INTERIM ORDER

January 26, 2021 Government Records Council Meeting

Charles K. Hewitt
Complainant

v.
City of Millville (Cumberland)
Custodian of Record

At the January 26, 2021 public meeting, the Government Records Council ("Council") considered the January 19, 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, finds that:

1. The GRC must conduct an in camera review of the redacted e-mails withheld from disclosure to determine the validity of the Custodian’s assertion that said e-mails fell under OPRA’s exemptions for attorney-client communications, the deliberative process privilege, and/or communications between the City of Millville and its insurance carrier. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. See Paff v. N.J. Dep’t of Labor, Bd. of Review, 379 N.J. Super. 346 (App. Div. 2005).

2. The Custodian shall deliver1 to the Council in a sealed envelope nine (9) copies of the requested unredacted records (see conclusion No. 1 above), nine (9) copies of the redacted records, a document or redaction index2, as well as a legal certification from the Custodian, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,3 that the records provided are the records requested by the Council for the in camera inspection. Such delivery must be received by the GRC within five (5) business days from receipt of the Council’s Interim Order.

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.

---

1 The in camera records may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives them by the deadline.

2 The document or redaction index should identify the record and/or each redaction asserted and the lawful basis for the denial.

3 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."
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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
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STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
January 26, 2021 Council Meeting

Charles K. Hewitt1
Complainant

v.

City of Millville (Cumberland)2
Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of: “Any e-mails to or from Commissioner Cooper, Ulalavos, Parent, Pepitone and Mayor Santiago, and Regina Burke. From any Contractor concerning but not limited to the demolition of 109 E. Main St. AKA Eagles Building. For the time period of March 1, 2018 through May 15, 2018.”

Custodian of Record: Jeanne M. Hitchner
Request Received by Custodian: July 5, 2019
Response Made by Custodian: July 10, 2019
GRC Complaint Received: August 7, 2019

Background3

Request and Response:

On July 5, 2019, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On July 10, 2019, the Custodian responded in writing providing copies of responsive records. The Custodian also stated that redactions were made under OPRA’s deliberative process privilege and attorney-client privilege. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. The Custodian also stated that some e-mails contained communications between the City and its insurance carrier and were thus redacted.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On August 7, 2019, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that upon receiving the redacted e-mails, an e-mail chain was included in both redacted and unredacted forms. The Complainant asserted that after reading the chain, he believed that the e-mails did not fall under

No legal representation listed on record.

1 Represented by Brock D. Russell, of the Law Office of Brock D. Russell, LLC (Millville, NJ).
2 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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the deliberative process privilege and questioned the validity of the redactions made to the other e-mails.

Statement of Information:

On August 26, 2019, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on July 5, 2019. The Custodian certified that her search included contacting the City of Millville’s (“City”) IT department to locate relevant e-mails. The Custodian certified that she then reviewed the e-mails with the City Attorney to decide if any of the e-mails required redactions. The Custodian certified that she responded in writing on July 10, 2019, providing the responsive e-mails with redactions.

The Custodian maintained that the redactions were valid, and each redaction was marked with the specific basis for same.

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 Paff v. N.J. Dep’t of Labor, Bd. of Review, 379 N.J. Super. 346 (App. Div. 2005), the complainant appealed a final decision of the Council that accepted the custodian’s legal conclusion for the denial of access without further review. The Appellate Division noted that “OPRA contemplates the GRC’s meaningful review of the basis for an agency’s decision to withhold government records . . . . When the GRC decides to proceed with an investigation and hearing, the custodian may present evidence and argument, but the GRC is not required to accept as adequate whatever the agency offers.” Id. The Court stated that:

[OPRA] also contemplates the GRC’s in camera review of the records that an agency asserts are protected when such review is necessary to a determination of the validity of a claimed exemption. Although OPRA subjects the GRC to the provisions of the ‘Open Public Meetings Act,’ N.J.S.A. 10:4-6 to -21, it also provides that the GRC ‘may go into closed session during that portion of any proceeding during which the contents of a contested record would be disclosed.’ N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(f). This provision would be unnecessary if the Legislature did not intend to permit in camera review.

[Id. at 355.]

Further, the Court found that:

We hold only that the GRC has and should exercise its discretion to conduct *in camera* review when necessary to resolution of the appeal. . . . There is no reason for concern about unauthorized disclosure of exempt documents or privileged information as a result of *in camera* review by the GRC. The GRC’s obligation to maintain confidentiality and avoid disclosure of exempt material is implicit in N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(f), which provides for closed meeting when necessary to avoid disclosure before resolution of a contested claim of exemption.

[Id.]

In the instant matter, the Custodian asserted that the redacted e-mails fell under the deliberative process privilege, attorney-client privilege, or contained communications between the City and its insurance carrier. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. The Complainant asserted that a chain of e-mails was provided in redacted and unredacted form and upon review did not believe the redactions were valid. The GRC thus must review the e-mails to determine the full applicability of the exemptions. Such an action is not uncommon, as the GRC routinely performs an *in camera* review in similar circumstances. See Pouliot v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2015-281 (Interim Order dated January 31, 2017); Ehrenreich v. N.J. Dep’t of Trans., GRC Complaint No. 2016-192 (Interim Order dated April 24, 2018).

Therefore, the GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the redacted e-mails withheld from disclosure to determine the validity of the Custodian’s assertion that said e-mails fell under OPRA’s exemptions for attorney-client communications, the deliberative process privilege, and/or communications between the City and its insurance carrier. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. See Paff, 379 N.J. Super. 346.

**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.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the redacted e-mails withheld from disclosure to determine the validity of the Custodian’s assertion that said e-mails fell under OPRA’s exemptions for attorney-client communications, the deliberative process privilege, and/or communications between the City of Millville and its insurance carrier. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. See Paff v. N.J. Dep’t of Labor, Bd. of Review, 379 N.J. Super. 346 (App. Div. 2005).
2. The Custodian shall deliver\(^5\) to the Council in a sealed envelope nine (9) copies of the requested unredacted records (see conclusion No. 1 above), nine (9) copies of the redacted records, a document or redaction index\(^6\), as well as a legal certification from the Custodian, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,\(^7\) that the records provided are the records requested by the Council for the \textit{in camera} inspection. Such delivery must be received by the GRC within five (5) business days from receipt of the Council’s Interim Order.

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.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado  
Staff Attorney  
January 19, 2021

\(^5\) The \textit{in camera} records may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives them by the deadline.

\(^6\) The document or redaction index should identify the record and/or each redaction asserted and the lawful basis for the denial.

\(^7\) “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.”
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