

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

PARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO Box 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

Lt. Governor Sheila Y. Oliver Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

June 30, 2020 Government Records Council Meeting

Kevin Alexander
Complainant
v.
County of Union
Custodian of Record

Complaint No. 2019-218

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 the Custodian has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request. Specifically, the Custodian certified that no responsive records exist, and the Complainant failed to submit any competent, credible evidence to refute the Custodian's certification. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).

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 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 2, 2020



STATE OF NEW JERSEY GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

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

Kevin Alexander¹ Complainant GRC Complaint No. 2019-218

v.

County of Union² Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to Complaint: Copies via U.S. mail of a cost savings analysis regarding the proposed dismantling of the law library at Union County Jail ("UCJ").

Custodian of Record: Marlena Russo

Request Received by Custodian: September 25, 2019 Response Made by Custodian: October 1, 2019 GRC Complaint Received: October 29, 2019

Background³

Request and Response:

On September 24, 2019, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act ("OPRA") request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On October 1, 2019, the Custodian responded in writing advising the Complainant that no responsive records exist.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On October 29, 2019, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council ("GRC"). The Complainant asserted that he believed that the Director of UCJ should have the above-mentioned records. The Complainant further asserted that the Director himself should provide the responsive records to his OPRA request. The Complainant argued that the Director was hiding behind the Board of Chosen Freeholders as well as the Custodian by not answering the subject OPRA request personally. The Complainant further argued that he had previously submitted OPRA requests to the Board of Chosen Freeholders as well as directly to the Director of UCJ for the same records.

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Represented by April C. Bauknight, Esq., Assistant County Counsel for the County of Union (Elizabeth, 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.

Statement of Information:

On November 27, 2019, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information ("SOI").⁴ The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant's OPRA request on September 25, 2019. The Custodian certified that she responded in writing on October 4, 2019 advising the Complainant that no responsive records to his request existed.

Additional Submissions:

On December 2, 2019, the Complainant submitted a letter in response to the Custodian's SOI.⁵ The Complainant alleged that the Custodian and the County Counsel were "engaging in stall tactics". The Complainant argued that the cost effect of destroying law library could be easily gleaned from viewing the "budget debt" documentation prior to its dismantling.

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.

The GRC has previously found that, in light of a custodian's certification that no records responsive to the request exist, and where no evidence exists in the record to refute the custodian's certification, no unlawful denial of access occurred. In <u>Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ.</u>, GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005), the custodian certified that no records responsive to the complainant's request for billing records existed and the complainant submitted no evidence to refute the custodian's certification regarding said records. The GRC determined that because the custodian certified that no records responsive to the request existed and no evidence existed in the record to refute the custodian's certification, there was no unlawful denial of access to the requested records.

In the matter before the Council, the Complainant's OPRA request sought a copy of cost savings analysis regarding the alleged dismantling of the law library at UCJ. The Custodian responded in writing advising the Complainant that no responsive records existed.

The Complainant's OPRA request did not name a specific record sought to illustrate the cost savings for the alleged action at UCJ. Notwithstanding, after reviewing the evidence on record, the GRC is satisfied that the Custodian lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA

⁴ The GRC returned the SOI on December 12, 2019 because the Custodian's response was comingled with responses to three (3) other Denial of Access Complaints. The Custodian subsequently resubmitted the SOI clearly identifying their recitation of the facts and legal arguments of each individual complaint.

⁵ The Complainant included in his letter discussion of the County's responses to other OPRA requests not at issue in the instant complaint.

request. The Custodian certified in the SOI that the responsive records do not exist. Further, the Complainant has not provided competent, credible evidence to refute the Custodian's certification.

Therefore, the Custodian has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request. Specifically, the Custodian certified that no responsive records exist, and the Complainant failed to submit any competent, credible evidence to refute the Custodian's certification. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that the Custodian has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request. Specifically, the Custodian certified that no responsive records exist, and the Complainant failed to submit any competent, credible evidence to refute the Custodian's certification. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).

Prepared By: Brandon Garcia

Case Manager

June 23, 2020