



State of New Jersey
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL
 101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
 PO Box 819
 TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

JON S. CORZINE
Governor

JOSEPH V. DORIA, JR.
Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

March 25, 2009 Government Records Council Meeting

Thomas Caggiano	Complaint Nos. 2006-211, -219 2007-
Complainant	24, -25, -26, -40, -43, -44, -45, -46, -47,
v.	-183, -184, -228, -229, -285, -289,
Borough of Stanhope (Sussex)	2008-105 (Consolidated)
Custodian of Record	

At the March 25, 2009 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the March 18, 2009 Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director and all related documentation submitted by the parties. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the entirety of said findings and recommendations. The Council, therefore, finds that the following cases should be dismissed based on Judge Dana’s December 3, 2008 Judgment: Thomas Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope, GRC Complaint Nos. GRC Complaint Nos. 2006-211, -219; 2007-24, -25, -26, -40, -43, -44, -45, -46, -47, -183, -184, -228, -229, -285, -289, 2008-105.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey within forty-five (45) days. Information about the appeals process can be obtained from the Appellate Division Clerk’s Office, Hughes Justice Complex, 25 W. Market St., PO Box 006, Trenton, NJ 08625-0006. Proper service of submissions pursuant to any appeal is to be made to the Council in care of the Executive Director at the State of New Jersey Government Records Council, 101 South Broad Street, PO Box 819, Trenton, NJ 08625-0819.

Final Decision Rendered by the
 Government Records Council
 On The 25th Day of March, 2009

Robin Berg Tabakin, Chair
 Government Records Council



I attest the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the Government Records Council.

Janice L. Kovach
Government Records Council

Decision Distribution Date: March 30, 2009

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
March 25, 2009 Council Meeting**

**Thomas Caggiano¹
Complainant**

**GRC Complaint Nos. 2006-211, -219;
2007-24, -25, -26, -40, -43, -44, -45, -46,
-47,-183, -184, -228, -229, -285, -289,
2008-105
(Consolidated)**

v.

**Borough of Stanhope (Sussex)²
Custodian of Records**

<p>Records Relevant to Complaint: Various Request Made: Various Dates Response Made: Various Dates Custodian: Robin Kline GRC Complaint Filed: Various Dates</p>

Background

December 20, 2007

Transmittal from the GRC to the Office of Administrative Law (“OAL”) of the following cases for an adjudicatory hearing: Thomas Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope (Sussex), GRC Complaint Nos. 2006-211, -219, 2007-24, -25, -26, -40, -43, -44, -45, -46, -47, -183, -184, -228, -229, -285.

February 4, 2008

Transmittal from the GRC to the OAL of Thomas Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope (Sussex), GRC Complaint No. 2007-289 for an adjudicatory hearing.

December 3, 2008

Judgment of the Honorable Craig U. Dana, J.M.C., Joint Municipal Court of the Townships of Green, Fredon, Hampton and the Borough of Andover. Judge Dana issues a Judgment of Conviction for harassment and trespass violations prohibiting Thomas Caggiano from having any contact with any present or former employee or official of the Borough of Stanhope except that Mr. Caggiano may mail his tax and utility payments to the Borough and he may call 911 if he has an emergency.

March 12, 2009

Letter from the GRC to the Office of Administrative Law. The Executive Director requests the return of the following complaints to the GRC for dismissal: Thomas

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Richard Stein, Esq. (Sparta, NJ).

Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope (Sussex), GRC Complaint Nos. 2006-211, -219, 2007-24, -25, -26, -40, -43, -44, -45, -46, -47, -183, -184, -228, -229, and -285.

Analysis

No analysis is required.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the following cases should be dismissed based on Judge Dana's December 3, 2008 Judgment: Thomas Caggiano v. Borough of Stanhope, GRC Complaint Nos. GRC Complaint Nos. 2006-211, -219; 2007-24, -25, -26, -40, -43, -44, -45, -46, -47, -183, -184, -228, -229, -285, -289, 2008-105.

