



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
Acting Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

April 30, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2022-48

v.

Raritan Police Department (Hunterdon)
Custodian of Record

At the April 30, 2024 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the April 23, 2024 Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director and all related documentation submitted by the parties. The Council voted unanimously to adopt the entirety of said findings and recommendations. The Council, therefore, finds that:

1. The Custodian’s January 26, 2022 response was insufficient because she 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 settlements existed between the Township of Raritan and any separated police officer.
2. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s January 20, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of police officers who separated from the Township of Raritan. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the Township 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).
3. 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” between the Township of Raritan and separated officers. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
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. 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. 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 Township of Raritan's possession and that no agreements between the Township and separated officers 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 30th Day of April 2024

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., 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 2, 2024

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
April 30, 2024 Council Meeting**

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

GRC Complaint No. 2022-48

v.

**Raritan Police Department (Hunterdon)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: Lisa Fania³

Request Received by Custodian: January 20, 2022

Response Made by Custodian: January 26, 2022

GRC Complaint Received: March 3, 2022

Background⁴

Request and Response:

On January 20, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On January 26, 2022, the Custodian

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

² Represented by Joseph V. Sordillo, Esq., of DiFrancesco, Bateman, Kunzman, Davis, Lehrer & Flaum, P.C. (Warren, NJ).

³ The current Custodian of Record is Donna Kukkla.

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. Raritan Police Department (Hunterdon), 2022-48 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

responded to the Complainant in writing providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On March 3, 2022, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the records did not provide the reasons for separation. The Complainant also asserted that creating a new spreadsheet or list stating “terminated” or “resigned” or “retired” is not sufficient. The Complainant also stated that the response did not state whether any officers left due to a plea deal or court proceeding that precludes them from law enforcement positions.

The Complainant requested that the GRC compel the Custodian to comply fully with the OPRA request and award counsel fees.⁵

Statement of Information:

On March 23, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that the Township of Raritan (“Township”) received the Complainant’s OPRA request on January 20, 2022. The Custodian certified that her search included preparing a report utilizing the Township’s payroll management software. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant in writing on January 26, 2022, providing the spreadsheet.

The Custodian maintained that she provided the Complainant with the requested information via the Excel spreadsheet generated through the Township’s payroll software. Further, the Custodian certified that there were no responsive agreements noted in subpart (a) of the request. The Custodian also certified that subparts (b) and (c) were not requests and therefore was not required to provide a response to them.

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).

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. Raritan Police Department (Hunterdon), 2022-48 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

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 requested personnel information. However, the Custodian's response did not indicate whether any "agreement" existed between the Township and the separated officers. It was not until the Custodian certified in the SOI that the records contained in the correspondence were responsive to the request for personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10, and that there were no 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 January 26, 2022 response was insufficient because she 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 settlements 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.

Personnel Information

In Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010), the Council found that the custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the requested records based on the custodian's certification that all such records were provided to the complainant. The Council held that the custodian's certification, in addition to the lack of refuting evidence from the complainant, was sufficient to meet the custodian's burden of proof. See also Burns v. Borough of Collingswood, GRC Complaint No. 2005-68 (September 2005); Holland v. Rowan Univ., GRC Complaint No. 2014-63, *et seq.* (March 2015).

Additionally, in Danis the Council 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.

Further, while longstanding case law supports that a custodian is not required to create records to respond to OPRA requests, those requests seeking "information stored or maintained electronically" as defined in N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1 require a different analysis. In Paff v. Twp. of Galloway, 229 N.J. 340 (2017), the New Jersey Supreme Court determined there that an agency's electronically stored information is a "government record" under OPRA, unless otherwise exempt. The Court thus reversed the Appellate Division, holding that basic e-mail information stored

electronically is a “government record” under OPRA, unless an exemption applies to that information. The Court reasoned that:

A document is nothing more than a compilation of information -- discrete facts and data. By OPRA’s language, information in electronic form, even if part of a larger document, is itself a government record. Thus, electronically stored information extracted from an email is not the creation of a new record or new information; it is a government record.

