his son. He explained at hearing that one mistake by a police officer can result in a person being arrested unlawfully for years. He testified, "I feared that my son was going to end up in jail…that he would have a criminal record at the age of twelve." As he waited for about five minutes for the principal to bring the child out, he was "getting wound up."

Once O.G.F. had his belongings, Giuliano and Carlson walked him through the vestibule to the front door. Carlson had a form with him about the psychiatric evaluation that he planned to hand to A.G.-F. and N.F. Carlson opened the front door and stood on the threshold with the form. A.G.-F. said, "I need to talk to you, I have my attorney on

the phone." Carlson replied, "We can setup a meeting but you're not gaining access to the school." N.F. opened the adjoining door and he and A.G.-F stepped around Carlson to enter the vestibule. N.F. immediately began yelling and pointing: "You need to stop speaking about my child. You have three cops out here and I'm extremely upset that you're disrespecting." Giuliano then stated, "I'm going to ask you to step outside, we're asking you to step outside." N.F. responded, "You're asking. Thank you. You're asking and I say no. That's an ask and I say no. There's no lawful order to be handled. Done. She's gonna speak to my attorney."

A brief discussion ensued in the vestibule. A.G.-F. asked what happened. Carlson said he explained the situation to N.F. on the phone, "but I'll explain it to you briefly now." O.G.F. cried and said, "I don't know what happened." N.F. responded, "Same bullcrap. Some students. No adult. No one. And all those last students are liars." A.G.-F. said she would like this on video. Carlson stated, "I'm not staying if you're recording." A.G.-F. responded, "Yes, you are gonna stay if we're recording." A.G.-F. questioned O.G.F. about what happened while Carlson and Giuliano both attempted to hand the form to A.G.-F.. She did not take it. Carlson placed the form on the ground and said, "You guys need to leave the building…"

A.G.-F. and N.F. then entered the school. Giuliano said, "Excuse us," as she moved from the vestibule into the school. Carlson entered the school immediately behind her, then turned and attempted to shut the door behind him. Both A.G.-F. and N.F. followed close behind so the door could not close. Giuliano stepped in front of them, extended her arm, and said, "We're asking you to stay out of the school." N.F. said, "You're asking. You're asking." A.G.-F. and N.F. then entered as Giuliano retracted her arm. Although Giuliano stated as they entered, "They pushed past me," the video footage clearly indicates that there was no pushing. Rather, the best way to describe it is that A.G.-F. and N.F. side-stepped and brushed past Giuliano when she retracted her arm.

Once in the main part of the school, N.F. walked quickly through the halls. The school made a shelter in place announcement over the loudspeaker. Carlson and three officers followed N.F. through the hall, asking him repeatedly to leave. A.G.-F. and

O.G.F. also followed. Both N.F. and A.G.-F. were holding their phones up as if they were recording.[1] N.F. attempted to open the door to the main office, but it was locked. He was speaking loudly and saying things like: "Three police called for him!"; "I expected this from you…lying!"; and, "I want an official trespass in writing…that's the law…in writing!" O.G.F. was crying. Both A.G.-F. and N.F. questioned what happened and why O.G.F. was being accused, then A.G.-F. encouraged N.F. to leave. She called his name and tried to grab his hand saying to the officer, "I'm trying to help. [N.], can we just go over here? [N.], please." They asked a few more questions and exited the building about four minutes after entering.

Once outside, the confrontation escalated. Carlson said, "I will explain if you put away your phone…I'm not letting you get into my building." The phrase "my building" triggered N.F.. He stepped up to Carlson, pointed, and yelled, "I don't give a…this is not your building, this is my building, I pay taxes!" He got in Carlson's face. Carlson stumbled backward. No physical contact was made, but an officer said, "Mr. [F.], don't touch him!" and stepped between them. N.F. said, "I didn't touch him!" He continued to yell: "Your building? Who the hell do you think you are!" A.G.-F. said, "This is our building, where our kid goes to school, where we live, where we pay taxes…you are actually working for us. You're not a good principal. You're racist." Carlson walked away while N.F. followed him shouting, "Who are you! Your building…my building! How about that? Harassment! So, I can say anything! Carlson threatened me with a gun! I fear for my life! Are you gonna do anything about it?" A.G.-F. said, "I heard him say it…" O.G.F. was sobbing and saying, "I just want to go home."

Some teachers and students witnessed the confrontation between N.F. and Carlson outside the school. When N.F. was yelling at and following Carlson, they were walking past classroom windows. Giuliano said into her radio, "Drop the shades. Drop the shades." She testified that students could hear and see what was going on.

[1] The Board requested these recordings in discovery, but A.G.-F. and N.F. did not produce them. A.G.-F. stated at hearing that, although she was holding up her phone, she wasn't actually recording. She explained further in her brief that she tried to record but her recording was interrupted by incoming phone calls. N.F. stated at hearing that he was recording through an app called Attorney Shield, so the recording was not saved on his phone. It was saved to a cloud server that he had difficulty accessing. Ultimately, however, it doesn't matter that A.G.-F. and N.F. didn't produce any videos. The entire incident was captured by school surveillance cameras and the officers' body cameras.

