September 28, 2021 Government Records Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) 
Complainant 

v. 

Buena Borough (Atlantic) 
Custodian of Record 

At the September 28, 2021 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the September 21, 2021 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 Council dismiss this complaint because the parties have agreed to a prevailing party fee amount, thereby negating the need for Complainant’s Counsel to submit a fee application in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13. Therefore, no further adjudication is required.

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 September 2021 

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: September 30, 2021
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

Prevailing Party Attorney’s Fees
Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
September 28, 2021 Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (On Behalf of African American Data and Research Institute) v. Buena Borough (Atlantic), 2018-184 – Supplemental
Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of:

1. Driving While Intoxicated/Driving Under the Influence (“DWI/DUI”) complaints prepared and filed by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.
2. Drug possession complaints prepared and filed by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.
3. Police Department’s “Arrest Listings” from January 2016 through present.
4. Drug paraphernalia complaints and summonses prepared by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.

Custodian of Record: Maryann Coraluzzo
Request Received by Custodian: July 28, 2018
Response Made by Custodian: July 31, 2018
GRC Complaint Received: August 16, 2018

Background

July 27, 2021 Council Meeting:

At its July 27, 2021 public meeting, the Council considered the July 20, 2021 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 that:

1. The Custodian did not fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. Specifically, although the Custodian timely provided the Complainant with the responsive records, she did not provide a certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director within the prescribed time frame.

1 The Complainant represents the African American Data and Research Institute.
2 Represented by Angela Maione Costigan, Esq. of Costigan & Costigan, LLC (Moorestown, N.J.).

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (On Behalf of African American Data and Research Institute) v. Buena Borough (Atlantic), 2018-184 – Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
2. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Additionally, the Custodian failed to fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. However, the Custodian demonstrated that she provided responsive records to the Complainant in accordance with the Interim Order. Additionally, 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 unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

3. Pursuant to the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order, the Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Specifically, the Custodian was ordered to locate, retrieve, and provide the requested records to the Complainant. Further, the relief ultimately achieved had a basis in law. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. 51. Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney's fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.

Procedural History:

On July 28, 2021, the Council distributed its Interim Order to all parties. On August 13, 2021, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC, advising an intent to withdraw the matter due to amicable settlement. The Complainant also stated that the resolution for settlement needed to be approved by Buena Borough (“Borough”). The Complainant subsequently stated that he was informed that the meeting for approval was slated for September 13, 2021.

On August 26, 2021, the GRC notified that parties that the deadline to advise of a settlement expired on August 25, 2021 but acknowledged the Complainant’s August 13, 2021 notification of a pending settlement. The GRC then formally inquired whether an extension was necessary to allow the Borough to approve the settlement. That same day, Custodian’s Counsel responded in writing, requesting forty-five (45) days to approve the settlement. The GRC replied by approving a twenty (20) business day extension, providing a new deadline of September 23, 2021.

On September 2, 2021, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC, stating that he received a check from the Borough for payment of counsel fees, and therefore the fee issue has been resolved.
Analysis

Prevailing Party Attorney’s Fees

At its July 27, 2021 meeting, the Council determined that the Complainant was a prevailing party entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees. The Council thus ordered that the “parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days.” The Council further ordered that the parties notify of any settlement prior to the expiration of the twenty (20) business day time frame. Finally, the Council ordered that, should the parties not reach an agreement, the Complainant’s Counsel would be required to “submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.”

On July 28, 2021, the Council distributed its Interim Order to all parties; thus, the Complainant’s response was due by close of business on August 17, 2021. On August 13, 2021, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC, advising that the parties have settled the matter subject to formal approval by the Borough on September 13, 2021. On August 26, 2021, the GRC granted an extension of twenty (20) business days for the Borough to approve the settlement. On September 2, 2021, the Complainant notified the GRC that he received payment from the Borough for counsel fees.

Accordingly, the Council should dismiss the complaint because the parties have agreed to a prevailing party fee amount, thereby negating the need for Complainant’s Counsel to submit a fee application in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13. Therefore, no further adjudication is required.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends that the Council dismiss this complaint because the parties have agreed to a prevailing party fee amount, thereby negating the need for Complainant’s Counsel to submit a fee application in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13. Therefore, no further adjudication is required.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado
Staff Attorney

September 21, 2021
INTERIM ORDER

July 27, 2021 Government Records Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Buena Borough (Atlantic) Custodian of Record

Complainant

Complaint No. 2018-184

At the July 27, 2021 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the July 20, 2021 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:

1. The Custodian did not fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. Specifically, although the Custodian timely provided the Complainant with the responsive records, she did not provide a certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director within the prescribed time frame.

2. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Additionally, the Custodian failed to fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. However, the Custodian demonstrated that she provided responsive records to the Complainant in accordance with the Interim Order. Additionally, 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 unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

3. Pursuant to the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order, the Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters v. DYFS. 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken. 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian was ordered to locate, retrieve, and provide the requested records to the Complainant. Further, the relief ultimately achieved had a basis in law. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. 51. Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to
Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.

Interim Order Rendered by the
Government Records Council
On The 27th Day of July 2021

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: July 28, 2021
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
July 27, 2021 Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (On Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Buena Borough (Atlantic)
GRC Complaint No. 2018-184

Complainant

v.

Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of:

1. Driving While Intoxicated/Driving Under the Influence (“DWI/DUI”) complaints prepared and filed by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.
2. Drug possession complaints prepared and filed by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.
3. Police Department’s “Arrest Listings” from January 2016 through present.
4. Drug paraphernalia complaints and summonses prepared by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.

Custodian of Record: Maryann Coraluzzo
Request Received by Custodian: July 28, 2018
Response Made by Custodian: July 31, 2018
GRC Complaint Received: August 16, 2018

Background

June 30, 2020 Council Meeting:

At its June 30, 2020 public meeting, the Council considered the June 23, 2020 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 that:

1. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records on the basis that the Township of Franklin, with which Buena Borough had a shared services agreement, possessed the records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Burnett v. Cnty. of Gloucester, 415 N.J. Super. 506 (App. Div. 2010); and Michalak v. Borough of Helmetta (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2010-220 (Interim Order dated January 31, 2012). The Custodian had

1 The Complainant represents the African American Data and Research Institute.
2 Represented by Angela Maione Costigan, Esq. of Costigan & Costigan, LLC (Moorestown, N.J.).
an obligation to obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant. See Meyers v. Borough of Fair Lawn, GRC Complaint No. 2005-127 (December 2005). Thus, the Custodian shall obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant.

2. The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 1 above within five (5) business days from receipt of the Council’s Interim Order with appropriate redactions, including a detailed document index explaining the lawful basis for each redaction, if applicable. Further, the Custodian shall simultaneously deliver\(^3\) certified confirmation of compliance, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,\(^4\) to the Executive Director.\(^5\)

3. The Council defers analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

4. The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

Procedural History:

On July 1, 2020, the Council distributed its Interim Order to all parties. On July 8, 2020, the Custodian responded to the Council’s Interim Order. The Custodian stated that she provided the Complainant with copies of the requested records that same day and attached copies of e-mails addressed to same. On July 9, 2020, the GRC replied to the Custodian stating that a certified confirmation of compliance was still required. On July 10, 2020, the Custodian provided a certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director.

Analysis

Compliance

At its June 30, 2020 meeting, the Council ordered the Custodian to locate and produce responsive records from the Township of Franklin (“Township”) to the Complainant. The Council also ordered the Custodian to submit certified confirmation of compliance, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4, to the Executive Director. On July 1, 2020 the Council distributed its Interim Order to all parties, providing the Custodian five (5) business days to comply with the terms of said Order. Thus, the Custodian’s response was due by close of business on July 9, 2020,

\(^3\) The certified confirmation of compliance, including supporting documentation, may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives it by the deadline.

\(^4\) “I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.”

\(^5\) Satisfactory compliance requires that the Custodian deliver the record(s) to the Complainant in the requested medium. If a copying or special service charge was incurred by the Complainant, the Custodian must certify that the record has been made available to the Complainant but the Custodian may withhold delivery of the record until the financial obligation is satisfied. Any such charge must adhere to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.
accounting for the Independence Day holiday.

On July 8, 2020, the fourth (4th) business day after receipt of the Council’s Order, the Custodian e-mailed the Complainant providing copies of the responsive records as attachments. However, the Custodian did not provide a certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director until July 10, 2020, the sixth (6th) business day after receipt. Thus, the Custodian’s response was untimely.

