



State of New Jersey
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

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

CHRIS CHRISTIE
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO
Lt. Governor

RICHARD E. CONSTABLE, III
Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

January 28, 2014 Government Records Council Meeting

Larry Kohn
Complainant

Complaint No. 2013-119

v.

Township of Livingston (Essex)
Custodian of Record

At the January 28, 2014 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the January 21, 2014 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:

1. The Custodian did not bear his burden of proof that he timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the Complainant’s OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial of the Complainant’s OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), and Kelley v. Rockaway Twp., GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s “deemed denial,” he responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request through his Statement of Information on May 13, 2013. Because there is no credible evidence in the record to refute the Custodian’s certification, it is unnecessary for the Council to order disclosure of the responsive documents.
3. Although the Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) and N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), the Custodian ultimately responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request on May 13, 2013. The evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and an unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.



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 28th Day of January, 2014

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., Chair
Government Records Council

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

Steven Ritardi, Esq., Secretary
Government Records Council

Decision Distribution Date: January 30, 2014

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
January 28, 2014 Council Meeting**

**Larry Kohn¹
Complainant**

GRC Complaint No. 2013-119

v.

**Township of Livingston (Essex)²
Custodial Agency**

Records Relevant to Complaint: copies of a Certificate of Availability of Funds R-13-96.

Custodian of Record: Glenn R. Turteltaub
Request Received by Custodian: March 26, 2013
Response Made by Custodian: May 13, 2013
GRC Complaint Received: April 24, 2013

Background³

Request and Response:

On March 26, 2013, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On May 13, 2013, thirty-two (32) business days later, the Custodian responded in writing via email with the requested record attached.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On April 24, 2013, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserts that he submitted the OPRA request on March 25, 2013,⁴ and has not received a response from the Custodian.

Statement of Information:

On May 13, 2013, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certifies that the OPRA request “fell through the cracks” as it arrived while the Custodian’s

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Represented by Sharon L. Weiner of Murphy, McKeon, PC (Riverdale, NJ) (“Township Attorney”).

³ The parties may have submitted additional correspondence or made additional statements/assertions in the submissions identified herein. However, the Council includes in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director the submissions necessary and relevant for the adjudication of this complaint.

⁴ The Custodian asserts that he received the OPRA request on March 26, 2013.

assistant was on vacation and the office was short-staffed. The Custodian certifies that the delay in response was due to this staff shortage during the month of April as well as other unforeseen circumstances.

Nevertheless, the Custodian attached his response to the Complainant's OPRA request in his SOI. The Custodian certifies that he included the responsive document and delivered it to the Complainant along with the completed SOI.

Analysis

Timeliness

OPRA mandates that a custodian must either grant or deny access to requested records within seven (7) business days from receipt of said request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). A custodian's failure to respond within the required seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial. Id. Further, a custodian's response, either granting or denying access, must be in writing pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g).⁵ Thus, a custodian's failure to respond in writing to a complainant's OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial of the complainant's OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), and Kelley v. Twp. of Rockaway, GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).

Here, the Custodian did not provide a response until May 13, 2013, the same day he submitted his SOI. The Custodian admits the delay in his certification, and does not state whether he requested additional time to respond to the Complainant's OPRA request within the statutorily mandated seven (7) days.

Therefore, the Custodian did not bear his burden of proof that he timely responded to the Complainant's OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, the Custodian's failure to respond in writing to the Complainant's OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial of the Complainant's OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), and Kelley, GRC 2007-11.

Unlawful Denial of Access

OPRA provides that government records made, maintained, kept on file, or received by a public agency in the course of its official business are subject to public access unless otherwise exempt. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. A custodian must release all records responsive to an OPRA request "with certain exceptions." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1. Additionally, OPRA places the burden on a custodian to prove that a denial of access to records is lawful pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

⁵ A custodian's written response either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days, even if said response is not on the agency's official OPRA request form, is a valid response pursuant to OPRA.

Here, the Custodian failed to respond in a timely manner to the Complainant's March 26, 2013 OPRA request because it "fell through the cracks." The Custodian certified that the delay in response was due to being short-staffed beginning in April 2013. Still, the Custodian certifies that he disclosed the requested record on May 13, 2013, accompanying his SOI. There is no evidence in the record to refute the Custodian's certification that he attached all responsive documents to the Complainant's OPRA request.

Thus, notwithstanding the Custodian's "deemed denial," he responded to the Complainant's OPRA request through his SOI on May 13, 2013. Because there is no credible evidence in the record to refute the Custodian's certification, it is unnecessary for the Council to order disclosure of the responsive document.

Knowing & Willful

OPRA states that "[a] public official, officer, employee or custodian who knowingly or willfully violates [OPRA], and is found to have unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances, shall be subject to a civil penalty ..." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11(a). OPRA allows the Council to determine a knowing and willful violation of the law and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances. Specifically OPRA states "... [i]f the council determines, by a majority vote of its members, that a custodian has knowingly and willfully violated [OPRA], and is found to have unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances, the council may impose the penalties provided for in [OPRA]..." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(e).

Certain legal standards must be considered when making the determination of whether the Custodian's actions rise to the level of a "knowing and willful" violation of OPRA. The following statements must be true for a determination that the Custodian "knowingly and willfully" violated OPRA: the Custodian's actions must have been much more than negligent conduct (Alston v. City of Camden, 168 N.J. 170, 185 (2001)); the Custodian must have had some knowledge that his actions were wrongful (Fielder v. Stonack, 141 N.J. 101, 124 (1995)); the Custodian's actions must have had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing (Berg v. Reaction Motors Div., 37 N.J. 396, 414 (1962)); the Custodian's actions must have been forbidden with actual, not imputed, knowledge that the actions were forbidden (Id.; Marley v. Borough of Palmyra, 193 N.J. Super. 271, 294-95 (Law Div. 1993)); the Custodian's actions must have been intentional and deliberate, with knowledge of their wrongfulness, and not merely negligent, heedless or unintentional (ECES v. Salmon, 295 N.J. Super. 86, 107 (App. Div. 1996)).

Although the Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) and N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), the Custodian ultimately responded to the Complainant's OPRA request on May 13, 2013 and produced records responsive to the request. The evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian's violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian's actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and an unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian did not bear his burden of proof that he timely responded to the Complainant's OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, the Custodian's failure to respond in writing to the Complainant's OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a "deemed" denial of the Complainant's OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), and Kelley v. Rockaway Twp., GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian's "deemed denial," he responded to the Complainant's OPRA request through his Statement of Information on May 13, 2013. Because there is no credible evidence in the record to refute the Custodian's certification, it is unnecessary for the Council to order disclosure of the responsive documents.
3. Although the Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) and N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i), the Custodian ultimately responded to the Complainant's OPRA request on May 13, 2013. The evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian's violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian's actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and an unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado, Esq.
Staff Attorney

Approved By: Dawn R. SanFilippo, Esq.
Senior Counsel

January 21, 2014