



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

March 29, 2022 Government Records Council Meeting

Judith Sullivan
Complainant

Complaint No. 2019-94

v.

Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen)
Custodian of Record

At the March 29, 2022 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the March 22, 2022 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 the complaint because the Complainant voluntarily withdrew this complaint in writing via e-mail to the GRC on March 16, 2022. Thus, 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 29th Day of March 2022

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: March 31, 2022



**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
March 29, 2022 Council Meeting**

Judith Sullivan¹
Complainant

GRC Complaint No. 2019-94

v.

Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen)²
Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to the Complaint: Copy via e-mail of “[e]mails by and between Mr. Travis Smith, Mr. Michael Marano, and Ms. Tanushree Desai regarding my son’s [name deleted] candidacy for sophomore class council president for the time period January 2, 2018 to May 30, 2018.”³

Custodian of Record: Thomas Lambe⁴

Requests Received by Custodian: April 8, 2019, April 16, 2019

Responses Made by Custodian: April 16, 2019, April 17, 2019, April 26, 2019, and May 10, 2019

GRC Complaint Received: May 17, 2019

Background

August 24, 2021 Council Meeting:

At its August 24, 2021 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the August 17, 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. Pursuant to Paff v. N.J. Dep’t of Labor, Bd. of Review, 379 N.J. Super. 346 (App. Div. 2005), the GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the records listed in Table 1 to determine the validity of the Custodian’s assertion that portions of the records were lawfully denied as advisory, consultative or deliberative material pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.
2. **The Custodian must deliver to the Council in a sealed envelope nine (9) copies of the requested unredacted records (see #1 above), nine (9) copies of the redacted**

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Represented by Stephen R. Fogarty, Esq., of Fogarty & Hara (Fair Lawn, NJ).

³ There were other records requested that are not relevant to this complaint.

⁴ Frank Ceurvels was the original Custodian.

Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Supplemental Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

records, a document or redaction index, as well as a legal certification from the Custodian, in accordance with N.J. Court Rule 1:4-4, 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.

Procedural History:

On August 25, 2021, the Council distributed its August 24, 2021 Interim Order to all parties. The Interim Order provided the Custodian five (5) business days to comply with the terms of said Order. Therefore, compliance was due on or before September 1, 2021. On August 27, 2021, the Custodian's Counsel, on behalf of the Custodian, responded to the Council's Interim Order by delivering to the Council nine (9) copies each of the unredacted records and redacted records for *in camera* inspection, together with a redaction index and legal certification.

On September 7, 2021, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC to state that her son had reached the age of 18 and that she is no longer legally able to receive any records the Council may order to be disclosed. The Complainant stated that she was assigning the complaint to her son by and through an Assignment that she attached to the e-mail. On March 3, 2022, the GRC informed the Complainant that the "[t]he right to institute any proceeding under [OPRA] shall be solely that of the requestor" pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. The GRC further informed the Complainant that because she was the requestor the GRC would not allow an assignment of the Complaint. The GRC advised the Complainant that she could either withdraw the complaint or proceed with written authorization from her son to the effect that she could receive the records should the Council order disclosure. On March 16, 2022, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC stating that she was withdrawing the complaint.

Analysis

No analysis required.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council dismiss the complaint because the Complainant voluntarily withdrew this complaint in writing via e-mail to the GRC on March 16, 2022. Thus, no further adjudication is required.

Prepared By: John E. Stewart
Staff Attorney

March 22, 2022



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

INTERIM ORDER

August 24, 2021 Government Records Council Meeting

Judith Sullivan
Complainant

Complaint No. 2019-94

v.

Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High
School District (Bergen)
Custodian of Record

At the August 24, 2021 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the August 17, 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. Pursuant to Paff v. N.J. Dep’t of Labor, Bd. of Review, 379 N.J. Super. 346 (App. Div. 2005), the GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the records listed in Table 1 to determine the validity of the Custodian’s assertion that portions of the records were lawfully denied as advisory, consultative or deliberative material pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.
2. **The Custodian must deliver¹ to the Council in a sealed envelope nine (9) copies of the requested unredacted records (see #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 Rule 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 they arrive at the GRC office 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."

Interim Order Rendered by the
Government Records Council
On The 24th Day of August 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: August 25, 2021

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
August 24, 2021 Council Meeting**

Judith Sullivan¹
Complainant

GRC Complaint No. 2019-94

v.

Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen)²
Custodial Agency

Records Relevant to the Complaint: Copy via e-mail of “[e]mails by and between Mr. Travis Smith, Mr. Michael Marano, and Ms. Tanushree Desai regarding my son’s [name deleted] candidacy for sophomore class council president for the time period January 2, 2018 to May 30, 2018.”³

Custodian of Record: Frank Ceurvels

Requests Received by Custodian: April 8, 2019, April 16, 2019

Responses Made by Custodian: April 16, 2019, April 17, 2019, April 26, 2019, and May 10, 2019

GRC Complaint Received: May 17, 2019

Background⁴

Requests and Responses:

On April 8, 2019, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On April 16, 2019, the sixth (6th) business day following receipt of said request, the Custodian responded in writing informing the Complainant that her request for e-mails and correspondence was denied as overly broad because it failed to comply with the necessary elements of a request for correspondence as required by Elcavage v. West Milford Twp. (Passaic), GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 8, 2010), and its progeny.

Via e-mail dated April 16, 2019, the Complainant clarified her request for correspondence by rewording it as set forth in the records relevant to the complaint. On April 17, 2019, the Custodian responded to the Complainant, informing her that he was accepting her

¹ No legal representation listed on record.

² Represented by Stephen R. Fogarty, Esq., of Fogarty & Hara (Fair Lawn, NJ).

³ There were other records requested that are not relevant to this complaint.

⁴ 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.

Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

April 16, 2019 e-mail as a *de novo* OPRA request and would communicate further with her regarding the search progress. On, April 26, 2019, the seventh (7th) business day following receipt of the Complainant's new April 16, 2019 request (the District was closed on April 19, 2019), the Custodian responded by informing the Complainant that he would require an extension of time until May 17, 2019, to search for records responsive to the request. On May 10, 2019, the Custodian responded to the Complainant by disclosing records responsive to the request.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On May 17, 2019, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council ("GRC"). The Complainant stated that she submitted her OPRA request on April 6, 2019, and that after the Custodian informed her it was too broad, she narrowed the request on April 16, 2019. The Complainant stated that the Custodian responded by disclosing an e-mail string in redacted form. The Complainant stated that the redactions were improper because the redacted content was not part of the deliberative process since the writers stated that they were not participating in the decision. The Complainant referred the GRC to a letter dated May 10, 2019, which she attached to the complaint. The Complainant stated that the letter contained her legal analysis.

The referenced May 10, 2019 letter was an e-mail from the Complainant to the Custodian, wherein the Complainant informed the Custodian that she was appealing a redacted e-mail dated May 16, 2018 from Ms. Desai to Ms. Perry. The Complainant asserted that the "statute provides that the information redacted can be withheld if it was communicated for purposes of decision making . . ." ⁵ The Complainant stated that in the redacted e-mail Ms. Desai stated that she would not be participating in the decision making process. The Complainant also stated that she had been told that the subject referenced in the e-mail was a matter within the province of Mr. Quirk and the Appeal Committee; therefore, the Complainant stated that the redaction of Ms. Perry's and Ms. Dargento's comments on the same e-mail string was inappropriate. The Complainant stated that the "same reasoning applies to the redacted portion of Mr. Smith's email to Mr. Quirk on May 23 as the decision had already been made by the Appeals Committee at that point." The Complainant attached a copy of the May 16, 2018 e-mail string consisting of three (3) pages with redactions appearing on the first two pages. ⁶

Statement of Information:

On May 31, 2019, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information ("SOI"). ⁷ The Custodian certified that he received the Complainant's OPRA request on April 8, 2019, and

⁵ The Complainant did not identify the statute or provide a citation.

⁶ In what appears to be an endnote in the Detail Summary, the Complainant stated: "In addition, 'attorney-client privileged' emails were withheld for the request on the law license matter, yet the attorneys involved do not allegedly work on this issue." Such referenced e-mails, however, are neither specifically identified by the Complainant nor made part of the records relevant to the complaint.

⁷ The SOI examines several request items; however, the Complainant made it clear that the only item at issue is a May 16, 2018 e-mail string, portions of which were denied via redaction. Although, the Custodian certified that at the GRC's direction he would submit a revised SOI focusing only upon the denials specifically challenged in the *Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen)*, 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

responded in writing on April 16, 2019, denying the records relevant to the request as overly broad pursuant to Elcavage, GRC 2009-07 and Verry v. Borough of South Bound Brook, GRC Complaint No. 2009-124 (April 2010). The Custodian certified that the Complainant submitted a clarified request on April 16, 2019, that he found to be valid so he accepted the clarified request as a new OPRA request.

