



## 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. 2021-347

v.

Bergen County Police Department  
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. Therefore, the Custodian’s October 27, 2021 and November 8, 2021 responses were insufficient because she failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); see Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008); Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013). Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive settlements existed between Bergen County and any separated police officer.
2. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s October 25, 2021 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that Bergen County 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).
3. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that he 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 Town of Harrison and separated police officers. Specifically, the 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).
4. 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 Bergen County's possession and that no agreements between the County 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 29<sup>th</sup> 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)<sup>1</sup>  
Complainant**

**GRC Complaint No. 2021-347**

v.

**Bergen County Police Department<sup>2</sup>  
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:** Ellen Busteed

**Request Received by Custodian:** October 25, 2021

**Response Made by Custodian:** October 27, 2021; November 8, 2021

**GRC Complaint Received:** December 20, 2021

**Background<sup>3</sup>**

**Request and Response:**

On October 25, 2021, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On October 27, 2021, the Custodian responded to the Complainant in writing providing responsive records for the years 2018 to present. The Custodian also stated that responsive records for the years 2014 through 2017

---

<sup>1</sup> The Complainant represents the African American Data & Research Institute.

<sup>2</sup> Represented by Christine D’Aloia, Esq., County Counsel (Hackensack, NJ).

<sup>3</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 African American Data & Research Institute) v. Bergen County Police Department, 2021-347 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

were being retrieved from storage. On November 8, 2021, the Custodian responded to the Complainant again, providing the remaining responsive records. On November 10, 2021, the Complainant what the acronyms “LO”, “TM”, and “RT” stood for in the records. That same day, the Custodian responded to the Complainant stating the acronyms stood for “lay off”, “terminated”, and “retired,” respectively.

#### Denial of Access Complaint:

On December 20, 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.

#### Statement of Information:

On February 3, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that Bergen County (“County”) received the Complainant’s OPRA request on October 25, 2021. The Custodian certified that the County’s Personnel Division conducted a search for records containing the requested personnel information. The Custodian certified that an additional search was conducted within the County’s archives. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant in writing on October 27, 2021 and November 8, 2021, providing records containing the requested personnel information.

The Custodian argued that she provided the Complainant with all disclosable personnel information in the County’s possession. The Custodian also 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.

#### Additional Submissions:

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 County 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 5, 2024, the Custodian responded to the GRC’s request for additional information. The Custodian certified that at the time of the request the Custodian conducted a search for any “agreement” between the County and any separated officer in addition to the

requested personnel information. The Custodian certified that her search located no “agreements” between the County and any separated officer.

## Analysis

### 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). 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 spreadsheets attached to two (2) e-mails. However, the e-mails failed to identify whether the Custodian was denying access to any records and further failed to address each request item. Instead, the Custodian disclosed spreadsheets which appeared to be responsive to the request for personnel information but did not indicate whether any “agreement” existed between the County and the officers. It was not until the Custodian certified in the SOI that the records contained in the correspondence were responsive to the request for personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. Further, it was only in response to the GRC’s request for additional information that the Custodian certified that she conducted a search for any “agreement” between the County and separated officers and that no records were located. The facts here are on point with those in Paff; thus, it follows there was an insufficient response in the instant complaint.

Therefore, the Custodian’s October 27, 2021 and November 8, 2021 responses were insufficient because she failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); see Paff, GRC 2007-272; Lenchitz, GRC 2012-265. Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive settlements existed between the County and any separated police officer.

### 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 25, 2021. On October 27, 2021, and November 8, 2021, the Custodian responded in writing providing spreadsheets 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 County possessed same at the time of the request.

Accordingly, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant's October 25, 2021 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the County 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 County and any separated officer that would contain the “reason for separation.” In response to the GRC's request for additional information, the Custodian certified that she conducted a search for such agreements at the time of the request, but none were located. Although the Complainant identified instances where other municipalities possessed such agreements, he failed to present any evidence that the County possessed same at the time of the request, or to refute the Custodian's certification.

Accordingly, notwithstanding the Custodian's insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the County and separated police officers. Specifically, the 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 (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.]

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 20, 2021, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers’ separations. However, the Custodian certified in the SOI and in response to the GRC’s additional information request that the County did not possess any additional records, nor any agreements between the County and separated officers. 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 County’s possession and that no agreements between the County 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. Therefore, the Custodian’s October 27, 2021 and November 8, 2021 responses were insufficient because she failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); see Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008); Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013). Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive settlements existed between Bergen County and any separated police officer.



2. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant's October 25, 2021 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that Bergen County 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).
3. Notwithstanding the Custodian's insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that he 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 Town of Harrison and separated police officers. Specifically, the 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).
4. 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 Bergen County's possession and that no agreements between the County 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