. . . .

With respect to electronically stored information by a municipality or other public entity, we reject the Appellate Division's statement that “OPRA only allows requests for records, not requests for information.” Paff, 444 N.J. Super. at 503, (quoting Bent, 381 N.J. Super. at 37). That position cannot be squared with OPRA's plain language or its objectives in dealing with electronically stored information.

[Id. at 353, 356.]

The Supreme Court’s ruling in Paff squares with the Council’s past decisions on the issue of coalescing information from electronic systems. Specifically, in Zahler v. Ocean Cnty. Coll., GRC Complaint No. 2013-266 (Interim Order dated July 29, 2014), the Council addressed the custodian’s argument that she was not required to create a record to satisfy an OPRA request for database information pursuant to Morgano v. Essex Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-156 (Interim Order dated February 27, 2008). Therein, the complainant sought access to a list of adjuncts to include certain information. The custodian produced a list that did not include all information sought; however, the evidence of record indicated that she could have produced a fully responsive record. Specifically, evidence existed to support that all information the complainant sought existed within a few different databases.

The Council first noted that the definition of a “government record” included “information stored or maintained electronically.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. The Council then distinguished the facts of Morgano and held that the custodian unlawfully denied access to the responsive list containing all elements identified in the subject OPRA request. The Council reasoned that:

The Morgano decision refers to compiling certain disclosable information from a paper record and listing or creating another paper record responsive to a request. However, in terms of certain electronic filing systems, general querying of information cannot be viewed as equal to creating a new paper record. While information stored electronically may include additional pieces of information/fields, many programs have the capability to extract requested information/fields for disclosure . . . Further, querying electronic file systems for responsive information is not unlike searching an e-mail account for e-mails responsive to an OPRA request.

[Id. at 12 (emphasis added).]

Thus, if the information sought is maintained electronically and can be provided as such, Paff and the GRC's prior decisions require disclosure. See also McBride v. City of Camden (Camden), GRC Complaint No. 2014-54 (Interim Order dated September 30, 2014).

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 January 20, 2022. On November 18, 2021, the Custodian responded in writing providing a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant claimed the provided spreadsheet 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 was awaiting 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, the provided spreadsheet was an acceptable form of disclosure, as it was generated through the agency’s electronic database. 229 N.J. at 353. The Council further held that under Matthews, GRC 2008-13, the custodian was not obligated to explicitly denote whether an officer’s separation was the result of a plea agreement or other court proceeding.

Here, the facts parallel those in Voorhees, GRC 2022-12. The Custodian certified all records were provided to the Complainant, and that the spreadsheet was generated via the Township’s payroll management software. Additionally, the Custodian certified in the SOI that no other responsive records exist containing the requested information.

Accordingly, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant’s January 20, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of police officers who separated from the Township. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the Township provided all responsive records in its possession. See Voorhees, GRC 2022-12; Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*

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 that would contain the “reason for separation.” In the SOI, the Custodian certified and confirmed that no other records existed at the time of the request, inclusive of any agreements. Additionally, the Complainant failed to present any evidence that the Township possessed same at the time of the request, or to refute the Custodian’s certification.

Accordingly, 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" between the Township and separated officers. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.

Prevailing Party Attorney's Fees

OPRA provides that:

A person who is denied access to a government record by the custodian of the record, at the option of the requestor, may: institute a proceeding to challenge the custodian's decision by filing an action in Superior Court . . .; or in lieu of filing an action in Superior Court, file a complaint with the Government Records Council . . . A requestor who prevails in any proceeding shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee.

[N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.]

In Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423 (App. Div. 2006), the Appellate Division held that a complainant is a "prevailing party" if he achieves the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian's conduct. Id. at 432. Additionally, the court held that attorney's fees may be awarded when the requestor is successful (or partially successful) via a judicial decree, a quasi-judicial determination, or a settlement of the parties that indicates access was improperly denied and the requested records are disclosed. Id.

