



**Minutes of the Government Records Council
October 31, 2017 Public Meeting – Open Session**

I. Public Session:

- **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:33 p.m. by Mr. Steven Ritardi at the Department of Community Affairs, Conference Room 129, Trenton, New Jersey.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**

All stood and recited the pledge of allegiance in salute to the American flag.

- **Meeting Notice**

Mr. Ritardi read the following Open Public Meetings Act statement:

“This meeting was called pursuant to the provisions of the Open Public Meeting Act. Notices of this meeting were faxed to the Newark Star Ledger, Trenton Times, Courier-Post (Cherry Hill), and the Secretary of State on October 26, 2017.”

Mr. Ritardi read the fire emergency procedure.

- **Roll Call**

Ms. Bordzoe called the roll:

Present: Robin Tabakin, Esq. (Chairwoman), Jennifer Simons, Esq. (designee of Department of Education Acting Commissioner Kimberley Harrington), Jason Martucci, Esq. (designee of Department of Community Affairs Commissioner Charles A. Richman), and Steven Ritardi, Esq. (Public Member).

*** Ms. Tabakin joined the meeting at meeting 2:00 p.m.**

GRC Staff in Attendance: Joseph Glover (Executive Director), Rosemond Bordzoe (Secretary), Frank F. Caruso (Communications Specialist/Resource Manager), John Stewart (Mediator), Samuel Rosado (Staff Attorney), and Deputy Attorney General Debra Allen.

Mr. Ritardi advised that copies of the agenda are available by the conference room door.

II. Executive Director's Report:

OPRA Trainings

- The GRC recently conducted an OPRA training for College and University staff. The GRC received very positive feedback on the presentation.
- The next OPRA seminar will be held during the annual conference of the New Jersey League of Municipalities in Atlantic City.

Current Statistics

- Since OPRA's inception in July 2002, the GRC has received 4,729 Denial of Access Complaints. That averages about 308 annual complaints per approximately 15½ program years. So far in the current program year, the GRC has received 66 Denial of Access Complaints. At approximately this same time last year, the GRC had received 103.
- 485 of the 4,729 complaints remain open and active. Of those open cases,
 - 25 complaints are on appeal with the Appellate Division (5.2%);
 - 17 complaints are currently in mediation (3.5%);
 - 37 complaints await adjudication by the Office of Administrative Law (7.6%);
 - 58 complaints are tentatively scheduled for adjudication at an upcoming GRC meeting, which includes the current meeting (12%); and,
 - 340 complaints are work in progress (70%).
- Since January 1, 2015, until present (and not including action at today's meeting):
 - The GRC has received 955 Denial of Access Complaints, which equals a bit over 20% of all complaints filed in the agency's history.
 - The GRC saw its second highest number of complaint filings in a calendar year (421 in CY 2015), which immediately followed its highest year (433 in CY 2014).
 - The GRC has processed 1,175 adjudications.
 - The GRC has received 5,631 inquiries, which equals a bit over 20% of all inquiries received in the agency's history.
 - The GRC has been successfully able to mediate 88 of 189 referred cases (47%), with 11 of those 189 cases currently in active mediation.
 - The GRC has conducted or participated in 39 outreaches or OPRA trainings to various groups around the state.
- Since Program Year 2004, the GRC has received 27,675 total inquiries, averaging about 1,931 annual inquiries per approximately 14½ tracked program years (the GRC did not track inquiries in the agency's first year). So far in the current program year, the GRC has received 580 inquiries. At approximately this time last year, the GRC had received 618 inquiries.

III. Closed Session

- Katalin Gordon v. City of Orange (Essex) (2013-255) (SR Recusal)
- Aakash Dalal v. County of Bergen (2016-116)

Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to go into closed session. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The Council adopted the motion by a unanimous vote; Mr. Ritardi was recused from GRC Complaint No. 2013-255.

The Council met in closed session from 2:13 p.m. until 2:27 p.m.

Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to end the closed session. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The Council adopted the motion by a unanimous vote. Open Session reconvened at 2:28 p.m., and Ms. Bordzoe called roll.

- Present: Ms. Tabakin, Ms. Simons, and Mr. Martucci.

IV. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

- **September 26, 2017 Open Session Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to approve the draft open session minutes of the September 26, 2017 meeting. Ms. Simons noted that she confirmed the accuracy of the draft minutes with Mr. Huber. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed by a unanimous vote; Mr. Ritardi abstained.

V. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Adjudication

Mr. Ritardi stated that an “Administrative Complaint Disposition” means a decision by the Council as to whether to accept or reject the Executive Director’s recommendation of dismissal based on jurisdictional, procedural, or other defects of the complaint. The reason for the Administrative Disposition is under each complaint below:

A. Administrative Disposition Adjudications with Recusals (Consent Agenda):

1. **Mark L. Tompkins v. City of Newark Municipal Court (Essex) (2017-187) (SR Recusal)**
 - The GRC has no jurisdiction over the complaint.
 - Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the recommendations as written in the above Administrative Complaint Disposition. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed by a majority vote; Mr. Ritardi recused.

B. Administrative Disposition Adjudications with no Recusals (Consent Agenda):

1. **Clinton C. Barlow, III v. NJ Department of Treasury, Division of Risk Management (2017-135)**

- The complaint is unripe for action.
- Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the recommendations as written in the above Administrative Complaint Disposition. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

C. Administrative Disposition of Uncontested, Voluntary Withdrawals by Complainant (No Adjudication of the Council is Required):

1. **Thomas M. Kennedy, Esq. (o/b/o Jockeys Guild, Inc.) v. NJ Racing Comm'n (2015-364)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
2. **Scott Madlinger v. Township of Berkeley (Ocean) (2016-162)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
3. **Joseph F. Kunicki v. Camden College Technical School (2016-245)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
4. **Robert P. Manetta v. City of Paterson (Passaic) (2017-69)**
 - The parties settled the matter through mediation.
5. **Robert P. Manetta v. City of Paterson (Passaic) (2017-92)**
 - The parties settled the matter through mediation.
6. **David H. Weiner v. County of Essex (2017-106)**
 - The parties settled the matter through mediation.
7. **Dr. Gina M. Cinotti v. Netcong Board of Education (Morris) (2017-119)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
8. **Hi-Nella Board of Education v. Borough of Hi-Nella (Camden) (2017-177)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
9. **Thomas S. Chichester v. Cinnaminson Fire District No. 1 (Burlington) (2017-183)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
10. **Mher Hartoonian v. NJ Department of Community of Affairs, Division of Codes and Standards (2017-195)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.
11. **Frederick L. Woeckener, Esq. v. City of Bayonne (Hudson) (2017-196)**
 - The Complainant voluntarily withdrew the complaint.

VI. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Individual Complaint Adjudication

A. Individual Complaint Adjudications with Recusals:

1. **Katalin Gordon v. City of Orange (Essex) (2013-255) (SR Recusal)**
 - Because the Appellate Division found that the City willfully and deliberately denied the Complainant's request and remanded the matter back to the GRC for the imposition of appropriate penalties, former City Clerk Dwight Mitchell shall pay a civil penalty in the amount of one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for an initial violation pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11(a).
 - Ms. Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr.

Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a majority vote; Mr. Ritardi recused.

2. **Susan Fleming v. Greenwich Township (Warren) (2015-18) (SR Recusal)**

- The Custodian complied with the Interim Order.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Ms. Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a majority vote; Mr. Ritardi recused.

3. **Robert A. Verry v. Borough of South Bound Brook (Somerset) (2015-133) SR Recusal)**

- The Council should grant the Complainant's request for reconsideration.
- The Council should rescind conclusion No. 1 from the January 31, 2017 Final Decision and find that the Custodian failed to comply fully with the Interim Order because he failed to certify definitively whether he provided all responsive records.
- The Custodian must provide additional details regarding his search for responsive records and must certify whether he provided all records that existed at the time of the OPRA request.
- The Council should rescind conclusion Nos. 2 and 3 and defer the knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses, pending the Custodian's compliance.
- Ms. Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a majority vote; Mr. Ritardi recused.

4. **Robert A. Verry v. Borough of South Bound Brook (Somerset) (2015-134) (SR Recusal)**

- The Custodian failed to comply with the Interim Order.
- The Council should refer the matter to the Office of Administrative Law for a proof hearing as to whether the Custodian knowingly and willfully violated OPRA and unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances.
- The Complainant is a prevailing party, and the OAL should determine an award of reasonable attorney's fees.
- Ms. Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a majority vote; Mr. Ritardi recused.

