



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

December 10, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2022-64

v.

Burlington Township Police Department (Burlington)
Custodian of Record

At the December 10, 2024, public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the December 3, 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 performed an insufficient search for the portion of the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking “agreement[s]” between Burlington Township and former police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013) (citing Schneble v. N.J. Dep’t of Env’tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008)). Specifically, the Custodian’s failure to locate the separation agreement until after conducting an additional search following receipt of the Denial of Access Complaint resulted in an insufficient search. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure since the evidence demonstrates the Custodian the Complainant with the agreement on April 19, 2022.
2. The Custodian 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 Burlington Township. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, 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. 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 located an additional responsive agreement between Burlington Township and separated officers after Complainant

filed the instant complaint. 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 10th Day of December 2024

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: December 12, 2024

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
December 10, 2024 Council Meeting**

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

GRC Complaint No. 2022-64

v.

**Burlington Township Police Department (Burlington)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: Mary E. Field

Request Received by Custodian: March 8, 2022

Response Made by Custodian: March 9, 2022; April 19, 2022

GRC Complaint Received: March 24, 2022

Background³

Request and Response:

On or before March 8, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On March 9, 2022, Cindy Eckman-Crist responded on the Custodian’s behalf in writing via e-mail providing a

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

² Represented by David M. Serlin, Esq., Township Solicitor (Moorestown, NJ).

³ 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. Burlington Township Police Department (Burlington), 2022-64 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information, and a court order pertaining to an officer's separation.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On March 24, 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 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.⁴

Supplemental Response:

On April 19, 2022, the Custodian e-mailed the GRC, stating that considering the Court's recent decision, she attached a settlement agreement for one of the separated officers. The Custodian also included resignation letters of four (4) other officers and stated that none of the officers were separated due to a plea agreement, conviction, criminal charges, or court judgements. The Custodian also noted that pension information was not provided because that information was not maintained by Burlington Township ("Township").

Statement of Information:

On April 25, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information ("SOI"). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant's OPRA request on March 8, 2022. The Custodian certified that the Township's Human Resource Office searched its records and retrieved a computer-generated spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Custodian certified Ms. Eckman-Crist responded to the Complainant in writing on March 9, 2022, providing the spreadsheet and court order.

The Custodian stated the initial response was provided by a member of her office while she was away. The Custodian further noted that her office was short-staffed and still lacked a Deputy Clerk.

The Custodian asserted that no reasons for the officers' separations were known insofar as being listed in a formal record. The Custodian asserted that as a courtesy the Township provided copies of resignation letters and a settlement agreement for one of the officers on April 19, 2022.

⁴ 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. Burlington Township Police Department (Burlington), 2022-64 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

The Custodian noted that no effort was made by the Complainant to discuss the response or notify her of the recent Court decision.

Additional Submissions:

On November 14, 2024, the GRC submitted a request for additional information to the Custodian. Specifically, the GRC inquired whether the information from the provided spreadsheet was collected from an electronic database, and whether the spreadsheet was created via Excel.

On November 26, 2024, the Custodian responded to the GRC's request for additional information. The Custodian certified that at the time of the request, Ms. Eckman-Crist obtained the personnel information from Jodi Botlinger, who is the Township's Personnel Officer. The Custodian certified she was informed by Ms. Botlinger that the personnel information was collected from the Township's electronic payroll database and was exported directly into an Excel spreadsheet.

Analysis

Sufficiency of Search

It is the custodian's responsibility to perform a complete search for the requested records before responding to an OPRA request, as doing so will help ensure that the custodian's response is accurate and has an appropriate basis in law. In Schneble v. N.J. Dep't of Env'tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008), the custodian initially stated that no records responsive to the complainant's OPRA request existed. The custodian certified that after receiving the complaint, which contained e-mails responsive to the OPRA request, the custodian conducted a second search and found additional records responsive to the request. The GRC held the custodian had performed an inadequate search and thus unlawfully denied access to the responsive records. See also Lebbing v. Borough of Highland Park (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2009-251 (January 2011).

Moreover, in Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013), the custodian initially responded to the complainant's request, producing four (4) responsive records and stating no other records existed. However, after receiving the denial of access complaint, the custodian performed another search and discovered several other records. Id. In accordance with Schneble, the Council held the custodian failed to perform an adequate initial search and unlawfully denied access to those additional records. Id.

In the instant matter, the Custodian asserted that at the time of the response, a court order pertaining to an officer's termination was located and provided to the Complainant. After receiving the instant complaint, the Custodian thereafter located a responsive separation agreement and provided a copy of same to the Complainant. The facts here are on point with those in Weiner, GRC 2013-52, and follows that an insufficient search occurred.

Accordingly, the Custodian performed an insufficient search for the portion of the Complainant's OPRA request seeking "agreement[s]" between the Township and former police

officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner, GRC 2013-52 (citing Schneble, GRC 2007-220). Specifically, the Custodian's failure to locate the separation agreement until after conducting an additional search following receipt of the Denial of Access Complaint resulted in an insufficient search. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure since the evidence demonstrates the Custodian the Complainant with the agreement on April 19, 2022.

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

Additionally, 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.

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 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 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.

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 March 8, 2022. On March 9, 2022, Ms. Eckman-Crist 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 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 in 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 2008-123, the custodian was not obligated to explicitly denote whether an officer's separation was the result of a plea agreement or other court proceeding.

The facts here also parallel those in Voorhees, GRC 2022-12. In response to the GRC's request for additional information, the Custodian certified that the spreadsheet was generated from the Township's electronic payroll database.

Accordingly, the Custodian 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 Township. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, the Township 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 (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 in part any "agreement[s]" between the Township and any separated police officer providing the "reason for separation." In response, the Custodian provided a court order pertaining to a separated officer and the Township, and that no other records exist. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on March 24, 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.

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 after receiving the instant complaint, she searched for and located an additional responsive agreement between the Township and separated officers. 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's fees.⁵

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 located an additional responsive agreement between the Township and separated officers after Complainant filed the instant complaint. 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:

⁵ The Council makes this determination with the understanding that the Complainant acted on behalf of a bona fide client at the time of the request. Although the Complainant's status as representing an actual client has been previously challenged, the available evidence on the record is insufficient to address that issue herein. See Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Neptune City Police Dep't (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-153 (April 2020) and Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Freehold Twp. Police Dep't (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-155 (Interim Order dated September 29, 2020).

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Burlington Township Police Department (Burlington), 2022-64 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

1. The Custodian performed an insufficient search for the portion of the Complainant's OPRA request seeking "agreement[s]" between Burlington Township and former police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013) (citing Schneble v. N.J. Dep't of Env'tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008)). Specifically, the Custodian's failure to locate the separation agreement until after conducting an additional search following receipt of the Denial of Access Complaint resulted in an insufficient search. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure since the evidence demonstrates the Custodian the Complainant with the agreement on April 19, 2022.
2. The Custodian 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 Burlington Township. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Specifically, the Custodian certified, and the record reflects, 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. 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 located an additional responsive agreement between Burlington Township and separated officers after Complainant filed the instant complaint. 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

December 3, 2024