



State of New Jersey

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

MIKIE SHERRILL
Governor

DR. DALE G. CALDWELL
Lieutenant Governor

JACQUELYN A. SUÁREZ
Commissioner

NOTICE OF MEETING Government Records Council June 30, 2026

Pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act, notice is hereby given that the Government Records Council will hold a regular meeting, at which formal action may be taken, commencing at 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, June 30, 2026, via Office Teams. Members of the public may attend the meeting by utilizing the following call-in information:

Telephone Number: 1-856-338-7074

Conference ID: 126 639 081#

The agenda, to the extent presently known, is listed below. The public session and consideration of cases is expected to commence at 1:30 p.m. remotely.

I. Public Session:

Call to Order
Pledge of Allegiance
Meeting Notice
Roll Call

II. Executive Director's Report

III. Closed Session

IV. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

May 28, 2026 Open Session Meeting Minutes

V. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Consent Agenda Administrative Complaint Disposition Adjudication *

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 Executive Director’s recommended reason for the Administrative Disposition is under each complaint below.

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

1. Chester Ray Ma’at El Bey v. Jersey City Municipal Utilities Authority (Hudson) (2026-87) (SR Recusal)
 - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.

2. William Santiago v. Jersey City Municipal Utilities Authority (Hudson) (2026-291) **(SR Recusal)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
3. Brian Camelio v. City of Jersey City (Hudson) (2026-321) **(SR Recusal)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.

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

1. Jeff Siipola v. NJ Office of Insurance Fraud Prosecutor (2024-12)
 - No Correspondence Received by the Custodian.
2. Amelia Nittolo v. Wharton Borough Public Schools (Morris) (2026-90)
 - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.
3. Brian Greene v. Monroe Township Police Department (Middlesex) (2026-268)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
4. Brian Greene v. Monroe Township Police Department (Middlesex) (2026-269)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
5. TRIDEV, LLC v. Township of East Hanover (Morris) (2026-316)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
6. Kevin Alexander v. Old Navy (Somerset) (2026-336)
 - Request Made to a Non-Public Agency.

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

1. Dina M. Grilo v. East Newark Board of Education (Hudson) (2024-94)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

2. Frederick G. Confessore v. East Newark Board of Education (Hudson) (2024-102)
 3. Frederick G. Confessore v. East Newark Board of Education (Hudson) (2024-103)
 4. Frederick G. Confessore v. East Newark Board of Education (Hudson) (2024-104)
- CONSOLIDATED**

- Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
5. Dorotea Malley v. Middletown Township School District (Monmouth) (2026-138)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
 6. Craig Hill v. City of Jersey City (Hudson) (2026-206)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
 7. Sabrina Sykes-Gelder (o/b/o Cobalt Intelligence) v. NJ Department of Treasury, Division of Revenue and Enterprise Services (2026-264)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
 8. Mark Kelly v. Piscataway Board of Education (Middlesex) (2026-301)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
 9. Maria Loble v. Township of Lakewood (Ocean) (2026-304)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
 10. Miguel Antonio Lugones v. Monmouth County Sheriff's Office (2026-343)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

VI. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Consent Agenda Administrative Order

An “Administrative order” means an order issued by the Council requiring the records custodian or the complainant to perform a specific action in furtherance of the adjudication of a pending denial of access complaint or taking other actions deemed appropriate to adjudicate a complaint in an expedited manner. The Executive Director’s recommended reason for the Administrative Order is under each complaint below.

A. Administrative Orders with Recusals (Consent Agenda): None

B. Administrative Orders with No Recusals (Consent Agenda):

1. Mark-Brian Kline v. Township of Hazlet (Monmouth) (2025-311)
 - Referral to the Office of Administrative Law (“OAL”).
2. Roberto Feliz Betancourt v. Bayonne Housing Authority (Hudson) (2025-321)
 - Motion to File Within Time Granted.

VII. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Individual Complaint Adjudication

The Executive Director’s recommended action is under each complaint below.

A. Individual Complaint Adjudications with Recusals:

1. Thomas Paciorkowski, Esq. (o/b/o Din Narain) v. County of Hudson (2023-221) (**SR Recusal**)
 - The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the responsive traffic tickets. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian did so on October 17, 2023, and January 31, 2024.
 - There is no knowing and willful violation.
 - The Complainant is a prevailing party.

