



## State of New Jersey

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

PHILIP D. MURPHY  
Governor

TAHESHA L. WAY  
Lieutenant Governor

JACQUELYN A. SUÁREZ  
Commissioner

### FINAL DECISION

#### May 20, 2025 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2022-224

v.  
City of Burlington Police Department (Burlington)  
Custodian of Record

At the May 20, 2025, public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the May 13, 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 April 12, 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 agreements existed between the City of Burlington and any separated police officer.
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the City of Burlington and separated police officers. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
3. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s March 8, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of police officers who separated from the City of Burlington. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the City provided all responsive records in its possession. See Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Voorhees Twp. Police Dep’t (Camden), GRC Complaint No. 2022-12 (March 2024); Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).
4. The Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. See Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, no factual causal

nexus exists between the Complainant's filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. See Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the City of Burlington's possession and that no agreements exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney's fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in the Appellate Division of the Superior Court of New Jersey within forty-five (45) days. Information about the appeals process can be obtained from the Appellate Division Clerk's Office, Hughes Justice Complex, 25 W. Market St., PO Box 006, Trenton, NJ 08625-0006. Proper service of submissions pursuant to any appeal is to be made to the Council in care of the Executive Director at the State of New Jersey Government Records Council, 101 South Broad Street, PO Box 819, Trenton, NJ 08625-0819.

Final Decision Rendered by the  
Government Records Council  
On The 20<sup>th</sup> Day of May 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 27, 2025**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
May 20, 2025 Council Meeting**

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

**GRC Complaint No. 2022-224**

v.

**City of Burlington Police Department (Burlington)<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:** Cindy A. Crivaro  
**Request Received by Custodian:** March 8, 2022  
**Response Made by Custodian:** April 12, 2022  
**GRC Complaint Received:** May 12, 2022

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

**Request and Response:**

On March 8, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On March 15, 2022, Patricia E. Tocci, the Deputy Clerk, e-mailed the Complainant requesting clarification on whether he sought

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Represented by Justin M. Strausser, Esq. of The Platt Law Group, P.C. (Stratford, NJ).

<sup>3</sup> The parties may have submitted additional correspondence or made additional statements/assertions in the submissions identified herein. However, the Council includes in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director the submissions necessary and relevant for the adjudication of this complaint.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. City of Burlington Police Department (Burlington), 2022-224 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

information on all City of Burlington (“City”) employees, or only police officers. On April 4, 2022, the Complainant replied to the Custodian stating, “police”. On April 12, 2022, Ms. Tocci responded on the Custodian’s behalf in writing, providing a spreadsheet containing the requested information.

#### Denial of Access Complaint:

On May 12, 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 the time for compliance had expired.

The Complainant requested the GRC order the City 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 20, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that the City received the Complainant’s OPRA request on March 8, 2022. The Custodian certified Ms. Tocci responded on the Custodian’s behalf on April 12, 2022, providing the Complainant with the spreadsheet containing the personnel information.

The Custodian maintained that the City provided all available information requested by the Complainant. The Custodian argued that pursuant to Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Ocean Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, 2018 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 25 (App. Div.), certif. denied, 235 N.J. 407 (2018), she was not obligated to “investigate, determine, and disclose [the employee’s] motivation for resigning or the circumstances surrounding his decision to resign.”

#### Additional Submissions:

On April 30, 2025, the GRC submitted a request for additional information to the Custodian. Specifically, the GRC inquired whether the requested information was collected from an electronic database. The GRC also inquired whether the City conducted a search for any agreements between the City and separated officers containing the reasons for separation.

On May 5, 2025, the Custodian responded to the GRC’s additional information request, providing a certification. The Custodian certified that the personnel information was collected

---

<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) v. City of Burlington Police Department (Burlington), 2022-224 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

from an electronic database and the spreadsheet was created through a separate program. The Custodian also certified that she conducted a search for responsive agreements at the time of the request and that none were located.

