



Re: Scott Leusner

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE  
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION ON  
JULY 29, 2015

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert M. Czech", is written over a solid horizontal line.

Robert M. Czech  
Chairperson  
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries  
and  
Correspondence

Henry Maurer  
Director  
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs  
Civil Service Commission  
Unit H  
P. O. Box 312  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

Attachment



**State of New Jersey**  
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

**INITIAL DECISION**

OAL DKT. NO. CSV 13342-11

AGENCY DKT. NO. 2012-1353

**IN THE MATTER OF SCOTT  
LEUSNER, CITY OF CAMDEN.**

---

**Cheryl L. Cooper, Esq.**, for appellant (Law Offices of Cheryl L. Cooper,  
attorneys)

**Meredith Accoo**, Assistant City Attorney, for respondent (Marc A. Riondino, City  
Attorney)

Record Closed: May 22, 2015

Decided: July 1, 2015

BEFORE **JOHN S. KENNEDY**, ALJ:

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Respondent, City of Camden (hereinafter Appointing Authority), assessed a fine upon appellant, Scott Leusner, an amount equal to a ten-day suspension. The Appointing Authority alleges that appellant, a police officer, conducted his duties in an inefficient or incompetent manner on June 9, 2010, and that a fine equal to a suspension for a period of ten days was the appropriate penalty.

Appellant was charged for this offense with violations of the Rules and Regulations of the Camden City Police Department, Disciplinary Code, Chapter 8, Rule 8.1.6(B) (R-1).

### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On August 20, 2010, the Appointing Authority issued a Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action setting forth the charges and specifications made against appellant R-1a). After a departmental hearing on September 16, 2011, the Appointing Authority issued a Final Notice of Disciplinary Action (R-1) on September 28, 2011, sustaining the charges in the Preliminary Notices and assessing a fine in the amount of \$3,770.20 equal to ten working days. Appellant appealed, and the matter was filed at the Office of Administrative Law on November 4, 2011, for hearing as contested cases pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to 15 and 14F-1 to 13. The matter was heard on several dates between August 21, 2014 and February 3, 2015. The parties were given the opportunity to submit post-hearing submissions, which occurred on May 22, 2015, and the record closed on that date.

### **FACTUAL DISCUSSION**

**John Hoffman** was a Lieutenant with the Camden City Police Department (CCPD). In 2010, the City of Camden Police Department was responsible for law enforcement within the City of Camden. On or about May 1, 2013, CCPD closed and law enforcement within the City of Camden became the responsibility of the Camden County Police Department. Hoffman has been employed by the Camden County Police Department since May 1, 2013. In 2010, Hoffman was a detective with the Internal Affairs Department in CCPD and was assigned to investigate an incident involving the appellant relating to a Compstat meeting held on June 9, 2010. Compstat is a statistically driven policing philosophy wherein weekly command staff would provide a presentation on the previous week's activities in order to allow executive staff to understand crimes and trends as an accountability measure. He followed the Attorney General's guidelines, CCPD Rules and Regulations and the New Jersey Administrative Code when he conducted his investigation. He was assigned the case by his

supervisor, Deputy Chief Wysocki. Hoffman conducted interviews, reviewed the memorandum of Captain Saponare reporting the appellant's lack of preparedness at the Compstat meeting of June 9, 2010, and reviewed a video of that meeting (P-1). He also reviewed cell phone records and the CCPD computer system known as the LEAA/CAD system to determine if appellant accessed the system or called into work during the week prior to the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting. Hoffman prepared an Internal Affairs memorandum summarizing his findings (R-6).