The Custodian certified that he responded to the request on April 17, 2019, informing the Custodian that he would commence a search for responsive records and update his response. On April 26, 2019, the Custodian again responded to the April 16, 2019 request by informing the Complainant that he would require an extension of time until May 17, 2019, to continue searching for responsive records. The Custodian certified that he disclosed records responsive to the request on May 10, 2019.

The Custodian certified that, per N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1, a government record does not include inter-agency or intra-agency advisory, consultative or deliberative (“ACD”) material. The Custodian certified that the ACD exemption has been found by the courts to encompass the common law deliberative process privilege, which permits public agencies to withhold documents that reflect advisory opinions, recommendations, and deliberations comprising part of a process by which governmental decisions and policies are formulated. The Custodian cited Educ. Law Ctr. v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., 198 N.J. 274, 285 (2009) and In re Liquidation of Integrity Ins. Co., 165 N.J. 75, 83 (2000). The Custodian certified that for the ACD exemption to apply the record must be pre-decisional and deliberative in nature, containing opinions, recommendations, or advice about agency policies. The Custodian certified that, contrary to the Complainant’s assertions, there is no requirement that the officials offering such opinions, recommendations or advice must be actual decision-makers with respect to the pre-decisional discussions.

The Custodian certified that on May 16, 2018, members of the high school staff engaged in an electronic discussion regarding the Complainant’s request that the school allow her son to participate in the class council elections (“participation issue”). The Custodian certified that the discussion included the advisor who was initially responsible for determining each student’s eligibility, the assistant principal, as well as the case manager and guidance counselor for the Complainant’s son. The Custodian certified that the electronic discussions occurred before a determination regarding the Complainant’s request with respect to the participation issue was made. The Custodian certified that the aforementioned school officials each shared their pre-decisional opinions concerning the participation issue. The Custodian certified that the Complainant erroneously appears to believe that the ACD exemption only applies to statements made by the actual decision maker. The Custodian certified that such an interpretation would undermine the deliberative process through which decision makers seek guidance, input and advice from others. The Custodian certified that the e-mail redactions were appropriate and the redacted statements should not be disclosed to the Complainant.

complaint, the GRC considers a resubmission unnecessarily burdensome, and instead will only address the portions of the SOI relevant to the redacted May 16, 2018 e-mail string.
Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

The Custodian identified the specific e-mails within the May 16, 2018 e-mail string that contained redacted material and provided the legal explanation for the redactions. Table 1 below sets forth the Custodian's explanations.

TABLE 1

NO.	REDACTED E-MAIL	NATURE OF REDACTIONS	LEGAL EXPLANATION
1	E-mail dated May 16, 2018, 12:12 p.m. from Desai to Perry, Dargento and Quirk.	Redacted statements from the case manager containing his opinions and recommendations regarding participation issue.	Redacted ACD material pursuant to <u>N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1</u>
2	E-mail dated May 16, 2018, 12:03 p.m. from Quirk to Dargento, forwarding e-mail from Complainant.	Redacted statements from the freshman class advisor containing his opinions and recommendations regarding participation issue.	Redacted ACD material pursuant to <u>N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1</u>
3	E-mail dated May 16, 2018, 12:31 p.m. from Perry to Quirk, Dargento and Desai.	Redacted communications evidencing the deliberative process regarding the District's response to Complainant's request regarding participation issue.	Information evidencing the pre-decisional deliberative process of a public agency may be redacted as ACD material.
4	E-mail dated May 16, 2018, 12:30 p.m. from Quirk to Dargento, Perry and Desai.	Redacted communications evidencing the deliberative process regarding the District's response to Complainant's request regarding participation issue.	Information evidencing the pre-decisional deliberative process of a public agency may be redacted as ACD material.
5 ⁸	E-mail dated May 23, 2018, 9:43 a.m. from Quirk to Smith.	Redacted communications evidencing the deliberative process regarding the District's response to Complainant's appeal of the District's class council decision.	Information evidencing the pre-decisional deliberative process of a public agency may be redacted as ACD material.
6	E-mail dated May 23, 2018, 9:59 a.m. from Smith to Quirk.	Redacted communications evidencing the deliberative process regarding the District's response to Complainant's appeal of the District's class council decision.	Information evidencing the pre-decisional deliberative process of a public agency may be redacted as ACD material.