Therefore, the Custodian did not fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. Specifically, although the Custodian timely provided the Complainant with the responsive records, she did not provide a certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director within the prescribed time frame.

**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)).

In the matter before the Council, the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Additionally, the Custodian failed to fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. However, the Custodian demonstrated that she provided responsive records to the Complainant in accordance with the Interim Order. Additionally, 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 unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.
**Prevailing Party Attorney’s Fees**

OPERA provides that:

A person who is denied access to a government record by the custodian of the record, at the option of the requestor, may: institute a proceeding to challenge the custodian's decision by filing an action in Superior Court . . .; or in lieu of filing an action in Superior Court, file a complaint with the Government Records Council . . . A requestor who prevails in any proceeding shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee.

\[\text{N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.}\]

In Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006), the Appellate Division held that a complainant is a “prevailing party” if he achieves the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. Additionally, the court held that attorney’s fees may be awarded when the requestor is successful (or partially successful) via a judicial decree, a quasi-judicial determination, or a settlement of the parties that indicates access was improperly denied and the requested records are disclosed. Id.

Additionally, the New Jersey Supreme Court has ruled on the issue of “prevailing party” attorney’s fees. In Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 71 (2008), the Court discussed the catalyst theory, “which posits that a plaintiff is a ‘prevailing party’ if it achieves the desired result because the lawsuit brought about a voluntary change in the defendant’s conduct”(quoting Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home v. West Virginia Dep’t of Health & Human Res., 532 U.S. 598, 131 S. Ct. 1835, 149 L. Ed. 2d 855 (2001)). In Buckhannon, the Supreme Court held that the phrase “prevailing party” is a legal term of art that refers to a “party in whose favor a judgment is rendered.” Id. at 603 (quoting Black’s Law Dictionary 1145 (7th ed. 1999)). The Supreme Court rejected the catalyst theory as a basis for prevailing party attorney fees, in part because “[i]t allows an award where there is no judicially sanctioned change in the legal relationship of the parties . . .” Id. at 605, 121 S. Ct. at 1840, 149 L. Ed. 2d at 863. Further, the Supreme Court expressed concern that the catalyst theory would spawn extra litigation over attorney's fees. Id. at 609, 121 S. Ct. at 1843, 149 L. Ed. 2d at 866.

However, the Court noted in Mason that Buckhannon is binding only when counsel fee provisions under federal statutes are at issue. 196 N.J. at 72, citing Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 429; see, e.g., Baer v. Klagholz, 346 N.J. Super. 79 (App. Div. 2001) (applying Buckhannon to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), certif. denied, 174 N.J. 193 (2002). “But in interpreting New Jersey law, we look to state law precedent and the specific state statute before us. When appropriate, we depart from the reasoning of federal cases that interpret comparable federal statutes.” 196 N.J. at 73 (citations omitted).

The Mason Court accepted the application of the catalyst theory within the context of OPRA, stating that:

OPERA itself contains broader language on attorney's fees than the former RTKL.
OPRA provides that “[a] requestor who prevails in any proceeding shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Under the prior RTKL, “[a] plaintiff in whose favor such an order [requiring access to public records] issues . . . may be awarded a reasonable attorney's fee not to exceed $500.00.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-4 (repealed 2002). The Legislature's revisions therefore: (1) mandate, rather than permit, an award of attorney's fees to a prevailing party; and (2) eliminate the $500 cap on fees and permit a reasonable, and quite likely higher, fee award. Those changes expand counsel fee awards under OPRA.

[196 N.J. at 73-76.]

The Court in Mason, further held that:

[R]equestors are entitled to attorney’s fees under OPRA, absent a judgment or an enforceable consent decree, when they can demonstrate (1) “a factual causal nexus between plaintiff’s litigation and the relief ultimately achieved”; and (2) “that the relief ultimately secured by plaintiffs had a basis in law.” Singer v. State, 95 N.J. 487, 495, cert. denied, New Jersey v. Singer, 469 U.S. 832 (1984).

[Id. at 76.]

Here, the Complainant sought records of complaints pertaining to drug possession and DUI/DWI offenses, as well as complaints and summonses pertaining to drug paraphernalia. The Complainant also sought arrest listings from the police department. The Custodian argued that Buena Borough had a shared services agreement with the Township to provide police services and therefore did not possess the requested records. The Complainant filed the instant matter to assert that the Borough had an obligation to retrieve the records.

