



## 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 February 24, 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, February 24, 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:**

January 27, 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. Abdelhamid Arbab v. NJ Department of Corrections (2023-39) (RBT and SR Recusals)
  - **Cannot be adjudicated due to lack of quorum.**



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

1. Brian Hampel v. Saddle River Board of Education (Bergen) (2024-3)
  - No Denial of Access at Issue
2. Alfred Tard-El v. Borough of Hopewell (Mercer) (2025-382)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
3. Alfred Tard-El v. Borough of Hightstown (Mercer) (2025-384)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
4. Alfred Tard-El v. Township of Lawrence (Mercer) (2025-386)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
5. Alfred Tard-El v. Township of Hopewell (Mercer) (2025-387)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
6. Alfred Tard-El v. Township of Pennington (Mercer) (2025-389)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
7. Alfred Tard-El v. Municipality of Princeton (Mercer) (2025-390)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
8. Alfred Tard-El v. Borough of Hopewell (Mercer) (2025-391)
  - Duplicate Complaint Filed With the GRC.
9. Alexander William Fay v. Freehold Township Police Department (Monmouth) (2025-406)
  - Complaint Dismissed Without Prejudice.
10. Pamela R. Sickinger v. Rockaway Township (Morris) (2025-409)
  - Motion To File Within Time Denied.
11. Alfred Tard-El v. Borough of Hopewell (Mercer) (2025-430)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
12. Sean Redzio v. Garfield Board of Education (Bergen) (2026-5)
  - Complaint Dismissed Without Prejudice.
13. John Paff v. Perth Amboy Public Schools (Middlesex) (2026-6)
  - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
14. Mark-Brian Kline v. Township of Hazlet (Monmouth) (2026-9)
  - All Records Responsive Provided in a Timely Manner.
15. Alfred Tard-El v. NJ Office of Attorney Ethics (2026-32)
  - Not Within the Council's Jurisdiction.

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

1. Avinash Melkote v. Township of Howell (Monmouth) (2025-254)
  - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
2. Lydia M. Couch v. Elizabeth Board of Education (Union) (2025-312)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
3. Dr. Raul Virella v. NJ Department of Labor & Workforce Development (2025-325)
  - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
4. Omar Saleh Al-Zaman v. NJ Institute of Technology (2025-343)
  - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
5. Brian Camelio v. Jersey City Department of Housing, Economic Development, & Commerce (Hudson) (2025-395)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.

6. Miky Ynirio v. NJ Department of Corrections (2026-10)
  - 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**

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

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

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

1. Michael F. Farmer (o/b/o Surenda Vallabhaneni) v. Monroe Township Board of Education (Middlesex) (2023-15)
  - The Custodian’s proposed special service charge of \$530.22 for 16.2 hours at an hourly rate of \$32.73 is warranted and reasonable. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(c); Courier Post v. Lenape Reg’l High Sch., 360 N.J. Super. 191, 204 (Law Div. 2002); 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 the responsive records upon remittance of the appropriate fee. Paff v. City of Plainfield, GRC Complaint No. 2006-54 (July 2006).
2. David J. Parreott, Jr. v. Township of Brick Police Department (Ocean) (2023-35)
  - No “deemed” denial of access occurred.
  - This complaint should be dismissed because the Complainant failed to state a claim. Loigman v. Monmouth Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2013-342 (July 2014).
3. Tyree Deshawn Mims v. Gloucester City Police Department (Camden) (2023-188)
  - No unlawful denial of access occurred because the Custodian did not receive the Complainant’s OPRA request. Ping v. Borough of Brielle (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2009-132 (April 2010).
  - The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the subject OPRA request because she disclosed all records that existed. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Danis v. Garfield Bd. of Educ. (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2009-156, *et seq.* (Interim Order dated April 28, 2010).

4. Charles Graber v. Lakewood Police Department (Ocean) (2023-214)
  - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested records under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a), N.J.S.A. 2C:25-33, and VanBree v. Bridgewater Twp. Police Dep't (Somerset), GRC Complaint No. 2014-122 (October 2014).
5. Ligia Alberto v. Bergenfield Public School District (Bergen) (2023-304)
  - The Custodian's failure to timely respond to the Complainant's OPRA request seeking immediate access records resulted in a "deemed" denial of access. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(e); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i). However, the Council should decline to order disclosure because same occurred on December 15, 2023.
6. Lauren A. Martin v. Delran Township Board of Education (Burlington) (2024-11)
  - The original Custodian's written response to the OPRA request was insufficient because he failed to provide a date certain on which he would respond to the subject OPRA request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(i); Hardwick v. N.J. Dep't of Transp., GRC Complaint No. 2007-164 (February 2008).
  - The Complainant's request item Nos. 1 and 2 were invalid because they did not contain the required correspondence criteria. MAG Entm't, LLC v. Div. of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005); Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint No. 2009-07 (April 2010); Thus, the Custodian lawfully denied access to these request items. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.
  - The Custodian violated N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(c) by failing to provide the Complainant the opportunity to accept or reject the proposed special service charge. Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. Delores Simmons, Baffi Simmons, & Grace Woko) v. Magnolia Police Dep't (Camden), GRC Complaint No. 2021-115 (January 2023). Further, the proposed special service charge was not supported by the evidence of record. Courier Post, 360 N.J. Super. 191; Palkowitz v. Borough of Hasbrouck Heights (Bergen), GRC Complaint No. 2014-302 (Interim Order dated May 26, 2015). Thus, the Custodian shall recalculate the charge and disclose the records upon payment thereof.
7. Richard Rivera v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2025-26)
  - This complaint should be dismissed because the Complainant withdrew it on January 12, 2026 in an e-mail to the Office of Administrative Law ("OAL").
8. Daniel Opdyke v. City of Trenton Department of Health & Human Services (Mercer) (2025-76)
  - This complaint should be dismissed because the Complainant withdrew it on January 15, 2026 in an e-mail to the OAL.
9. Alfred Tard-El v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2025-377)
  - The Custodian's failure to submit a Statement of Information 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. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. Thus, the Custodian shall either locate and disclose to the Complainant responsive records, provide a specific lawful basis for denial, or certify if no records exist.
- The knowing and willful and prevailing party analyses are deferred.

**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.