



## **Minutes of the Government Records Council July 25, 2023 Public Meeting – Open Session**

### **I. Public Session:**

- **Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:31 p.m. by Ms. Robin Berg Tabakin via Microsoft Teams.

- **Pledge of Allegiance**

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

- **Meeting Notice**

Ms. Berg Tabakin 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 July 20, 2023.

- **Roll Call**

Ms. Bordzoe called the roll:

Present: Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq. (Chairwoman), Michael Hahn, Esq. (designee of Department of Education Acting Commissioner Dr. Angelica Allen-McMillan), John Alexy (designee of Department of Community Affairs Commissioner, Lt. Governor Sheila Y. Oliver), and Steven Ritardi, Esq., Public Member.

GRC Staff in Attendance: Frank F. Caruso (Executive Director), Rosemond Bordzoe (Secretary), John Stewart (Mediator), Samuel Rosado (Staff Attorney), and Deputy Attorney General Steven Gleeson.

### **II. Executive Director’s Report:**

#### **Current Statistics**

- Since OPRA’s inception in July 2002, the GRC has received 6,804 Denial of Access Complaints. That averages about 324 annual complaints over 21 tracked program years.

So far in the current program year (FY2023), the GRC has received 19 Denial of Access Complaints.

- 590 of the 6,804 complaints remain open and active (8.6%). Of those open cases:
  - 13 complaints are on appeal with the Appellate Division (2.2%);
  - 26 complaints are currently in mediation (4.4%);
  - 5 complaints are proposed for the Office of Administrative Law (0.8%);
  - 24 complaints await adjudication by the Office of Administrative Law (4.1%);
  - 38 complaints are tentatively scheduled for adjudication at an upcoming GRC meeting, which includes the current meeting (6.4%);
  - 484 complaints are work in progress (82.0%); and
  - 0 complaints are being held in abeyance (0.0%).

The GRC's excessive backlog, mostly due to receipt of 1,042 complaints in the last two (2) program years largely predicated on filings by two (2) individuals, has shown positive signs of decrease. That progress has grown significantly as one of the aforementioned individuals withdrew 162 open and active complaints being memorialized as withdrawn today. Thus, since the last meeting, the backlog has decreased by 168 cases (from 758 to 590).

- Since Program Year 2004, the GRC has received and responded to 37,570 total inquiries, averaging about 1,879 annual inquiries per 20 tracked program years (the GRC did not track inquiries in the agency's first year). So far in the current program year (FY2023), the GRC has received 80 inquiries (5.3 inquiries per workday).
- Since Program Year 2011 (beginning July 1, 2010), 1,420 complaints were referred to mediation. Of those, 743 were settled in mediation, 653 were referred back to the GRC for adjudication, and 24 remain active in mediation.

### **GRC Regulations**

- As the Council knows, the GRC has continued to monitor its process in light of significant changes to the regulations in November 2022. Recently, GRC staff identified potential issues with the current time frames afforded parties to comply with interim orders and final decisions. Staff is internally reviewing the potential for expanding those time frames, noting that same are not specifically constrained by regulation. The GRC will report back to the Council if any changes are made.

### **GRC Outreaches**

- The next outreach will be on July 27, 2023 and is hosted by the City of New Brunswick in New Brunswick, NJ.

**III. Closed Session: None**

**IV. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings:**

**June 27, 2023 Open Session Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to approve the draft open session minutes of the June 27, 2023 meeting. Mr. Alexy noted that he confirmed the accuracy of the minutes with Mr. Martucci. Mr. Alexy made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Hahn. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

**V. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Adjudication**

Ms. Berg Tabakin 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): None**

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

1. **Scott Madlinger v. Ocean County Health Department (2022-532)**
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
2. **Angelous Jackson v. Bound Brook Police Department (Somerset) (2023-97)**
  - Unripe Cause of Action.
3. **Scott Madlinger v. Berkeley Township (Ocean) (2023-113)**
  - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.
4. **Anne LaGrange Loving v. Village of Ridge (Bergen) (2023-120)**
  - No Denial of Access at Issue.

Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the recommendations as written in all the above Administrative Complaint Dispositions. Mr. Alexy made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Hahn. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

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

1. **John Doe v. Township of Irvington (Essex) (2022-132 et al.) (See Appendix A)**
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
2. **Anonymous v. Township of Irvington (Essex) (2022-479)**
3. **Anonymous v. Township of Irvington (Essex) (2022-480) Consolidated**
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
4. **Isidro Cruz v. Borough of Roselle Park (Union) (2023-59)**
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

5. **Brandon J. Becker v. County of Gloucester (2023-123)**
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
6. **William Robb Graham v. Moorestown Fire District No. 1 (Burlington) (2023-129)**
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
7. **Barry Muller v. Sayreville Board of Education (Middlesex) (2023-139)**
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
8. **Scott Madlinger v. Berkeley Township (Ocean) (2023-145)**
  - 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): None**

