



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 28, 2023 Government Records Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o Delores Simmons,  
Baffi Simmons, and Grace Woko)  
Complainant

Complaint No. 2021-190

v.

Somers Point Police Department (Atlantic)  
Custodian of Record

At the March 28, 2023 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the March 21, 2023 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 unlawfully denied access to the requested complaints and summonses responsive to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian had an obligation to locate and retrieve responsive records created by the City of Somers Point. See Simmons v. Mercado, 247 N.J. 24, 42 (2021). However, the Council declines to order disclosure since the evidence of record demonstrates that the Custodian provided the Complainant with responsive records on March 22, 2022 and April 29, 2022.
2. The Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian did not provide the Complainant with the requested records until after the instant complaint was filed. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. **Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13(c).**

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 28<sup>th</sup> Day of March 2023

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: April 3, 2023**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
March 28, 2023 Council Meeting**

**Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of Delores Simmons,  
Baffi Simmons, and Grace Woko)<sup>1</sup>  
Complainant**

**GRC Complaint No. 2021-190**

**v.**

**Somers Point Police Department (Atlantic)<sup>2</sup>  
Custodial Agency**

**Records Relevant to Complaint:** Electronic copies via e-mail of:<sup>3</sup>

1. Complaints and summonses prepared by your police department relating to individuals who were charged with drug possession and or drug paraphernalia by your police department from January 2021 to present.
2. Driving While Intoxicated/Driving under the Influence (“DWI/DUI”) complaints and summonses prepared and or issued by your police department from January 2021 to present.

**Custodian of Record:** Lucy Samuelson

**Request Received by Custodian:** June 23, 2021

**Response Made by Custodian:** August 6, 2021

**GRC Complaint Received:** August 11, 2021

**Background<sup>4</sup>**

**Request and Response:**

On June 23, 2021, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On August 6, 2021, the Custodian responded in writing stating that no records exist and stated that records may be available from the Somers Point Municipal Court (“Municipal Court”).

---

<sup>1</sup> The Complainant represents Delores Simmons, Obafemi Simmons, and Grace Woko.

<sup>2</sup> Represented by Thomas G. Smith, Esq., of the Law Offices of Thomas G. Smith, P.C. (Northfield, NJ).

<sup>3</sup> The Complainant sought additional records that are not at issue in this complaint.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of Delores Simmons, Obafemi Simmons, and Grace Woko) v. Somers Point Police Department (Atlantic), 2021-190 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

### Denial of Access Complaint:

On August 11, 2021, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the Custodian improperly denied access to the request items in the wake of the New Jersey Supreme Court’s decision in Simmons v. Mercado, 247 N.J. 24 (2021), rev’g 464 N.J. Super. 77 (App. Div. 2020). The Complainant requested the GRC compel the City of Somers Point (“City”) to provide the records and award counsel fees.

### Supplemental Response:

On March 22, 2022, Shelby Heath responded on the Custodian’s behalf providing sixty-five (65) pages of responsive records. Ms. Heath further stated that redactions were made for personally identifying information pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. On April 29, 2022, Ms. Heath e-mailed the Complainant again resending her March 22, 2022 response.

### Statement of Information:<sup>5</sup>

On May 3, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on June 23, 2021. The Custodian certified that she responded in writing on August 6, 2021, stating the City had no responsive records and suggested the Municipal Court may possess same.

The Custodian asserted that after receiving the instant complaint, she submitted an OPRA request to the Municipal Court Administrator. The Custodian asserted the records received were forwarded to the Complainant on March 22, 2022, and April 29, 2022.

### Additional Submissions:

On May 3, 2022, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC stating there was no need to respond to the SOI as the Custodian admitted the CDR-1s were provided after the complaint was filed. The Complainant asserted the Custodian violated OPRA considering the Simmons decision, and thus the only outstanding issue was counsel fees.

## **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.

---

<sup>5</sup> On September 8, 2021, this complaint was referred to mediation. On January 28, 2022, this complaint was referred back to the GRC for adjudication.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of Delores Simmons, Obafemi Simmons, and Grace Woko) v. Somers Point Police Department (Atlantic), 2021-190 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Additionally, the Council has previously held that criminal complaints and summonses are subject to disclosure. Merino v. Borough of Ho-Ho-Kus, GRC Complaint No. 2003-110 (July 2004); see also Mawhinney v. Egg Harbor City Police Dep't (Atlantic), GRC Complaint No. 2015-85 (January 2016).

