



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

### June 24, 2025 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2022-219

v.  
Borough of Garwood Police Department (Union)  
Custodian of Record

At the June 24, 2025, public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the June 17, 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 has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the Borough of Garwood 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 16, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a report by compiling the information from physical documents, rather than providing the most comprehensive records 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).
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 24<sup>th</sup> Day of June 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: June 26, 2025**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
June 24, 2025 Council Meeting**

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

**GRC Complaint No. 2022-219**

**v.**

**Borough of Garwood Police Department (Union)<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:** Catherine D. Cameron

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

**Response Made by Custodian:** March 28, 2022; April 21, 2022

**GRC Complaint Received:** May 20, 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 28, 2022, the Custodian extended the time to respond until April 25, 2022. On April 21, 2022, the Custodian responded to the Complainant in writing, providing a report containing the requested personnel information.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Represented by Bradley Tishman, Esq. of Cleary, Giacobbe, Alfieri, & Jacobs, LLC (Oakland, 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 & Baffi Obafemi) v. Borough of Garwood Police Department (Union), 2022-219 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

The Custodian stated the report did not contain the final salary information for the officers, but noted the Borough of Garwood (“Borough”) was not obligated create a record to comply with an OPRA request. The Custodian further stated that no responsive agreements between the Borough and separated officers exist.

#### Denial of Access Complaint:

On May 20, 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” 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. 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.<sup>4</sup>

#### Statement of Information:

On September 26, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified the Borough received the Complainant’s OPRA request on March 16, 2022. The Custodian certified that she contacted the Borough’s Chief of Police, James Wright. The Custodian certified the Chief compiled the requested information and provided same to the Custodian. The Custodian also certified that she was told by the Chief that no responsive agreements existed. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant in writing on April 21, 2022, providing the table containing the personnel information.

The Custodian argued that the Complainant’s OPRA request channels the “personnel records” exemption under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. The Custodian asserted that if the Complainant had sought a specific record containing the reason for separation, the Borough would have been obligated to produce same. The Custodian argued instead that the Complainant failed to specifically identify government records the Borough could produce via a general search. Therefore, the Custodian argued that the Complainant’s request was invalid under OPRA. MAG Entm’t, LLC v. Div. of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005); N.J. Builders Ass’n v. N.J. Council on Affordable Hous., 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007).

The Custodian contended that the Complainant’s request was more akin to a discovery demand rather than an OPRA request and was a textbook example of an OPRA request that

---

<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 Institute & Baffi Obafemi) v. Borough of Garwood Police Department (Union), 2022-219 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

requires the Custodian to perform research to fulfill. The Custodian argued that OPRA did not require her to conduct research. See Sussex Commons Assocs., LLC v. Rutgers Univ., 210 N.J. 531, 544 (2012); Matthews v. City of Atlantic City, GRC Complaint No. 2008-123 (Feb. 2009).

The Custodian asserted that although she had no obligation, she compiled a list of police officers who separated from the Borough from 2014 to present. The Custodian nevertheless maintained that she was not required to utilize taxpayer resources to conduct research on the Complainant's behalf.

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. Id. The Custodian asserted that in matter, the Borough complied with its obligations to the Complainant in accordance with Ocean Cnty. Prosecutor's Office.

The Custodian further noted that the Court's decision in Libertarians did not require the Custodian to conduct research to ascertain the reasons for an officer's separation. The Custodian also asserted that in any event the Borough did not possess any responsive agreements.

The Custodian finally noted that the Complainant and AADARI are the same entity, and therefore not entitled to an attorney fee award in the event the Complainant is a prevailing party.

#### Additional Submissions:

On April 29, 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.

On May 13, 2025, the Custodian's Counsel responded to the GRC's additional information request, providing a certification from the current Chief of Police, Douglas Stoffer. The current Chief certified that he was serving as Captain at the time of the request and was tasked with processing OPRA requests seeking police records. The current Chief certified that he assisted Chief Wright with compiling the information provided in the report. The current Chief certified that the personnel information was not collected from an electronic database but was created in Excel and converted into a PDF document.

### 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 that, where a custodian certified that no responsive records exist, no unlawful denial of access occurred. Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005). Here, in addition to the requested personnel information, the Complainant sought any "agreement" between the Borough and any separated officer containing the "reasons" for separation. On April 21, 2022, the Custodian responded to the Complainant stating that no responsive agreements exist. Additionally the Custodian certified in the SOI that no responsive agreements exist between the Borough and separated officers. Moreover, the Complainant failed to present any evidence that the Borough 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 Borough 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 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 Borough. 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, in response to the GRC's request for additional information the current Chief certified that the personnel information did not come from an electronic database, but was compiled into an Excel spreadsheet. 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 20, 2022 OPRA request seeking Section 10 personnel information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a report by compiling 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 spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on May 20, 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 report.

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 report was located and compiled into an Excel spreadsheet and did not originate from an electronic database. 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 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 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:

1. The Custodian has borne his burden of proof that he lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the Borough of Garwood 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 16, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian created a report by compiling the information from physical documents, rather than providing the most comprehensive

---

<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 Institute & Baffi Obafemi) v. Borough of Garwood Police Department (Union), 2022-219 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

records 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).

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

June 17, 2025