**VII. New Business – Cases Scheduled for Individual Complaint Adjudication**

**A. Individual Complaint Adjudications with Recusals: None**

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

**B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:**

1. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o Baffi Simmons) v. Glassboro Police Department (Gloucester) (2020-157)**
  - Complainant’s Counsel complied with the Council’s September 29, 2022 Interim Order.
  - The Council should find that Complainant’s Counsel is entitled to an adjusted fee award of \$2,010.00 representing 6.7 hours of service at \$300.00 per hour with no fee enhancement.
  - Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director’s findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.
2. **Larry S. Loigman, Esq. v. NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Division of Unemployment Insurance (2021-176)**
  - The Complainant’s request for reconsideration should be denied.

- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.
3. **Stacy Hogan v. Township of Denville (Morris) (2021-231)**
- The Custodian's request for an extension of the statutory response time frame was timely and proper. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i); Rivera v. City of Plainfield Police Dep't (Union), GRC Complaint No. 2009-317 (May 2011).
  - This complaint should be dismissed as unripe because the Complainant filed it before the statutory time frame, as extended, expired. Rivera v. Borough of Rutherford Police Dep't (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2011-277 (August 2012).
  - Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.
4. **Anonymous v. Belleville Board of Education (Essex) (2021-233)**
- The Complainant's anonymous complaint was lawful at the time of filing. Anonymous (In Care of John Paff) v. Twp. of Monroe, GRC Complaint No. 2006-160 (April 2008).
  - The Complainant's request item No. 2 was invalid because it required research. MAG Entm't, LLC v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 549 (App. Div. 2005); Valdes v. Union City Bd. of Educ. (Hudson), GRC Complaint No. 2011-147, *et seq.* (July 2012).
  - The Custodian's proposed special service charge of \$1,741.80 was warranted and reasonable. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(c); Rivera v. Rutgers, The State Univ. of N.J., GRC Complaint No. 2009-311 (Interim Order dated May 29, 2012). Thus, the Custodian shall disclose responsive records upon payment of the fee unless the Complainant declines to remit same or fails to pay within ten (10) business days.
  - Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.
5. **Patrick Wall v. Newark Public Schools (Essex) (2021-257)**
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to responsive e-mails because same qualified as "student records" not subject to disclosure under N.J.A.C. 6A:32-7.5(e). N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); N.J.A.C. 6A:32-2.1.

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the portion of the OPRA request seeking text messages 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).
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

6. **Eleanore Rogalski v. Township of Barnegat (Ocean) (2021-260)**

- The Custodian's failure to disclose the responsive permit resulted in an unlawful denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. However, the Council should decline to order disclosure because the Custodian, through Custodian's Counsel, did so on November 19, 2021.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.  
Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

7. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Montvale Police Department (Bergen) (2021-264)**

- The Custodian's October 26, 2021 response was insufficient. DeAppolonio v. Borough of Deal (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2008-62 (September 2009) and Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008).
- The Custodian's response was consistent with prevailing case law and the Council's prior decisions. Libertarians for Transparent Gov't v. Cumberland Cnty., 465 N.J. Super. 11 (App. Div. 2020). Thus, the Council should decline to find that an unlawful denial of access occurred. Moore v. N.J. Dep't of Corr., GRC Complaint No. 2009-144 (Interim Order dated October 26, 2010).
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

8. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Secaucus Police Department (Hudson) (2021-265)**

- The Custodian's October 26, 2021 response was consistent with prevailing case law and the Council's prior decisions. Libertarians, 465 N.J. Super. 11. Thus, the Council should decline to find that an unlawful denial of access occurred. Moore, GRC 2009-144.

- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

9. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Jackson Police Department (Ocean) (2021-269)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all records were previously provided. Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the portion of the OPRA request seeking internal affairs records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(b); Rivera v. Union Cnty. Prosecutor's Office, 250 N.J. 124, 142-43 (2022); Gannett Satellite Info. Net., LLC v. Twp. of Neptune, 467 N.J. Super. 385, 404-05 (App. Div. 2021).
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

10. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Haddon Township Police Department (Camden) (2021-270)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all records were previously provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

11. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Audubon Park Police Department (Camden) (2021-272)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all records were previously provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as

written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

12. **Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American Data & Research Institute) v. Point Pleasant Police Department (Ocean) (2021-279)**

- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to records responsive to the Complainant's OPRA request because all records were previously provided. Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the portion of the OPRA request seeking internal affairs records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(b); Rivera, 250 N.J. at 142-43; Gannett, 467 N.J. Super. at 404-05.
- The Complainant is not a prevailing party.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