## Analysis

### Sufficiency of Response

OPRA provides that if a “custodian is unable to comply with a request for access, the custodian *shall indicate the specific basis therefor . . .* on the request form and promptly return it to the requestor.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) (emphasis added). In Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008), the Council held that “[t]he Custodian’s response was legally insufficient because he failed to respond to each request item individually. Therefore, the Custodian has violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g).” See also Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013).

Upon review, the GRC is satisfied that the Custodian provided an insufficient response. Here, the Custodian responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request by providing a spreadsheet containing the responsive personnel information. However, the response failed to indicate whether any “agreement[s]” existed between the City and the separated officers. It was not until the Custodian certified in response to the GRC’s request for additional information that the City searched for responsive agreements at the time of the request, and none were located. The facts here are on point with those in Paff; thus, it follows there was an insufficient response in the instant complaint.

Therefore, the Custodian’s April 12, 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 City 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 City and any separated officer containing the “reasons” for separation. In response to the GRC’s additional information request, the Custodian certified that no responsive agreements exist. Moreover, the Complainant failed to present any

evidence that the City possessed same at the time of the request, or to refute the Custodian's certification.

Accordingly, notwithstanding the Custodian's insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request seeking any "agreement[s]" between the City and separated police officers. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.

### Personnel Information

The Council in Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010) determined that a public employee's "name, title, position, salary, payroll record and length of service" was information specifically considered to be a "government record" under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. 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, in that case the Council also held that a custodian was not required to disclose a record that did not exist in the format requested.

In the instant matter, the Complainant requested the "[n]ames, date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, salary, payroll record, amount and type of pension of individuals who either resigned or retired or terminated or otherwise separated from 2014 to the present" on March 8, 2022. That same day, the Custodian responded in writing, providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant claimed the provided list was insufficient to satisfy his request for the "reasons for separation." The Complainant also contended the response failed to indicate whether officers were separated due to a plea agreement or court proceeding.

While this matter awaited adjudication, the GRC issued its decision in Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Voorhees Twp. Police Dep't (Camden), GRC Complaint No. 2022-12 (March 2024). There, the complainant raised the same objections as the instant matter, with the custodian providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. However, the Council found that in accordance with Paff v. Twp. of Galloway, 229 N.J. 340, 353 (2017), the spreadsheet provided was an acceptable form of disclosure, as it was generated through the agency's electronic database. The Council further held that, under Matthews, GRC 2008-123, the custodian was not obligated to explicitly denote whether an officer's separation was the result of a plea agreement or other court proceedings.

Here, the facts parallel those in Voorhees, GRC 2022-12. In response to the GRC's additional information request, the Custodian certified that the information within the provided spreadsheet was derived from an electronic database system and converted into a spreadsheet. Therefore, the Custodian's response was permitted in accordance with Paff.

Accordingly, notwithstanding the Custodian's insufficient response, she did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant's OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel

information of police officers who separated from the City. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the City provided all responsive records in its possession. See Voorhees, GRC 2022-12; Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*

### **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 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” as well as any “agreement[s]” between the City and any separated police officer providing the “reason for separation.” In response, the Custodian provided a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on May 12, 2022, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers’ separations. However, the Custodian certified that the spreadsheet provided was generated from the City’s electronic database. Furthermore, while the Custodian submitted an insufficient response, she certified that no responsive agreements exist. Thus, the Complainant has not achieved the desired result and is not a prevailing party in this complaint.

Therefore, the Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. See Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Additionally, no factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. See Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Specifically, the Custodian certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the City’s possession and that no responsive agreements exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian’s April 12, 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 agreements existed between the City of Burlington and any separated police officer.
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the City of Burlington and separated police officers. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
3. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s March 8, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of police officers who separated from the City of Burlington. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the City provided all responsive records in its possession. See Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Voorhees Twp. Police Dep’t (Camden), GRC Complaint No. 2022-12 (March 2024); Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).
4. The Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. See Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, no factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. See Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the City of Burlington’s possession and that no agreements exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado  
Senior Staff Attorney

May 13, 2025