

C.G., on behalf of minor child, G.G.,	:	
Petitioner,	:	
V.	:	Commissioner of Education
Board of Education of the	:	Decision
Township of Morris,	:	
Morris County,	:	
Respondent.	:	

**Synopsis**

*Pro se* petitioner challenged the determination of the respondent Board that her daughter was ineligible for a free public education in the Morris Township Schools during the period from January 20, 2017 through February 2, 2018. The respondent Board contended that a residency investigation indicated that petitioner and her daughter are no longer domiciled at the Morristown address provided to the school district, but rather are now domiciled out of district, at an address in Randolph Township, New Jersey. The Board filed a counterclaim for tuition for the period of the children’s ineligible attendance.

The ALJ found, *inter alia*, that: pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 18A:38-1(a), public schools are free to persons over five and under twenty years of age who are domiciled within the school district, or are kept in the home of another person domiciled in the district and supported by such other person gratis, as if she were such other person’s child; here, the evidence shows that the petitioner and her child lived in Morristown until January 2017, when C.G. purchased a home in Randolph; G.G. continued to attend school in Morris Township Schools after the mother and daughter relocated to Randolph; after receiving a notice of ineligibility from the District, C.G. withdrew G.G. for a short period of time, only to re-enroll her after procuring a court order which granted residential custody of G.G. to a friend of C.G.’s who is domiciled in Morristown; the Board once again conducted a residency investigation to find that G.G. was still residing in Randolph with her mother despite the court order; as a result, the District determined that neither C.G. nor G.G. are domiciled within the school district, and therefore G.G. is not entitled to a free public education in Morris Township Schools. Accordingly, the school district is entitled to collect tuition from C.G. for the period of G.G.’s ineligible attendance during the period of January 18, 2017 through February 2, 2018 at a rate of \$86.02 per day, for a total of 381 days. The ALJ ordered petitioner to reimburse the Board for tuition in the amount of \$26,769.81.

Upon review, the Commissioner concurred with the ALJ that G.G. was not domiciled in the District between January 20, 2017 and February 2, 2018. However, the Commissioner found that the amount of tuition owed is not clear from the record or the Initial Decision. Accordingly, the matter is remanded to the OAL for the calculation of tuition costs owed for the period of G.G.’s ineligible attendance.

This synopsis is not part of the Commissioner’s decision. It has been prepared for the convenience of the reader. It has been neither reviewed nor approved by the Commissioner.

January 30, 2019

C.G., on behalf of minor child, G.G., :  
Petitioner, :  
V. : Commissioner of Education  
Board of Education of the : Decision  
Township of Morris, :  
Morris County, :  
Respondent. :

---

The record of this matter and the Initial Decision of the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) have been reviewed.<sup>1</sup> The petitioner, C.G., is challenging the Morris Township Board of Education’s (Board) determination that G.G. was not eligible to attend school in the District between January 20, 2017 and February 2, 2018. After a hearing at the OAL, the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) found that G.G. was not domiciled in the District between January 20, 2017 and February 2, 2018 and assessed tuition in the amount of \$26,769.81 for G.G.’s ineligible attendance in the District.<sup>2</sup>

Upon a comprehensive review of the record, the Commissioner concurs with the ALJ that G.G. was not domiciled in the District between January 20, 2017 and February 2, 2018. With respect to the amount of tuition owed to the District for G.G.’s ineligible attendance, the Commissioner finds that this matter must be remanded to the OAL for the proper development of the record.

The Commissioner of Education is expressly authorized to assess tuition pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 18A: 38-1b(2) and *N.J.A.C.* 6A:22-6.2(a), to a parent or guardian for a minor child’s ineligible attendance in a school district. Importantly, “tuition shall be computed on the basis of 1/180 of the total annual per pupil cost to the local district multiplied by the number of days of

---

<sup>1</sup> The record does not include a transcript of the hearing held at the OAL on November 13, 2018.