Prepared By: Karyn Gordon, Esq.
In House Counsel

Approved By: Catherine Starghill, Esq.
Executive Director

March 18, 2009



State of New Jersey
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

VINCENT P. MALTESE, Chairman
ACTING COMMISSIONER JOSEPH V. DORIA, JR.
COMMISSIONER LUCILLE DAVY
ROBIN BERG TABAKIN
DAVID FLEISHER
CATHERINE STARGHILL Esq., Executive Director

101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO Box 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

Toll Free: 866-850-0511
Fax: 609-633-6337
E-mail: grc@dca.state.nj.us
Web Address:
www.nj.gov/grc

INTERIM ORDER

December 19, 2007 Government Records Council Meeting

Thomas Caggiano	Complaint No. 2006-211, 2006-219, 2007-24,
Complainant	2007-25, 2007-26, 2007-40, 2007-43, 2007-44,
v.	2007-45, 2007-46, 2007-47, 2007-183, 2007-184,
Borough of Stanhope (Sussex)	2007-228, 2007-229, & 2007-285
Custodian of Record	

At the December 19, 2007 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the December 12, 2007 Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director and all related documentation submitted by the parties. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the entirety of said findings and recommendations as amended. The Council, therefore, finds that the request for a stay of the November 28, 2007 Interim Orders referring sixteen (16) complaints to the Office of Administrative Law not be granted since the complaints were referred to the Office of Administrative Law due to a conflict of interest between Complainant and Executive Director Starghill based on the criminal harassment complaint filed and the temporary restraining order obtained for the GRC against Complainant.

Interim Order Rendered by the
Government Records Council
On The 19th Day of December, 2007

Robin Berg Tabakin, Vice Chairman
Government Records Council

I attest the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the Government Records Council.

David Fleisher, Secretary
Government Records Council

Decision Distribution Date: December 27, 2007



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL
Regarding Custodian Counsel's Motion for a Stay
Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
December 19, 2007 Council Meeting

Thomas Caggiano¹
Complainant

GRC Complaint Nos. 2006-211, 2006-219, 2007-24, 2007-25, 2007-26, 2007-40, 2007-43, 2007-44, 2007-45, 2007-46, 2007-47, 2007-183, 2007-184, 2007-228, 2007-229 & 2007-285

v.

Borough of Stanhope (Sussex)²
Custodian of Records

Records Relevant to Complaint: Various.

Request Made: Various.

Response Made: Various.

Custodian: Various.

GRC Complaint Filed: Various.

Background

November 28, 2007

Government Records Council's ("Council") Interim Orders. At its November 28, 2007 public meeting, the Council considered the November 21, 2007 Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director and all related documentation submitted by the parties. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the entirety of said findings and recommendations. The Council, therefore, found in all instances that because of a conflict of interest and at the request of the Complainant, these matters be referred to the Office of Administrative Law ("OAL") for a hearing to resolve the facts and determine whether the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records, and if so, whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated the Open Public Records Act ("OPRA") and unreasonable denied access under the totality of the circumstances.

November 29, 2007

Council's Interim Orders distributed to the parties.

December 3, 2007

Council's Interim Orders and supporting complaint file documents transmitted to the OAL.

December 6, 2007

Custodian's Request for Stay of the Council's Interim Orders. The Custodian's Counsel asserts that the GRC does not understand the ramification of its decision to send

¹ No legal representative listed in the file.

² Represented by Richard Stein of Laddey, Clark & Ryan, LLP (Sparta, NJ).

all sixteen (16) Denial of Access Complaints to the OAL. Specifically, the Custodian's Counsel states that by entering the orders it has (referring the complaints to the OAL due to a conflict of interest between Complainant and Executive Director Starghill based on the criminal harassment complaint filed and the temporary restraining order obtained for the GRC against Complainant), the GRC has caved into the harassment and intimidation of the Complainant and that Complainant should not be allowed to benefit by his own behavior but instead should be punished criminally for this behavior.

The Custodian's Counsel also states that by referring the sixteen (16) complaints to the OAL, the Borough of Stanhope will have to engage in the full administrative hearing procedure on each of the complaints with the strong likelihood that the Administrative Law Judge will recommend to the GRC that such complaints are frivolous and made in bad faith solely for the purpose of harassment which the GRC will still have to rule on by accepting the decision of the Administrative Law Judge.

Additionally, the Custodian's Counsel states that the public interest and the injury to the public was not considered by the GRC because the Borough of Stanhope must be represented by legal counsel in hearings before OAL requiring pretrial preparation, as well as trips to the OAL in Newark at an estimated cost of \$3,000 per complaint or over \$50,000 versus no legal counsel required before the GRC.

Further, the Custodian's Counsel states that there is no harm to any party by the GRC continuing to process the complaints in the usual administrative manner since the GRC members and staff are now protected by a restraining order and should be able to function normally in the administrative determination of these matters. The Custodian's Counsel asserts that the GRC should not blithely abrogate its duties under OPRA because of a harassment complaint.