Detective Torres stepped aside to speak with the family. O.G.F., still crying, explained what happened in class. Both parents complained that there's no evidence against O.G.F.: "Someone can say anything about anybody." N.F. went on to say, "If I whip my cock out and pee on you, I'm gonna go in jail right? Am I wrong? I just asked you a question." O.G.F. said tearfully, "I just wanna do school." A.G.-F. stated that O.G.F. doesn't have problems anywhere except at this school with Principal Carlson. She also stated that the children who made the report about O.G.F. were bullying him. A.G.-F. and N.F. left soon after.

At approximately 2:00 p.m., N.F. returned to the school. He testified that he was driving by and saw a friend outside the school, so he stopped to speak with him. N.F. was parked and standing in the school driveway. Two officers approached. Officer Kevin Stewart said, "Mr. [F.], you've been asked to leave." An argument ensued. N.F. responded, "I'm on a public easement…I'm not in the building…If you want to trespass me, let's get it done. If not, bounce. Tell them, tell them…do we understand? Done. I'm going to disrupt you right now because you're interrupting my conversation…" N.F. continued to argue with the officers for about ten minutes until he calmed down. The officers walked away.

Carlson was concerned that N.F. would disrupt the 2:30 p.m. dismissal. He testified that he did not call the police; rather, it was likely the SRO who alerted the police that N.F. had returned to school. However, Carlson wondered why N.F. was there, as N.F. already picked up O.G.F. and had no other children at the school. Carlson acknowledged that the officers told him to let N.F. remain outside. They reasoned that making N.F. leave might cause a greater disturbance. At the same time, Carlson called another shelter in place, which he then called off at the end of the period. The students were dismissed on time, and N.F. was still there. Officers and the superintendent advised Carlson not to go outside at dismissal per his usual custom, but he went outside anyway.

Nothing more happened at dismissal, though Giuliano testified that she heard students talking about what happened earlier in the day. She stated that students

asked her with tears in their eyes if they would be safe coming to school tomorrow. She said they would. She heard other students say that someone brought a gun to school and had it in their locker. She stated generally that there were a lot of rumors going around.

After dismissal, Carlson called a faculty meeting. He informed the staff that the shelters in place were due to a parental disturbance. He thanked them for their cooperation. Two teachers with classrooms near the incident spoke to him about student reactions. Carlson then decided to hold a student assembly the next morning to explain "why we do what we do and that their safety is our first priority" and to email the parents. In the parent email, he explained that the two shelter-in-place incidents were only called to reduce disruption, no one was in danger, and the police presence was not in response to any threats or acts of violence.

At 5:08 p.m. that day, Superintendent Brad Siegel sent an email to N.F. prohibiting him and A.G.-F. from entering Briarcliff School. The message was addressed to both parents, but A.G.-F. testified that she didn't receive the email. N.F. testified that he did not tell A.G.-F. about the email because he did not want to further upset her. The emailed copy presented by the school does not reflect where it was sent, which is strange, because every other email provided by the school lists the email recipient addresses. Indeed, Superintendent Siegel's September 12th follow-up email directed to both parents does reflect where it was sent: only to N.F.'s email address.

Superintendent Siegel's September 10th email that, again, was only sent to N.F., stated:

> Dear [A.G.-F. and N.F.]:
>
> The incident that occurred today at Briarcliff School that resulted in a Shelter-in-Place and the intervention of law enforcement is a serious violation of the School Visitor Policy and follows several prior communications with you regarding the District's need to strictly enforce the policy for the safety and protection of our students and staff members. The prior superintendent and principal previously expressed to you that they were hopeful that their correspondence would clarify the Board's expectations for

> parents and guardians when they are on the school premises, so that positive interaction with the District could be realized.
>
> Regrettably, the incident that occurred today, when you arrived at Briarcliff School to pick up your son who was suspended for a violation of the code of conduct, demonstrates your flagrant disregard for the Board's policies and safety protocols and the prior warnings of the administration. Specifically, when you arrived, you were requested to wait outside of the building and that your son would be escorted out of the building to your custody. Instead, you proceeded to enter the building, arguing with Principal Carlson and law enforcement and then using physical force to gain entry. Your conduct today is completely inimical to the health and safety of the students and staff of Briarcliff School
>
> You are henceforth informed that pursuant to Board Policy 9150, you are prohibited from entering Briarcliff School for any reason and if you attempt to enter Briarcliff School, you will be requested to leave. If you refuse to leave school grounds or cause a disturbance, the principal is authorized to request from the local law enforcement agency whatever assistance is required to remove you.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Dr. Brad Siegel, Superintendent

As stated in the email, Siegel barred A.G.-F. and N.F. from entering Briarcliff School pursuant to Board Policy 9150. The policy states:

> The Superintendent and Building Principal each possess the authority to prohibit the entry of any person into a school of this district or to expel any person from the school when there is reason to believe the presence of such person would be inimical to the good order of the school. If such person refuses to leave the school grounds or causes a disturbance, the principal is authorized to request from the local law enforcement agency whatever assistance is required to remove the individual. The Board may bar the attendance at school functions or access to school property of any visitor whose conduct, in the opinion of the Board, may constitute a disruption.