Hoffman's review of the CCPD computer system revealed that between June 3, 2010 and June 9, 2010, the appellant accessed the system for twenty-three minutes on June 5, 2010, seventeen minutes on June 6, 2010, and four minutes prior to the meeting on June 9, 2010 (R-6, p. 22). A review of appellant's city-issued cellular telephone records indicated that appellant had not used his phone from June 3, 2010 through June 8, 2010. Lt. Hoffman also reviewed video footage of the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting (P-1). As a result of the Investigation, it was determined that appellant was not prepared for the Compstat meeting on June 9, 2010. Although appellant was off duty on June 4, 6, 8 and half of June 7, 2010, he still had an obligation to be prepared for his presentation at Compstat on June 9, 2010, as he was unaware of the number of curfew violations or violent trends and did not report on the follow up issues he was requested to report on from the prior Compstat meeting. According to the video of the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting, appellant stated the he "didn't prepare any Compstat numbers (P-1).

**Richard Verticelli** was a Captain with the CCPD. He presented weekly at the Compstat meetings in 2010 as the tactical force commander. He would gather information and create crime maps to present to the other shift Captains at the Compstat meetings. He used the CCPD computer system and the crime mapping system to prepare for Compstat meetings. Compstat was an important tool and he prepared weekly for these meetings. Compstat meetings are recorded. Each Captain such as appellant would make presentations and questions would follow. He explained the importance of the Compstat meetings and the need to be prepared so that accurate data could be relayed to the other shifts within the department. This assisted in law enforcement efforts throughout the department.

**Joseph Saponare** was Acting Police Inspector for the CCPD in 2010 and is now a Lieutenant with the Camden County Police Department. On June 10, 2010, he sent a memorandum to Deputy Chief Wysocki recommending progressive discipline against appellant based on his unpreparedness for the Compstat meeting on June 9, 2010 (R-2). Compstat attendees analyze the crimes of the previous week broken down into three shifts and the Captains made presentations in an effort to show awareness and try to institute plans to stop criminal activity. Appellant was given follow up issues to report on from the previous week's Compstat meeting including curfew enforcement, low performers for the month of May 2010 and in-service times by the night shift. On June 9, 2010, appellant failed to report on his shift's low performers for the month of May. He was also unaware of the number of curfew violators taken into short term custody on the most recent curfew run that occurred on June 8, 2010, and failed to make operational adjustments in response to nine robberies that occurred on his tour during the prior week. Compstat reporting period runs from Monday to Sunday of the week immediately preceding the Compstat meeting. Compstat meetings are typically held on Wednesdays. While Saponare agreed that June 8, 2010 was the Tuesday before the Compstat meeting and outside of the reporting period, appellant should have known the numbers from the curfew run on June 8, 2010, as this was an issue he was instructed to report on as a follow up from the previous Compstat meeting. Appellant reported at the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting that he does not follow crime trends daily.

In June 2010, appellant held the position of Acting Captain. The Captains that presented and Compstat would commonly help one another to prepare for the meetings. Appellant was not the best public speaker among the Captains that presented at Compstat but his presentations improved after June 9, 2010. While appellant had several days off during the week prior to the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting, it was still his responsibility to be prepared for his presentation. In October 2010, all interim or acting positions were eliminated and all employees were placed back to their previous civil service rank. This included Saponare and the appellant.

**Anthony Moffa** was a Lieutenant with CCPD in 2010. He was the watch commander for the 9:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. shift and he reported directly to appellant. The appellant was responsible to oversee the daily operations of his platoon. Moffa

was on vacation from June 1, 2010 through June 10, 2010. His days off would have been approved by a Capitan but he does not recall if appellant approved his vacation for that week. Lieutenant Davenport also reported to appellant and he would likely not have been on vacation or been approved off duty since Moffa and appellant had time off during the time in question. It was not difficult to generate reports off of the LEAA/CAD system. On June 9, 2010, appellant sent Moffa and Davenport an email that advised that he "was made to look like an ass" for not identifying the three lowest performers on each platoon (R-9). The email made reference to a previous email dated June 2, 2010 wherein he directed his Lieutenants to obtain this information for him (R-8).