<sup>2</sup> The petitioner did not appear at the November 13, 2018 hearing.

ineligible attendance.” *Id.* In the Initial Decision, the ALJ inexplicably calculated the tuition assessment based on the number of calendar days between January 20, 2017 and February 2, 2018. The ALJ states that the per diem tuition rate is \$86.01, and that rate multiplied by 381 days of ineligible attendance amounts to a total of \$26,769.81 due to the District.<sup>3</sup>

The only evidence in the record regarding the tuition rate is found in the Board’s final letter of ineligibility, dated April 3, 2018, where it states that the tuition rate is \$86.01. It is not clear if \$86.01 was the tuition rate for the 2017-2018 school year as well as the 2016-2017 school year. There is also nothing in the record that indicates the number of school days between January 20, 2017 and February 2, 2018.<sup>4</sup> The Board’s submissions provide no clearer indication as to the accurate amount of tuition that should be assessed to the petitioner. In light of the fact that the Board did not submit an affidavit outlining the tuition costs – and the record does not contain a transcript from the hearing at the OAL – it is impossible to ascertain the correct tuition amount that is owed to the District.

Accordingly, this matter is remanded to the OAL for the calculation of tuition costs owed to the District for G.G.’s ineligible attendance in Morris Township Schools. In reaching a decision on the tuition assessment, the ALJ should be mindful that the Commissioner may only “assess tuition for the period during which the appeal was pending, and for up to one year of a student’s ineligible attendance in the district prior to the appeal’s filing and including the 21-day period to file an appeal.” *N.J.A.C.* 6A:22-6.2(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Date of Decision: January 30, 2019

Date of Mailing: January 30, 2019

---

<sup>3</sup> Even if 381 was the correct number of days of G.G.’s ineligible attendance, \$86.01 multiplied by 381 would equal \$32,769.81, not \$26,769.81.

<sup>4</sup> The Board is seeking tuition for two separate school years.



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

**INITIAL DECISION**

OAL DKT. NO. EDU 07231-18

AGENCY REF. NO. 98-4/18

**C.G. ON BEHALF OF G.G.,**

Petitioner,

v.

**BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE TOWNSHIP  
OF MORRIS, MORRIS COUNTY,**

Respondent.

---

**C.G.**, Parent of **G.G.**, Petitioner, pro se

**Janelle Edwards-Stewart**, Esq., for Respondent (Porzio, Bromberg & Newman,  
attorneys)

Record closed: November 13, 2018

Decided: December 21, 2018

BEFORE **JOHN P. SCOLLO**, ALJ:

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

Petitioner C.G. challenges the “Notice of Final Determination of Ineligibility” dated April 3, 2018, (R-12) rendered by the Morris Township School District (Morris Township B.O.E. or Board), which determined that C.G. was ineligible to attend Morris Township Schools during the period from January 20, 2017, through February 2, 2018. Petitioner

C.G. also seeks an Order relieving her from any obligation to pay for tuition for her daughter, G.G., to the Morris Township School District.

### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On January 24, 2018, the Superintendent of the Morris Township School District (the District) sent a "Notice of Initial Determination of Ineligibility" (R-11) to C.G. advising her that the District determined that she and her daughter, G.G., did not reside in the District based on its investigation, including an interview of C.G. at her home in Randolph Township. The District offered C.G. the opportunity to appear at a hearing before the Morris Township Board of Education to contest the District's determination. C.G. declined the offer of a hearing and withdrew G.G. A short time later Rosemary Strelec, a friend of C.G. who resided in Morristown (a town within the Morris Township School District) sought and obtained an Order (R-20) from the Superior Court, Chancery Division granting residential custody of G.G. to her with liberal visitation rights for C.G. Strelec re-enrolled G.G. in the District's school. The District conducted a second investigation which confirmed its previous opinion that neither C.G. nor G.G. was domiciled in the District.

C.G. filed a Residency Appeal on April 18, 2018, with the Department of Education, which was transmitted to the OAL on May 17, 2018, and filed on May 18, 2018, under the Administrative Procedure Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 to -15 and the act establishing the Office of Administrative Law, N.J.S.A. 52:14F-1 to -23 for a hearing under the Uniform Administrative Procedure Rules, N.J.A.C. 1:1-1.1 to -21.6, and the rules of procedure established by the Department of Education to hear and decide controversies and disputes arising under school laws, N.J.A.C. 6A:3-1.1 to -1.17. Jurisdiction is conferred under N.J.S.A. 18A:6-9.