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Brian F. McBride v. Borough of Collingswood (Camden) (2023-245)2. Brian F. McBride v. Borough of Collingswood (Camden) (2023-246)3. Brian F. McBride v. Borough of Collingswood (Camden) (2023-247)4. Brian F. McBride v. Borough of Collingswood (Camden) (2023-248)5. Brian F. McBride v. Borough of Collingswood (Camden) (2023-249) |
|--|

CONSOLIDATED

- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request item Nos. 1 and 2 under the Internal Affairs Policy and Procedures. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(b); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10; Rivera v. Union Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, 250 N.J. 124, 142-143 (2022).
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to OPRA request item Nos. 3, 4, and 5 because she certified, and the record reflects, that no records exist. Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
6. David Weiner v. County of Essex (2024-18)
 - The Custodian’s failure to timely respond resulted in a “deemed” denial of

- access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i).
- The Complainant’s request is invalid because it sought generic “documents”. MAG Entm’t, LLC v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005); Feiler-Jampel v. Somerset Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-190 (Interim Order dated March 26, 2008).
7. Andrea Ryan Vaccariello v. Town of Newton (Sussex) (2024-89)
 - The Custodian failed to conduct a reasonable search for records responsive to the Complainant’s OPRA request. Schneble v. N.J. Dep’t of Env’tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian disclosed all responsive records as part of the Statement of Information (“SOI”).
 8. Shaun Clifton-Short v. Essex County Prosecutor’s Office (2024-98)
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested surveillance footage under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; N. Jersey Media Grp., Inc. v. Twp. of Lyndhurst, 229 N.J. 541 (2017).
 9. Brian Roman v. Hunterdon Central Regional High School (Hunterdon) (2024-175)
 - The Custodian’s failure to timely respond resulted in a “deemed” denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i).
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested security camera footage, which is exempt under the security and surveillance exemption. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; Gilleran v. Twp. of Bloomfield, 227 N.J. 159 (2016).
 10. Alfred Tard-El v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2025-429)
 - The Custodian failed to comply with the Council’s March 31, 2026 Interim Order.
 - The Council’s Order is enforceable in Superior Court. R. 4:67-6; N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.9(c).
 - The Custodian’s actions may have been knowing and willful. Thus, this complaint should be referred to the OAL for a knowing and willful hearing.
 11. Keith McHugh v. Borough of Spring Lake (Monmouth) (2026-42)
 - The Custodian’s failure to timely respond resulted in a “deemed” denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian disclosed all responsive records on January 15, 2026.
 12. Henry Alberto v. Bergenfield Board of Education (Bergen) (2026-43)
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the OPRA request because she certified, and the record reflects, that no records exist. Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.
 13. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-86)
 14. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-112)
 15. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-133)
 16. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-161)
 17. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-162)

- 18. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-194)
- 19. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-233)
- 20. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-283)
- 21. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-320)

CONSOLIDATED

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant’s written equivalent requests because they were incomplete. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(f); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

- 22. Amelia Nittolo v. Wharton Borough Public Schools (2026-91)

- The Custodian’s failure to timely respond resulted in a “deemed” denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian disclosed all responsive records on March 2, 2026.

- 23. Jennifer Lopez v. Borough of Penns Grove (Salem) (2026-198)

- The Custodian’s failure to submit an SOI resulted in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4.
- The Custodian’s failure to timely respond to the Complainant’s OPRA request resulted in a “deemed” denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i).
- The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request. Thus, the Custodian shall: 1) locate and disclose responsive records; 2) identify any records exempt from disclosure in part or whole; or 3) certify if no records exist.

VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal:

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

- Morris View Healthcare Ctr. v. State Dep’t of Human Servs., 2026 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1045 (App. Div. May 20, 2026)
- Saadeh v. Borough of Watchung, 2026 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1243 (App. Div. June 8, 2026)
- Rosetti v. Ramapo-Indian Hills Reg’l High Sch. Bd. of Educ., 2026 N.J. LEXIS 560 (June 11, 2026)

X. Complaints Adjudicated in U.S. District Court:

XI. Public Comment:

The public comment period is limited to providing an opportunity for speakers to present suggestions, views and comments relevant to the Council’s functions and responsibilities. In the interest of time, speakers shall be limited to **five (5) minutes** per the GRC’s By-Laws. Speakers shall not be permitted to make oral or written testimony regarding pending or scheduled adjudications.*

XII. Adjournment

*Neither attorneys nor other representatives of the parties are required to attend this meeting nor will they be permitted to make oral or written comment during the adjudication.