

PHILIP D. MURPHY

Governor

SHEILA Y. OLIVER

Lt. Governor

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
DIVISION OF PENSIONS AND BENEFITS
P. O. Box 295

TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0295
Telephone (609) 292-7524 / Facsimile (609) 777-1779
TRS 711 (609) 292-6683
www.nj.gov/treasury/pensions

August 10, 2022

ELIZABETH MAHER MUOIO State Treasurer

JOHN D. MEGARIOTIS

Acting Director



RE: Paul lantosca
TPAF CONTROL TYP 03756-2021

## FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Dear Mr. Schwartz:

At its meeting on July 7, 2022, the Board of Trustees of the Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund (TPAF) considered the Initial Decision (ID) of the Honorable Matthew G. Miller, Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), dated June 14, 2022; all exhibits; the exceptions filed by Deputy Attorney General Porter Strickler, dated June 22, 2022; the reply to exceptions filed by Robert M. Schwartz, Esq., dated July 5, 2022; and the written submissions and personal statements of The Board noted the exceptions and the reply to exceptions. After careful consideration, the Board voted to adopt the ALJ's factual findings, but to reject the ALJ's decision recommending modification of the Board's partial forfeiture of Paul lantosca's service and salary credit (7 years and 9 months of service and salary) from the date he transferred to Denville Township Board of Education, July 1, 2011, through his termination of employment.

The ALJ recommended modifying the partial forfeiture amount to 2 years and 9 months of service and salary credit with a further reduction of Mr. lantosca's monthly retirement allowance of 36.5%.

Re: Paul lantosca August 10, 2022

Page 2

For the reasons set forth below, the Board rejected the ALJ's recommendation to modify

the partial forfeiture amount. The Board directed the Secretary to prepare the Findings of Fact

and Conclusions of Law as outlined below, which were approved by the TPAF Board at its meeting

on August 9, 2022. 1 This will constitute the Board's Final Administrative Determination in this

matter.

Paul lantosca was formerly employed as the Principal of Valleyview Middle School

(VVMS) in Denville, New Jersey. On May 16, 2019, Mr. lantosca engaged in inappropriate

communications with a 16 year-old, W.H., a former student at VVMS. Later that day, he was

arrested near the rugby field having arranged to meet W.H. there to

engage in sexual activity. Thereafter, he was charged with multiple offenses by the Denville Police

Department. ID at 2.

On May 17, 2019, Mr. lantosca was suspended from VVMS. On July 31, 2019, he entered

a guilty plea to a single count of child abuse (4th degree) in violation of N.J.S.A. 9:6-3 in Morris

County Superior Court. In the plea agreement, he agreed to forfeit his teaching certificate(s). On

that same day he was terminated from his position as principal. On August 19, 2019, his teaching

certificates were revoked.

On September 3, 2020, the Board weighed the "Uricoli" factors of N.J.S.A. 43:1-3 -- the

Board found that Mr. lantosca knowingly engaged in sexual communications with a minor, for his

own personal gratification, directly related to his employment. After careful consideration and

balancing of the statutory factors, the Board found that a forfeiture of his TPAF service and salary

credit beginning as of the date he transferred to VVMS, i.e. July 1, 2011, through his termination

of employment was warranted (totaling 7 years and 9 months of service and salary credit). This

forfeiture rendered Mr. lantosca ineligible for an Early retirement benefit.

<sup>1</sup> Due to health and safety concerns for the public regarding COVID-19, the Board meeting was

conducted via teleconference.

Re: Paul lantosca August 10, 2022

Page 3

You filed a timely appeal and a motion for reconsideration/interlocutory relief. At its

meeting of November 12, 2020, the Board affirmed its previous decision but granted an

administrative hearing based upon the standards for a contested case hearing set forth in the

Administrative Procedure Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 et seg. and N.J.A.C. 1:1-1.1 et seg.

The case was conferenced on May 12, 2021, July 13, 2021, October 1, 2021, December

17, 2021 and January 6, 2022 and was heard on March 8, 2022 and March 17, 2022. After

allowing time to submit supplemental arguments, the record closed on June 3, 2022. ID at 3.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW** 

N.J.S.A. 52:14B-10(c), provides for the rejection or modification of findings of fact and

conclusions of law by the ALJ so long as Board "state[s] clearly the reasons for doing so." It is

well within the right of the Board to "make new or modified findings supported by sufficient,

competent, and credible evidence in the record." Ibid. The Board accepts the ALJ's factual

findings and finds that no additional findings are needed. "The order or final decision rejecting or

modifying the initial decision shall state in clear and sufficient detail the nature of the rejection or

modification, the reasons for it, the specific evidence at hearing and interpretation of law upon

which it is based and precise changes in result or disposition caused by the rejection or

modification." N.J.A.C. 1:1-18.6(b). See In re Carter, 191 N.J. 474, 476 (2007) (There the court

erred by concluding that the punishment of removal for the sleeping charges was too severe and

substituting its own reevaluation of the case for the Board's opinion that terminated the police

officer from his position.).