An initial telephone conference was held on June 29, 2018, and a Pre-Hearing Order was issued on that date. On or about July 20, 2018, the Tribunal received correspondence from C.G. stating that she wished to withdraw her appeal. The Tribunal processed this as a withdrawal, closed the file, and returned the file to the Department of Education. On August 24, 2018, counsel for the Respondent brought the

provisions of N.J.A.C. 6A:22-6.2 to the Tribunal's attention and demanded the right to a hearing to present its proofs for the charging of tuition against C.G. On October 18, 2018, the Tribunal held a telephone conference on the record with C.G. and Janelle Edwards-Stewart, Esq., counsel to the District. During that telephone conference the ALJ explained that he had erred when he processed the withdrawal and closed the file. The ALJ set the hearing date for November 13, 2018. The ALJ warned the parties that failure to appear at the hearing on November 13, 2018, would result in an adverse verdict for the non-appearing side, that is, a marking of "Failed to Appear," and that the presentation of proofs by the appearing side would take place. On November 13, 2018, the hearing was held, but neither C.G. nor anyone else appeared for the Petitioner's side. The Respondent presented its proofs at that hearing. On the date of the hearing the Tribunal was not aware of any bankruptcy petitions filed by the Petitioner.

### **TESTIMONY**

The following is not intended to be a verbatim recitation of the testimony, but rather only highlights of the testimony, which the ALJ found especially relevant and important.

#### **Testimony of Debora Engelfried**

Debora Engelfried (Engelfried) presented a binder of twenty-two tabbed documents and utilized most of them during her testimony. Engelfried testified that the Morris Township School District contains the towns of Morristown and Morris Plains. Persons between the ages of five and twenty years of age who are domiciled in those towns are eligible to enroll in the District's public schools. The Morris Township Board of Education is the body that presides over and operates the District.

Engelfried testified that when students enroll in one of the District's schools his or her parents or legal guardians are asked to provide various documents which would prove that they are domiciled in the District. These can include documents such as the child's birth certificate, utility bills, leases, deeds, mortgages, etc.

Engelfried testified that there is a recurring problem of people who attempt to enroll their children in the District's schools even though they are not bona fide domiciliaries of the District. She testified that when non-domiciliaries enroll in the District's schools, they use resources that should be utilized for students who are bona fide District domiciliaries. The District's efforts to detect the enrollment of people who are not domiciled in the District often involves utilizing the services of a private detective, named Jeffrey Oster.

In regard to G.G.'s enrollment in one of the District's schools, Engelfried testified that the parent of one of G.G.'s classmates alleged that G.G. and her mother, C.G. were no longer living in the District and provided the address of their actual residence in Randolph Township, which has its own school district. Engelfried testified about social media posts by C.G. (R-17), which demonstrated that C.G. and G.G. moved into their Randolph home on January 18, 2017.

Engelfried testified that the District initiated an investigation. Using the address information supplied by C.G. when she enrolled G.G., the District discovered that they were no longer living in their former apartment on Village Drive in Morristown. A search at the Morris County Registry of Deeds and Mortgages revealed that C.G. purchased a home in Randolph Township on January 18, 2017. (R-22 is a copy of C.G.'s Deed to the Randolph home.) Utilizing the surveillance services of Private Investigator Jeffrey Oster (Oster or the detective), Engelfried testified that the District obtained information from him that C.G. and G.G. resided in Randolph in January 2018. Specifically, on January 23, 2018 C.G. admitted to Oster that she and G.G. resided at the Randolph home. (See R-6.)

Engelfried testified that she communicated with C.G. regarding whether she and G.G. were properly domiciled in the District or whether they had changed their domicile to Randolph Township. In the interim, the Board of Education issued its "Notice of Initial Determination of Ineligibility," dated January 24, 2018 (R-11), in which it informed C.G. that G.G. was improperly enrolled in the District's school and it asked C.G. to either withdraw G.G. from the District's school voluntarily or opt for a hearing before the Board of Education. Engelfried testified that she and C.G. spoke about the investigation and

that C.G. decided to withdraw G.G. and enroll her in the Randolph schools on February 2, 2018. However, Engelfried further testified that only a short time later, C.G. asked her how long it would take to re-enroll G.G. in the District's school, an inquiry which Engelfried thought was peculiar. Engelfried testified that shortly thereafter Rosemary Strelec (Strelec), C.G.'s friend, who was domiciled in Morristown, procured an Order from the Morris County Superior Court, Chancery Division on March 19, 2018 (see R-20), which granted residential custody of G.G. to Strelec and granted liberal visitation rights to C.G. On March 19, 2018 Strelec submitted paperwork to re-enroll G.G. in the District's school and G.G. was re-enrolled on April 9, 2018.