In his email, Siegel referred to prior communications with A.G.-F. and N.F. about the school visitor policy. In specific, there was a situation in 2022 when A.G.-F. was allowed to enter the school, but then she went directly to her child's class, which is not permitted. There was another situation in 2023 when she entered a side door and

delivered a project directly to her child's class. Finally, there was a situation in 2024 when N.F. made an alarming statement when picking up his son. Something was said about students being afraid of his son and N.F. allegedly responded, "You should be more afraid of me."

At approximately 7:40 p.m., N.F. responded to Superintendent Siegel's email. N.F. wrote:

> New Jersey State and Federal law allows me to be in the school and since there no LAWS broken I cannot be banned from a public building. So when I have to be in that school I will be and threats of police action leads to the harassment.

Meanwhile, A.G.-F. was emailing back and forth with Principal Carlson. Some of what they wrote is set forth below:

Carlson at 2:40 p.m.:	As per my conversation with Mr. [F.] today…[O.G.F.] will be suspended from school through 9/12/25…We will plan for a re-entry meeting on Monday morning at 7:45 a.m. or at a time of your convenience on Monday…
A.G.-F. at 3:20 p.m.:	[O.G.F.] did not say the alleged statement and he has been cleared. He would like to return to school tomorrow. We can all meet tomorrow at 7:45 am.
Carlson at 3:44 p.m.:	[O.G.F.] will be suspended for the remainder of the week…[He] is expected back in school on Monday and we look forward to meeting with you at that time…
A.G.-F. at 4:00 p.m.:	I don't think that you are fully investigating what is going on with the 'witnesses' who are making these things up…We will be dropping the [clearance] letter off today and would like for [O.G.F.] to return to school tomorrow.
Carlson at 6:43 a.m. the next day:	You may scan the clearance letter to me at your convenience…[O.G.F.] is suspended from school for the remainder of the week…he would return Monday…
A.G.-F. at 8:01 a.m.:	I would like to hand the clearance letter in person. Please stop saying [O.G.F.] said this.

Then, on the morning of September 11, 2025, A.G.-F. appeared at Briarcliff School with O.G.F.. She rang the bell and three officers approached. They said O.G.F. is suspended. A.G.-F. insisted that the school inform her on an official letterhead. Principal Carlson came to the door, pointed at A.G.-F., and said angrily: "Your son is suspended, I've communicated with you, you can scan that to me." He slammed the door. A.G.-F. said he was aggressive. She continued to ask for notification of the suspension on school letterhead. The officers asked her to leave. A.G.-F. asked, "Am I not allowed to be here? How is this trespassing?" The officers repeated that the child is suspended and referred A.G.-F.'s questions to the Board. A.G.-F. repeated that nothing was handed to her. The officers said they would get it. While waiting, A.G.F. stated, "I need a reason, too, why I'm not allowed to be here and why my son is not allowed to be here. Is it because he's black?...They just don't like the fact that he's a black boy in the school and he's doing well. So I need to have it in writing." One of the officers confirmed that she received an email. A.G.-F. said, "I'm waiting for the letter. This is like the 1950s. This school is like the deep South of the North." A.G.-F. waited for several more minutes before leaving and going to Siegel's office to speak with him, but he was not there.

On September 12, 2025, Superintendent Siegel wrote another email to both A.G.-F. and N.F. that was only sent to N.F.. In that email and attached letter, the Board prohibited A.G.-F. and N.F. from all Mountain Lakes schools and campuses. Siegel wrote:

> Dear [A.G.-F. and N.F.]:
>
> The purpose of this correspondence is to inform you that as a result of [A.G.-F.'s] conduct today in defiance of the restrictions that I imposed on her access to Briarcliff School on September 10, and the correspondence I received from [N.F.] the same day stating he will not comply with those restrictions, you are now prohibited from visiting any school or being present on any campus in the Mountain Lakes School District for any reason without express written permission from me.
>
> As a result of your outrageous conduct toward an administrator and law enforcement on September 10, I served you with written notice that you were not permitted to enter Briarcliff School. The reasons that compelled me to take this action under Board Policy

9150 were clearly set forth in my written correspondence. Notwithstanding the clear restraints place on you, [A.G.-F.] attempted to gain access to Briarcliff School yesterday in defiance of those restraints and the direction given to her by the school resource officer who had to intervene to prevent her from entering the building. In addition, I received the following email correspondence from [N.F.] on September 10 in response to the restraints I imposed on his access to Briarcliff School:

New Jersey state and federal law allows me to be in the school and since there no LAWS broken I cannot be banned from a public building. So when I have to be in that school I will be and threats of police action leads to harassment.

