



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

FINAL DECISION

February 29, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2021-344

v.

Hasbrouck Heights Police Department (Bergen)
Custodian of Record

At the February 29, 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 did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s October 13, 2021 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights provided all responsive records containing the requested information. See Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).
2. The Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking the “reason for separation”, “amount and type of pension”, and any “agreement[s]” between the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights and separated police officers. Specifically, the current Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
3. The Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, no 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 certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights’s possession and that no agreements between the Borough and separated officers exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not 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.

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 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: March 4, 2024

**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. 2021-344

v.

**Hasbrouck Heights Police Department (Bergen)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: Laurie Varga³

Request Received by Custodian: October 13, 2021

Response Made by Custodian: November 15, 2021

GRC Complaint Received: December 17, 2021

Background⁴

Request and Response:

On or about October 13, 2021, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On November 15, 2021, the Custodian responded to the Complainant in writing via e-mail providing a spreadsheet

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

² Represented by Graham K. Staton, Esq., of Inglesino, Webster, Wyciskala, & Taylor, LLC (Parsippany, NJ).

³ The current Custodian of Record is Michelle Sery.

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.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Hasbrouck Heights Police Department (Bergen), 2021-344
– Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

containing the requested personnel information. The Custodian also stated that additional time was needed to research separation agreements and due to the estimated time to conduct said research a special service charge may be imposed. The Custodian estimated that the research would take 15 to 25 hours and requested the Complainant to respond if the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights (“Borough”) should move forward with the research.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On December 17, 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 also contended that simply stating “terminated”, “resigned”, or “retired,” was insufficient under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10.

The Complainant requested that the GRC compel the Custodian to comply fully with the OPRA request and award counsel fees.⁵

Statement of Information:

On February 3, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on or about October 13, 2021. The Custodian certified that her search included contacting the Administrative Secretary for the Hasbrouck Heights Police Department to obtain the relevant records. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant in writing on November 15, 2021, attaching the responsive spreadsheet containing the responsive personnel information. The Custodian further certified that the Borough did not possess any additional records concerning the resignation, retirement, or termination of separated employees.

The Custodian argued that she provided the Complainant with all disclosable personnel information in the Borough’s possession. The Custodian contended the Complainant sought personnel information beyond what is permitted under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. The Custodian asserted that in Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Ocean Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, 2018 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 25 (App. Div.), cert. denied, 235 N.J. 407 (2018), the Appellate Division considered the very issue in this matter. The Custodian contended that the court held that OPRA did not require the Custodian to release any additional information explaining the circumstances surrounding an employee’s retirement or resignation.

The Custodian further asserted that the Complainant was not a prevailing party, and requested the Council deny the request for attorney’s fees.

Additional Submissions:

On February 4, 2022, the Complainant submitted a brief in response to the Complainant’s SOI. The Complainant asserted that the Custodian failed to provide the “real reasons” for separation in response to his OPRA request.

⁵ The Complainant did not raise an issue regarding the Custodian’s possible imposition of a special service charge pertaining to the portion of the request seeking separation agreements. Thus, the Council declines to address same. Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Hasbrouck Heights Police Department (Bergen), 2021-344 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

The Complainant initially argued that the terms “terminated”, “retired”, or “resigned,” did not sufficiently provide the “reason for separation” because they were merely types of employment separations and did not adequately describe the underlying basis thereof. The Complainant argued that the “reason” for separation was likely located within a separate document constituting a government record, and the Custodian was obligated to retrieve that record, rather than create a spreadsheet or list containing the words “terminated”, “retired”, or “resigned.”

The Complainant next asserted that in many instances where a police officer is charged for crimes, they may enter a plea agreement which may require them to leave the police department or be removed from employment because of a conviction. The Complainant argued that it was insufficient for the Custodian to merely state the terms “retired”, “resigned”, or “terminated” as the reason for separation if the “real reason” was that the officer was compelled to separate as part of a plea agreement or sentence. The Complainant thus argued that the Custodian violated OPRA by not providing the “real reasons” for any of the separations listed.

The Complainant asserted that a guilty plea agreement between an officer and prosecutor is akin to a settlement agreement normally entered into in civil proceedings. Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Cumberland Cnty, 465 N.J. Super. 11 (App. Div. 2020)⁶. The Complainant argued that civil settlement agreements are subject to OPRA, and therefore guilty plea agreements should also be subject to OPRA in accordance with Libertarians.