Engelfried testified that paperwork from the Randolph Township school system stated that as of February 2, 2018, (the date that C.G. enrolled G.G. in the Randolph School system) C.G. stated that she had sole custody of G.G. She further testified that Strelec gave a copy of the Court Order to the Morris Township School District and informed the District that G.G. has lived with her since March 19, 2018. She testified that the change of custody in such a short time and the statement that G.G. lived with Strelec only since March 19, 2018, were among the circumstances which led her to initiate a second investigation to find out if G.G. was actually residing with Strelec in Morristown or was still residing with her mother in Randolph. Again, Oster's services were utilized. Engelfried testified that Oster's surveillance indicated that G.G. was not residing with Strelec and that G.G. continued to reside with her mother in Randolph. (See R-6, R-7 and R-8.) As a result of this investigation the District decided that neither C.G. nor G.G. were domiciliaries of the District, that G.G. was not entitled to a free public education in the Morris Township School District and that per diem tuition would be sought.

### **Testimony of Jeffrey Oster, Private Detective**

Jeffrey Oster testified that he was a licensed private detective and was a retired detective sergeant from the Mine Hill Police Department.

Oster testified that he went to the Randolph home on January 23, 2018, and spoke with C.G. about the investigation into whether she and G.G. were domiciled in



Morris Township. C.G. admitted that she was the owner of the Randolph home and stated that she moved into the home in the Summer of 2017, but that G.G. sometimes stayed overnight with Strelec in Morristown. Oster mentioned that C.G. did not mention anything about sharing custody of G.G. with Strelec. Oster reported this information to the District. (R-6.)

Oster testified that on March 26, 2018, he was asked by the District to conduct a second investigation. He was aware of the Court Order granting residential custody of G.G. to Strelec. He testified that he conducted surveillance of Strelec's home on March 27 and 28, 2018, both of which were school days, and reported that no child came out of Strelec's residence on either day. (R-8.)

Oster testified that he was aware that G.G. was re-enrolled into the District school on April 5, 2018. He testified that he conducted surveillance of the Randolph home on April 11, 12, and 13, 2018, (all of which were school days) and on those dates he observed C.G. and G.G. leave the Randolph home in the early morning (from 6:45 a.m. to 7:15 a.m.) and drive away in C.G.'s car. He also took several photographs of C.G. and G.G. exiting the home and entering C.G.'s car. Oster testified that on each day he contacted the District and learned that G.G. was in school.

Oster testified that he believes that C.G. became aware of his surveillance activities. During surveillance conducted on April 16, 17 and 18, 2018, he did not see G.G. leave the Randolph home. He testified that he had spoken directly with C.G. at her home on January 23, 2018, and so she already knew who he was. Oster testified that he conducted surveillance on April 25 and 26, 2018. Both were school days. He testified that on April 25, 2018, he saw C.G. leave her home with G.G. and enter a new Land Rover car, which was registered to her. On this occasion C.G. stopped her car near Oster's car and looked straight at him. The next morning, April 26, 2018, C.G. left her home without G.G. Oster testified that he spoke with the District and learned that G.G. was in school on both days. (See R-9 and R-10.) In his report to the District dated April 26, 2018, (R-10) he concluded that G.G. was not residing with Strelec in Morristown and that she was residing with her mother, C.G., in the Randolph home.

## **FACTUAL DISCUSSION**

No one appeared at the hearing on behalf of C.G. Therefore, the testimony of the witnesses for the Morris Township Board of Education was received without objection in its entirety, as summarized above.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

Having had the opportunity to examine the documents presented and to hear the witnesses and to assess their credibility, I make the following **FINDINGS of FACT**:

1. C.G. and G.G., formerly of Morristown, moved into their new home in Randolph, NJ on January 18, 2017. (See R-17 and R-22.)
2. C.G.'s social media post of January 18, 2017, (R-17) constitutes an admission that she and her daughter, G.G., resided in the Randolph home from January 18, 2017, forward.
3. G.G. remained enrolled in a Morris Township school after January 18, 2017.
4. Upon information from a school parent, officials from the Morris Township School District conducted an investigation into whether C.G. and G.G. were domiciled in Morris Township. That investigation resulted in the District concluding that C.G. and G.G. were no longer domiciled in Morris Township as of January 18, 2017. (See R-11.)
5. As a result of the District's investigation and of the issuing of the "Notice of Initial Determination of Ineligibility" by the District, C.G. withdrew G.G. from the Morris Township school in which she had been enrolled and registered her in a Randolph Township school.
6. Rosemary Strelec, who is domiciled in Morristown and who is a friend of C.G., initiated an action to obtain residential custody of G.G. On March 19, 2018,

the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Morris County issued an Order entered on March 22, 2018, granting residential custody to Strelec and granting liberal visitation rights to C.G.