Your respective actions, which are disruptive and threaten the good order of our schools are completely unacceptable and will not be tolerated in the future. [N.F.'s] correspondence and [A.G.-F.'s] actions yesterday have also been reported to the Mountain Lakes Police Department.

For your review, I am again enclosing Mountain Lakes Board of Education Policy 9150, "School Visitors." The policy states, "the Superintendent and Building Principal each possess the authority to prohibit the entry of any person into a school of this district or to expel any person from the school when there is reason to believe the presence of such person would be inimical to the good order of the school. If such a person refuses to leave the school grounds or creates a disturbance, the Principal is authorized to request from the local law enforcement agency whatever assistance is required to remove the individual."

Given the gravity of your recent actions, it is evident that I must take certain measures to ensure the protection of all students and staff members in our schools. Therefore, as a result of the above, I am compelled to exercise my authority under Policy 9150 to restrain you from being present in any school or on any campus in the Mount Lakes School District, for any reason, without express written permission from me. If you disregard any of the restrictions contained in this correspondence, we will request the assistance of the Mountain Lakes Police Department to enforce these restrictions.

If you have any questions concerning the actions that I have taken, or the restrictions imposed on you under Board Policy 9150, you may contact my office.

Very truly yours,

Dr. Brad Siegel
Superintendent of Schools

On or about September 15, 2025, immediately after school at dismissal, the school held a meeting for parents about the September 10th incident. The meeting lasted about thirty to forty-five minutes. Carlson explained the difference between a shelter in place and lockdown. Parents mentioned rumors about guns in the school. Carlson affirmatively stated that there was not a gun in the school. He did not give specifics about the situation and did not name the parties involved.

The Board held a meeting later that evening to discuss the parent meeting and September 10th incident. Siegel characterized the September 10th incident as a disturbance, not a security issue. He explained the difference between a shelter in place and lockdown. A parent asked why the child was allowed back in school, and a Board member immediately interrupted and said, “Please don’t talk about a child.” Another parent asked, “If a particular student, or family, or member of the community continuously creates similar problems, what is done?” Siegel declined to answer other than to say that’s a common pattern and it’s more unusual to have only a single incident with a child or family. Siegel and the Board did not give specifics about the situation or name any of the parties involved despite pressure from emotional parents.

A.G.-F. and N.F. point to the Board meeting as evidence that they are unwelcome in Mountain Lakes. Both testified that they don’t feel like they are part of the community. Indeed, A.G.-F., N.F., and their children are one of only a few black families in town, and they are the only black family in their section of town.

Similarly, N.F. feels that the school district does not consider them part of the community. He testified that the school’s restrictions have been further isolating. He explained that, on September 10th, he was only “loudly advocating” for his son, he did not threaten anyone, and when he returned to the school, it was to speak with a friend who is also black and of a similar background that would understand his experience.

A.G.-F. testified that September 10th was a difficult day for her. She had recently returned from a Girl Scout camping trip with fourteen eight and nine-year-old girls where she got little sleep. She had been studying for a board recertification exam that she completed on September 9th. The exam was eight hours long, and she had to

reschedule patients to accommodate the exam. The family was having car issues and was down to one car. Coordinating rides for her five children was difficult. She was exhausted and stressed. She was just finishing with a patient when N.F. told her about the phone call from the school.

A.G.-F. explained what happened at the school. She was shocked at the number of police cars in the school driveway when she arrived. She also believed her son had been falsely accused for the second time. One year prior, students accused O.G.F. of making a similar statement, and Carlson purportedly omitted key facts when he spoke to the police. A.G.-F. testified that she did not push anyone, she just wanted to find out from Carlson what happened. But, when Carlson said, you're not getting into "my building," it was very triggering. She testified, "It seemed to imply that we don't belong there."

A.G.-F. also testified that on the evening of September 10th at the elementary Back to School night, she was followed by two Mountain Lakes police officers in and out of classrooms and the gym throughout the event.

A.G.-F. explained what happened on September 11, 2025. Because she had a psychiatric clearance letter, she believed O.G.F. could return to school. This is what happened after the previous incident one year prior: when O.G.F. was cleared, he returned. A.G.-F. acknowledged on cross-examination that the September 2025 incident was different because O.G.F. was suspended (he was not suspended the year prior), though she further explained that none of her children were ever suspended before. She believed the suspension could be lifted once she provided the clearance.

A.G.-F. expressed regret. After watching video of herself from September 10 and 11, she stated, "I cringe when I see it. I would never do it again."

Siegel acknowledged during his testimony that he did not indicate a length of time for the restriction of A.G.-F. and N.F. from school property. He did not provide instructions on how to pick up and drop off the children or their items. At trial, he stated his understanding was that items were to be left outside. On the other hand, Carlson

seemed to believe that A.G.-F. and N.F. were permitted in school vestibules, since he left an item in a vestibule for them to pick up on or about December 15, 2025.