The Board found that on May 16, 2019, during school hours, Mr. lantosca engaged in

sexually explicit text conversations with W.H. and arranged to meet him in-person after school to

perform sexual acts on him. ID at 20. Accordingly, the Board found that the relationship between

the misconduct and Mr. lantosca's public duties was direct. Mr. lantosca cultivated a relationship

with a former student of VVMS through his position as Principal.

Re: Paul lantosca August 10, 2022

Page 4

The factual record at hearing establishes Mr. lantosca's gross misconduct and the

corresponding factual circumstances were even more egregious than what the Board considered

in its original forfeiture determination. The ALJ noted that the Board found that Mr. lantosca

violated the trust and exploited a minor student for his own personal gain and that his actions

were calculated, manipulative and sexually vulgar. The ALJ further noted:

That the contacts between Mr. lantosca occurred during the school hours and that a school computer was used to research the age of sexual consent only exacerbated the severity of the conduct. It was emphasized that; His actions were undertaken while working at the school, with a student in the current school district, and using school resources. Indeed his crime was only made possible by the public trust that he was endowed with as a result of his public employment as a principal. Respondent also argued that while May 16, 2019 was the date of the act in question, Mr. lantosca's inappropriate activities predated this circumstance, with his inappropriately adding many children and students on his SnapChat account in his time at Denville.

[ID at 14-15.]

As emphasized above, testimony during the hearing revealed that not only was Mr. lantosca having inappropriate contacts with many children and former students but that he used a school computer to research the age of sexual consent prior to his arranged meet up with a minor, W.H.

Further, the ALJ found that Mr. lantosca was not a credible witness. ID at 23. The following conclusion was made after Mr. lantosca testified:

His testimony, in which he <u>nominally</u> "took responsibility" for his actions, in reality <u>attempted to deflect responsibility</u> for the same, pointing to psychological and physical stressors <u>as well as raising implications that he was drawn into this predicament by the four boys involved. I found his denials about his activities on the evening of to be <u>unpersuasive</u>, <u>as was his assertion that he had no interaction with the victim's brother, S.H.-1</u>, the next day at school.</u>

[ID at 23; emphasis added.]

Re: Paul lantosca August 10, 2022

Page 5

The ALJ's assessments of Mr. lantosca's credibility weighs against a reduction in forfeiture and

adds further support for a greater forfeiture than what the Board originally determined.

The Board notes that by modifying the forfeiture the ALJ ignores the salary increases that

Mr. lantosca received during his time at VVMS. The ALJ also failed to appropriately weigh that

Mr. lantosca was only 52 years old when he was terminated from VVMS and could obtain health

benefits by seeking other employment or by purchasing health benefits through the marketplace.

The ALJ specifically concluded the following with respect to Mr. lantosca:

For Mr. lantosca, the only reason he knew the victim was because of his employment, his contact with the victim's younger brother was highly disturbing and his admitted use of the school computer to research the age of consent reflects not a concern for the victim, but rather a concern for any potential consequences if he were to be caught. The audacity of a middle school principal checking the age of consent on a school computer is striking.

[ID at 28; emphasis added]

Here, Mr. lantosca admitted to committing all the requisite factual basis for the crime of

luring, found at N.J.S.A. 2C:13-6, which mandates a 5 year minimum sentence of incarceration

under N.J.S.A. 2C:43:6. ID at 28. However, through a plea agreement he only served 2 days of

incarceration and 2 years of probation. Therefore, the Board rejects the ALJ's application of Mr.

lantosca's conviction of the lesser charge of 4<sup>th</sup> degree child abuse as a mitigating factor. The

ALJ incorrectly concluded that this was "a significant penalty." ID at 29. In contrast, the Board

asserts that the ALJ should have applied it as an aggravating factor to support a greater forfeiture.

Mr. lantosca's limited jail time, probation, and the fact that he is not required to register as a sex

offender pales in comparison to a sentence representative of his egregious sexual misconduct.

The only factor that the ALJ believed weighed in favor of mitigating or reducing the

forfeiture was factor #11 because Mr. lantosca would not retain his state-sponsored health

Re: Paul lantosca August 10, 2022

Page 6

benefits. As mentioned above, Mr. lantosca would be able to obtain health benefits by finding alternate employment, or obtaining them through the federal marketplace.

For the foregoing reasons, the Board rejected the ALJ's recommendation to modify the forfeiture amount.

You have the right to appeal this administrative action to the Superior Court of New Jersey,

Appellate Division, within 45 days of the date of this letter, in accordance with the Rules Governing

the Courts of the State of New Jersey. All appeals should be directed to:

Superior Court of New Jersey Appellate Division Attn: Court Clerk PO Box 006 Trenton, NJ 08625

Sincerely,

Saretta Dudley, Secretary

Board of Trustees

Teachers' Pension and Annuity Fund

G-2/SD

c: Paul lantosca

J. Ehrmann (ET); A. Ginsburg (ET);

Retired Health Benefits Section (ET)

DAG Jeffrey Padgett (ET); DAG Porter Strickler (ET)

OAL, Attn: Library (ET)