



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO Box 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

TAHESHA L. WAY
Lieutenant Governor

JACQUELYN A. SUÁREZ
Acting Commissioner

INTERIM ORDER

February 27, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American
Data & Research Institute)
Complainant

Complaint No. 2021-334

v.

Pine Beach Police Department (Camden)
Custodian of Record

At the February 27, 2024 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the February 20, 2024 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’s failure to provide a completed Statement of Information to the GRC, despite more than one request, results in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(a). Moreover, the Custodian’s failure to respond additionally obstructed the GRC in its efforts to “receive, hear, review and adjudicate a complaint filed by any person concerning a denial of access to a government record by a records custodian . . .” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(b).
2. The Custodian’s November 19, 2021 response was insufficient because the Custodian failed to provide a specific legal basis for denying access to the requested records and failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g). See also DeAppolonio v. Borough of Deal (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2008-62 (September 2009) and Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008). Therefore, the Custodian shall search for and certify whether such agreements exist.
3. The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking “salary” and “payroll” information of police officers who separated from the Borough of Pine Beach since 2014. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Kovalcik v. Somerset Cty. Prosecutor's Office, 206 N.J. 581 (2011); Jackson v. Kean Univ., GRC Complaint No. 2002-98 (February 2004). The Custodian shall identify, locate, and produce the requested personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. If no responsive information could be located, the Custodian shall certify to same.
4. **The Custodian shall comply with conclusion Nos. 4 and 5 above within ten (10) business days from receipt of the Council’s Interim Order with appropriate redactions, including a detailed document index explaining the lawful basis for**

each redaction, if applicable. Further, the Custodian shall simultaneously deliver¹ certified confirmation of compliance, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,² to the Executive Director.³

5. The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian's compliance with the Council's Interim Order.

Interim Order Rendered by the
Government Records Council
On The 27th Day of February 2024

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: February 29, 2024

¹ The certified confirmation of compliance, including supporting documentation, may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives it by the deadline.

² "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."

³ Satisfactory compliance requires that the Custodian deliver the record(s) to the Complainant in the requested medium. If a copying or special service charge was incurred by the Complainant, the Custodian must certify that the record has been *made available* to the Complainant but the Custodian may withhold delivery of the record until the financial obligation is satisfied. Any such charge must adhere to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
February 27, 2024 Council Meeting**

**Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American
Data & Research Institute)¹
Complainant**

GRC Complaint No. 2021-334

v.

**Pine Beach Police Department (Camden)²
Custodial Agency**

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of: Names, date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, salary, payroll record, amount and type of pension of individuals who either resigned or retired or terminated or otherwise separated from 2014 to the present. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10.

- a. This request includes any agreement entered with each one of the separated police officer(s).
- b. When stating the reason for separation, please note that some police officers separate due to plea deal, criminal convictions, criminal charges, sentences, and or other court agreement or court proceedings that require officers to be separated from your police department and or law enforcement jobs.
- c. Some police officers separate due to internal affairs investigations within the police departments.

Custodian of Record: Chief Keith Brown
Request Received by Custodian: November 7, 2021
Response Made by Custodian: November 19, 2021
GRC Complaint Received: December 16, 2021

Background³

Request and Response:

On November 7, 2021, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On November 19, 2021, the Custodian responded in writing, providing a spreadsheet containing a list of former officers, which included their names, date of hire, date of separation, and reason for separation.

¹ The Complainant represents the African American Data & Research Institute.

² No 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.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Pine Beach Police Department (Ocean), 2021-334 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Denial of Access Complaint:

On December 16, 2021, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the records did not provide the reasons for separation. The Complainant contended that simply stating “terminated”, “resigned”, or “retired,” was insufficient under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. The Complainant also asserted that the Complainant failed to provide the salary information of the separated officers.

The Complainant requested that the GRC compel the Custodian to comply fully with the OPRA request and award counsel fees.