In Simmons, the Complainant requested the same or similar records as those at issue in the instant matter, with the custodian asserting that the records were not maintained by the Millville Police Department (“MPD”) once its officers created and submitted the records through eCDR. 247 N.J. at 32. The Court reversed the Appellate Division and found that the requested records were government records subject to disclosure under OPRA. Id. at 29. The Court found that notwithstanding which government branch created the CDR-1 and -2 forms, it is the information contained within those forms by MPD officers that is sought by AADARI. Id. at 40-41. Thus, the Court held that:

Because MPD officers create the completed CDR-1s by populating the forms with the information necessary to generate a summons and submit it to the court, there is no question that the CDR-1s are government records subject to disclosure pursuant to OPRA.

[Id.]

Additionally, the Court rejected MPD’s argument that they did not maintain the records, holding that OPRA’s definition of a government record is not restricted to records maintained by the agency, but rather includes records it creates, even if not maintained. Id. at 41. Thus, the Court found, “that the Judiciary might maintain on its servers the information that MPD made does not absolve MPD of its obligation to produce that information pursuant to a proper OPRA request made to MPD.” Id. at 42.

In the instant matter, the Custodian denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request on August 6, 2021. The Complainant filed the instant matter on August 11, 2021, stating the Custodian’s non-disclosure was contrary to the Simmons decision. In the SOI, the Custodian asserted that City received the instant complaint, she requested the records from the Municipal Court and forwarded them to the Complainant on March 22, 2022 and April 29, 2022.

When considering the Court’s decision in Simmons, the Custodian maintained the obligation to provide the Complainant with responsive records created by the City. Notwithstanding whether the City maintained physical copies of same, the Court held that since police departments created the CDR-1s and CDR-2s when inputting information, they were government records even if the records were maintained by the Judiciary’s electronic databases. Simmons, 247 N.J. at 42.

Accordingly, the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested complaints and summonses responsive to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian had an obligation to locate and retrieve responsive records created by the City See Simmons, 247 N.J. at 42. However, the Council declines to order disclosure since the evidence of

record demonstrates that the Custodian provided the Complainant with responsive records on March 22, 2022, and April 29, 2022.

### **Prevailing Party Attorney's Fees**

OPRA provides that:

A person who is denied access to a government record by the custodian of the record, at the option of the requestor, may: institute a proceeding to challenge the custodian's decision by filing an action in Superior Court . . .; or in lieu of filing an action in Superior Court, file a complaint with the Government Records Council . . . . A requestor who prevails in any proceeding shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee.

[N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.]

In Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423 (App. Div. 2006), the Appellate Division held that a complainant is a “prevailing party” if he achieves the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. Id. at 432. Additionally, the court held that attorney’s fees may be awarded when the requestor is successful (or partially successful) via a judicial decree, a quasi-judicial determination, or a settlement of the parties that indicates access was improperly denied and the requested records are disclosed. Id.

Additionally, the New Jersey Supreme Court has ruled on the issue of “prevailing party” attorney’s fees. In Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 71 (2008), the Court discussed the catalyst theory, “which posits that a plaintiff is a ‘prevailing party’ if it achieves the desired result because the lawsuit brought about a voluntary change in the defendant’s conduct” (quoting Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home v. West Virginia Dep’t of Health & Human Res., 532 U.S. 598, 131 S. Ct. 1835, 149 L. Ed. 2d 855 (2001)). In Buckhannon, the Supreme Court held that the phrase “prevailing party” is a legal term of art that refers to a “party in whose favor a judgment is rendered.” Id. at 603 (quoting Black’s Law Dictionary 1145 (7<sup>th</sup> ed. 1999)). The Supreme Court rejected the catalyst theory as a basis for prevailing party attorney fees, in part because “[i]t allows an award where there is no judicially sanctioned change in the legal relationship of the parties . . .” Id. at 605, 121 S. Ct. at 1840, 149 L. Ed. 2d at 863. Further, the Supreme Court expressed concern that the catalyst theory would spawn extra litigation over attorney's fees. Id. at 609, 121 S. Ct. at 1843, 149 L. Ed. 2d at 866.