The Complainant contended the Borough did not want to provide the “real reasons” for separation due to the pervasive culture and predisposition to protect officers convicted of misconduct. The Complainant argued that providing single word descriptions was only partially truthful and did not promote OPRA’s goal of transparency.

The Complainant asserted that as an example of police departments’ culture, he noted that in response to a similar OPRA request, Millville Police Department stated that two (2) officers “resigned” from the department. The Complainant asserted that in fact the officers pleaded guilty to criminal charges and as part of the agreement and sentencing they were required to be separated from the department.

The Complainant requested that the GRC compel the Custodian to comply fully and truthfully with the OPRA request. The Complainant also requested the GRC declare the Complainant a prevailing party and award counsel fees.

On February 1, 2024, the GRC submitted a request for additional information from the Custodian. Specifically, the GRC inquired whether the Custodian searched for and provided any “agreements” the Borough entered with any separated police officers. The GRC also stated that if no search was conducted, the Custodian must conduct same and certify whether any responsive records were located.

On February 15, 2024, the current Custodian responded to the GRC’s request for additional information. The current Custodian certified that at the time of the request the Custodian conducted

⁶ Subsequently reversed in Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Cumberland Cnty., 250 N.J. 46 (2022). Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Hasbrouck Heights Police Department (Bergen), 2021-344 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

a search for any “agreement” between the Borough and any separated officer and that no agreements were located. The current Custodian also certified that she contacted the Borough’s Law Department and police department and confirmed that no responsive agreements exist.

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.

Personnel Information

In Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010), the Council found that the custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the requested records based on the custodian’s certification that all such records were provided to the complainant. The Council held that the custodian’s certification, in addition to the lack of refuting evidence from the complainant, was sufficient to meet the custodian’s burden of proof. See also Burns v. Borough of Collingswood, GRC Complaint No. 2005-68 (September 2005); Holland v. Rowan Univ., GRC Complaint No. 2014-63, *et seq.* (March 2015).

In the instant matter, the Complainant requested the “[n]ames, 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” on October 13, 2021. On November 15, 2021, the Custodian responded in writing providing a spreadsheet containing the requested information. In the SOI, the Custodian certified that she provided a fully responsive record and that no portion of the OPRA request was denied. Although the Complainant identified instances where other municipalities possessed records elaborating on the “reason for separation,” he failed to present any evidence that the Borough possessed same at the time of the request.

Accordingly, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s October 13, 2021 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the Borough provided all responsive records containing the requested information. See Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*

Agreements

The Council has previously found that, where a custodian certified that no responsive records exist, no unlawful denial of access occurred. Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005). Here, in addition to the requested personnel information, the Complainant sought any “agreement” between the Borough and any separated officer that would

contain the “reason for separation.” In response to the GRC’s request for information, the current Custodian certified and confirmed that a search for agreements was conducted at the time of the request and that no responsive records were located. Additionally, the Complainant failed to present any evidence that the Borough possessed same at the time of the request, or to refute the current Custodian’s certification.

Accordingly, the Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement” between the Borough and separated officers. Specifically, the current Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.

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 (7th 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.]

Here, the Complainant sought “[n]ames, 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,” as well as any “agreement” providing the “reason for separation.” In response, the Custodian provided records containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on December 17, 2021, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers' separations. However, the Custodian certified in the SOI that a complete response was provided. Further, the current Custodian certified that no agreements were located at the time of the request. Thus, the Complainant has not achieved the desired result and is not a prevailing party in this complaint.

Therefore, the Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian's conduct. Teeters, 387 N.J.

Super. at 432. Additionally, no 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 certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the Borough’s possession and that no agreements between the Borough and separated officers exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not 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.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s October 13, 2021 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights provided all responsive records containing the requested information. See Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).
2. The Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking the “reason for separation”, “amount and type of pension”, and any “agreement[s]” between the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights and separated police officers. Specifically, the current Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
3. The Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, no 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 certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the Borough of Hasbrouck Heights’s possession and that no agreements between the Borough and separated officers exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not 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.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado
Staff Attorney

February 20, 2024