Appellant testified that he was appointed interim Captain in January 2010 and he was a patrol Lieutenant from 2005 until January 2010. He was employed with CCPD from 1994 until it's dissolution in May 2013. As an interim Captain, appellant duties included supervising the evening shift patrol, making operational adjustments, presenting information regarding his command at the weekly Compstat meetings, supervising and controlling two patrol platoons and operating the LEAA/CAD system. He had a working knowledge of the LEAA/CAD system and knew how to generate reports from the system. At the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting, appellant was prepared and had a binder of relevant statistics and reports. He had a week to prepare for the follow up questions from the prior Compstat meeting and was aware that he would be required to make a presentation as to those items. He did most of his reporting research on Mondays because the LEAA/CAD system had complete statistics for the week on Mondays. He was only in the Police Department for half a day on the Monday immediately prior to the June 9th Compstat meeting as he worked the Police Honor Guard for part of the day. Appellant admits that he did not have information regarding low performers and he should have. He corrected the mistake and improvements in his Compstat reporting were noted by Saponare.

**John Sosinavage** was a Lieutenant when he was laid off from the CCPD on May 1, 2013 after eighteen years and eight months on the job. In June 2010, he was a Captain. He has been a Lieutenant in the Internal Affairs (IA) Department and understands that IA investigations must be conducted in accordance with Attorney General's guidelines. He became Captain in November 2009 until October 2010 and

reported at the Compstat meetings during this time. The captains received no formal training on how to present at Compstat but received assistance from the other captains. He generally prepared for Compstat throughout the week but spent most of Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday mornings gathering reports. He personally ran most of the Compstat reports he presented on and would share information with the other captains. In 2010, Sosinavage was the vice president of the union in which the appellant was a member. He was aware that appellant was demoted in October 2010 but was not charged with any additional discipline. The disciplinary charges relating to the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting had not been resolved at the time appellant was demoted in October 2010.

**Joseph Wysocki** was hired in 1991 and obtained his highest rank of Lieutenant in 2008. He was assigned to IA in April 2009 and was responsible to oversee that department to ensure investigations were complete and followed the Attorney General's Guidelines. Once an investigation was complete, Wysocki would bring it to the Chief of Police and he would decide if discipline was warranted. While he never presented at Compstat he was held to the same type of scrutiny when briefing the chief regarding IA matters. Those briefings were private and less formal than Compstat but in both situations you are expected to know every answer without hesitation.

Wysocki recalls interviewing appellant during this investigation and reviewing the LEAA/CAD records and video of the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting. Appellant told Wysocki in an interview conducted on June 16, 2010 that it was his responsibility to be aware of what is going on during his tour whether he was off duty or not (R-21). Appellant further admitted that he failed to report his low performers for the month of May 2010 which was a follow up issue from the previous week and that it was his fault that he was deficient in this regard. Appellant also admitted that he was unaware of the number of curfew violators and gave the accurate number by chance after taking time to research the figure. He admitted that he did not adequately prepare himself to be "100% sure." Id. The statements appellant made in his interviews, the LEAA/CAD records and the video of the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting show that appellant was unprepared for the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting. The other captains took more time to prepare and spent more time reviewing the LEAA/Cad system.



## FINDINGS OF FACT

After carefully reviewing the exhibits and documentary evidence presented numerous times 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 be the relevant and credible **FACTS** in this matter:

On or about May 1, 2013, CCPD closed and law enforcement within the City of Camden became the responsibility of the Camden County Police Department. Hoffman has been employed by the Camden County Police Department since May 1, 2013. In 2010, Hoffman, a detective with the Internal Affairs Department in CCPD, was assigned to investigate an incident involving the appellant relating to a Compstat meeting held on June 9, 2010. Compstat is a statistically driven policing philosophy wherein weekly command staff would provide a presentation on the previous week's activities in order to allow executive staff to understand crimes and trends as an accountability measure. Hoffman conducted interviews, reviewed the memorandum of Captain Saponare reporting the appellant's lack of preparedness at the Compstat meeting of June 9, 2010, and reviewed a video of that meeting. He also reviewed cell phone records and the CCPD computer system known as the LEAA/CAD system to determine if appellant accessed the system or called into work during the week prior to the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting. Hoffman prepared an Internal Affairs memorandum summarizing his findings. Between June 3, 2010 and June 9, 2010, the appellant accessed the system for twenty-three minutes on June 5, 2010, seventeen minutes on June 6, 2010, and four minutes prior to the meeting on June 9, 2010, and had not used his city-issued phone from June 3, 2010 through June 8, 2010. Appellant was off duty on June 4, 6, 8 and half of June 7, 2010.