Lastly, the Custodian's Counsel asserts that the Complainant will continue to file Denial of Access Complaints with the GRC which the GRC will refer to the OAL, thus resulting in enormous legal expenses to the Borough of Stanhope. The Custodian's Counsel states that the Borough of Stanhope has decided to seek judicial relief in Superior Court against the Complainant and will file a Complaint with an Order to Show Cause within the next ten (10) days. Therefore, the Custodian requests a stay of all proceedings and schedule these matters for a reconsideration pending the Borough's Superior Court action against the Complainant.

Analysis

Whether the GRC should grant a stay of the November 28, 2007 Interim Orders referring sixteen (16) complaints to the Office of Administrative Law?

The Custodian requests a stay of the November 28, 2007 Interim Orders of the Government Records Council and asserts the following justification for such stay:

Likelihood of Success on the Merits

The Custodian's Counsel states that the Borough of Stanhope has decided to seek judicial relief in Superior Court of New Jersey against the Complainant and will file a Complaint with an Order to Show Cause within the next ten (10) days. The Custodian's Counsel does not make any assertions regarding the likelihood of success on the merits of this action before Superior Court.

Danger of Irreparable Harm

The Custodian's Counsel asserts that the irreparable harm from the GRC not granting a stay of the referral of the sixteen (16) complaints to the OAL is that the Borough of Stanhope must be represented by legal counsel in hearings before OAL requiring pretrial preparation, as well as trips to the OAL in Newark at an estimated cost of \$3,000 per complaint or over \$50,000 versus no legal counsel required before the GRC.

Potential Chilling Effect

The Custodian's Counsel further asserts that the Complainant will continue to file Denial of Access Complaints with the GRC which the GRC will refer to the OAL, thus resulting in enormous legal expenses to the Borough of Stanhope. Additionally, the Custodian's Counsel asserts that by entering the orders it has (referring the complaints to the OAL due to a conflict of interest between Complainant and Executive Director Starghill based on the criminal harassment complaint filed and the temporary restraining order obtained for the GRC against Complainant), the GRC has caved into the harassment and intimidation of the Complainant and that Complainant should not be allowed to benefit by his own behavior but instead should be punished criminally for this behavior.

The arguments made by the Custodian's Counsel are not enough to overcome the harm that may be done by the Executive Director and the entire GRC staff and members continuing with the agency adjudication of complaints filed by a Complainant against whom the Executive Director has a filed a criminal harassment complaint and obtained an agency temporary restraining order. These facts present an obvious perception of a conflict of interest which will only minimally be affected by the GRC's acceptance of the initial decisions rendered by an Administrative Law Judge hearing these complaints at OAL.

Additionally, the Complainant specifically requested that all his open complaints be forwarded to the OAL for adjudication due to the perceived conflict of interest. This request alone and acknowledgement by the Complainant of a conflict of interest is, in and of itself, enough to justify the GRC's referral of these matters to the OAL. The GRC's adjudication of these complaints may be viewed as an impingement upon the Complainant's due process right. Also, the Custodian's Counsel should note that the vast majority of litigates before the OAL are pro se. Therefore, while the Borough's anticipated legal expense to defend the Custodian at the OAL may be extensive, it is not a requirement of the proceedings. Lastly, the harassing behavior of the Complainant toward GRC staff tips the balancing scales in the decision to refer these complaints to the OAL. Contrary to the Custodian's Counsel argument that the GRC should not allow the

Complainant to benefit from his own harassing behavior toward GRC Staff, the GRC does not view referring these complaints as a “benefit” to the Complainant but rather an executive branch administrative procedure allowed per the provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act, N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1 et seq.

For these reasons mentioned above, the Custodian’s request for a stay should not be granted.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the request for a stay of the November 28, 2007 Interim Orders referring sixteen (16) complaints to the Office of Administrative Law not be granted since the complaints were referred to the Office of Administrative Law due to a conflict of interest between Complainant and Executive Director Starghill based on the criminal harassment complaint filed and the temporary restraining order obtained for the GRC against Complainant.