However, the Court noted in Mason that Buckhannon is binding only when counsel fee provisions under federal statutes are at issue. 196 N.J. at 72, citing Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 429; see, e.g., Baer v. Klagholz, 346 N.J. Super. 79 (App. Div. 2001) (applying Buckhannon to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), certif. denied, 174 N.J. 193 (2002). “But in interpreting New Jersey law, we look to state law precedent and the specific state statute before us. When appropriate, we depart from the reasoning of federal cases that interpret comparable federal statutes.” 196 N.J. at 73 (citations omitted).

The Mason Court accepted the application of the catalyst theory within the context of OPRA, stating that:

OPRA itself contains broader language on attorney's fees than the former RTKL did. OPRA provides that “[a] requestor who prevails in any proceeding shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Under the prior RTKL, “[a] plaintiff in whose favor such an order [requiring access to public records] issues . . . may be awarded a reasonable attorney's fee not to exceed \$500.00.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-4 (repealed 2002). The Legislature's revisions therefore: (1) mandate, rather than permit, an award of attorney's fees to a prevailing party; and (2) eliminate the \$500 cap on fees and permit a reasonable, and quite likely higher, fee award. Those changes expand counsel fee awards under OPRA.

[196 N.J. at 73-76.]

The Court in Mason, further held that:

[R]equestors are entitled to attorney's fees under OPRA, absent a judgment or an enforceable consent decree, when they can demonstrate (1) “a factual causal nexus between plaintiff's litigation and the relief ultimately achieved”; and (2) “that the relief ultimately secured by plaintiffs had a basis in law.” Singer v. State, 95 N.J. 487, 495, cert. denied, New Jersey v. Singer, 469 U.S. 832 (1984).

[Id. at 76.]

In the instant matter, the Complainant sought complaints and summonses prepared by the City's police department pertaining to drug possession, drug paraphernalia, and DUI/DWI offenses. The Custodian responded on August 6, 2021, stating no responsive records exist and suggested the Municipal Court may have the records. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on August 11, 2021, asserting that the Custodian should have obtained the records via the City's police department in accordance with the Simmons decision. While the matter remained pending, the Custodian provided the Complainant with access to the requested records on March 22, 2022, and April 29, 2022.

In determining whether the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney's fees, the GRC is satisfied that the evidence of record supports a conclusion in the affirmative. The Custodian initially denied access to the Complainant's request by directing him to the Municipal Court. It was only until after the complaint was filed that the Custodian reversed course and provided the Complainant with responsive records. Thus, a causal nexus exists between this complaint and the change in the Custodian's conduct. Mason 196 N.J. at 76. Accordingly, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney's fees.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The Council makes this determination with the understanding that the Complainant acted on behalf of a bona fide client at the time of the request. Although the Complainant's status as representing an actual client has been previously challenged, the available evidence on the record is insufficient to address that issue herein. See Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Neptune City Police Dep't (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-153 (April 2020) and Owoh, Esq. Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of Delores Simmons, Obafemi Simmons, and Grace Woko) v. Somers Point Police Department (Atlantic), 2021-190 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Therefore, the Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Specifically, the Custodian did not provide the Complainant with the requested records until after the instant complaint was filed. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. **Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13(c).**

### Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested complaints and summonses responsive to the Complainant’s OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian had an obligation to locate and retrieve responsive records created by the City of Somers Point. See Simmons v. Mercado, 247 N.J. 24, 42 (2021). However, the Council declines to order disclosure since the evidence of record demonstrates that the Custodian provided the Complainant with responsive records on March 22, 2022 and April 29, 2022.
2. The Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian did not provide the Complainant with the requested records until after the instant complaint was filed. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. **Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13(c).**

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado  
Staff Attorney

March 21, 2023

---

(O.B.O. AADARI) v. Freehold Twp. Police Dep’t (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-155 (Interim Order dated September 29, 2020).

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of Delores Simmons, Obafemi Simmons, and Grace Woko) v. Somers Point Police Department (Atlantic), 2021-190 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director