Additionally, the New Jersey Supreme Court has ruled on the issue of "prevailing party" attorney's fees. In Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 71 (2008), the Court discussed the catalyst theory, "which posits that a plaintiff is a 'prevailing party' if it achieves the desired result because the lawsuit brought about a voluntary change in the defendant's conduct" (quoting Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home v. West Virginia Dep't of Health & Human Res., 532 U.S. 598, 131 S. Ct. 1835, 149 L. Ed. 2d 855 (2001)). In Buckhannon, the Supreme Court held that the phrase "prevailing party" is a legal term of art that refers to a "party in whose favor a judgment is rendered." Id. at 603 (quoting Black's Law Dictionary 1145 (7th ed. 1999)). The Supreme Court rejected the catalyst theory as a basis for prevailing party attorney fees, in part because "[i]t allows an award where there is no judicially sanctioned change in the legal relationship of the parties . . ." Id. at 605, 121 S. Ct. at 1840, 149 L. Ed. 2d at 863. Further, the Supreme Court expressed concern that the catalyst theory would spawn extra litigation over attorney's fees. Id. at 609, 121 S. Ct. at 1843, 149 L. Ed. 2d at 866.

However, the Court noted in Mason that Buckhannon is binding only when counsel fee provisions under federal statutes are at issue. 196 N.J. at 72, citing Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 429; see, e.g., Baer v. Klagholz, 346 N.J. Super. 79 (App. Div. 2001) (applying Buckhannon to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act), certif. denied, 174 N.J. 193 (2002). "But in interpreting New Jersey law, we look to state law precedent and the specific state statute before

us. When appropriate, we depart from the reasoning of federal cases that interpret comparable federal statutes.” 196 N.J. at 73 (citations omitted).

The Mason Court accepted the application of the catalyst theory within the context of OPRA, stating that:

OPRA itself contains broader language on attorney's fees than the former RTKL did. OPRA provides that “[a] requestor who prevails in any proceeding shall be entitled to a reasonable attorney's fee.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Under the prior RTKL, “[a] plaintiff in whose favor such an order [requiring access to public records] issues . . . may be awarded a reasonable attorney's fee not to exceed \$500.00.” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-4 (repealed 2002). The Legislature's revisions therefore: (1) mandate, rather than permit, an award of attorney's fees to a prevailing party; and (2) eliminate the \$500 cap on fees and permit a reasonable, and quite likely higher, fee award. Those changes expand counsel fee awards under OPRA.

[196 N.J. at 73-76.]

The Court in Mason, further held that:

[R]equestors are entitled to attorney’s fees under OPRA, absent a judgment or an enforceable consent decree, when they can demonstrate (1) “a factual causal nexus between plaintiff’s litigation and the relief ultimately achieved”; and (2) “that the relief ultimately secured by plaintiffs had a basis in law.” Singer v. State, 95 N.J. 487, 495, cert. denied, New Jersey v. Singer, 469 U.S. 832 (1984).

[Id. at 76.]

Here, the Complainant sought “[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 “agreements” providing the “reason for separation.” The Custodian provided a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on March 3, 2022, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers’ separations and state whether officers were removed due to a plea agreement or court proceeding. However, the Custodian certified in the SOI that the Township did not possess any additional records, nor any agreements between the Township and separated officers. 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. 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. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Specifically, the Custodian certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the Township’s possession and that no agreements between the Township and separated officers 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 January 26, 2022 response was insufficient because she 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 settlements existed between the Township of Raritan and any separated police officer.
2. The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the Complainant's January 20, 2022 OPRA request seeking disclosable personnel information of police officers who separated from the Township of Raritan. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that the Township 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).
3. 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" between the Township of Raritan and separated officers. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
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. 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. 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 Township of Raritan's possession and that no agreements between the Township and separated officers 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
Staff Attorney

April 23, 2024