Approved By:

Catherine Starghill, Esq.
Executive Director

December 18, 2007



State of New Jersey

GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO Box 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

Toll Free: 866-850-0511
Fax: 609-633-6337
E-mail: grc@dca.state.nj.us
Web Address:
www.nj.gov/grc

VINCENT P. MALTESE, Chairman
ACTING COMMISSIONER JOSEPH V. DORIA, JR.
COMMISSIONER LUCILLE DAVY
ROBIN BERG TABAKIN
DAVID FLEISHER
CATHERINE STARGHILL Esq., Executive Director

INTERIM ORDER

November 28, 2007 Government Records Council Meeting

Thomas Caggiano
Complainant

Complaint No. 2007-228

v.

Borough of Stanhope (Sussex)
Custodian of Record

At the November 28, 2007 public meeting, the Government Records Council ("Council") considered the November 21, 2007 Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director and all related documentation submitted by the parties. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the entirety of said findings and recommendations. The Council, therefore, finds that because of a conflict of interest and at the request of the Complainant, this matter be referred to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing to resolve the facts and determine whether the custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records, and if so, whether the denial was knowing and willful in violation of OPRA and unreasonable under the totality of the circumstances.

Interim Order Rendered by the
Government Records Council
On The 28th Day of November, 2007

Vincent P. Maltese, Chairman
Government Records Council

I attest the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the Government Records Council.

Government Records Council



Decision Distribution Date: November 29, 2007

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
November 28, 2007 Council Meeting**

**Thomas Caggiano¹
Complainant**

GRC Complaint No. 2007-228

v.

**Borough of Stanhope (Sussex)²
Custodian of Records**

Records Relevant to Complaint: Please see Complainant's seven-page, multi-part handwritten OPRA request, attached hereto as Exhibit "A."³

Request Made: August 9, 2007

Response Made:

Custodian: Robin R. Kline, Municipal Clerk

GRC Complaint Filed: October 2, 2007

Background

Because of a conflict of interest,⁴ and at the request of the Complainant, this matter should be referred to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing to resolve the facts of this case and any possible violations of OPRA arising therefrom.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that because of a conflict of interest and at the request of the Complainant, this matter be referred to the Office of Administrative Law for a hearing to resolve the facts and determine whether the custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records, and if so, whether the denial was knowing and willful in violation of OPRA and unreasonable under the totality of the circumstances.

Prepared By:

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² No legal representation listed on record.

³ The Complainant states in his Denial of Access Complaint that this is an eight-page request. However, only seven pages were attached to the original OPRA request which the Complainant included with his Denial of Access Complaint.

⁴ On or about October 21, 2007, the Executive Director of the GRC, Catherine Starghill, filed a criminal harassment complaint against the Complainant in Mercer County Municipal Court. On or about October 29, 2007, the Government Records Council obtained a temporary civil restraining order against the Complainant in the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division.

Karyn Gordon, Esq.
In House Counsel

Approved By:

Catherine Starghill, Esq.
Executive Director

November 21, 2007



NOTE:
 REDACTIONS ARE
 PERMITTED
 PER OPRA

State of New Jersey

BOROUGH OF STANHOPE

Sussex County

thomascaggiano.com



GOVERNMENT RECORDS REQUEST FORM

RECEIVED

Important Notice

The reverse side of this form contains important information related to your rights concerning government records. Please read it carefully.

Requestor Information - Please Print Clearly

First Name THOMAS MI J Last Name CAGGIAMO
 Company] _____
 Mailing Address 10 EAST DRIVE
 City STANHOPE State NJ Zip 07871 Email _____
 Business Hours Telephone: Area Code 903 Number 347-4357 Extension _____
 Preferred Delivery: Pick Up _____ US Mail On Site Inspect _____
 Circle One: Under penalty of N.J.S.A. 2C:28-3, I certify that I ~~HAVE~~ / HAVE NOT been convicted of any
 indictable offense under the laws of New Jersey, any other State, or the United States of America.
 Signature _____ Date 8/6/07

Payment Information

STANHOPE BOROUGH
 Maximum Authorization Cost: \$ _____
 SELECT PAYMENT METHOD
 Cash _____ Check _____ Money Order _____
 Fees: Pages 1-10 @\$0.75
 Pages 11-20 @\$0.50
 Pages 21 - @\$0.25
 Delivery: Delivery / Postage fees additional depending upon delivery type.
 Extras: Extraordinary Service fees dependent upon request.

RECEIVED
 AUG 15 2007

Record Request Information: To expedite the request, be as specific as possible in describing the records being requested. Also, please include the type of access requested (copying or inspection), and if data, the medium requested.