7. Having been granted residential custody of G.G. by the Chancery Division, Strelec submitted paperwork to re-enroll G.G. in school in Morris Township and G.G. was re-enrolled on April 9, 2018.
8. Due to unsettled facts and apparent inconsistencies in the facts as related by C.G., the District decided to, once again, verify the actual domicile of C.G. and G.G. The District undertook a second investigation which involved surveillance of Strelec's home and C.G.'s home. The testimony of the District's private investigator, Jeffrey Oster, along with clear and convincing photographic evidence, convinces this Tribunal that G.G. resided almost exclusively with her mother, C.G., at the Randolph home and that she did not leave for school on school days from Strelec's home.
9. As a result of the second investigation the District sent a "Notice of Final Determination of Ineligibility" dated April 3, 2018, to C.G. (R-12.)
10. The District proved by a preponderance of the credible evidence that C.G. sent her daughter G.G. to school in Morris Township during period of time, specifically January 18, 2017, through February 2, 2018, when they were not domiciled in Morris Township, a total of 381 days.
11. Several days after the November 13, 2018, hearing the Tribunal received information (a letter from an attorney representing C.G.) that C.G. had filed for bankruptcy.

### **APPLICABLE LAW**

N.J.S.A. 18A:36-19a provides "the school district shall obtain proper identification of any new student such as a certified copy of the student's certificate of birth." N.J.S.A.

18A:36-25.1(a) provides “When a child is enrolled in a school district for the first time, the superintendent shall require the child’s parent or legal guardian to provide a certified copy of the child’s birth certificate or other proof of the child’s identity, within 30 days of enrollment.”

Public schools are free to persons over five and under twenty years of age who are domiciled within the school district or are kept in the home of another person domiciled within the school district and supported by such other person *gratis* as if he were such other person’s own child. N.J.S.A. 18A:38-1(a). If the school district finds that the parent or guardian of a child who is attending the schools of the district is not domiciled within the district and the child is not kept in the home of another person domiciled within the school district and supported by such person *gratis* as if the child was the person’s own child, the superintendent or administrative principle may apply to the Board of Education for the removal of the child. N.J.S.A. 18A:38-1(b)(2). The parent or guardian is entitled to a hearing before the board and, if in the judgment of the board, the parent or guardian is not domiciled within the school district or the child is not kept in the home of another person domiciled within the school district and supported *gratis*, the board may order the transfer or removal of the child from school. Ibid. The parents or guardian may contest the board’s decision before the commissioner within 21 days of the date of the decision and is entitled to an expedited hearing. Ibid. The parent or guardian has the burden of proof by a preponderance of the evidence that the child is eligible for a free education under the criteria listed in the statute. Ibid.

Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:22-3(1)(a)(1), a student is eligible to attend a school district if he or she is domiciled within the school district, and a student is domiciled in the school district when he or she is the child of a parent or guardian whose domicile is located within the school district.

“Domicile” is defined as “the place where [a person] has [his or her] true, fixed, permanent home and principal establishment, and to which whenever he is absent, he has an intention of returning.” C.B.W. ex rel. A.W. v. Bd. of Ed. of the Township of Belleville, Essex County, 1998 N.J. AGEN. LEXIS 122, Agency Docket number 159-5/96, 1998 WL 668678 (N.J. ADM. JUNE 18, 1998). As the court noted in Collins v.

Yancey, 55 N.J. Super. 514, 520-21 (Law Div. 1959), a person may have several residences or places of abode, but only one domicile at a time. Ibid.; D.L. v. Bd. of Educ. of Princeton Reg'l Sch. Dist., 366 NJ Super. 269, 273-74 (App. Div. 2004).]