The restrictions have affected A.G.-F. and N.F.'s five children. The two oldest attend Mountain Lakes High School, the middle, O.G.F., is at Briarcliff, and the two youngest are in elementary school. The eldest son had an anxiety attack. The eldest daughter has become more of a handful. The middle son, O.G.F., is more depressed and has gained weight. The fourth child is more argumentative and doesn't want to go to school. The youngest is eight years old and still sleeps in a diaper.

The September 10th incident in particular clearly affected O.G.F.. He sobbed throughout the ordeal and said things like, "I want to go home" and "I just want to do school." He sobbed hardest when his father was yelling. N.F. testified that O.G.F. was upset because he thought his father would be arrested; but, even if that's true, O.G.F. would not have feared his father's arrest if his father wasn't yelling inside the school and in the principal's face.

Indeed, N.F. did not just yell on September 10th. He entered the school building without authorization. He was told to leave and didn't. Giuliano asked him to leave, but Carlson directed him to leave more than once: e.g., "You're not gaining access to the building," and "You guys need to leave the building." N.F. walked quickly through the halls past classes in session, speaking loud and forcefully, drawing attention from students and staff. Outside, he yelled and pointed in Carlson's face, followed him past more classes in session, and yelled about Carlson having a gun. N.F. wasn't actually accusing Carlson of having a gun (he was making a point about the damaging effect of baseless accusations); however, yelling in front of a school about a gun will cause panic and alarm, is therefore dangerous, and is absolutely unacceptable except in the event of an emergency. After leaving, N.F. almost immediately returned to the school. Even though he returned to talk to a friend, N.F. either knew or should have known that his return would draw attention from the school administrators or officers, as he had just created a disturbance. It was reasonable for anyone who witnessed the disturbance to assume that he returned to do it again. He then openly defied Siegel's direction not to re-enter Briarcliff by emailing him, "When I have to be in that school, I will be."

A.G.-F.'s actions on September 10th and 11th, though problematic, were not as egregious. She primarily followed N.F.'s lead. Like N.F., she entered the building after being told not to. However, once inside the building, A.G.-F. trailed behind N.F. in the halls and then tried to get him to leave. Outside, N.F. was shouting while A.G.-F. interjected at times, but she did not curse, point at, follow, or approach anyone. Although A.G.-F. returned to the school the next day with O.G.F. knowing that Carlson said not to, she did not attempt to enter the school. She rang the bell and stood outside waiting for a letter. A.G.-F. was debating her point with the officers and unreasonably insisting on a letter (the suspension was already confirmed in writing via email), but she was calm. She did not yell, curse, point at, or confront anyone. At worst, she was being difficult.

The school also made mistakes. Siegel did not send his September 10th and 12th emails to A.G.-F.. The September 10th email stated that A.G.-F. and N.F. used "physical force to gain entry" to Briarcliff, which is not accurate. A.G.-F. and N.F. stepped around and past Carlson and Giuliano, but they did not use "physical force." Carlson should not have said to N.F., "You're not getting into *my* building." It was an insensitive thing for a white man in a position of power to say to a black man. Later, Superintendent Siegel and the police told Carlson not to exit the building at dismissal to avoid further confrontation, but he did it anyway. When A.G.-F. returned to school the next day, Carlson opened the door, pointed at her, raised his voice angrily, and slammed the door shut. Siegel then stated in his September 12th letter: "[A.G.-F.] attempted to gain access to Briarcliff School yesterday in defiance of th[e] restraints and the direction given to her by the school resource officer who had to intervene to prevent her from entering the building." This is not true. The restraint set forth in Siegel's email – which A.G.-F. did not receive – said that she could not enter the school. A.G.-F. did not attempt to enter the school, and no one had to prevent her from entering.

To be sure, the school was in a difficult position with angry parents on both sides. A.G.-F. and N.F. were upset by the accusation against their son, his suspension, and the significant police presence that day. Other parents were angry that the child was

quickly allowed back to school and not enough was done about the family that "continuously creates problems."

A.G.-F. and N.F. were in a difficult position as well, and they testified credibly as such. They believe their son and have never heard him make a threat. They feel that certain children bully and target him, and they were frustrated that the school did not seek corroboration from any adults, like the teacher who was present when the alleged threat was made. As parents of the only black child in the school, they were alarmed that three police cars were parked outside the school for a twelve-year-old who, even Carlson acknowledged, is not threatening.

On the other hand, A.G.-F. and N.F. take unreasonable positions at times. There was no good reason for them to enter the school on September 10th once their son was returned to them safely, they saw he had not been arrested, and the principal offered to "set a meeting" to discuss the suspension. Everything they said inside the school that day could have been addressed in said meeting with Carlson without upsetting their son and other students. There was no good reason for N.F. to refuse to leave school grounds when he returned after causing a commotion. There was no good reason for A.G.-F. to insist that the school issue an official suspension on letterhead when the principal had already confirmed it in writing via email.

