



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 August 25, 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, August 25, 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

- Jeffrey Brian Wills, Jr. v. Medford Police Department (Burlington) (2026-66)
Legal Advice (N.J.S.A. 10:4-12(b)(7)).

IV. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:

July 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 – New Category

- Summary Judgement – This category can be used when there is no material question of fact and one party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. This category is consistent with the Council’s authority under both OPRA and its own regulations, the Administrative Procedures Act, and is consistent with OPRA’s requirement that the Council adjudicate complaints in a “summary or expedited manner” pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Finally, this category will assist the GRC in meeting its statutory adjudication timeframe set forth in N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(e).

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

1. Carla Tiago v. NJ Department of Corrections (2024-275) **(RBT & SR Recusal)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
2. Alyza Brevard-Rodriguez v. City of Jersey City, Cannabis Control Board (Hudson) (2026-365) **(SR Recusal)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied in Part.

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

1. James Butler v. Township of West Caldwell (Essex) (2025-251)
 - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.
2. James Butler v. Township of West Caldwell (Essex) (2025-252)
 - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.
3. Richard Rivera v. Borough of Penns Grove (Salem) (2025-414)
 - Unripe Cause of Action.
4. Roberto Feliz Betancourt v. Bayonne Housing Authority (Hudson) (2026-20)
 - Summary Judgement – Failure to Submit Statement of Information (“SOI”).
5. Mary Kate Wright v. Ringwood Police Department (Passaic) (2026-36)
 - Complaint Dismissed Without Prejudice.
6. Rebecca Petersen v. Hunterdon Central Regional High School Board of Education (2026-295)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
7. Arthur J. Rittenhouse Jr. v. Borough of Sayreville (Middlesex) (2026-309)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
8. Klarida Papajani v. Saddle Brook School District (Bergen) (2026-356)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied in Part.
9. Klarida Papajani v. Pascack Valley Regional High School (Bergen) (2026-357)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied in Part.
10. Qumere McClendon v. South Toms River Municipal Court) (2026-363)
 - Not Within the Council’s Jurisdiction.
11. Lisa-ann Moyer v. Allamuchy Township School District (Warren) (2026-419)
 - Unripe Cause of Action.

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

1. Terrance Huettl v. County of Burlington (2023-244)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

2. Bradley A. Harsch v. Township of Montclair (Essex) (2025-144)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
3. Avinash Melkote v. City of Hoboken (Hudson) (2026-94)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
4. Edward Eid v. City of Newark (Essex) (2026-150)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
5. Adam Rzepka v. Rutgers University (2026-224)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
6. Angelina Godoy v. NJ State Police (2026-267)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
7. Avinash Melkote v. Town of Boonton (Morris) (2026-272)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
8. Tyler P. Lowe v. NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Division of Unemployment Insurance (2026-302)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
9. Justin Rodriguez v. City of Newark (Essex) (2026-386)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
10. Ashish Gupta v. NJ Department of Treasury, Division of Pensions and Benefits (2026-406)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
11. Wynter L. Willis v. College Achiever Charter Paterson Schools (Passaic) (2026-422)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
12. Brandon H. Zanan, Esq. (o/b/o Milagros Del Carmen Gutierrez Quintero) v. Township of Mahwah (Bergen) (2026-429)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
13. Jerome Greco v. Township of Lakewood (Ocean) (2026-449)
 - 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. Nalda M. Pineiro v. Perth Amboy Police Department (Middlesex) (2025-427)
 - *In Camera* Review.

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. Andrew Tobin v. NJ Board of Public Utilities (2024-63) **(RBT Recusal)**
 - The Custodian's failure to respond within the renewed time frame resulted in a "deemed" denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i); Carter v. Franklin Fire Dist. No. 1 (Somerset), GRC Complaint No. 2011-100 (Interim Order dated June 26, 2012).
 - The Complainant's request is invalid because it failed to include sufficient identifiers necessary for the Custodian to perform a search. MAG Entm't, LLC v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Dep't, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005); Lagerkvist v. Office of the Governor, 443 N.J. Super. 230, 237 (App. Div. 2015); Ciszewski v. Newton Twp. Police Dep't (Sussex), GRC Complaint No. 2013-90 (October 2013).
2. Hassan Dallas v. NJ Department of Corrections (2024-122) **(RBT & SR Recusal)**
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested video recording. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); N.J.A.C. 10A:22-2.3(a)(14); Huysers v. N.J. Dep't of Corr., GRC Complaint No. 2018-38 (January 2020).
3. Shante Coleman v. Newark Housing Authority (2025-228) **(SR Recusal)**
 - This complaint is being tabled for additional review.
4. Kevin Kearns v. City of Hoboken (Hudson) (2026-156) **(SR Recusal)**
 - The Custodian's failure to submit an SOI resulted in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4.
 - The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. 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.
 - The knowing and willful analysis is deferred.
5. Kevin Kearns v. City of Hoboken (Hudson) (2026-157) **(SR Recusal)**
 - The Custodian's failure to submit an SOI resulted in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4.
 - The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. 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.
 - The knowing and willful analysis is deferred.
6. Matthew Sordill v. Port Authority of NY & NJ (2026-108) **(AC Recusal)**
 - 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 did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant's OPRA request because he certified, and the record reflects, that he disclosed all responsive records. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

