

Why My Case Has Merit: Boyce v. Newfield Central School District

Introduction

On July 28, 2025, I filed a petition in Tompkins County Supreme Court to protect my rights under New York's Notice of Claim statute and to challenge unlawful Freedom of Information Law (FOIL) practices and contradictory termination records. This is not just about me. It is about how public agencies are held accountable when they fail to follow the law.

The Termination Date Conflict

The record shows three different versions of my termination:

- **April 22, 2025** — TST BOCES issued a premature COBRA separation letter before the Newfield Board of Education even met.
- **April 23, 2025** — The Newfield Board voted in executive session after 6:00 p.m. to terminate my employment.
- **April 24, 2025** — Outside agencies, including the Department of Labor (DOL) and the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC), recorded my termination as effective this day.

The difference between April 22 and April 24 is not trivial. Termination dates determine unemployment rights, COBRA coverage, pension credits, and legal claim deadlines. Misstating that date undermines due process.

Outside Agency Confirmations

My case does not rely on my word alone. Independent state agencies have confirmed the true record:

- **Department of Labor (DOL):** Twice upheld my unemployment eligibility using April 23/24 as the operative date.
- **Office of the State Comptroller (OSC):** FOIL records confirm payroll entries tied to April 24.

- **Committee on Open Government (COOG):** Advisory opinions criticized Newfield's FOIL delays and confirmed the legal standards the district failed to meet.

These agencies provide un rebutted evidence that the April 22 date cannot control.

Misfeasance or Malfeasance

At best, this was **misfeasance** — sloppy or negligent record-keeping by public officials. At worst, it was **malfeasance** — an intentional act to strip me of rights and delay accountability. Either way, the law does not permit school districts to “fudge” dates that determine fundamental rights.

Why the Case Has Merit

My case meets the Article 78 standard: the district acted **arbitrarily, capriciously, and contrary to law** by relying on contradictory records and obstructing FOIL. My Notice of Claim was filed within 90 days of April 24, 2025 — making it timely. Even the petition for a “late” notice reflects good faith and diligence, not neglect.

This is not about one employee's paperwork. It is about the principle that **government must be accurate, transparent, and lawful.**

Conclusion

Boyce v. Newfield CSD is a case with merit. It is backed by statute, by outside agency confirmations, and by the fundamental rule that dates matter in law. If this case succeeds, it will serve as a clear precedent: **school districts cannot manipulate termination dates, and they cannot ignore FOIL.**

This is about accountability, not just for me, but for everyone.