Given this discussion, I **FIND** the following as **FACT**. A.G.-F. and N.F. were emotionally triggered by several events that happened at school on September 10, 2025. However, they both entered the school that day without authorization. N.F. caused a disruption in the school by loudly walking the halls, and he caused a disruption outside by yelling and pointing in the principal's face, shouting about a gun, cursing, returning to the school that same day, and refusing to leave just to make a point. When the superintendent later prohibited A.G.-F. and N.F. from entering the middle school, N.F. openly defied him: "When I have to be in that school, I will be." A.G.-F. did not receive the email prohibiting her from entering the school, and she did not attempt to enter the school the next day. However, the superintendent then issued a blanket, indefinite prohibition against both A.G.-F. and N.F. from being present on any campus in the school district for any reason. This has furthered isolated the family which is one of

few black families in the community. The family will continue to be members of the school community for years to come, as they have five children attending the high school, middle school, and elementary school.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

It is well settled that a Board of Education has full control over all its lands and may adopt rules for the use of the property. N.J.S.A. 18A:20-20. Furthermore, when a Board acts within its authority, "its decision is entitled to a presumption of correctness and will not be upset unless there is an affirmative showing that such decision was arbitrary, capricious or unreasonable." Thomas v. Morris Twp. Bd. of Educ., 89 N.J. Super. 327, 332 (App. Div. 1965).

In this case, the Board's decision on September 10, 2025 to prohibit A.G.-F. and N.F. from entering Briarcliff Middle School was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. As discussed at length above, A.G.-F. and N.F. entered the school without authorization and after they were specifically instructed not to. There was at least one previous incident when A.G.-F. entered a school (to deliver a project) and a classroom (to speak with her son) without authorization. There was a previous incident when N.F. made an alarming statement at school. Both A.G.-F. and N.F. – but mostly N.F. – also caused a disturbance at the school on September 10th.

Similarly, the Board's decision on September 12, 2025 to prohibit N.F. from Mountain Lakes school campuses was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. As discussed at length above, N.F. got in Principal Carlson's face on September 10th, yelled about a gun, returned to the school almost immediately, argued with police officers outside, refused to leave to prove a point, and openly defied Superintendent Siegel's directive not to re-enter the school.

However, the Board's decision on September 12, 2025 to include A.G.-F. in the prohibition from all Mountain Lakes school property was arbitrary and capricious. As discussed at length above, A.G.-F. never received the email prohibiting her from entering Briarcliff school, and she also did not attempt to re-enter the school. She went

there the next day to try to get O.G.F. back into school with a clearance letter, but she only rang the bell and spoke to the three officers that confronted her. At worst, she was being difficult as she stood outside complaining about O.G.F.'s suspension while waiting for a letter that one of the officers said he would retrieve. To put it another way, when Siegel banned A.G.-F. from all of school property, he said it was "a result of [A.G.-F.'s] conduct today in defiance of the restrictions that I imposed on her access to Briarcliff School on September 10." However, A.G.-F. did *not* defy the restrictions imposed on her access to Briarcliff School on September 10 and, therefore, Siegel's determination in this regard was arbitrary and capricious.

The Board's September 12, 2025 decision to ban A.G.-F. from all school property is also unreasonable in this particular circumstance because it is overly broad. There is no time limit or mechanism for review of the prohibition in the future. There is no direction or allowance for pick-up and drop-off of the children or their belongings. As the prohibition is currently written, A.G.-F. cannot step foot on any Mountain Lakes school property for any reason and forever. The parties have five children with the youngest in elementary school and will be involved with Mountain Lakes schools for many years to come. As discussed at length above, A.G.-F. was being difficult, but her behavior was not egregious, and she currently has no means of getting back on school property for graduations, parent-teacher conferences, games, concerts, IEP meetings, back to school nights, etc.

For this reason and others, the instant case is distinguishable from L.A. o/b/o T.J.A. and P.M.A. v. Port Republic Bd. of Educ., EDU 04308-05, Initial Decision (January 9, 2007), adopted, Comm'r (February 22, 2007), http://njlaw.rutgers.edu/collections/oal/>. In that case, a school district barred a mother from entering her sons' school "except under specific conditions." The mother "used foul language and made obscene gestures," and was a self-professed "troublemaker" who likes to "torment people." She "terrorized the superintendent, harassed teachers and staff, insulted parents, cursed in front of children, [and] threatened police…" The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) and Commissioner agreed with the district's decision to restrict her access to the school building. Nevertheless, the ALJ cautioned: "I note that

for reasons of fundamental fairness and due process, the Board would be well advised to review the restrictions imposed upon petitioner at reasonably regular intervals."

