



PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

TAHESHA L. WAY
Lieutenant Governor

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

JACQUELYN A. SUÁREZ
Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

December 10, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2022-106

v.
East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex)
Custodian of Record

At the December 10, 2024, public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the December 3, 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 has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the Township of East Brunswick 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).
2. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s March 7, 2022, OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of separated police officers from 2014 to the present. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a spreadsheet by extracting the information from physical records, rather than providing the most comprehensive record containing the requested information. See Valdes v. Union City Bd. of Educ. (Hudson), GRC Complaint No. 2011-64 (Interim Order dated August 28, 2012); Morgano v. Essex Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-156 (February 2008). Thus, the Custodian shall locate and provide such records to the Complainant.
3. **The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 2 above within twenty (20) business days from receipt of the Council’s Final Decision. In the circumstance where the records ordered for disclosure are not provided to the Complainant, the Council’s Final Decision may be enforced in the Superior Court of New Jersey. N.J. Court Rules, R. 4:67-6; N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.9(c).**
4. 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 improperly provided a spreadsheet containing the requested information, rather than the actual records containing same. 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. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. 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 10th Day of December 2024

John A. Alexy, 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: December 12, 2024

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
December 10, 2024 Council Meeting**

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

GRC Complaint No. 2022-106

v.

**East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex)²
Custodial Agency**

Records Relevant to Complaint:³ 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: Tamar Lawful

Request Received by Custodian: March 7, 2022

Response Made by Custodian: March 25, 2022

GRC Complaint Received: April 8, 2022

Background⁴

Request and Response:

On March 7, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On March 15, 2022, the Custodian extended the time to respond until March 30, 2022. On March 25, 2022, Carol Bellisano responded

¹ The Complainant represents the African American Data & Research Institute, Baffi Simmons, and Delores Simmons.

² Represented by Anthony C. Iacocca, Esq., of Hoaglan, Longo, Moran, Dunst & Doukas, LLP (New Brunswick, NJ).

³ The Complainant sought additional records that are not at issue in this complaint.

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. East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex), 2022-106
– Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

on the Custodian's behalf in writing providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The provided spreadsheet also noted that no agreements existed between any of the officers and the Township of East Brunswick ("Township").

Denial of Access Complaint:

On April 8, 2022, 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 asserted that creating a new spreadsheet or list stating "terminated" or "resigned" or "retired" is not sufficient. The Complainant also stated that the response did not state whether any officers left due to a plea deal or court proceeding that precludes them from law enforcement positions.

The Complainant requested the GRC to order the Custodian to comply with the Supreme Court decision Libertarians for Transparent Gov't v. Cumberland Cnty., 250 N.J. 46 (2022), issued on March 7, 2022. The Complainant also requested the GRC award counsel fees.⁵

Statement of Information:

On July 8, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information ("SOI"). The Custodian certified she received the Complainant's OPRA request on March 7, 2022. The Custodian certified the request was sent to the Township's police department to perform a search for records. The Custodian certified that on March 25, 2022, Ms. Bellisano responded to the Complainant's request.

The Custodian argued the Complainant's request was too broad and unclear and failed to specifically identify government records. MAG Entm't, LLC v. Div. of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005). The Custodian contended that the request was open-ended and required the Custodian to conduct a general search of the Township's files. The Custodian argued that she nevertheless made a good faith attempt to complete OPRA request by providing the summary sheet.

The Custodian asserted that the only clear request was for any "agreement[s]" between the Township and separated officers. The Custodian noted that the response noted that no responsive records existed and therefore there was no unlawful denial of access pursuant to Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).

Additional Submissions:

On November 14, 2024, the GRC submitted a request for additional information to the Custodian. Specifically, the GRC inquired whether the information from the provided spreadsheet was collected from an electronic database, and whether the spreadsheet was created via Excel.

⁵ The Complainant further noted that access to the records should have been granted under the "common law 'right to access public records.'" However, the GRC does not have the authority to address a requestor's common law right to access records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(b); Rowan, Jr. v. Warren Hills Reg'l Sch. Dist. (Warren), GRC Complaint No. 2011-347 (January 2013); Kelly v. N.J. Dep't of Transp., GRC Complaint No. 2010-215 (November 2011). Thus, the GRC cannot address any common law right of access to the requested records.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex), 2022-106
– Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

On November 19, 2024, the Custodian responded to the GRC's request for additional information. The Custodian certified that the information within the spreadsheet was collected from hardcopy versions of relevant personnel files. The Custodian certified that the information was then generated via Microsoft Excel, converted to PDF format, and provided to the Complainant.

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.