Appellant was given follow up issues to report on from the previous week's Compstat meeting including curfew enforcement, low performers for the month of May 2010 and in-service times by the night shift. On June 9, 2010, appellant failed to report on his shift's low performers for the month of May. He was also unaware of the number of curfew violators taken into short term custody on the most recent curfew run that occurred on June 8, 2010. Compstat reporting period runs from Monday to Sunday of

the week immediately preceding the Compstat meeting. Compstat meetings are typically held on Wednesdays. In June 2010, appellant held the position of interim Captain. As an interim Captain, appellant's duties included supervising the evening shift patrol, making operational adjustments, presenting information regarding his command at the weekly Compstat meetings, supervising and controlling two patrol platoons and operating the LEAA/CAD system. He had a working knowledge of the LEAA/CAD system and knew how to generate reports from the system. Appellant was not the best public speaker among the Captains that presented at Compstat but his presentations improved after June 9, 2010. In October 2010, all interim or acting positions were eliminated and all employees were placed back to their previous civil service rank. This included Saponare, Sosinavage and the appellant.

On June 9, 2010, appellant sent Moffa and Davenport an email that advised that he "was made to look like an ass" for not identifying the three lowest performers on each platoon. The email made reference to a previous email dated June 2, 2010, wherein he directed his Lieutenants to obtain this information for him. The captains received no formal training on how to present at Compstat but received assistance from the other captains. Appellant was demoted in October 2010 but was not charged with any additional discipline. The disciplinary charges relating to the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting had not been resolved at the time appellant was demoted in October 2010.

Appellant told Wysocki in an interview conducted on June 16, 2010 that it was his responsibility to be aware of what is going on during his tour whether he was off duty or not. Appellant further admitted that he failed to report his low performers for the month of May 2010 which was a follow up issue from the previous week and that it was his fault that he was deficient in this regard. Appellant also admitted that he was unaware of the number of curfew violators and gave the accurate number by chance after taking time to research the figure. He admitted that he did not adequately prepare himself to be "100% sure."

## 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 was charged with violations of the Rules and Regulations of the Camden City Police Department, Disciplinary Code, Chapter 8, Rule 8.1.6(B). Pursuant to those Rules and Regulations, incompetency or inefficiency shall be cause for removal from service. Absence of judgment alone can be sufficient to warrant termination if the employee is in a sensitive position that requires public trust in the agency's judgment. See In re Herrmann, 192 N.J. 19, 32 (2007) (DYFS worker who waved a lit cigarette lighter in a five-year-old's face was terminated, despite lack of any prior discipline).

"There is no constitutional or statutory right to a government job." State-Operated Sch. Dist. of Newark v. Gaines, 309 N.J. Super. 327, 334 (App. Div. 1998). (NOTE: Gaines had a substantial prior disciplinary history, but the case is frequently quoted as a threshold statement of civil service law.) "In addition, there is no right or reason for a government to continue employing an incompetent and inefficient individual after a showing of inability to change." Klusaritz v. Cape May County, 387 N.J. Super. 305, 317 (App. Div. 2006) (termination was the proper remedy for a County treasurer who couldn't balance the books, after the auditors tried three times to show him how).

In reversing the MSB's insistence on progressive discipline, contrary to the wishes of the appointing authority, the Klusaritz panel stated that "[t]he [MSB's] application of progressive discipline in this context is misplaced and contrary to the public interest." The court determined that Klusaritz's prior record is "of no moment" because his lack of competence to perform the job rendered him unsuitable for the job and subject to termination by the county.