In this case, A.G.-F.'s behavior was not nearly as bad, the restrictions are broader, and there's no provision for review at regular intervals. More specifically, A.G.-F. did not make obscene gestures, curse in front of children, threaten police, etc. She also was not banned from a school building "except under specific conditions." Rather, she was banned from all school property with no exceptions for specific conditions. Finally, the Board in this case did not provide for review of the restrictions at reasonably regular intervals. In sum, when comparing this case to L.A. and others, the Board's restrictions on A.G.-F. are unreasonably broad given the level of misconduct. See also, Griffin v. Monmouth Reg'l High School Dist. Bd. of Educ., EDU 04362-94, Initial Decision (September 19, 1994), adopted, Comm'r (November 10, 1994) (parent who punched a coach was only prohibited from attending athletic events).

For the foregoing reasons, I **CONCLUDE** that the Board's September 12, 2025 decision to ban A.G.-F. from all Mountain Lakes school property was arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable. I further **CONCLUDE** that the Board's decision to prohibit A.G.-F. and N.F. from entering Briarcliff Middle School and its decision to prohibit N.F. from entering school property was not arbitrary, capricious, or unreasonable. However, just as the ALJ cautioned in L.A., the Board should consider reviewing these restrictions at reasonably regular intervals. At some point in the future, the restrictions may no longer be reasonable, and they may even become arbitrary with the passage of time and no further disruptions.

ORDER

Given my findings of fact and conclusions of law, I **ORDER** that A.G.-F.'s petition is **GRANTED IN PART** and the Board's decision to ban her from all Mountain Lakes school property is **REVERSED**. The Board's remaining restrictions issued on September 10, 2025, and September 12, 2025, remain in effect.

I hereby **FILE** this initial decision with the **COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION** for consideration.

This recommended decision may be adopted, modified, or rejected by the **COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,** who by law is authorized to make a final decision in this matter. If the Commissioner of the Department of Education 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. 52:14B-10.

Within thirteen days from the date on which this recommended decision was mailed to the parties, any party may file written exceptions with the **COMMISSIONER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. Exceptions may be filed by email to ControversiesDisputesFilings@doe.nj.gov or by mail to Office of Controversies and Disputes, 100 Riverview Plaza, 4th Floor, PO Box 500, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0500**. A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.



July 24, 2026

DATE

ANDREA PERRY VILLANI, ALJ

Date Received at Agency: July 24, 2026

Date Mailed to Parties: July 24, 2026

sej

APPENDIX

Petitioner's Witnesses

A.G.-F.
N.F.

Respondent's Witnesses

Barbara Giuliano
Erik Carlson
Brad Siegel

Petitioner's Exhibits

P-1 Gmail, re: Math 8, Carlson, dated November 17, 2022 (Redacted)
P-2 Gmail, 6th Carlson letter about cheating on Link It test (Redacted)
P-3 Gmail, "Math," regarding math placement, August 2025 (Redacted)
P-4 Briarcliff Flash, dated August 29, 2025
P-5 Gmail, meeting request to address bullying by Principal Carlson (Redacted)
P-6 September 24, 2025 communication with Siegel (Redacted)
P-7 Gmail, re: attempt to meet w/ Siegel to discuss mistreatment (Redacted)
P-8 "Allowed to return to campus false allegation," dated Sept. 2025 (Redacted)
P-9 Gmail, meeting for sophomore parents and students (Redacted)
P-10 September 26, 2025, petitioner children unjustifiably accosted (Redacted)
P-11 Gmail, HIB Investigation Conclusion, retaliation with increase ban (Redacted)
P-12 Gmail email chain regarding detentions, dated December 2, 2025

(Redacted)

P-13 Gmail, parent-teacher conference (Redacted)

P-14 Gmail, conference link not working (Redacted)

P-15 Gmail, conference link not working (Redacted)

P-16 Gmail, conference link not working (Redacted)

P-17 Gmail, conference link not working (Redacted)

P-18 Email, conference link not working (Redacted)

P-19 Town hall meeting, petitioner, date change

P-20 Kids not able to attend band concerts (Redacted)

P-21 Gmail- IEP Meeting (Redacted)

P-22 OMITTED

P-23 Gmail to Siegel, dated September 11, 2025 (Redacted.

P-24 Gmail, re: bar from attending band concerts (Redacted)

P-25 My Portal Intake, NJ DCR Portal

P-26 Gmail, “Briarcliff Entry this morning” PDF (Redacted)

P-29 No attendance on campus at school-sponsored events

P-30 EDU 18852-2025 escort stop letter

P-31 January 8, 2026 letter regarding restrictions on access to school property

P-32 Email to pick up device from vestibule

P-33 Interview of Mr. Carlson, Affirmative Action complaint

P-34 Gmail, class participation grade

P-36 September 10, 2025 email regarding second shelter-in-place (Redacted);

P-37 Gmail, access to schools / allowed to attend book fair (Redacted)

P-39 Exterior Front Circle surveillance video, September 10, 2025, 12:01 PM

P-40 Screenshot of exterior side view, September 10, 2025

P-41 Dan Cacciabeve body-worn camera video, September 10, 2025, 11:56 AM

P-42 September 11, 2025 video of A.G.-F. dropping clearance letter

P-44 September 15, 2025 Board meeting, public comments.