In determining whether the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney’s fees, the GRC is satisfied that the evidence of record supports a conclusion in the affirmative. In accordance with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order, the Custodian was required to locate and obtain the requested records from the Township, which was the Complainant’s desired result in filing the instant complaint. Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Thus, a causal nexus exists between this complaint and the change in the Custodian’s conduct. Mason 196 N.J. at 76. Accordingly, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney’s fees.6

Therefore, pursuant to the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order, the Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately

---

6 The Council makes this determination with the understanding that the Complainant acted on behalf of a bona fide client at the time of the request. Although the Complainant’s status as representing an actual client has been previously challenged, the available evidence on the record is insufficient to address that issue herein. See Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Neptune City Police Dep’t (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-153 (April 2020) and Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Freehold Twp. Police Dep’t (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-155 (Interim Order dated September 29, 2020).
achieved. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Specifically, the Custodian was ordered to locate, retrieve, and provide the requested records to the Complainant. Further, the relief ultimately achieved had a basis in law. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. 51. Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian did not fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. Specifically, although the Custodian timely provided the Complainant with the responsive records, she did not provide a certified confirmation of compliance to the Executive Director within the prescribed time frame.

2. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Additionally, the Custodian failed to fully comply with the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order. However, the Custodian demonstrated that she provided responsive records to the Complainant in accordance with the Interim Order. Additionally, 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 unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

3. Pursuant to the Council’s June 30, 2020 Interim Order, the Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian was ordered to locate, retrieve, and provide the requested records to the Complainant. Further, the relief ultimately achieved had a basis in law. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. 51. Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.
INTERIM ORDER

June 30, 2020 Government Records Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh Esq. (o/b/o African American Data and Research Institute) Complaint No. 2018-184
Complainant

v.

Buena Borough (Atlantic) Custodian of Record

At the June 30, 2020 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the June 23, 2020 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 unlawfully denied access to the requested records on the basis that the Township of Franklin, with which Buena Borough had a shared services agreement, possessed the records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Burnett v. Cnty. of Gloucester, 415 N.J. Super. 506 (App. Div. 2010); and Michalak v. Borough of Helmetta (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2010-220 (Interim Order dated January 31, 2012). The Custodian had an obligation to obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant. See Meyers v. Borough of Fair Lawn, GRC Complaint No. 2005-127 (December 2005). Thus, the Custodian shall obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant.

2. The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 1 above within five (5) business days from receipt of the Council’s Interim Order with appropriate redactions, including a detailed document index explaining the lawful basis for each redaction, if applicable. Further, the Custodian shall simultaneously deliver\(^1\) certified confirmation of compliance, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,\(^2\) to the Executive Director.\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) The certified confirmation of compliance, including supporting documentation, may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives it by the deadline.

\(^2\) “I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment.”

\(^3\) Satisfactory compliance requires that the Custodian deliver the record(s) to the Complainant in the requested medium. If a copying or special service charge was incurred by the Complainant, the Custodian must certify that the record has been made available to the Complainant but the Custodian may withhold delivery of the record until the financial obligation is satisfied. Any such charge must adhere to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.
3. The Council defers analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

4. The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

Interim Order Rendered by the Government Records Council
On The 30th Day of June 2020

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: July 1, 2020**
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
June 30, 2020 Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (On Behalf of1
African American Data & Research Institute)
Complainant

v.

Buena Borough (Atlantic)2
Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of:

1. Driving While Intoxicated/Driving Under the Influence (“DWI/DUI”) complaints prepared and filed by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.
2. Drug possession complaints prepared and filed by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.
3. Police Department’s “Arrest Listings” from January 2016 through present.
4. Drug paraphernalia complaints and summonses prepared by the Police Department from January 2016 through present.

Custodian of Record: Maryann Coraluzzo
Request Received by Custodian: July 28, 2018
Response Made by Custodian: July 31, 2018
GRC Complaint Received: August 16, 2018

Background3

Request and Response:

On July 28, 2018, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On July 31, 2018, the Custodian responded in writing stating that Buena Borough’s (“Borough”) police department functions were facilitated through the Township of Franklin (“Franklin”) in Gloucester County. The Custodian also provided the e-mail address of Franklin’s Police Chief. That same day, the Complainant replied to the Custodian asking her to forward his OPRA request to the police department in charge of the Borough.