13. **Joanne Schreyer v. Township of Belleville (Essex) (2022-199)**

- 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 did not unlawfully deny access to OPRA request No.1 and item No. 1 of OPRA request Nos. 2 and 3 because she certified, and the record reflects, that no records exist. Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.
- The Custodian unlawfully denied access to certificates of occupancy responsive to item No. 2 of both the Complainant's OPRA request Nos. 2 and 3. Thus, the Custodian shall disclose those records to the Complainant.
- There is no knowing and willful violation.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

14. **Anonymous v. Borough of Haledon (Passaic) (2022-204)**

- The Custodian's failure to locate multiple case and CAD reports until after a more reasonable search was conducted resulted in an insufficient search. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013). However, the Council should decline to order disclosure because the Custodian did so on June 7, 2022.
- The Custodian's failure to locate summonses responsive to CAD Report No. 16-19099 was not the result of an insufficient response: Mr. Freitas was not provided with enough information to conduct the search required to locate same.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a



motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

15. **Anonymous v. Englishtown Police Department (Monmouth) (2022-439)**

- The Borough's collective failure to submit a Statement of Information resulted in a violation of N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.4(a).
- 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 Library (Essex), GRC Complaint No. 2007-124 (March 2008).
- The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the responsive records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. The current Custodian shall disclose the responsive records or certify if none exist inclusive of an explanation of search from all individuals involved.
- Ms. Berg Tabakin called for any discussion on the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to accept the Executive Director's findings and recommendations as written. Mr. Alexy made a motion and Mr. Hahn seconded the motion. The motion passed by a unanimous vote.

**VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal: None**

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

- Gannett Satellite Info. Network, LLC v. Twp. of Neptune, 2023 N.J. LEXIS 650 (2023): On appeal where the Plaintiff was a prevailing party under the common law right of access, the Court held that the Plaintiff was not entitled to an attorney fee award. The Court held that OPRA does not permit a prevailing party to obtain an attorney fee award under the common law, nor do the other narrow exceptions to the American Rule. Further, the Court declined to recognize a new exception to the American Rule for prevailing parties in common law right of access cases. Affirmed as modified.
- Zeza v. Evesham Twp. Bd. of Educ., 2023 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1095 (App. Div. 2023): In a request for surveillance camera footage at an elementary school, the Defendant argued that Gilleran v. Twp. of Bloomfield, 227 N.J. 159 (2016) created a categorical OPRA exception for public surveillance videos. The Appellate Division found that the Gilleran Court only restricted access to surveillance footage when the governmental entity fulfilled its burden of demonstrating that release of said footage would reveal security-compromising information. The court found that because the Defendant failed to meet that burden, the surveillance footage was subject to disclosure as a government record. Affirmed.
- First Managed Care Option, Inc. v. N. Hudson Reg'l Fire & Rescue, 2023 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1094 (App. Div. 2023): In a request for "documents regarding the scoring, ranking or selection of the winning bid or proposal for the Request for Qualifications", the Defendant argued that the documents were exempt under OPRA's

deliberative process privilege. The Plaintiffs argued that the documents were required to be disclosed under the Pay-to-Play Law and the Local Public Contracts Law and therefore were not covered by the privilege. The Appellate Division found that the Plaintiffs misinterpreted both laws, and they did not require the Defendant to disclose documents pertaining to its internal evaluations of potential bids or proposals. The court therefore held that the Defendant properly withheld access under the privilege. Affirmed.

- C.E. & B. v. Elizabeth Pub. Sch. Dist. & Harold E. Kennedy, 2023 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1206 (App. Div. 2023): In May 2020, Plaintiff submitted an OPRA request to the Defendant seeking immediate access records. The Defendant responded stating that same would respond to the request when the Defendant's offices were able to reopen. The Plaintiff filed an Order to Show Cause ("OTSC"), and the trial court denied same w/o prejudice in August 2020, hoping the parties could negotiate a resolution. In November 2020, Plaintiff requested the records again. In January 2021, Plaintiff filed a second OTSC, but was denied w/o prejudice again but on procedural grounds. The Defendant produced responsive records a few days thereafter. The Plaintiff thereafter filed to reinstate the OTSC and filed a motion for attorney's fees. The Appellate Division found that the Defendant did not refuse to provide the Plaintiff with records, but instead provided an open-ended period to respond due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The court also found that the Plaintiff failed to demonstrate that the OTSC filings precipitated the Defendant's release of the records. Next the court held that the Defendant made reasonable efforts to respond to the Plaintiff's OPRA request given the circumstances of the pandemic and the nature of the request. Finally, the court held that the Plaintiff's first and second OTSC were properly denied. Affirmed.