N.J.A.C. 6A:22-6 governs the tuition rate; and N.J.A.C. 6A:28-2.10 governs the calculation of tuition charged.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The Tribunal is satisfied that the factual record demonstrates that, during the time period proven by the District, specifically, January 18, 2017, through February 2, 2018, G.G. resided with her mother, C.G. at the Randolph home. Moreover, there was little or no factual evidence presented in support of P=etitioner's allegation that G.G. resided during the school term with Rosemary Strelec in Morristown and/or that Rosemary Strelec supported G.G. *gratis* as if she were Rosemary Strelec's own child. It follows, and I **CONCLUDE** that from January 18, 2017, through February 2, 2018, G.C. was domiciled and resided in Randolph Township, which is not within the Morris Township School District. Moreover, I **CONCLUDE** that C.G. and G.G. did not meet the requirement set forth in N.J.S.A. 18A:38-1(a) of G.G. being "kept in the home of another person domiciled within the school district and supported by such other person *gratis* as if she were such other person's own child." The Petitioner having failed to carry her burden of proving that G.G. was domiciled in the Morris Township School District, I **CONCLUDE** the Morris Township Board of Education acted properly when it removed G.G. from its school. Moreover, I **CONCLUDE** that the Morris Township Board of Education has proven by a preponderance of the credible evidence that during the time of G.G.'s attendance in the Morris Township School District, she was not domiciled in the Morris township School District and therefore the school district is entitled to collect from G.G.'s parent, C.G., an amount of per diem tuition, namely \$86.01, times the number of days in attendance.

I **CONCLUDE** that the number of days attended between January 18, 2017, and February 2, 2018, comes to 381 days and that the total due to the District is \$26,769.81.

I also **CONCLUDE** that C.G., by failing to appear at the hearing, failed to prove that she is entitled to an Order relieving her from any obligation to pay for the tuition for G.G.'s attendance in the District's school.

### **ORDER**

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the action taken by the District to remove G.G. from its school is hereby **AFFIRMED**. It is hereby **ORDERED** that C.G. shall pay to the Morris Township Board of Education the sum of \$26,769.81, which **ORDER** shall be stayed under the laws of the United States of America concerning bankruptcy, until the Trustee in Bankruptcy authorizes the payment or until the conclusion of the bankruptcy proceedings.

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, ATTN: BUREAU OF CONTROVERSIES AND DISPUTES, 100 Riverview Plaza, 4th Floor, P.O. Box 500, Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0500**, marked "Attention: Exceptions." A copy of any exceptions must be sent to the judge and to the other parties.



December 21, 2018  
DATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
**JOHN P. SCOLLO, ALJ**

Date Received at Agency:

\_\_\_\_\_

Date Mailed to Parties:  
db

\_\_\_\_\_

## **ADDENDUM**

### **List of Witnesses**

#### **For Petitioner:**

None

#### **Respondent's Witnesses:**

Debora Engelfried, Supervisor of Strategic Planning and Student Information Management

Jeffrey Oster, Private Investigator

### **List of Exhibits**

#### **Tribunal's Exhibit:**

C-1 The Tribunal's Letter to the Parties dated October 18, 2018

#### **Petitioner's Exhibits:**

None

#### **Respondent's Exhibits:**

R-1 through R-5 Not admitted into evidence

R-6 Initial Report of Residency Investigation, dated January 24, 2018

R-7 Initial Report of Residency Investigation, dated 3/29/18

R-8 Report of Residency Investigation, dated April 13, 2018

R-9 Report of Residency Investigation, dated April 18, 2018

R-10 Report of Residency Investigation, dated April 26, 2018

R-11 Notice of Initial Determination of Ineligibility, dated January 24, 2018

R-12 Notice of Final Determination of Ineligibility, dated April 3, 2018

R-13 Not admitted into evidence



- R-14 Email chain between C.G. and Engelfried, dated February 1, 2018
- R-15 Email chain between C.G. and Engelfried, dated March 28, 2018
- R-16 Not admitted into evidence
- R-17 Email chain amongst Superintendent Prendergast, Engelfried, Donna Karr, Carla Walker, and Sandra Wall, dated February 2, 2018
- R-18 Randolph Township Schools registration forms completed February 2, 2018
- R-19 Morris School District registration form completed March 19, 2018
- R-20 Court Order entered on March 22, 2018, concerning custody hearing of March 19, 2018
- R-21 Not admitted into evidence
- R-22 C.G.'s Deed dated January 18, 2017, to her Randolph home