



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 May 28, 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., Thursday, May 28, 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:

April 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 with Recusals (Consent Agenda):

1. Abdelhamid Arbab v. NJ Department of Corrections (2023-39) (SR and RBT Recusal)
 - Unable to Locate Complainant.



2. Newell Knight v. NJ Department of Corrections (2026-155) **(SR and RBT Recusal)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.
3. Noelle Hardy v. City of Newark (Essex) (2026-183) **(SR Recusal)**
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied.

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

1. John Hastings v. Norwood Public School (Bergen) (2026-181)
 - Motion to File Within Time Denied in Part.

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

1. Kelly A. Moore (o/b/o Amazon.com Services, LLC) v. NJ Office of the Attorney General (2025-339)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
2. Scott Coulson v. Town of Kearny (Hudson) (2025-392)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
3. Maggie Doucette v. Borough of Point Pleasant Beach (Ocean) (2025-418)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
4. Shant Cakirdas v. NJ Institute of Technology (2026-19)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
5. Syed Eshaan Ali v. NJ Department of Children and Families (2026-73)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
6. Jennifer Akturk v. NJ Department of Transportation (2026-139)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
7. Nicholas Sodano v. Township of Mount Holly (Burlington) (2026-146)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
8. Robert C. Scutro v. City of Linden (Union) (2026-178)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
9. Jacqueline N. Lopez v. Borough of Bellmawr Police Department (Camden) (2026-180)
 - Complaint Settled in Mediation.
10. Wanda R. Stevenson v. City of Newark (Essex) (2026-195)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
11. Fawziyya Muhammad v. City of Newark (Essex) (2026-210)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
12. John F. Huegel v. County of Essex (2026-218)
 - Complaint Voluntarily Withdrawn.
13. Michael Smith v. NJ Division of Criminal Justice, State Office of Victim-Witness Advocacy (2026-226)
 - 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. Gregory J. Puliti v. Township of Lawrence (Mercer) (2023-107)
 - *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. Thomas Dudley, Jr. v. NJ Department of Corrections (2024-46) **(SR and RBT Recusal)**
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested logbooks. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); N.J.A.C. 10A:22-2.3(a)(13).
2. Terrence Holmes v. NJ Department of Corrections (2024-167) **(SR and RBT Recusal)**
 - The Custodian lawfully denied access to the requested phone call recordings. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-9(a); N.J.A.C. 10A:22-2.3(a)(12).

B. Individual Complaint Adjudications with no Recusals:

1. Terry Peifer v. City of Trenton (Mercer) (2024-172)
 - The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to OPRA request item Nos. 2 through 5. 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.

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-281)3. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-292)4. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-313)5. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-337)6. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-346)7. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-375)8. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-404)9. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2025-439)10. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-28)11. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-31)12. Councilman Andrew Seise v. Borough of Lincoln Park (Morris) (2026-50) <p>CONSOLIDATED)</p> |
|---|

- No “deemed” denial of access occurred in GRC 2025-281 because the Custodian timely responded directing the Complainant to the Borough of Lincoln Park’s (“Borough”) website.
- The Custodian did not unlawfully deny access to any of the eleven (11) OPRA requests because she acted lawfully in accordance with N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(e) and was not required to produce the responsive recordings on compact discs.

13. Andrew Cary Baldwin v. Township of Clinton (Hunterdon) (2025-293)
- 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 response was insufficient because she failed to address each OPRA request item individually. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(g); Paff v. Willingboro Bd. of Educ. (Burlington), GRC Complaint No. 2007-272 (May 2008).
 - The Custodian may have unlawfully denied access to the outstanding portions of 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.
14. Joseph Loughlin v. Somerset Raritan Valley Sewerage Authority (Somerset) (2026-40)
- The Council should dismiss the portion of the complaint regarding the November 24, 2025 OPRA request as out of time. N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.1(a). The Complainant did not provide evidence showing good cause existed to accept this portion of the complaint as within time.
 - The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the responsive meeting recording. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Burlett v. Monmouth Cnty. Bd. of Chosen Freeholders, GRC Complaint No. 2009-49 (February 2010). The Custodian shall search for and disclose the responsive records.
15. Mark-Brian Kline v. Somerset County (2026-51)
- The Custodian lawfully denied access to the Complainant’s OPRA request item No. 1 seeking oaths of office because same are exempt from disclosure. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1; Kaufmann, Jr. v. N.J. Office of the Attorney Gen., GRC Complaint. No. 2022-178 (May 2023).
16. Jeffrey Brian Wills, Jr. v. Medford Police Department (Burlington) (2026-66)
- Tabled for additional review.

VIII. Court Decisions of GRC Complaints on Appeal:

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

- Hopkins v. Cty. of Hunterdon, 2026 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 858 (App. Div. Apr. 30, 2026)
- Afr. Am. Data & Rsch. Inst. (AADARI) v. Hitchner, 2026 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 1028 (App. Div. May 18, 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.