5. **Robert A. Verry v. Borough of South Bound Brook (Somerset) (2015-192) (SR Recusal)**

- The Custodian did not bear the burden of proving that he timely responded to the OPRA request, thus resulting in a “deemed” denial.
- The Council should refer the matter to the Office of Administrative Law for a determination of whether the Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested correspondence and attachments.
- The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred, pending the OAL’s disposition.
- Ms. Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion, and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a majority vote; Mr. Ritardi recused.

A brief summary of the Executive Director’s recommended action is under each complaint:

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

1. **Robert A. Verry v. Franklin Fire District No. 1 (Somerset) (2013-196)**

- The current Custodian complied with the Interim Order.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- The Complainant is a prevailing party, who is entitled to an award of reasonable attorney’s fees.
- The parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees as they relate solely to the GRC’s adjudication of the complaint and promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. Otherwise, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

2. **Shawn G. Hopkins v. Colts Neck Township (Monmouth) (2014-21)**

- The Custodian did not bear the burden of proving that he timely responded to the OPRA request, thus resulting in a “deemed” denial.
- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the responsive CAMA data. The Custodian must therefore disclose the responsive records.
- The Custodian might have unlawfully denied access to responsive photographs. The Custodian must therefore either disclose the responsive records or certify that no responsive records exist, as might be appropriate.
- The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred, pending the Custodian’s compliance.

- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
3. **Shawn G. Hopkins v. Borough of Deal (Monmouth) (2014-22)**
- The Custodian unlawfully denied access because he failed to provide a lawful basis for the denial.
 - The Custodian must therefore disclose all responsive records. Should no responsive records exist, the Custodian must so certify.
 - The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian’s compliance.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
4. **Shawn G. Hopkins v. Borough of Englishtown (Monmouth) (2014-23)**
- Ms. Fitzpatrick unlawfully denied access because she did not prove a lawful basis for the denial.
 - The Custodian must therefore disclose all responsive records.
 - The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred, pending the Custodian’s compliance.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
5. **Shawn G. Hopkins v. Borough of Fair Haven (Monmouth) (2014-24)**
- The Council should dismiss the complaint because the parties have agreed to a prevailing party fee amount, thereby obviating the need for any further adjudication.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
6. **Shawn G. Hopkins v. Borough of Farmingdale (Monmouth) (2014-25)**
- The Council should dismiss the complaint because the parties have agreed to a prevailing party fee amount, thereby obviating the need for any further adjudication.

- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
7. **Shawn G. Hopkins v. Borough of Rumson (Monmouth) (2014-29)**
- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the OPRA request because he provided no lawful basis for denial.
 - The Custodian must therefore disclose all responsive records to the Complainant. Should no responsive records exist, the Custodian must so certify.
 - The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian's compliance.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
8. **Mary Loigu v. Manasquan Police Department (Monmouth) (2014-239)**
- The Complainant withdrew the matter from the Office of Administrative Law. The Council should therefore dismiss the complaint.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
9. **Michael I. Inzelbuch, Esq. v. NJ Office of Administrative Law (2015-78)**
- The Custodian complied with the Interim Order.
 - There is no knowing and willful violation.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.
10. **Karen Murray, Esq. v. Elizabeth Board of Education (Union) (2015-271)**
- The parties reached a settlement agreement, and the Complainant withdrew the complaint. The Council should therefore dismiss the matter.
 - Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

11. **Stuart Alterman, Esq. (o/b/o Police Benevolent Association Local 167 (Mercer County Corrections Officers)) v. County of Mercer (2016-57)**

- Based on advice from legal counsel, the Council tabled the matter for further review.
- Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to have the above matter tabled. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

12. **Alfred W. Schweikert, III v. Borough of High Bridge (Hunterdon) (2016-58)**

- The Custodian timely responded to the OPRA request.
- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to any responsive records.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

13. **Clifford P. Yannone, Esq. v. NJ Department of Corrections (2016-73)**

- The Custodian has borne the burden of proving a lawful denial of access to the requested video because no responsive record exists.
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the recorded interview because the record constituted a "grievance filed by or against an individual."
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the "escort/camera move recording" because the record is exempt as "security and surveillance techniques that would jeopardize . . . staff and facilities."
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party and therefore not eligible for an award of reasonable attorney's fees.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

14. **Aakash Dalal v. County of Bergen (2016-116)**

- The Custodian did not fully comply with the Interim Order.
- The *in-camera* review reveals that the Custodian lawfully denied access to all responsive records except one entry in a legal bill. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Complainant admits that he was able to decipher the redacted information.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Ms. Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