⁸ It is unclear whether the e-mails listed as items number 5 through 7 are part of the records relevant to the complaint; however, May 23rd e-mail communications were referenced by the Complainant in her May 10, 2019 letter attached to the complaint. As such, the GRC includes the May 23, 2018 e-mail string.

Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

7	E-mail dated May 23, 2018, 12:10 p.m. from Perry Desai to, Dargento Quirk and Desai.	Redacted statements from the guidance counselor containing her opinions and recommendations regarding participation issue.	Redacted ACD material pursuant to <u>N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1</u>
---	--	--	---

The Custodian included the following legend to accompany the above table: “Perry” refers to Jennifer Perry, Supervisor of Guidance; “Smith” refers to Travis Smith, Building Principal; “Quirk” refers to Sean Quirk, Advisor to the 2017-2018 Freshman Class; “Desai” refers to Tanushree Desai, School Psychologist and Case Manager; “Dargento” refers to Claudia Dargento, Assistant Principal.

Additional Submissions:

On June 6, 2019, the Complainant asked for, and was granted, permission to file a response to the SOI because she alleged the SOI raised new issues.

On June 16, 2019, the Complainant submitted to the GRC a response to the Custodian’s SOI. At the outset, much of the Complainant’s submission delves into the background of her child’s history within the District, as well as her family’s less than satisfactory relationship with officials representing the District. The Complainant’s response did not address the Custodian’s reasons for redacting the May 16, 2018 e-mail string, other than to assert that Mr. Quirk was the only person responsible for making the decision regarding the participation issue. The Complainant alleged that no other administrators were involved in the decision; therefore, the Custodian’s “pretend response” about the District’s need to consult with others is a misrepresentation and no deliberative process protection should be afforded Case Manager Desai and Guidance Counselor Perry. The Complainant questioned why the privilege log (Item 9 of the SOI) was not provided to her as part of the Custodian’s response to the OPRA request.

The Complainant asserted the District admitted that their attorney independently chose to file an ethics complaint against her; therefore, since it was an independent action by the District’s counsel there should be no attorney-client privilege afforded the records.⁹ The Complainant attached to her submission a copy of the ethics grievance.

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.

⁹ Although the Custodian listed in Item 9 of the SOI several communications alleged to be attorney-client privileged, these records are not records relevant to the complaint.
 Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

The Complainant made it clear in both the Records Denied List, and her legal argument (a May 10, 2019 letter attached to the complaint), that she was only challenging the redactions contained in an e-mail string dated May 16, 2018, from Ms. Desai. However, in the May 10, 2019 letter she incorporated within the complaint, the Complainant stated that the same reasoning for challenging the e-mail string dated May 16, 2018, should apply to the redacted portion of Mr. Smith's email to Mr. Quirk dated May 23, 2018. Therefore, by making such a contention, the Complainant is also challenging the redactions within the May 23, 2018 e-mail string. The Complainant alleged that all of the e-mail redactions were unlawful because the deliberative process privilege is not applicable.

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 Council¹⁰ dismissing the complaint by accepting the custodian's legal conclusion for the denial of access without further review. The Court stated 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 also stated that:

The statute 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 stated 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.]

Therefore, pursuant to Paff, 379 N.J. Super. at 346, the GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the records listed in Table 1 to determine the validity of the Custodian's assertion that portions of the records were lawfully denied as ACD material pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.

¹⁰ Paff v. NJ Dep't of Labor, Bd. of Review, GRC Complaint No. 2003-128 (October 2005).
Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

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. Pursuant to Paff v. N.J. Dep't of Labor, Bd. of Review, 379 N.J. Super. 346 (App. Div. 2005), the GRC must conduct an *in camera* review of the records listed in Table 1 to determine the validity of the Custodian's assertion that portions of the records were lawfully denied as advisory, consultative or deliberative material pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.
2. **The Custodian must deliver¹¹ to the Council in a sealed envelope nine (9) copies of the requested unredacted records (see #1 above), nine (9) copies of the redacted records, a document or redaction index¹², as well as a legal certification from the Custodian, in accordance with N.J. Court Rule 1:4-4,¹³ 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.

Prepared By: John E. Stewart
Staff Attorney

August 17, 2021

¹¹ The *in camera* records may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as they arrive at the GRC office by the deadline.

¹² The document or redaction index should identify the record and/or each redaction asserted and the lawful basis for the denial.

¹³ "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."

Judith Sullivan v. Ramapo Indian Hills Regional High School District (Bergen), 2019-94 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director