November 10, 2020 Government Records Council Meeting

Matthew Schapiro, Complainant
v.
Jersey City Board of Education (Hudson), Custodian of Record

At the November 10, 2020 public meeting, the Government Records Council ("Council") considered the October 27, 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:

1. The Custodian did not bear her burden of proof that she timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the 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 dated October 31, 2007).

2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s “deemed” denial, she has borne her burden of proof that she 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).

3. The Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) and (i) by failing to respond to the Complainant’s OPRA request. However, the Custodian lawfully denied access by certifying that no responsive records exist. Additionally, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.
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 10th Day of November 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
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STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL  
Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
November 10, 2020 Council Meeting  

Matthew Schapiro¹  
Complainant  

v.  

Jersey City Board of Education (Hudson)²  
Custodial Agency  

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of “the schedules for all board committee meetings already held and currently scheduled to be held from 01/01/19 onward.”

Custodian of Record: Regina Robinson  
Request Received by Custodian: February 27, 2019  
Response Made by Custodian: N/A  
GRC Complaint Received: May 23, 2019

Background³

Request and Response:  

On February 27, 2019, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. That same day, the Custodian responded that same day acknowledging receipt of the request.

On March 19, 2019, the Complainant e-mailed the Custodian stating that the requested records were overdue and requested whether the Custodian possessed the records. That same day, the Custodian responded in writing asking whether the Complainant received responses to two (2) earlier requests submitted by the Complainant. The Complainant replied by stating that he did.

Denial of Access Complaint:  

On May 23, 2019, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the dates and times of the Jersey City Board of Education (“Board”) Committee meetings were public information and should have been provided in response to his OPRA request.

¹ No legal representation listed on record.  
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.  

Matthew Schapiro v. Jersey City Board of Education (Hudson), 2019-98 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
Statement of Information:

On June 5, 2019 the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on February 27, 2019. The Custodian certified that she was unable to provide a response.

The Custodian asserted that a document specifically responsive to the request did not exist. The Custodian asserted that the chairs of committees were not obligated to provide a schedule of their committee’s activities. The Custodian asserted that committee reports were reflected in minutes, but copies of said minutes were not requested by the Complainant.

The Custodian also asserted that she reached out to administrative staff members who attended the relevant meetings, but she could not complete a comprehensive list.

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).\(^4\) 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 dated October 31, 2007).

In the instant matter, the Complainant submitted his OPRA request on February 27, 2019. Although the Custodian acknowledged receipt of the request, she failed to respond to the Complainant’s request within the allotted period. Rather, the Custodian asserted that she could not provide a response because no records could be produced. Notwithstanding, the Custodian was obligated under OPRA to provide a response within the allotted deadline. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i).

Therefore, the Custodian did not bear her burden of proof that she timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the 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, GRC 2007-11.

\(^4\) 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.

Matthew Schapiro v. Jersey City Board of Education (Hudson), 2019-98 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
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 Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., 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 schedules for Board committee meetings being held or would be held from a certain period onward. In the SOI, the Custodian asserted that no specific record containing the information existed. The Custodian also asserted that she reached out to committee members to obtain the information and create a record but could not do so prior to the complaint filing. The Complainant asserted that the information should be public but provided no evidence to refute the Custodian’s certification that the information was not contained within a specific record.

Therefore, notwithstanding the Custodian’s “deemed” denial, she has borne her burden of proof that she 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.

Knowing & Willful

OPRA states that “[a] public official, officer, employee or custodian who knowingly or willfully violates [OPRA], and is found to have unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances, shall be subject to a civil penalty . . .” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11(a). OPRA allows the Council to determine a knowing and willful violation of the law and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances. Specifically OPRA states “. . . [i]f the council determines, by a majority vote of its members, that a custodian has knowingly and willfully violated [OPRA], and is found to have unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances, the council may impose the penalties provided for in [OPRA] . . .” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(e).

Certain legal standards must be considered when making the determination of whether the Custodian’s actions rise to the level of a “knowing and willful” violation of OPRA. The following statements must be true for a determination that the Custodian “knowingly and willfully” violated OPRA: the Custodian’s actions must have been much more than negligent conduct (Alston v. City
of Camden, 168 N.J. 170, 185 (2001)); the Custodian must have had some knowledge that his actions were wrongful (Fielder v. Stonack, 141 N.J. 101, 124 (1995)); the Custodian’s actions must have had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing (Berg v. Reaction Motors Div., 37 N.J. 396, 414 (1962)); the Custodian’s actions must have been forbidden with actual, not imputed, knowledge that the actions were forbidden (id.; Marley v. Borough of Palmyra, 193 N.J. Super. 271, 294-95 (Law Div. 1993)); the Custodian’s actions must have been intentional and deliberate, with knowledge of their wrongfulness, and not merely negligent, heedless or unintentional (ECES v. Salmon, 295 N.J. Super. 86, 107 (App. Div. 1996)).

In the instant matter, the Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) and (i) by failing to respond to the Complainant’s OPRA request. However, the Custodian lawfully denied access by certifying that no responsive records exist. Additionally, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian did not bear her burden of proof that she timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. As such, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the 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 dated October 31, 2007).

2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s “deemed” denial, she has borne her burden of proof that she 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).

3. The Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) and (i) by failing to respond to the Complainant’s OPRA request. However, the Custodian lawfully denied access by certifying that no responsive records exist. Additionally, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. Therefore, the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado
Staff Attorney
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