



## 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 March 31, 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, March 31, 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:**

February 24, 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. Mark-Brian Kline v. Township of Hazlet (Monmouth) (2025-360)
  - No Records Responsive to the Request Exist.
2. Ricotson R. Dolisca v. Township of Irvington (Essex) (2025-425)
  - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
3. Christopher Capodice, Sr. v. Springfield Public Schools (Union) (2026-34)
  - Complaint Dismissed Without Prejudice.
4. Anisa Williams v. Township of Irvington (Essex) (2026-64)
  - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
5. Christopher Capodice, Sr. v. Springfield Public Schools (Union) (2026-65)
  - Duplicate Complaint Filed With the GRC.

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

1. Katherine Taylor v. Rutgers University (2025-334)
  - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
2. David Durling v. NJ Office of Administrative Law (2026-12)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
3. Vincent Michael Russo (o/b/o Rudy Hill) v. City of Newark (Essex) (2026-13)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
4. Kyle Printon v. Borough of Glassboro (Gloucester) (2026-18)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
5. Syed Eshaan Ali v. Old Bridge Township (Middlesex) (2026-39)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
6. Kai Collins v. NJ Department of Education (2026-57)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
7. Renee Gambarcorta v. NJ Department of Community Affairs, Division of Local Government Services (2026-59)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
8. Syed Eshaan Ali v. Old Bridge Township (Middlesex) (2026-60)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
9. Kristin McConnell v. Red Bank Police Department (Monmouth) (2026-74)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
10. Yosef Leser v. City of East Orange (Essex) (2026-75)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
11. Ronald Hampton v. Port Authority of NY & NJ (2026-89)
  - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
12. Jeffrey Michael Green v. NJ Department of Banking and Insurance (2026-109)
  - 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. Lorraine Gallagher v. Old Bridge Police Department (Middlesex) (2025-283)
  - 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. Debra Salters v. City of Newark (Essex) (2022-632) **(SR Recusal)**
  - The Custodian’s failure to timely respond to each of the subject OPRA requests 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 Complainant’s March 30, 2022 OPRA request 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).
  - The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to the April 11, 2022 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).
2. Thomas Dudley, Jr. v. NJ Department of Corrections (2024-46) **(RBT and SR Recusals)**
  - **Cannot be adjudicated due to lack of quorum.**

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

1. Naeem Akhtar v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2022-227)
  - This complaint should be dismissed because the Complainant failed to appear for a scheduled hearing on January 21, 2026, before the Office of Administrative Law (“OAL”) and did not submit any explanation for said failure.
2. Judith V. Burton v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2022-297)
  - This complaint should be dismissed because the Complainant withdrew it on February 11, 2026, in an e-mail to the OAL.
3. Shmuel Edeltuch v. Township of Lakewood (Ocean) (2023-66)
  - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the responsive records under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9, N.J.S.A. 2A:4A-60, and Loigman, Esq. (o/b/o Shlomie Klein) v. Township of Lakewood (Ocean), GRC Complaint No. 2021-154 (October 2023). N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

4. *Renata Hobbs v. Jersey City Board of Education (Hudson) (2023-109)*
  - The Custodian lawfully denied access to OPRA request item Nos. 1 through 3 and 5 through 6 because the records sought relate to the Jersey City Board of Education’s recruitment process. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10; Toscano v. N.J. Dep’t of Human Servs., Div. of Health Servs., GRC Complaint No. 2010-147 (May 2011); Vandy v. Burlington Cnty. Bd. of Social Servs., GRC Complaint No. 2016-319 (December 2018).
  - The Custodian lawfully denied access to OPRA request item Nos. 4 and 7 under the “inter-agency or intra-agency advisory, consultative, or deliberative [“ACD”] material” exemption. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.
  
5. *Juan Carols Ramirez Rodriguez (o/b/o Rosa Ermelinda Ruiz de Rugama a.k.a. Marveli Flavia Ubeda) v. Neptune Township Police Department (Monmouth) (2023-150)*
  - The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the responsive arrest report and complaint. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-3(b); N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Morgano v. Essex Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, GRC Complaint No. 2007-156 (February 2009). The Custodian shall disclose those records, with redactions where appropriate, to the Complainant.
  - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the responsive police report under the criminal investigatory exemption. 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); Janeczko v. N.J. Dep’t of Law and Pub. Safety, Div. of Criminal Justice, GRC Complaint No. 2002-79, *et seq.* (June 2004).
  
6. *Aakash Dalal v. Bergen County Prosecutor’s Office (2023-284)*
  - The Custodian conducted an insufficient search for the responsive letter. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian did so as part of the Statement of Information (“SOI”).
  - There is no knowing and willful violation.
  
7. *Anne Vukicevich v. Moorestown Township (Burlington) (2023-288)*
  - Notwithstanding the OPRA request being delivered to the Custodian’s “Junk” mail folder, her failure to timely respond to the subject OPRA request resulted in a violation of the immediate access provision of OPRA and “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).
  - The Complainant’s request is invalid because it required research. MAG Entm’t, LLC v. Div. of ABC, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005); Carter v. N.J. Dep’t of Cmty. Affairs, Div. of Local Gov’t Serv., 2019 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 2510 (App. Div. 2019).
  
8. *Aaron Albert Mitchell Jr. v. Township of Willingboro (Burlington) (2024-57)*
  - Ms. Cooper-McBride’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 the subject OPRA request because she disclosed all records that existed. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Danis, GRC 2009-156, *et seq.*

9. Brian R. Wittig v. Rockaway Township (Morris) (2024-71)
  - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the OPRA request seeking draft documents under the ACD exemption. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Libertarians for Transparent Gov't v. Gov't Records Council, 453 N.J. Super. 83 (App. Div. 2018).
  
10. Matthew Bledsoe v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2024-147)
  - The Custodian's extensions were unwarranted and unreasonable; thus, a "deemed" denial of access occurred. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); Ciccarone v. N.J. Dep't of Treasury, GRC Complaint No. 2013-280 (Interim Order dated July 29, 2014). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian did so on July 10, 2024.
  
11. Steve Clegg v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2025-38)
  - The Custodian complied with the Council's January 27, 2026 Interim Order.
  - There is no knowing and willful violation.
  
12. Steve Clegg v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2025-82)
  - The Custodian failed to comply with the Council's January 27, 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.
  
13. Everett Falt v. Borough of Carteret (Middlesex) (2025-196)
  - The Council should decline to address the Custodian's request for reconsideration because it was untimely. N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.10.
  - The Custodian did not fully comply with the Council's December 9, 2025 Interim Order.
  - The Custodian is being provided with a final opportunity to comply with the Council's Interim Order.
  
14. Pamela R. Sickinger v. Rockaway Township (Morris) (2025-409)
  - The Complainant's request for reconsideration should be denied.
  
15. Alfred Tard-El v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2025-429)
  - 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.
  - The knowing and willful analysis is deferred.

**VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal:**

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

- Borough of Spotswood v. Middlesex Cnty. Prosecutor's Office, 2026 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 395 (App. Div. 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.