



## State of New Jersey

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

PHILIP D. MURPHY  
Governor

TAHESHA L. WAY  
Lieutenant Governor

JACQUELYN A. SUÁREZ  
Commissioner

### FINAL DECISION

#### July 30, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2022-71

v.

Delaware Township Police Department (Hunterdon)  
Custodian of Record

At the July 30, 2024 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the July 23, 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’s January 26, 2022 response is insufficient because she failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g). See Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008); Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013). Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive agreements existed between Delaware Township and any separated police officer.
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between Delaware Township and separated police officers. Specifically, the current Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).
3. The Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, no 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 certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in Delaware Township’s possession and the current Custodian certified that no agreements between the Township and separated officers exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not 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.

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 30<sup>th</sup> Day of July 2024

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., 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: August 1, 2024**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
July 30, 2024 Council Meeting**

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

**GRC Complaint No. 2022-71**

v.

**Delaware Township Police Department (Hunterdon)<sup>2</sup>  
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:** Tiffany Crivelli<sup>3</sup>

**Request Received by Custodian:** January 19, 2022

**Response Made by Custodian:** January 26, 2022

**GRC Complaint Received:** March 28, 2022

**Background<sup>4</sup>**

**Request and Response:**

On January 19, 2022, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On January 26, 2022, the Custodian

---

<sup>1</sup> The Complainant represents the African American Data & Research Institute.

<sup>2</sup> Represented by Joseph C. Tauriello, Esq. (Princeton, NJ).

<sup>3</sup> The current Custodian of Record is Diana Rumage.

<sup>4</sup> 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. Delaware Township Police Department (Hunterdon), 2022-71 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

responded to the Complainant in writing via e-mail, providing redacted payroll and employee service cards containing the requested information.

#### Denial of Access Complaint:

On March 28, 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.<sup>5</sup>

#### Statement of Information:

On May 13, 2022, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that the Township received the Complainant’s OPRA request on January 19, 2022. The Custodian certified that several hours were spent by the Delaware Township’s (“Township”) Police Secretary and Chief Financial Officer locating, scanning, and redacting archived documents. The Custodian certified that she responded to the Complainant in writing on January 26, 2022, providing responsive records with redactions.

The Custodian first asserted that the responsive records contained the reasons for separation, as one of the provided documents contained the reasons for each officer. The Custodian next asserted that the Township did not provide the Complainant with any spreadsheet, but instead provided payroll and employee records with redactions.

The Custodian next argued that the provided records contained the reasons for separation, which implicitly addressed the question of whether any officers were separated due to a plea deal or other court action.

#### Additional Submissions:

On May 13, 2022, the Complainant e-mailed the GRC, stating that no additional response was necessary when considering the Court’s decision in Libertarians, and the Appellate Division’s decision in African Am. Data & Research Inst. v. Profitt, 2022 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 622 (App. Div. 2022). Custodian’s Counsel responded that same day stating that Profitt was an

---

<sup>5</sup> 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. Delaware Township Police Department (Hunterdon), 2022-71 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

unpublished decision, and maintained that no request was denied and the Township sufficiently provided the reasons for separation.<sup>6</sup>

On June 26, 2024, the GRC submitted a request for additional information to the Custodian. Specifically, the GRC inquired whether the Custodian searched for and provided any “agreements” the Township entered with any separated police officers. The GRC also stated that if no search was conducted, the Custodian must conduct same and certify whether any responsive records were located.

On June 28, 2024, the current Custodian responded to the GRC’s request for additional information. The current Custodian certified that at the time of the request, the Township searched for agreements between the Township and the identified separated officers. The current Custodian certified that no agreements were located.

## Analysis

### Sufficiency of Response

OPRA provides that if a “custodian is unable to comply with a request for access, the custodian *shall indicate the specific basis therefor . . . on the request form and promptly return it to the requestor.*” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g) (emphasis added). In Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008), the Council held that “. . . [t]he Custodian’s response was legally insufficient because he failed to respond to each request item individually. Therefore, the Custodian has violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g).” See also Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013).

Upon review, the GRC is satisfied that the Custodian provided an insufficient response. Here, the Custodian responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request providing payroll and employment records containing the requested information. However, the Custodian’s response did not indicate whether any “agreement” existed between the Township and the officers. It was not until the Custodian certified in the SOI that the records contained in the correspondence were responsive to the request for personnel information under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10. Further, it was not until responding to the GRC’s request for additional information that the current Custodian certified that a search for settlements was conducted at the time of the request, but none were located. The facts here are on point with those in Paff; thus, it follows there was an insufficient response in the instant complaint.

Therefore, the Custodian’s January 26, 2022 response is insufficient because she failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g). See Paff, GRC 2007-272; Lenchitz, GRC 2012-265. Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive agreements existed between the Township and any separated police officer.

---

<sup>6</sup> The parties submitted additional correspondence, but no additional arguments were put forth that were not already presented to the GRC.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Delaware Township Police Department (Hunterdon), 2022-71 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

## **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.

### **Agreements**

The Council has previously found that, where a custodian certified that no responsive records exist, no unlawful denial of access occurred. Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep’t of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005). Here, in addition to the requested personnel information, the Complainant sought any “agreement” between the Township and any separated officer containing the “reason for separation.” On January 26, 2022, the Custodian responded to the Complainant providing records containing the requested personnel information but did not address the request for agreements. However, in response to the GRC’s request for additional information, the current Custodian certified that the Township conducted a search at the time of the request and that no responsive agreements were located. Additionally, the Complainant failed to present any evidence that the Township possessed same at the time of the request, or to refute the current Custodian’s certification.

Accordingly, notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between the Township and separated police officers. Specifically, the current Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer, GRC 2005-49.

### **Personnel Information**

The GRC notes that the Complainant raised arguments in the SOI that are wholly inapposite with the evidence presented. Specifically, the Custodian provided the requested personnel information through payroll and employee records and not as information via a manually generated list or spreadsheet. Furthermore, because the Complainant did not raise the issues with the redactions made to the disclosed records, the GRC declines to address same.

## **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 (7<sup>th</sup> 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 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.” In response, the Custodian provided payroll and employee records containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on March 28, 2022, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers’ separations. However, the Custodian certified in the SOI that a complete response was provided, and the current Custodian certified that the Township did not possess any agreements between itself and separated officers. Thus, the Complainant has not achieved the desired result and is not a prevailing party in this complaint.

Therefore, the Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct. Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Additionally, no 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 certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in the Township’s possession and the current Custodian certified that no agreements between the Township and separated officers exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not 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.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian’s January 26, 2022 response is insufficient because she failed to address each request item. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g). See Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008); Lenchitz v. Pittsgrove Twp. (Salem), GRC Complaint No. 2012-265 (Interim Order dated August 27, 2013). Specifically, the Custodian failed to indicate whether responsive agreements existed between Delaware Township and any separated police officer.
2. Notwithstanding the Custodian’s insufficient response, she has borne her burden of proof that she lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking any “agreement[s]” between Delaware Township and separated police officers. Specifically, the current Custodian certified, and the record reflects, that no such



records exist. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; see Pusterhofer v. N.J. Dep't of Educ., GRC Complaint No. 2005-49 (July 2005).

3. The Complainant has not achieved the desired result because the complaint did not bring about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian's conduct. Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, no 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 certified that she provided the Complainant with all responsive records in Delaware Township's possession and the current Custodian certified that no agreements between the Township and separated officers exist. Therefore, the Complainant is not 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.

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado  
Staff Attorney

July 23, 2024