



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

### February 18, 2025 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complainant

v.

Township of Long Hill Police Department (Morris)  
Custodian of Record

Complaint No. 2022-140

At the February 18, 2025, public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the February 11, 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 25, 2022, response was insufficient because he 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 agreements existed between the Township of Long Hill and any separated police officer.
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, he has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the Township of Long Hill 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).
3. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s March 16, 2022, OPRA request seeking the date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, and salary of 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.

4. **The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 3 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).**
5. 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 table 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 18<sup>th</sup> Day of February 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: February 20, 2025**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
February 18, 2025 Council Meeting**

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

**GRC Complaint No. 2022-140**

**v.**

**Township of Long Hill Police Department (Morris)<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:** James Marczewski

**Request Received by Custodian:** March 16, 2022

**Response Made by Custodian:** March 25, 2022

**GRC Complaint Received:** April 18, 2022

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

**Request and Response:**

On March 16, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On March 25, 2022, the Custodian responded in writing providing a table containing the name, date of hire, date of separation and

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Represented by John R. Pidgeon, Esq. of Pidgeon & Pidgeon, P.C. (Princeton, 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) v. Township of Long Hill Police Department (Morris), 2022-140 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

reason for separation, and salary of officers who separated from the Township of Long Hill (“Township”).

### 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 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” or “left to go to another agency” is not sufficient. The Complainant also stated 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 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.<sup>4</sup>

### Statement of Information:

On August 2, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified he received the Complainant’s OPRA request on March 2, 2022. The Custodian certified that he searched for responsive records and information along with the Township Clerk and Township Treasurer. The Custodian certified he responded on March 25, 2022, providing a table containing the requested personnel information.

The Custodian maintained the Complainant received all records containing the responsive information. The Custodian also stated he was unaware of any agreements between the separated officers and the Township. The Custodian also stated he was unaware of officers who separated due to any court proceedings, criminal actions, or as a condition or requirement stemming from an internal affairs investigation.

## 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).

---

<sup>4</sup> 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) v. Township of Long Hill Police Department (Morris), 2022-140 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Upon review, the GRC is satisfied the Custodian provided an insufficient response. Here, the Custodian responded to the Complainant's OPRA request providing a table containing the responsive personnel information. However, the response failed to indicate whether any "agreement" existed between the Township and the listed officers. It was not until the Custodian certified in the SOI that the Township did not possess any 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 25, 2022 response was insufficient because he 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 agreements existed between the Township 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.

### **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 Township and any separated officer containing the "reason for separation." In the SOI, the Custodian certified that the Township did not possess any responsive agreements. Furthermore, the Complainant failed to present any evidence that the Township possessed same at the time of the request.

Accordingly, notwithstanding the Custodian's insufficient response, he has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request seeking any "agreement[s]" between the Township 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.

### **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. 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 table containing the requested information. However, while such information could be provided in that format if originating from an electronic database, the Custodian certified in the SOI that the data came from multiple sources, including Township meeting minutes and documents received from the New Jersey Police Training Commission. 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 16, 2022 OPRA request seeking the date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, and salary of police officers from 2014 to the present. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a table by extracting the information from physical documents, rather than providing the most comprehensive records containing the requested information. See Valdes, GRC 2011-64; Morgano, GRC 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 (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 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 table 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. The Complainant also asserted the Custodian did not provide the requested information via actual records but instead provided a created table.

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 table was researched manually using physical records. 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. See Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Accordingly, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney fees.<sup>5</sup>

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 table 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**

---

<sup>5</sup> 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) v. Township of Long Hill Police Department (Morris), 2022-140 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director



**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 25, 2022 response was insufficient because he 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 agreements existed between the Township of Long Hill and any separated police officer.
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian's insufficient response, he has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request seeking any "agreement[s]" between the Township of Long Hill 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).
3. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant's March 16, 2022 OPRA request seeking the date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, and salary of 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.
4. **The Custodian shall comply with conclusion No. 3 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).**
5. 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 table 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

February 11, 2025