



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

April 29, 2025 Government Records Council Meeting

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

GRC Complaint No. 2022-139

v.
Englishtown Borough Police Department (Monmouth)
Custodian of Record

At the April 29, 2025 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the April 15, 2025 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 March 29, 2022 response was insufficient because she failed to address each request item. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); 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 Englishtown Borough and any separated police officer. The current Custodian shall therefore conduct a search for responsive agreements or certify that none exists.
2. The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s February 28, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the current Custodian failed to indicate how the information was generated. Thus, the current Custodian shall locate and provide the most comprehensive records containing the 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).
3. **The current Custodian shall comply with conclusion Nos. 1 & 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, and failed to assert whether any responsive agreements exist. 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 29th Day of April 2025

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: May 5, 2025

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
April 29, 2025 Council Meeting**

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

GRC Complaint No. 2022-139

v.

**Englishtown Borough Police Department (Monmouth)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: Gretchen McCarthy³
Request Received by Custodian: February 28, 2022
Response Made by Custodian: March 24, 2022
GRC Complaint Received: April 18, 2022

Background⁴

Request and Response:

On February 28, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. That same day, the Custodian

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

² Represented by James Plosia, Jr., of Plosia Cohen, LLC (Morris Plains, NJ). Previously represented by Joseph Youssouf, Esq.

³ The current Records Custodian is Kerry Killeen.

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. Englishtown Borough Police Department (Union), 2022-139 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

responded to the Complainant seeking clarification on his request. The Custodian inquired whether the Complainant sought personnel information for all Englishtown Borough (“Borough”) employees or only police officers. On March 9, 2022, the Complainant responded to the Custodian stating he sought records relating to law enforcement.

On March 16, 2022, the Custodian responded to the Complainant in writing seeking further clarification on the Complainant’s request. Specifically, the Custodian inquired about what type of payroll record the Complainant sought. The Custodian also extended the time to respond to March 25, 2022.

On March 24, 2022, the Custodian responded to the Complainant in writing, providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Custodian also stated she did not receive clarification on the type of payroll sought, and therefore that portion of the request was closed. The Custodian added that, for the remainder of the request, no officer left due to a plea bargain or internal affairs investigation.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On April 18, 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. Furthermore, the Complainant asserted that the time for compliance had expired.

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 29, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified the Borough received the Complainant’s OPRA request on February 28, 2022. The Custodian certified that the request was forwarded to the police department. The Custodian certified she received a list from a police officer on March 15, 2022, and an additional response on March 21, 2022. The Custodian certified she received additional information from the Borough’s finance clerk and compiled the responsive spreadsheet. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant in writing on March 24, 2022, providing the spreadsheet containing the personnel information.

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. Englishtown Borough Police Department (Union), 2022-139 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

The Custodian maintained that she provided the Complainant with all responsive information in the Borough's possession. The Custodian further maintained that no officers left due to plea bargains or internal affairs investigations, thus arguing she provided a complete response to the Complainant.

Additional Submissions:

On January 27, 2025, the GRC submitted a request for additional information to the Custodian. Specifically, the GRC inquired whether the provided personnel information was collected from an electronic database, and whether the spreadsheet was created via Excel. The GRC also inquired whether the Borough conducted a search for agreements at the time of the request.

On January 30, 2025, Custodian's Counsel e-mail the GRC stating the Custodian no longer works for the Borough and is actively suing the Borough and therefore cannot provide a certification as requested. Counsel further stated the Borough was willing to respond to a new request from the Complainant. On March 4, 2025, the GRC asked Counsel whether the Borough intended to respond to the request for additional information. On March 5, 2025, Counsel responded to the GRC maintaining it was not possible to provide the requested certification.

Analysis

Sufficiency of Response

Agreements

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 a spreadsheet containing the responsive personnel information. However, the response failed to indicate whether any "agreement" existed between the Borough and the separated officers. Moreover, the current Custodian declined to respond to the GRC's additional information request asking whether the Borough in fact searched for responsive agreements. 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 March 24, 2022 response was insufficient because she failed to address each request item. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); Paff, GRC 2007-272; Lenchitz, GRC 2012-265. Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive agreements existed between the Borough and any separated police officer. The current Custodian shall therefore conduct a

search for responsive agreements or certify that none exists.

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

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 held that responding to an OPRA request for personnel information requires a custodian to provide the most comprehensive records containing 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, the Custodian provided a spreadsheet containing the requested information. However, while such information could be provided in that format if originating from an electronic database, the current Custodian declined to respond to the GRC’s request for additional information. Therefore, it is unclear whether the Section 10 information originated from

an electronic database or from physical files.

Accordingly, the Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant's February 28, 2022 OPRA request seeking Section 10 personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the current Custodian declined to indicate how the information was generated. Thus, the current Custodian shall locate and provide the most comprehensive records containing the information. See Valdes, GRC 2011-64 and Morgano, GRC 2007-156.

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 also 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.” Mason, 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 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 Complainant also sought any “agreements” between the Borough and separated officers containing the reasons for separation. In response, the Custodian provided a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on April 18, 2022, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers’ separations.

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 current Custodian declined to certify whether the information contained in the spreadsheet was located and compiled using physical records and not an electronic database. Therefore, the Council has no other option than to order the current Custodian to locate and provide the actual records containing the requested personnel information as well as locate any responsive agreements. 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 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, and failed to assert whether any responsive agreements exist. 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:

1. The Custodian’s March 29, 2022 response was insufficient because she failed to address each request item. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); 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 Englishtown Borough and any separated police officer. The current Custodian shall therefore conduct a search for responsive agreements or certify that none exists.
2. The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s February 28, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the current Custodian failed to indicate how the information was generated. Thus, the current Custodian shall locate and provide the most comprehensive records containing the 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).
3. **The current Custodian shall comply with conclusion Nos. 1 & 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**

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. Englishtown Borough Police Department (Union), 2022-139 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

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, and failed to assert whether any responsive agreements exist. 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

April 15, 2025