1 The Complainant represents the African American Data and Research Institute.
2 Represented by Angela Maione Costigan, Esq. of Costigan & Costigan, LLC (Moorestown, N.J.).
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.
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Denial of Access Complaint:

On August 16, 2018, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that as of August 15, 2018, the Custodian has not provided any records or requested an extension of time to respond. The Complainant requested that the Council find that the Custodian violated OPRA in accordance with Burnett v. Cnty. of Gloucester, 415 N.J. Super. 506 (App. Div. 2010); Michalak v. Borough of Helmetta (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2010-220 (Interim Order dated January 31, 2012). The Complainant also requested that the Council award him counsel fees.

Additional Correspondence:

On August 23, 2018, the Custodian’s Counsel submitted a response brief to the GRC. Counsel asserted that a shared services agreement (“SSA”) was signed by the Borough and Franklin and became effective on January 1, 2018. Counsel also asserted that the Borough merged its police department with Franklin on January 22, 2018, and therefore all police records sought by the Complainant were sent to Franklin on or about that time. Counsel included copies of the relevant ordinance, SSA, and resolutions from both municipalities.

Later that same day on August 23, 2018, the Complainant submitted a response to the Custodian. Therein, the Complainant reiterated his Denial of Access Complaint argument that the Custodian violated OPRA pursuant to Michalak, GRC 2010-220, as the Custodian failed to obtain the records from Franklin. See also Burnett, 415 N.J. Super. 506; and Meyers v. Borough of Fair Lawn, GRC Complaint No. 2005-127 (December 2005).

The Complainant requested that the matter be scheduled for adjudication considering the SSA provided by Counsel. The Complainant also reiterated that the Council should award him counsel fees as a prevailing party. Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423 (App. Div. 2006).

Statement of Information:

On August 29, 2018, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on July 28, 2018. The Custodian certified that all the Borough’s police records were sent to Franklin in January 2018. The Custodian certified that therefore the Borough did not possess any police records to review or search. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant on July 31, 2018.

The Custodian asserted that she was not the custodian of police records, and advised the Complainant to submit an OPRA request in accordance with N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i) to Franklin, which is the appropriate custodial agency for obtaining police records. The Custodian also incorporated Counsel’s August 23, 2018 correspondence and accompanying attachments as part of her SOI.

Additional Submissions:

On August 29, 2018, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC stating he would not submit a
direct reply to the Custodian’s SOI. The Complainant stated that his August 23, 2018 correspondence was a sufficient response.

Analysis

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.

In Burnett, 415 N.J. Super. 506, the Appellate Division determined that the defendant was required to obtain settlement agreements from its insurance broker. The court’s decision largely rested on the fact that there was no question that the broker was working on behalf of the defendant to execute settlement agreements. The court noted that it previously held that although a third party, such as insurance broker or outside counsel, may execute settlement agreements, “they nonetheless bind the county as principal, and the agreements are made on its behalf.” Id. at 513. In determining that the defendant had an obligation to obtain responsive records from the insurance broker, the court distinguished Bent v. Stafford Police Dep’t. 381 N.J. Super. 30, 38-39 (App. Div. 2005) from the facts before it. The court reasoned that:

In Bent, the requester sought records and information regarding a criminal investigation of his credit card activities conducted jointly by the Stafford Township Police Department [“STPD”], the United States Attorney for New Jersey and a special agent of the Internal Revenue Service. As part of his request, Bent sought “discrete records of the 1992 criminal investigation conducted by the STPD,” which were fully disclosed. Id. at 38. Additionally, he sought a “[c]opy of contact memos, chain of custody for items removed or turned over to third parties of signed Grand Jury reports and recommendations.” Bent v. Stafford Twp. Police Dept., GRC 2004-78, final decision (October 14, 2004). Affirming the determination of the [GRC], we stated: “to the extent Bent’s request was for records that either did not exist or were not in the custodian’s possession, there was, of necessity, no denial of access at all.” Bent, supra, 381 N.J. Super. at 38 . . . We continued by stating:

“Of course, even if the requested documents did exist, the custodian was under no obligation to search for them beyond the township’s files. OPRA applies solely to documents ‘made, maintained or kept on file in the course of [a public agency's] official business,’ as well as any document ‘received in the course of [the agency’s] official business.’ N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. Contrary to Bent’s assertion, although OPRA mandates that ‘all government records . . . be subject to public access unless exempt,’ the statute itself neither specifies nor directs the type of record that is to be ‘made, maintained or kept on file.’ In fact, in interpreting OPRA’s predecessor
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statute, the Right to Know Law, we found no requirement in the law concerning 'the making, maintaining or keeping on file the results of an investigation by a law enforcement official or agency into the alleged commission of a criminal offense... Thus, even if the requested documents did exist in the files of outside agencies, Bent has made no showing that they were, by law, required to be ‘made, maintained or kept on file’ by the custodian so as to justify any relief or remedy under OPRA. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.”

