



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

December 15, 2020 Government Records Council Meeting

Frank J. Festa, Jr.
Complainant

Complaint No. 2019-174

v.

Township of Marlboro (Monmouth)
Custodian of Record

At the December 15, 2020 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the December 8, 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 the Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, no “deemed” denial of access occurred here. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). Further, the Council need not address whether an unlawful denial of access occurred because the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that she disclosed all records that existed. See Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).

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 15th Day of December 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: December 17, 2020

New Jersey is an Equal Opportunity Employer • Printed on Recycled paper and Recyclable

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
December 15, 2020 Council Meeting**

**Frank J. Festa, Jr.¹
Complainant**

GRC Complaint No. 2019-174

v.

**Township of Marlboro (Monmouth)²
Custodial Agency**

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of “[r]ecords” from:

1. DC-001507-06 Centrastate Medical v. Twp. of Marlboro
2. DC-003339-07 Farrell v. Twp. of Marlboro
3. DC-007108-11 Schlem v. Twp. of Marlboro
4. DC-009276-01 Twp. of Marlboro v. CMI, Inc.
5. DC0013123-05 Twp. of Marlboro v. Anthony Apallicro Holdings
6. SC-001237-17 Frisher v. Twp. of Marlboro
7. SC-001753-13 Green v. Twp. of Marlboro
8. SC-003091-98 Ronald Birenkrant v. Twp. of Marlboro

Custodian of Record: Suzanne Branagan
Request Received by Custodian: July 29, 2019
Response Made by Custodian: July 30, 2019
GRC Complaint Received: August 21, 2019

Background³

Request and Response:

On July 25, 2019, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On July 30, 2019, the first (1st) business day after receipt of the OPRA request, the Custodian responded in writing disclosing records for item Nos. 3, 6, and 7. The Custodian noted that no records related to the remaining cases existed.

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Represented by Brian P. Trelease, Esq., of Rainone, Coughlin, Minchello, LLC (Iselin, NJ).

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.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On August 21, 2019, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the Custodian failed to respond to his OPRA request.

Statement of Information:

On October 22, 2019, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on July 29, 2019. The Custodian certified that she responded in writing on July 30, 2019 disclosing records for three (3) items and advising that no remaining records existed.

The Custodian stated that OPRA “only allows requests for records, not requests for information.” MAG Entm’t, LLC v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Dep’t, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005). The Custodian further contended that the OPRA response time frame did not apply where requests failed to identify specific records. N.J. Builders Ass’n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous., 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007). The Custodian contended that the evidence of record is clear that she timely responded to the OPRA request at issue here.

The Custodian averred that it should be noted that the Complainant only alleged that she failed to respond and did not challenge the actual response. The Custodian argued that the Complainant was “fully aware” of the Township’s responses and pursued this action with intent to harass the Township. The Custodian thus contended that this complaint was frivolous and must be dismissed.

Additional Submissions:

On October 28, 2019, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC alleging several communication issues with the Township. The Complainant asserted that the Township was not assisting him to locate specific records and instead denied his OPRA requests as invalid.⁴

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

⁴ The Complainant’s e-mail was sent in relation to each of his ten (10) complaints being concurrently adjudicated.

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.

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).

In the matter before the Council, the Complainant contended that the Custodian failed to respond to his OPRA request. In the SOI, the Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request on July 30, 2019 disclosing records responsive to three (3) of the items and stating that no records responsive to the remaining items existed. The Custodian attached as part of the SOI her written response sent to the Complainant via e-mail on that date.

The Complainant’s contention in the instant complaint is that he received no response to the subject OPRA request. However, the Custodian provided sufficient evidence in the SOI to show that she responded in writing to the OPRA request.⁶ Further, the Custodian’s evidence is persuasive that she reasonably refuted the Complainant’s allegations. Based on this, no “deemed” denial of access occurred here.

Therefore, the Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, no “deemed” denial of access occurred here. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). Further, the Council need not address whether an unlawful denial of access occurred because the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that she disclosed all records that existed. See Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, no “deemed” denial of access occurred here. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g), N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). Further, the Council need not address whether an unlawful denial of access occurred because the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that she disclosed all records that existed. See Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).

Prepared By: Frank F. Caruso
Executive Director

December 8, 2020

⁶ The GRC notes that the Complainant’s OPRA request is invalid on its face because it fails to identify any specific records sought. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. at 546; Feiler-Jampel v. Somerset Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-190 (Interim Order dated March 26, 2008).