**X. Complaints Adjudicated in U.S. District Court: None**

**XI. Public Comment: None**

**XII. Adjournment:**

Ms. Berg Tabakin called for a motion to end the Council meeting. Mr. Alexy made a motion, which was seconded by Mr. Hahn. The motion passed by a unanimous vote. The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., Chair

Date Approved: August 29, 2023

Appendix A – John Doe v. Twp. of Irvington (Essex), Complaints Withdrawn on June 22, 2023

1. GRC 2022-132
2. GRC 2022-146
3. GRC 2022-158
4. GRC 2022-164
5. GRC 2022-186
6. GRC 2022-190
7. GRC 2022-200
8. GRC 2022-201
9. GRC 2022-209
10. GRC 2022-210
11. GRC 2022-211
12. GRC 2022-226
13. GRC 2022-228
14. GRC 2022-233
15. GRC 2022-244
16. GRC 2022-245
17. GRC 2022-250
18. GRC 2022-253
19. GRC 2022-256
20. GRC 2022-257
21. GRC 2022-260
22. GRC 2022-261
23. GRC 2022-262
24. GRC 2022-263
25. GRC 2022-264
26. GRC 2022-265
27. GRC 2022-266
28. GRC 2022-270
29. GRC 2022-271
30. GRC 2022-272
31. GRC 2022-273
32. GRC 2022-274
33. GRC 2022-276
34. GRC 2022-278
35. GRC 2022-282
36. GRC 2022-292
37. GRC 2022-306
38. GRC 2022-307
39. GRC 2022-308
40. GRC 2022-309
41. GRC 2022-310
42. GRC 2022-311
43. GRC 2022-312
44. GRC 2022-313
45. GRC 2022-314
46. GRC 2022-315
47. GRC 2022-320
48. GRC 2022-321
49. GRC 2022-323
50. GRC 2022-324
51. GRC 2022-326
52. GRC 2022-327
53. GRC 2022-328
54. GRC 2022-329
55. GRC 2022-330
56. GRC 2022-331
57. GRC 2022-332
58. GRC 2022-333
59. GRC 2022-334
60. GRC 2022-336
61. GRC 2022-346
62. GRC 2022-347
63. GRC 2022-350
64. GRC 2022-351
65. GRC 2022-352
66. GRC 2022-353
67. GRC 2022-360
68. GRC 2022-361
69. GRC 2022-362
70. GRC 2022-363
71. GRC 2022-364
72. GRC 2022-365
73. GRC 2022-367
74. GRC 2022-368
75. GRC 2022-369
76. GRC 2022-373
77. GRC 2022-374
78. GRC 2022-375
79. GRC 2022-377
80. GRC 2022-379
81. GRC 2022-380
82. GRC 2022-381
83. GRC 2022-384
84. GRC 2022-386
85. GRC 2022-390
86. GRC 2022-391
87. GRC 2022-396
88. GRC 2022-399
89. GRC 2022-400
90. GRC 2022-401
91. GRC 2022-402
92. GRC 2022-403
93. GRC 2022-405
94. GRC 2022-407
95. GRC 2022-408
96. GRC 2022-409
97. GRC 2022-410
98. GRC 2022-412
99. GRC 2022-415
100. GRC 2022-416
101. GRC 2022-417
102. GRC 2022-418
103. GRC 2022-419
104. GRC 2022-420
105. GRC 2022-421
106. GRC 2022-425
107. GRC 2022-426
108. GRC 2022-427
109. GRC 2022-428
110. GRC 2022-430
111. GRC 2022-431
112. GRC 2022-434
113. GRC 2022-440
114. GRC 2022-441
115. GRC 2022-445
116. GRC 2022-446
117. GRC 2022-447
118. GRC 2022-448
119. GRC 2022-449
120. GRC 2022-450
121. GRC 2022-454
122. GRC 2022-460
123. GRC 2022-461
124. GRC 2022-462
125. GRC 2022-466
126. GRC 2022-467
127. GRC 2022-468
128. GRC 2022-469
129. GRC 2022-470
130. GRC 2022-474

Appendix A – John Doe v. Twp. of Irvington (Essex), Complaints Withdrawn on June 22, 2023

131. GRC 2022-485
132. GRC 2022-486
133. GRC 2022-489
134. GRC 2022-490
135. GRC 2022-493
136. GRC 2022-498
137. GRC 2022-499
138. GRC 2022-507
139. GRC 2022-510
140. GRC 2022-522
141. GRC 2022-524
142. GRC 2022-540
143. GRC 2022-541
144. GRC 2022-542
145. GRC 2022-543
146. GRC 2022-545
147. GRC 2022-579
148. GRC 2022-580
149. GRC 2022-581
150. GRC 2022-610
151. GRC 2022-612
152. GRC 2022-613
153. GRC 2022-614
154. GRC 2022-615
155. GRC 2022-616
156. GRC 2022-617
157. GRC 2022-618
158. GRC 2022-619
159. GRC 2022-620
160. GRC 2022-621
161. GRC 2022-622
162. GRC 2022-623