



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO Box 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

LT. GOVERNOR SHEILA Y. OLIVER
Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

March 27, 2018 Government Records Council Meeting

Eric Petr
Complainant

Complaint No. 2017-95

v.

Town of Morristown (Morris)
Custodian of Record

At the March 27, 2018 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the March 20, 2018 Findings and Recommendations of the Council Staff 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’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. Twp. of Rockaway, GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).
2. The Complainant’s OPRA request is invalid because it fails to seek an identifiable government record. MAG Entm’t v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 549 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Dep’t, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005); N.J. Builders Ass’n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous., 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009). Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant’s request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.
3. The Custodian failed to respond to the Complainant’s request in a timely manner; however, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s actions had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or were intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian’s actions did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and 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 27th Day of March, 2018

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: March 29, 2018

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Council Staff
March 27, 2018 Council Meeting**

**Eric Petr¹
Complainant**

GRC Complaint No. 2017-95

v.

**Town of Morristown (Morris)²
Custodial Agency**

Record Relevant to the Complaint: “I would like the cost of the patrol supervisor overtime from June 1, 2014 to January 20, 2017. Specifically the amount of money spent on supervisor overtime for being the patrol supervisor.”³

Custodian of Record: Kevin D. Harris
Request Received by Custodian: March 30, 2017
GRC Complaint Received: May 2, 2017
Response Made by Custodian: May 12, 2017

Background⁴

Request:

On March 30, 2017, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned record.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On May 2, 2017, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserts that he submitted his request to the Custodian on March 30, 2017, and did not receive a response from the Custodian. The Complainant states that he requested a budgetary item and has been denied access to the information. The Complainant further states that he wants an immediate response from the Custodian.⁵

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Represented by Vijayant Pawar, Esq. (Morristown, NJ).

³ The Complainant requested that the information be delivered to him via e-mail.

⁴ 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.

⁵ N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(e) provides that “[i]mmediate access ordinarily shall be granted to budgets, bills, vouchers, contracts, including collective negotiations agreements and individual employment contracts, and public employee salary and overtime information.” As such, paid overtime does constitute an immediate access record.

Response:

On May 12, 2017, the thirtieth (30th) business day following receipt of the request, and the eighth (8th) business day after the Complainant filed the complaint, the Custodian responded in writing informing the Complainant that his request seeks information, is not a valid OPRA request, and is denied. The Custodian further informed the Complainant that a custodian is not required to conduct research or create new records in response to an OPRA request.

Statement of Information:

On May 15, 2017, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that he received the Complainant’s OPRA request on March 30, 2017, and responded in writing on May 12, 2017. The Custodian certifies that the Complainant’s request was denied because it was not a valid OPRA request. The Custodian certifies that the request sought information and did not identify a specific government record. The Custodian further certifies that a custodian is not required to conduct research or create new records in response to an OPRA request. The Custodian cites MAG Entm’t v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 549 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Dep’t, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005); N.J. Builders Ass’n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous., 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009) along with other Council decisions in support of his denial.

Analysis

Timeliness

Unless a shorter time period is otherwise provided, a custodian must 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 accordingly 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).⁶ 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 certified that he received the Complainant’s request on March 30, 2017, but did not respond in writing to the request until May 12, 2017. The Custodian thus failed to respond in a timely manner to the Complainant’s request.

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

⁶ 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.

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.

Validity of Request

The New Jersey Appellate Division has held that:

While OPRA provides an alternative means of access to government documents not otherwise exempted from its reach, it is not intended as a research tool litigants may use to force government officials to identify and siphon useful information. Rather, OPRA simply operates to make identifiable government records "readily accessible for inspection, copying, or examination." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.

[MAG Entm't v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, at 546 (App. Div. 2005).]

The Court reasoned that:

Most significantly, the request failed to identify with any specificity or particularity the governmental records sought. *MAG provided neither names nor any identifiers other than a broad generic description of a brand or type of case prosecuted by the agency in the past.* Such an open-ended demand required the Division's records custodian to manually search through all of the agency's files, analyze, compile and collate the information contained therein, and identify for MAG the cases relative to its selective enforcement defense in the OAL litigation. Further, once the cases were identified, the records custodian would then be required to evaluate, sort out, and determine the documents to be produced and those otherwise exempted.

[Id. at 549 (emphasis added).]

The Court further held that "[u]nder OPRA, *agencies are required to disclose only 'identifiable' government records* not otherwise exempt . . . In short, OPRA does not countenance open-ended searches of an agency's files." Id. at 549 (emphasis added). See also Bent v. Stafford Police Dep't, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005);⁷ N.J. Builders Ass'n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous., 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009).

Here, the Complainant sought "... the cost of the patrol supervisor overtime ... the amount of money spent on supervisor overtime for being the patrol supervisor." The Town of Morristown maintains a website. On the Police Department page under the category of "Police Divisions" is the following descriptive information: "The patrol division is divided into two squads, 'A' side and 'B' side and is further broken down into platoons. Each platoon is overseen by a lieutenant who serves as the shift commander and a sergeant who acts as the road supervisor."⁸ It is clear

⁷ Affirming Bent v. Stafford Police Dep't, GRC Complaint No. 2004-78 (October 2004).

⁸http://www.townofmorristown.org/index.asp?SEC=AC7F09A7-EADC-43E3-9DC8-C969ABD691E1&Type=B_BASIC (accessed March 1, 2018).

from this description that the Morristown Police Department has more than one patrol supervisor; however the Complainant failed to identify the specific patrol supervisor for whom he was requesting the overtime expenditure.

To fulfill the Complainant's request the Custodian would have to conduct research to determine which supervisor, if any, received overtime pay from June 1, 2014 to January 20, 2017. Such actions on the part of the Custodian are beyond the scope of his duties under OPRA.

Therefore, the Complainant's OPRA request is invalid because it fails to seek an identifiable government record. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534; Bent, 381 N.J. Super. 30; N.J. Builders Ass'n, 390 N.J. Super. 166; Schuler, GRC 2007-151. Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant's request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

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)).

Here, the Custodian failed to respond to the Complainant's request in a timely manner; however, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian's actions had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or were intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian's actions did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Council Staff respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. 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. Twp. of Rockaway, GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).
2. The Complainant's OPRA request is invalid because it fails to seek an identifiable government record. MAG Entm't v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 549 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Dep't, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005); N.J. Builders Ass'n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous., 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009). Thus, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant's request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.
3. The Custodian failed to respond to the Complainant's request in a timely manner; however, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian's actions had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or were intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian's actions did not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

Prepared By: John E. Stewart

March 20, 2017