[T]he circumstances presented in Bent [are] far removed from those existing in the present matter because, as we have previously concluded, the settlement agreements at issue here were “made” by or on behalf of the Board in the course of its official business. Were we to conclude otherwise, a governmental agency seeking to protect its records from scrutiny could simply delegate their creation to third parties or relinquish possession to such parties, thereby thwarting the policy of transparency that underlies OPRA. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.

[Id. at 516-17.]

The Council subsequently expanded the court’s holding in Burnett to agencies entering into shared services agreements. See Michalak, GRC 2010-220. In that case, the complainant sought police dispatch logs from the Borough of Helmetta (“Helmetta”). The custodian asserted that Helmetta did not maintain the records as dispatch calls were routed through the Spotswood Police Department (“SPD”). The Council held that since Helmetta entered into a shared services agreement with the Borough of Spotswood to operate Helmetta’s dispatch log, the custodian was obligated to obtain the requested records from SPD. The Council found that SPD “made, maintained, or kept on file” the dispatch logs on behalf of Helmetta pursuant to the shared services agreement. See Burnett, 415 N.J. Super. at 517.

Moreover, in Meyers, GRC 2005-127, the complainant requested e-mails sent to various individuals regarding official business but located on the mayor’s home computer. The custodian alleged that due to the records’ location, they were not government records. The Council found that the definition of a government record was not restricted by its physical location. The Council further found that the requested records should be released in accordance with OPRA, to the extent they fell within the definition of a government record. Thus, the Council held that the location of a document was immaterial to its status as a government record.

Both Burnett and Michalak are directly applicable in the instant matter. The evidence of record demonstrates that the Borough entered into an SSA with Franklin to provide law enforcement services within the Borough. Thus, the requested records were created and maintained in Franklin on behalf of the Borough. Additionally, the Custodian was obligated to retrieve the records from Franklin, as their physical location is immaterial. See Meyers, GRC 2005-127.

Accordingly, the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records on the basis that Franklin, with which the Borough had a shared services agreement, possessed the records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Burnett, 415 N.J. Super. 506; and Michalak, GRC 2010-220. The Custodian
had an obligation to obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant. See Meyers, GRC 2005-127. Thus, the Custodian shall obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant.

Knowing & Willful

The Council defers analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

Prevailing Party Attorney’s Fees

The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested records on the basis that the Township of Franklin, with which Buena Borough had a shared services agreement, possessed the records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Burnett v. Cnty. of Gloucester, 415 N.J. Super. 506 (App. Div. 2010); and Michalak v. Borough of Helmetta (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2010-220 (Interim Order dated January 31, 2012). The Custodian had an obligation to obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant. See Meyers v. Borough of Fair Lawn, GRC Complaint No. 2005-127 (December 2005). Thus, the Custodian shall obtain the responsive records from Franklin and provide same to the Complainant.

2. The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 1 above within five (5) business days from receipt of the Council’s Interim Order with appropriate redactions, including a detailed document index explaining the lawful basis for each redaction, if applicable. Further, the Custodian shall simultaneously deliver certified confirmation of compliance, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,5 to the Executive Director.6

---

4 The certified confirmation of compliance, including supporting documentation, may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives it by the deadline.

5 "I certify that the foregoing statements made by me are true. I am aware that if any of the foregoing statements made by me are willfully false, I am subject to punishment."

6 Satisfactory compliance requires that the Custodian deliver the record(s) to the Complainant in the requested medium. If a copying or special service charge was incurred by the Complainant, the Custodian must certify that the record has been made available to the Complainant but the Custodian may withhold delivery of the record until the financial obligation is satisfied. Any such charge must adhere to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.
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3. The Council defers analysis of whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

4. The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado
Staff Attorney

June 23, 2020