Respondent's Exhibits:

R-1	11/17/2022-11/22/2022	Email Exchange between Principal Erik Carlson and Petitioner regarding visitor conduct
R-2	1/11/2023	Letter from former Superintendent Michael Fetherman to Petitioner and N.F. regarding visitor conduct and policy violation
R-3	1/11/2023	Email from former Superintendent Michael Fetherman to Petitioner and N.F. regarding visitor conduct and policy violation
R-4	2/01/2023	Second Letter from former Superintendent Michael Fetherman to Petitioner and N.F. regarding visitor conduct and policy violation
R-5	2/03/2023	Email from former Superintendent Michael Fetherman to Petitioner and N.F. regarding visitor conduct and policy violation
R-6	6/11/2024	Third Letter from former Superintendent Michael Fetherman to Petitioner and N.F. regarding visitor conduct and policy violation
R-7	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from School Resource Officer Barbara Giuliano displaying Petitioner and N.F. forcefully entering Briarcliff Middle School resulting in a shelter-in-place being issued
R-8	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from Officer Sean Torres capturing the incident from 9/10/2025 after Petitioner and N.F. entered Briarcliff Middle School
R-9	9/10/2025	Main entrance camera footage showing Petitioner and N.F. entering Briarcliff Middle School
R-10	9/10/2025	Hallway camera footage around 12:09 P.M. on 9/10/2025 showing Petitioner and N.F. refusing to leave Briarcliff Middle School
R-11	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from Officer Kevin Stewart around 12:13 P.M. on 9/10/2025 when Petitioner and N.F. were outside

		Briarcliff Middle School speaking to Principal Carlson and various Officers
R-12	9/10/2025	Exterior main entrance camera footage around 12:14 P.M. on 9/10/2025 after Petitioner and N.F. had already taken their child out of Briarcliff Middle School
R-13	9/10/2025	Exterior side driveway camera footage around 12:13 P.M. showing the entrance to Briarcliff Middle School when Petitioner and N.F. were outside with their child
R-14	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from Officer Dan Cacciabeve around 2:04 P.M. on 9/10/2025 showing N.F. refusing to leave Briarcliff Middle School
R-15	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from Officer Kevin Stewart around 2:04 P.M. on 9/10/2025 showing N.F. refusing to leave Briarcliff Middle School
R-16	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from Officer Dan Cacciabeve around 2:45 P.M. on 9/10/2025 when officers discuss how students believed someone brought a gun to Briarcliff Middle School
R-17	9/10/2025	Body-worn camera footage from Officer Carmello Imbruglia during Briarcliff Middle School dismissal around 2:31 P.M. on 9/10/2025
R-18	9/10/2025	Email from current Superintendent Brad Siegel prohibiting Petitioner and N.F. from entering Briarcliff Middle School due to their conduct in violation of visitor policy and N.F.’s reply refusing to comply
R-19	9/10/2025	Fourth letter from Superintendent Siegel notifying Petitioner and N.F. prohibiting Petitioner and N.F. from entering Briarcliff Middle School due to their conduct in violation of visitor policy
R-20	9/10/2025	Police investigation report and supplemental report from 9/10/2025

R-21	9/11/2025	Email from Barbara Giuliano, School Resource Officer, documenting the incident from September 10, 2025
R-22	9/12/2025	Email from Superintendent Siegel to Petitioner and N.F. attaching updated letter which expanded the prohibition against Petitioner and N.F. to all Mountain Lakes District schools and property after Petitioner sought to access Briarcliff Middle School on 9/11/2025
R-23	9/10/2025-9/12/2025	Email communication between Principal Carlson and Petitioner and N.F. wherein Carlson denies Petitioner's request to submit a clearance letter in person and offers virtual re-entry meeting for Petitioner's child.
R-24	9/12/2025	Letter from Superintendent Siegel to Petitioner and N.F. expanding the prohibition against Petitioner and N.F. to all Mountain Lakes District schools and property after Petitioner sought to access Briarcliff Middle School on 9/11/2025
R-25	9/14/2025	Email from Principal Carlson to Petitioner notifying Petitioner that she cannot attend the School Security Parent Meeting per the directive of Superintendent Siegel on 09/12/2025
R-26-36	9/22/2025	OMITTED
R-37	11/20/2025	Email from superintendent Siegel to Petitioner granting her permission to attend Book Fair, but denying access to several other events
R-38	11/28/2025	Respondent's Interrogatories and Request for Document Production
R-39	12/04/2025	OMITTED
R-40	12/05/2025	Petitioner's Response to Respondent's interrogatories
R-41	12/05/2025	OMITTED
R-42	01/08/26	OMITTED