FINAL DECISION

December 15, 2020 Government Records Council Meeting

Frank J. Festa, Jr. Complaint No. 2019-175
Complainant
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).

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
Frank J. Festa, Jr. v. Township of Marlboro (Monmouth)

Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of the following regarding the Township of Marlboro ("Township") Ethics Board ("Board"): “when was it created, why was it created (Court Order), who funds it and what is the budget per year[?]”

Custodian of Record: Suzanne Branagan
Request Received by Custodian: August 12, 2019
Response Made by Custodian: August 20, 2019
GRC Complaint Received: August 23, 2019

Background

Request and Response:

On August 7, 2019, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act ("OPRA") request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On August 20, 2019, the sixth (6th) business day after receipt of the OPRA request, the Custodian responded in writing denying the Complainant’s request as invalid because it sought “information and not documents.”

Denial of Access Complaint:

On August 23, 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 August 12, 2019. The Custodian certified that she responded in writing on August 20, 2019 denying the request as invalid.

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 further contended that the request is invalid because it asked questions and did not seek any records.

The Custodian argued that the Complainant was “fully aware” of the Township’s response 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 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 August 20, 2019 denying it as invalid. The Custodian attached as part of the SOI her written response sent to the Complainant via e-mail on that date.

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.

Frank J. Festa, Jr. v. Township of Marlboro (Monmouth), 2019-175 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
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 timely responded in writing to the subject OPRA request. 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).

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).

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 asks questions. Watt v. Borough of North Plainfield (Somerset), GRC Complaint No. 2007-246 (September 2009); Rummel v. Cumberland Cnty. Bd. of Chosen Freeholders, GRC Complaint No. 2011-168 (December 2012).
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