15. **Stacie Percella v. City of Bayonne (Hudson) (2017-70)**

- The Custodian did not bear the burden of proving a lawful denial of access. The Custodian must therefore disclose the responsive records with redactions, as might be appropriate.
- The knowing and willful analysis is deferred, pending the Custodian's compliance.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

16. **Judy DeHaven v. Red Bank Charter School (Monmouth) (2017-81)**

- The Custodian failed to comply fully with the Interim Order.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Mr. Ritardi called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Hearing none, Mr. Ritardi called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Martucci made a motion and Ms. Simons seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. Ms. Tabakin was not yet in attendance.

* **Mr. Ritardi exited the meeting at 2:28 p.m.**

VII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal:

- Spillane v. NJ State Parole Bd., 2017 N.J. Super. LEXIS 2392 (App. Div. 2017): Here, the Appellate Division affirmed the Council's decision to deny the complainant access to a copy of his mental health evaluation. The Court held that the Council correctly determined that the custodian lawfully applied Executive Order No. 26 and N.J.A.C. 10A:71-2.2 to the record. The Court rejected complainant's claim that he was entitled to the record because it was about himself. Also, based on GRC jurisdiction limitations, the Court rejected complainant's assertion that the Council's decision blocked his due process rights to a parole hearing.

VIII. Complaints Adjudicated in NJ Superior Court & NJ Supreme Court:

- Ganzweig v. Twp. of Lakewood, 2017 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 2164 (App. Div. 2017): This case was actually discussed at the September Council meeting. In the interest of time, the GRC refers the Council to the September 26, 2017 Lexis Alert.
- L.R. (O.B.O. J.R.) v. Camden City Pub. Sch. Dist., 2017 N.J. Super. LEXIS 145 (App. Div. 2017) (Approved for Publication): The facts of this complaint are extremely complex, given that the Appellate Division consolidated L.R. with three (3) other appeals (one of which was also filed by L.R.) from various counties that contained conflicting results. All four cases originated with OPRA requests submitted to school districts. Two of the requests at issue, filed with Cherry Hill and Hillsborough by Innisfree, sought

special education settlement agreements. The other two requests at issue, filed with Camden City and Parsippany-Troy Hills by L.R. through an attorney, sought multiple special education records (some of which pertained to J.R.).

The resulting trial court decisions produced a number of varied results. For instance, Camden County Superior Court ordered Cherry Hill to disclose to Innisfree agreements with redactions and rejected the Council's holding in Popkin v. Englewood Board of Education, Complaint No. 2011-263 (December 2012) for lack of precedential value. However, Somerset County Superior Court dismissed Innisfree's complaint by concluding that the responsive agreements were exempt from disclosure in their entirety. L.R.'s cases similarly provided a checkered procedural history with sorted rulings from Camden and Morris County Superior Courts.

Thereafter, the Appellate Division accepted all four (4) appeals on a global order because they "were suitable 'test cases' the disposition of which might provide guidance in other pending matters." Id. at 19. The Court also granted amicus curiae status to the NJ Sch. Boards Assoc. and ACLU-NJ.

The analysis is extensive and complicated to say the least but worth a read for those intrigued by school records. In the interest of expediency, the Court's holding is summarized as follows:

1. The Court determined that plaintiffs in the Hillsborough, Parsippany-Troy Hills, and Cherry Hill cases were entitled to redacted records if they could "either: (1) establish they have the status of '[b]ona fide researcher[s]' within the intended scope of N.J.A.C. 6A:32-7.5(e)(16); or (2) obtain from the Law Division a court order authorizing such access pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:32-7.5(e)(15)." Id. at 5. The Court thus remanded to allow the trial court. The Court also noted that the school districts "shall not turn over the redacted records" until they provided reasonable advanced notice to the affected students' parents/guardians. The parents/guardians would then have the option to object or provide "insight" to aid in redacting the records.
2. The Court remanded the Camden City case for further proceedings to address the disclosure of records referring to J.R. and other students, but affirmed L.R.'s right to records exclusively mentioned only J.R.

As one final note, the Court also directed that all four (4) cases be moved to the Camden vicinage.

IX. Public Comment: None.

X. Adjournment:

Ms. Tabakin called for a motion to end the Council meeting. Mr. Martucci made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Simons. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., Chair

Date Approved: November 14, 2017