[In re Herrmann, 192 N.J. 19, 35-36 (2007) (citations omitted).]

There is no definition in the administrative code of the term "inefficiency," and therefore, it has been left to interpretation. In general, incompetence, inefficiency, or failure to perform duties exists where the employee's conduct demonstrates an unwillingness or inability to meet, obtain or produce effects or results necessary for adequate performance. Clark v. New Jersey Dep't of Agric., 1 N.J.A.R. 315 (1980).

The fundamental concept that one should be able to perform the duties of the position is stated in Briggs v. Department of Civil Service, 64 N.J. Super. 351, 356 (App. Div. 1960), which happens to be a probationary period case involving a nurse:

Manifestly, the purpose of the probationary period is to further test a probationer's qualifications. Neither the Legislature nor the Commission has given the courts any guidance in determining the extent of assistance or orientation which a probationer must receive. Undoubtedly her duties must be explained to her and she must be given reasonable opportunity to perform the duties expected of her. But this does not mean she is entitled to on-the-job training in the manner of performing her duties. This is what she must be qualified for -- the proper performance of her duties as outlined by the appointing authority.

Appellant's status as a police 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).]

The LEAA/CAD system has information with respect to all crime activities and police reports. Appellant was aware of how to use the LEAA/CAD system and had access to the system to pull up weekly statistics, officers and squad unit. Further, the Department provided appellant with a mobile phone which gave appellant the ability to communicate with members of the Department. A review of the record shows that appellant made no phone calls to the Police Department on his city-issued mobile phone during the week leading up to the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting. A review of the LEAA/CAD system reveals that appellant accessed the system for a total of forty-four minutes during that same week.

Appellant was aware that the duties of his interim position as captain required that he prepare for Compstat and was aware that he had to make a presentation that included follow up questions from the prior week. Appellant did not know the number of curfew violators and he was not prepared to answer his follow-up questions from the previous June 2, 2010 Compstat meeting.

I **CONCLUDE**, based on the statements appellant made in his interviews, the LEAA/CAD records and the video of the June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting, that appellant

was unable to perform the duties requested of him that he be prepared for Compstat in a timely and satisfactory manner. Therefore, I **CONCLUDE** that the Appointing Authority has met its burden of proof on this issue.

Appellant asserts that the charges should be dismissed as duplicative discipline since he was demoted in September 2010. The testimony of two other officers (Saponare and Sosinavage) indicates that all interim or acting positions were eliminated and all employees were placed back to their previous civil service rank. Appellant's own argument concedes that no other discipline was issued against him and the "Flattening" of the Camden Police Department occurred on October 6, 2010. There has been no testimony presented or documentation to support that appellant was demoted as a result of the charges at issue here. As such, I **CONCLUDE** that the Appointing Authority did not duplicate the discipline against appellant.

### **PENALTY**

In determining the appropriateness of a penalty, several factors must be considered, including the nature of the employee's offense, the concept of progressive discipline, and the employee's prior record. George v. N. Princeton Developmental Ctr., 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 463. Pursuant to West New York v. Bock, 38 N.J. 500, 523-24 (1962), concepts of progressive discipline involving penalties of increasing severity are used where appropriate. See also In re Parlo, 192 N.J. Super. 247 (App. Div. 1983). However, where the charged dereliction is an act which, in view of the duties and obligations of the position, substantially disadvantages the public, good cause exists for removal. See Golaine v. Cardinale, 142 N.J. Super. 385 (Law Div. 1976), aff'd, 163 N.J. Super. 453 (App. Div. 1978); In re Herrmann, 192 N.J. 19 (2007). The question to be resolved is whether the discipline imposed in this case is appropriate.