Statement of Information:

On December 21, 2021, the GRC requested a completed Statement of Information (“SOI”) from the Custodian. On January 25, 2022, the GRC sent a “No Defense” letter to the Custodian, requesting a completed SOI within three (3) business days of receipt. The GRC noted that the Custodian’s failure to submit an SOI could lead to an adjudication based solely on the Complainant’s submission. N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(f). The GRC did not receive any correspondence from the Custodian.

Analysis

Failure to Submit SOI

OPRA also provides that “Custodians shall submit a completed and signed statement of information (SOI) form to the Council and the complainant simultaneously that details the custodians' position for each complaint filed with the Council[.]” N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(a).

OPRA further provides that:

Custodians shall submit a completed and signed SOI for each complaint to the Council's staff and the complainant not later than five business days from the date of receipt of the SOI form from the Council's staff . . . Failure to comply with this time period may result in the complaint being adjudicated based solely on the submissions of the complainant.

[N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(f).]

Finally, OPRA provides that “[a] custodian’s failure to submit a completed and signed SOI . . . may result in the Council’s issuing a decision in favor of the complainant.” N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(g). In Alterman, Esq. v. Sussex Cnty. Sheriff’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2013-353 (September 2014), the custodian failed to provide a completed SOI to the GRC within the allotted deadline. Thus, the Council noted the custodian’s failure to adhere to N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(a). See also Kovacs v. Irvington Police Dep’t (Essex), GRC Complaint No. 2014-196 (January 2015); Howell v. Twp. of Greenwich (Warren), GRC Complaint No. 2015-249 (November 2016).

In the instant matter, the Custodian did not comply with the GRC's initial request for an SOI. On January 25, 2022, well after the expiration of the five (5) business day deadline, the GRC transmitted a "No Defense" letter to the Custodian providing him an additional three (3) business days to submit the requested SOI. The transmission also included a copy of the original SOI letter providing detailed instructions on how to properly submit an SOI. The GRC never received a completed SOI or any communication from the Custodian.

Accordingly, the Custodian's failure to provide a completed SOI to the GRC, despite more than one request, results in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(a). Moreover, the Custodian's failure to respond additionally obstructed the GRC in its efforts to "receive, hear, review and adjudicate a complaint filed by any person concerning a denial of access to a government record by a records custodian . . ." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(b).

Sufficiency of Response

OPRA provides that if a "custodian is unable to comply with a request for access, the custodian *shall indicate the specific basis therefor . . .* on the request form and promptly return it to the requestor." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) (emphasis added). A custodian's failure to do so results in an insufficient response and a violation of OPRA. The Council has held that for a denial of access to be in compliance with OPRA, it must be specific and sufficient to prove that a custodian's denial is authorized by OPRA. See DeAppolonio v. Borough of Deal (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2008-62 (September 2009); Morris v. Trenton Police Dep't (Mercer), GRC Complaint No. 2007-160 (May 2008). Further, in Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008), the Council held that ". . . [t]he Custodian's response was legally insufficient because he failed to respond to each request item individually. Therefore, the Custodian has violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g)." See also Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013).

Upon review, the GRC is satisfied that the Custodian provided an insufficient response. Here, the Custodian responded to the Complainant's OPRA request by providing a spreadsheet containing personnel information for separated officers. However, the e-mail failed to identify whether the Custodian was denying access to personnel information not provided and further failed to address each request item. Namely, the Custodian did not indicate whether responsive records exist containing the officers' salary information. Furthermore, the Custodian failed to indicate whether any agreements existed between the Borough of Pine Beach ("Borough") and any separated officer. The facts here are on point with those in DeAppolonio and Paff; thus, it follows there was an insufficient response in the instant complaint.

Therefore, the Custodian's November 19, 2021 response was insufficient because the Custodian failed to provide a specific legal basis for denying access to certain personnel information. Furthermore, the Custodian failed to address whether any agreements exist between the Borough and separated officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g). See also DeAppolonio, GRC 2008-62 and Paff, GRC 2007-272. Therefore, the Custodian shall search for and certify whether such agreements exist.

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.