1. Shawn G. Hopkins v. Warren County Board of Taxation (2019-103)
2. Shawn G. Hopkins v. Warren County Board of Taxation (2020-118)

CONSOLIDATED

- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the requested CAMA data. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. The Custodian must obtain the responsive data and provide same to the Complainant.
 - There is no knowing and willful violation.
 - The Complainant is a prevailing party.
3. Brian F. McBride v. Camden County Prosecutor's Office (2023-206)
 - The Complainant's request is invalid because it failed to identify specific records and would have required research. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. at 549; Lagerkvist, 443 N.J. Super. at 237.
 4. David Weiner v. County of Essex (2024-19)
 - The Complainant's request item Nos. 1 and 2 are invalid because they failed to identify specific records and would have required research. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. at 546; Lagerkvist, 443 N.J. Super. at 237.
 - The Complainant's request item No. 3 is invalid because it failed to contain the necessary criteria set forth in Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010).
 5. Mary Zayac v. NJ State Police (2024-22)
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to OPRA request item No. 1 under the criminal investigatory exemption. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N. Jersey Media Grp., Inc. v. Twp. of Lyndhurst, 229 N.J. 541 (2017); Janeczko v. N.J. Dep't of Law and Pub. Safety, Div. of Criminal Justice, GRC Complaint No. 2002-79, et seq. (June 2004).
 - The Complainant's request item Nos. 2 and 3 are invalid because they failed to identify specific records and would have required research. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534; Lagerkvist, 443 N.J. Super. at 237.
 6. Kim M. Brantley v. Township of Willingboro (Burlington) (2024-41)
 - The Custodian's failure to timely respond within the extended time frame resulted in a "deemed" denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i); Kohn v. Twp. of Livingston Lib. (Essex), GRC Complaint No. 2007-124 (March 2008).
 - The Complainant's request item Nos. 2 and 3 are invalid because they sought information and not identifiable government records. MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534; Rummel v. Cumberland Cnty. Bd. of Chosen Freeholders, GRC Complaint No. 2011-168 (December 2012); LaMantia v. Jamesburg Pub. Lib. (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2008-140 (February 2009).
 - Notwithstanding the "deemed" denial, the Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant's OPRA request item Nos. 1 and 4 because she certified, and the record reflects, that she disclosed all responsive records. Danis, GRC 2009-156, et seq.

7. David Weiner v. County of Essex (2024-53)
 - The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to responsive records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Valdes v. Union City Bd. of Educ. (Hudson), GRC Complaint No. 2011-64 (Interim Order dated August 28, 2012); Macek v. Bergen Cnty. Sheriff's Office, GRC Complaint No. 2017-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated June 25, 2019). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Complainant already possessed the responsive record. Bart v. City of Paterson Hous. Auth., 403 N.J. Super. 609 (App. Div. 2008).
8. Kevin Alexander v. Middlesex County Correction Center (2024-81)
 - The Custodian timely responded to the Complainant's OPRA request.
 - The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the Complainant's OPRA request item No. 1 because she certified, and the record reflects, that she disclosed all responsive records. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested log book information. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); N.J.A.C. 10A:22-2.3(a)(4) and (b); Executive Order No. 26 (Gov. McGreevey, 2002)("EO 26"); Brunson v. N.J. Dep't of Corr., GRC Complaint No. 2015-357 (February 2017).
9. Kevin Livermore v. West New York School District (Hudson) (2024-137)
 - 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).
 - Notwithstanding the "deemed" denial, the Custodian lawfully denied access to resumes of unsuccessful candidates. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); EO 26; Toscano v. N.J. Dep't of Human Servs., Div. of Mental Health Servs., GRC Complaint No. 2010-147 (May 2011).
10. Everett Falt v. Borough of Carteret (Middlesex) (2025-196)
 - The current Custodian complied with the Council's March 31, 2026 Interim Order.
11. Jamil Glenn v. Moorestown Township Public Schools (Burlington) (2025-411)
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to OPRA request item Nos. 1, 2, 4, 8, and 9 because he certified, and the record reflects, that no records exist. Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
 - The Complainant's request item Nos. 3, 5, 7, and 10 are invalid because they failed to identify specific records and required research. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); MAG, 375 N.J. Super. 534.
 - The Complainant's request item No. 6 is invalid because it failed to include specific job titles or accounts to be searched. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); Elcavage, GRC 2009-07.
12. Jeffrey Brian Wills, Jr. v. Medford Police Department (Burlington) (2026-66)
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the Complainant's OPRA request under the Internal Affairs Policy and Procedures. O'Shea v. Twp. of West Milford, 410 N.J. Super. 371, 382 (App. Div. 2009).

13. Lori Gaines, Esq. (o/b/o Ted Stanziale, et al.) v. Parsippany-Troy Hills Township (Morris) (2026-213)

- The Custodian's proposed special service charge is warranted and reasonable and the Complainant failed to prove otherwise. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(c). Thus, the Custodian shall disclose the responsive records, with redactions where applicable, upon receipt of the charge. Paff v. City of Plainfield, GRC Complaint No. 2006-54 (July 2006).

VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal:

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

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.