1) PROVIDE COPY OF PUBLIC NOTICE OF MTG where APPARENTLY SEVERAL OFFICIALS HAD A MTG with the TOWN ADMIN Teri MASSOUD & SITE RESIGN COPY PROVIDE COPY OF RICHARD Stein bills for meetings, telephone calls, memo regarding Teri MASSOUD PERFORMANCE REV & TERMINATION to BORO of Stanhope MAY 2007 - Aug 2007
 2) PROVIDE COPY of Teri MASSOUD FINAL PAYROLL CHECK & WRITTEN NOTIFICATION TO STATE of N.J OFFICIALS on Her RESIGNATION / TERMINATION. Provide copy of REDACTED NOTES, conference calls By RICHARD STEIN FOR ERK CLAIM submitted in 12/1/2006 STEIN to STANHOPE. 4) PROVIDE COPY of Acct 79245 RJ143 Document 5/1/07
 TOTAL 7 PAGES

thomascaggiano.com

AGENCY USE ONLY

Est. Document Cost: _____
 Est. Delivery Cost: _____
 Est. Extras Cost: _____
 Total Est. Cost: _____
 Less Deposit Amount: _____
 Estimated Balance: _____
 Deposit Date: _____

AGENCY USE ONLY

Disposition Notes
 Custodian: If any part of request cannot be delivered in seven business days, detail reasons here.

In Progress - Open _____
 Denied - Closed _____
 Filled - Closed _____
 Partial - Closed _____

AGENCY USE ONLY CONTINUED

Tracking Information		Final Cost	
Tracking #	_____	Total:	_____
Rec'd Date:	_____	Deposit:	_____
Ready Date:	_____	Balance Due:	_____
Total Pages:	_____	Balance Paid	_____
Records Provided			
Custodian Signature		Date	

OPMA REG 8/6/03 Continued THOMAS CAGGIANO

- 5) Provide copy of John Cilo Jr CLAIM for \$1,145 for Acct 792405, 7/16/07 PO 10214 AND COPY OF John Cilo Jr ASSOCIATES CONTRACT with Borough of Stanhope to submit CLAIM.
- 6) Provide copy of invoices by the MUNICIPAL ENGINEER AND COPY OF MUNICIPAL ENGINEER'S CONTRACT FOR CLAIMS SUBMITTED TO ENF DEV. CO. LLC ESCROW ACCT for checks 1187 on 4/13/2000, 1058 on 7/30/2001, 1096 on 5/31/2002, 1511 on 11/30/2002, 1528 on 10/31/2002, 1551 on 6/30/2004 AND 1554 on 8/31/2004 BY JOHN CILLO JR. ASSOCIATES. INCLUDE COPY OF FINANCE COMMITTEE APPROVAL for EACH CLAIM, COPY OF CONTRACT FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES THAT WAS AWARDED FOR JOHN CILLO JR ASSOCIATES FOR EACH YEAR FOR EACH CLAIM NOTED ABOVE AND COPY OF REQUIRED NEWSPAPER ANNOUNCEMENT FOR CONTRACT FOR JOHN CILLO JR. ASSOCIATES FOR EACH YEAR per the LOCAL PUBLIC CONTRACTS LAW THAT JOHN CILLO JR ASSOCIATES WAS PAID FROM THE Borough of STANHOPE ESCROW ACCOUNT.

Continued
Pg 2 of 8

OPRA Req Continued Thomas Caggiano

7) Provide copy of contract amendment or email, or record of conversation by any Borough official authorizing Richard Stein to attend a case not against the Borough of Stanhope or any official in Stanhope on 11/22/06. Provide copy of Richard Stein's claim and approval of \$900 claim that has nothing to do with the Borough of Stanhope or any official in Stanhope. Provide a copy of contract amendment to LADDEY, CLARK & RYAN LLP that authorized the expenditure of \$900.00 for non-Stanhope functions. Provide a copy of Richard Stein's report on charging \$500⁰⁰ and for telephone calls on 11/27/2006 & 11/29/2006 for \$60 to Borough Admin for a 20th exit and copy of notes, telephone log by Borough Admin authorizing the calls to be received as they were not Borough of Stanhope related.