For his actions arising out of this incident, appellant has been found to have violated the Rules and Regulations of the Camden City Police Department, Disciplinary Code, Chapter 8, Rule 8.1.6(B), "incompetency or inefficiency." Appellant received a fine in the amount of \$3,770.20 equal to ten working days. The Appointing Authority provided appellant's disciplinary record which included two written reprimands for

violations of Rule 8.1.6 "Inefficiency" (R-4, R-5). Each of these reprimands give appellant notice that any future violations of this nature will result in appropriate progressive discipline. After having considered all of the proofs offered in this matter, and the impact upon the CCPD regarding the behavior by appellant herein, and after having given due deference to the impact of and the role to be considered by and relative to progressive discipline, I **CONCLUDE** that appellant's violations are significant enough to warrant a penalty, which, in part, is meant to impress upon him, as well as others, the seriousness of any further infractions by her in that regard. Therefore, I **CONCLUDE** that the imposition of a fine in the amount of \$3,770.20 equal to ten working days was an appropriate penalty.

### **DISPOSITION**

I **CONCLUDE** that the Appointing Authority has sustained its burden of proof as to the charge of violation of Rules and Regulations of the Camden City Police Department, Disciplinary Code, Chapter 8, Rule 8.1.6(B) (R-1).

Accordingly, I **ORDER** that the action of the Appointing Authority is **AFFIRMED**. Appellant will receive a fine in the amount of \$3,770.20 equal to ten working days.

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. 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 **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.

July 1, 2015  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOHN S. KENNEDY, ALJ

Date Received at Agency:

July 1, 2015  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date Mailed to Parties:

July 1, 2015  
\_\_\_\_\_

cmo



**APPENDIX**  
**LIST OF WITNESSES**

**For Appellant:**

Scott Leusner, Appellant  
Joseph Sosinavage  
Joseph Wysocki

**For Respondent:**

John Hoffman  
Richard Verticelli  
Joseph Saponare  
Anthony Moffa

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

**For Appellant:**

P-1 Video of June 9, 2010 Compstat meeting  
P-2 Attorney General Guidelines, Page 19

**For Respondent:**

R-1 Final Notice of Disciplinary Action with Specifications for Appellant Scott Leusner  
R-1A Preliminary Notice of Disciplinary Action with Specifications for Appellant Scott Leusner  
R-2 Camden City Police Department Uniform Operations Bureau Memorandum regarding Implementation of Progressive Discipline (June 10, 2010)  
R-3 Disciplinary History of Appellant Scott Leusner

- R-4 February 4, 2010 Written Reprimand: Violation of Rule 8.1.6 "Inefficiency"
- R-5 March 9, 2010 Written Reprimand: Violation of Rule 8.1.6 "Inefficiency"
- R-6 Camden City Police Department Professional Standards Bureau  
Memorandum regarding Internal Affairs Number 10-130 (August 25, 2010)
- R-7 Electronic Mail Message from inspector Joseph Saponare to Robert Frett,  
John Sosinavage and Scott Leusner with Compstat Agenda attached  
thereto
- R-8 Two (2) Forwarded Electronic Mail messages regarding "Compstat  
Meeting" from Anthony Davenport to Joseph Hoffman
- R-9 Electronic Mail Message from Scott Leusner to Anthony Moffa
- R-10 Compstat Week #23 (May 31-June 6) Minutes
- R-11 Compstat Week #24 (June 7-June 13) Minutes
- R-12 Curfew Reporting Statistics for Week #23 (May 31-June 6)
- R-13 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Lt. Anthony Davenport
- R-14 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Lt. Richard Verticelli
- R-15 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Captain John Sosinavage
- R-16 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Lt. Anthony Moffa
- R-17 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Inspector Joseph Saponare
- R-18 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Captain Robert Frett
- R-19 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Captain Scott Leusner, August 11, 2010
- R-20 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Deputy Chief Michael Lynch
- R-21 City of Camden, New Jersey Bureau of Police Internal Affairs Case #10-  
130, Statement of Captain Scott Leusner, June 16, 2010