Agreements

The Council has previously found where a custodian certified that no responsive records exist, no unlawful denial of access occurred. Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49. Here, in addition to the requested personnel information, the Complainant sought any "agreement" between the Township and any separated officer that would contain the "reason for separation." Ms. Bellisano responded, and the Custodian certified in the SOI, that no other records exist at the time of the request, inclusive of any agreements. Additionally, the Complainant failed to present any evidence that the Township possessed same at the time of the request, or to refute the 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[s]" between the Township and separated 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.

Personnel Information

Regarding personnel records, OPRA begins with a presumption against disclosure and "proceeds with a few narrow exceptions that . . . need to be considered." Kovalcik v. Somerset Cnty. Prosecutor's Office, 206 N.J. 581, 594 (2011). These exceptions include "an individual's name, title, position, salary, payroll record, length of service, date of separation and the reason therefore, and the amount and type of any pension received shall be government record." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10 ("Section 10").

In Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated June 29, 2010), the Council determined that "name, title, position, salary, payroll record and length of service" is information which is specifically considered to be a "government record" under Section 10, and that "payroll records" must be disclosed pursuant to Jackson v. Kean Univ., GRC Complaint No. 2002-98 (February 2004). The Council thus held that the complainant's March 25, 2009, request for "[t]he name, position, salary, payroll record and length

of service for every [agency] employee who was employed in whole or part from January 1, 2008, to March 24, 2009” was a valid request pursuant to OPRA. Id. at 5. Additionally, prior GRC case law supports the disclosure of database information regarding personnel actions. See Matthews v. City of Atlantic City (Atlantic), GRC Complaint No. 2008-123 (February 2009).

However, the Council has previously required that responding to an OPRA request for personnel information requires a custodian provide the most comprehensive records containing the responsive information. See Valdes v. Union City Bd. of Educ. (Hudson), GRC Complaint No. 2011-64 (Interim Order dated August 28, 2012). In Valdes, the complainant sought the same personnel information at issue in the instant case. The custodian denied access since the requestor sought only information and did not identify a specific record that may contain the requested information. The Council held that OPRA did not require the custodian to extract and synthesize requested information from government records, but instead to provide the most comprehensive record containing said information, with necessary redactions. See also Morgano v. Essex Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-156 (February 2008).

In the instant matter, the Complainant requested, in part, Section 10 information from the Custodian. In response, Ms. Bellisano provided a spreadsheet containing a portion of the requested information. However, while such information could be provided in that format if originating from an electronic database, in response to the GRC’s additional information request, the Custodian certified that the data was manually researched from the Borough’s files. Thus, in accordance with Valdes and Morgano, the Custodian was obligated to instead provide the most comprehensive records containing Section 10 information, with redactions applied as necessary.

Accordingly, the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s March 7, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of separated police officers from 2014 to the present. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a spreadsheet by extracting the information from physical documents, rather than providing the most comprehensive records containing the requested information. See Valdes, GRC 2011-64; Morgano, 2007-156. Thus, the Custodian shall locate and provide such records to the Complainant.

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 in part 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." The Custodian responded by providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on April 8, 2022, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the "real reason" for the officers' separations. The Complainant also asserted that the Custodian did not provide the requested information via actual records but instead provided a created spreadsheet.

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 certified that the information contained in the spreadsheet was not collected an electronic database but was instead researched manually. The Custodian is therefore obligated to locate and provide the actual records containing the requested personnel information. 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.⁶

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 improperly provided a spreadsheet containing the requested information, rather than the actual records containing same. 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. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. 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:

⁶ 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. (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 African American Data & Research Institute) v. East Brunswick Police Department (Middlesex), 2022-106
– Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

1. The Custodian has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request seeking any "agreement[s]" between the Township of East Brunswick 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).
2. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant's March 7, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of separated police officers from 2014 to the present. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a spreadsheet by extracting the information from physical records, rather than providing the most comprehensive record containing the requested information. See Valdes v. Union City Bd. of Educ. (Hudson), GRC Complaint No. 2011-64 (Interim Order dated August 28, 2012); Morgano v. Essex Cnty. Prosecutor's Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-156 (February 2008). Thus, the Custodian shall locate and provide such records to the Complainant.
3. **The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 2 above within twenty (20) business days from receipt of the Council's Final Decision. In the circumstance where the records ordered for disclosure are not provided to the Complainant, the Council's Final Decision may be enforced in the Superior Court of New Jersey. N.J. Court Rules, R. 4:67-6; N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.9(c).**
4. 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 improperly provided a spreadsheet containing the requested information, rather than the actual records containing same. 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. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. 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
Senior Staff Attorney

December 3, 2024