8) Provide copy of Richard Stein 11/07/2006 letter to Governing Body (retracted email) on 11/7/2006

9) Provide copy of Richard Stein's claims for professional services related to 2007 OPRA requests by Thomas Caggiano as the only made findings against Stanhope's only municipal cleric and town admin in Dec 2006, Apr 2007 & Jul 2007.

thomascaggiano.com

OPRA PER THOMAS CAGGIANO

14) Provide copy of DOLAN & DOLAN BILLS AND LADDY, CLARK & RYAN LLP BILLS to

15) REVIEW PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS THAT WERE AWARDED FOR EACH YEAR 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 AND 2006 FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING COMPANIES, provide a copy of EACH CONTRACT FOR EACH YEAR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING & PLANNING SERVICES WERE CHANGED TO THE BOROUGH OF STANHOPE BY EITHER OF FOLLOWING COMPANIES.

15.1) JOHN GILB JR ASSOCIATES
JOHN GILB JR (PE) or SCRIFLATT DOYLE (PP)

15.2) OMLAND ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES
ERIC KELLER (PE/PP)

15.3) P. DAVID ZIMMERMAN (PP) AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

ONLY COPY OF INITIAL CONTRACT FOR EACH YEAR FOR EACH COMPANY IS DESIRED DONOT ~~HERE~~ INCLUDE COPIES OF AMENDMENTS.

16) Provide a copy of the FINANCE COMMITTEE, AND CHECK PAID TO EACH FIRM FOR EACH YEAR. ONLY FIRST CHECK PAID IS DESIRED AND A COPY OF SIGNED CONTRACT BY BOARD OF STANHOPE + COMPANY PER LOCAL PUBLIC CONTRACTS LAW.

(17) ON Aug 3, 2007, I had a mtg among town Council, Gov Body Member George GRATHAM AND A VERY DISTRESSED MUNICIPAL CLERK RUBIN KLINE AS THE Borough of Stanhope's original Municipal Clerk was found Guilty by the GRC of violating my OPRA Rights in its Finding of GRC 200602 of the GRC issued an interim order to produce documents in 5 days & did not. The town Administration was found guilty by the GRC on Apr 25, 2007, on Jul 25, 2007 the GRC after ~~two~~ seven month intensive review through the distressed OPRA custodian rather than calling any hearings at the GRC or the GRC discussing the issue of non-response with the Mayor DIANA KURCKEN or Gov Body found a review of facts was needed and transmitted a 16 exhibit case to the Office of Administrative Law. I was never informed of the town administrator's resignation as she was the respondent in my case against Stanhope. By the GRC. Mr. GRATHAM refused to even tell me if she was fired or resigned, what date was any meeting held or what Gov officials ~~attended~~ attended the mtg. This also directly impacts the case against me by Stanhope as Sgt Charles Zweig wrote a false 911 report and the

thomascaggiano.com

DPRA REO THOMAS CAGGIANO

Town Administration must review my complaint against both the Chief of Police Steven Pittiger & Sgt Zweigh as the Chief of Police

Refuses to review a transcript of the 911 call or listen to an mp3 recording I made at Hopatcong Police St as the LT REFUSED/DENIED my VALID

DPRA REQ TO OBTAIN A ~~FILE~~ WORD FILE or transcript of the short 911 msg to prove the SGT 911 Report was false or

to talk with the Developer of 3 Oct Dr who talked to Sgt Zweigh as former came into their home from the adjacent properties on Block 10903 lots 13+15 which was developed ILLEGALLY BY ENF Development LLC (18) I request the

following:

(17.1) ~~1~~ Copy of Stanhope Borough Eng'r Approved Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plans (MAPS) THAT ARE ALSO CERTIFIED BY SUSSEX COUNTY

Soil Conservation District for ENF's Block 10902 lots 10+12 AND Block 10903 lot 13 or ^{Lot 13} +14

thomasaggiano.com

Page 7
48

17.2 A copy of the JAN check PAID to John Cito Jr ASSOCIATES for work performed by the Firm's employee Scarlett Doyle, for professional planner services in 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 AND 2006 with disbursed ~~franchise~~ funds to John Cito Jr ASSOCIATES in JAN services each year ONLY ALLOW ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS MAY HAVE BEEN MADE IN FOLLOWING MONTHS, A copy of the claim by John Cito Jr ASSOCIATES performed contracted services as a professional planner to the Borough of Stanhope, a copy of the written contract signed by John Cito Jr ASSOCIATES with a Borough of Stanhope official & a copy of the required newspaper published legal notice in the "official newspaper" of the Award DATA, NATURE of services, total amount of contract & professional planner cost / hr that was negotiated per the Local Public Contracts Law & a copy of each year's record of negotiation / comparison cost of ~~ALL~~ ALTERNATIVE contractors if NOT DONE IN 3 YRS.