Further, OPRA provides that “[n]otwithstanding the provisions [OPRA] or any other law to the contrary, the personnel or pension records of any individual in the possession of a public agency . . . shall not be considered a government record . . .” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. OPRA begins with a presumption against disclosure and “proceeds with a few narrow exceptions that . . . need to be considered.” Kovalcik v. Somerset Cty. Prosecutor’s Office, 206 N.J. 581 (2011). These include “an individual’s name, title, position, *salary* [and] *payroll record*.” Id. (emphasis added). See also Jackson v. Kean Univ., GRC Complaint No. 2002-98 (February 2004) (defining a “payroll record” for purposes of OPRA as records relating to payment of a public employee). Further, the Council has previously required that responding to an OPRA request for personnel information requires that a custodian provide the most comprehensive records containing the responsive information. Valdes v. Union City Bd. of Educ. (Hudson), GRC Complaint No. 2011-64 (Interim Order dated August 28, 2012); Richardson v. N.J. Office of the Attorney General, GRC Complaint No. 2014-277 (Interim Order dated May 26, 2015).

In the instant matter, the Complainant requested in part the “[n]ames, date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, salary, payroll record, amount and type of pension” of police officers who separated from the Borough since 2014. In his response, the Custodian provided a portion of the requested personnel information, but did not state whether records exist containing the requested salary and payroll information. Furthermore, because the Custodian did not provide an SOI, it remains unclear whether such records exist.

Therefore, the Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking “salary” and “payroll” information of police officers who separated from the Borough since 2014. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Kovalcik, 206 N.J. 581; Jackson, GRC 2002-98. The Custodian shall identify, locate, and produce the requested personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. If no responsive information could be located, the Custodian shall certify to same.

Prevailing Party Attorney’s Fees

The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian’s compliance with the Council’s Interim Order.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian's failure to provide a completed Statement of Information to the GRC, despite more than one request, results in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(a). Moreover, the Custodian's failure to respond additionally obstructed the GRC in its efforts to "receive, hear, review and adjudicate a complaint filed by any person concerning a denial of access to a government record by a records custodian . . ." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(b).
2. The Custodian's November 19, 2021 response was insufficient because the Custodian failed to provide a specific legal basis for denying access to the requested records and failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g). See also DeAppolonio v. Borough of Deal (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2008-62 (September 2009) and Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008). Therefore, the Custodian shall search for and certify whether such agreements exist.
3. The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant's OPRA request seeking "salary" and "payroll" information of police officers who separated from the Borough of Pine Beach since 2014. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Kovalcik v. Somerset Cty. Prosecutor's Office, 206 N.J. 581 (2011); Jackson v. Kean Univ., GRC Complaint No. 2002-98 (February 2004). The Custodian shall identify, locate, and produce the requested personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. If no responsive information could be located, the Custodian shall certify to same.
4. **The Custodian shall comply with conclusion Nos. 4 and 5 above within ten (10) business days from receipt of the Council's Interim Order with appropriate redactions, including a detailed document index explaining the lawful basis for each redaction, if applicable. Further, the Custodian shall simultaneously deliver⁴ certified confirmation of compliance, in accordance with N.J. Court Rules, R. 1:4-4,⁵ to the Executive Director.⁶**
5. The Council defers analysis of whether the Complainant is a prevailing party pending the Custodian's compliance with the Council's Interim Order.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado
Staff Attorney

February 20, 2024

⁴ The certified confirmation of compliance, including supporting documentation, may be sent overnight mail, regular mail, e-mail, facsimile, or be hand-delivered, at the discretion of the Custodian, as long as the GRC physically receives it by the deadline.

⁵ "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."

⁶ Satisfactory compliance requires that the Custodian deliver the record(s) to the Complainant in the requested medium. If a copying or special service charge was incurred by the Complainant, the Custodian must certify that the record has been *made available* to the Complainant but the Custodian may withhold delivery of the record until the financial obligation is satisfied. Any such charge must adhere to the provisions of N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Pine Beach Police Department (Ocean), 2021-334 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director