



State of New Jersey  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

101 SOUTH BROAD STREET  
PO BOX 819  
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

CHRIS CHRISTIE  
Governor

KIM GUADAGNO  
Lt. Governor

RICHARD E. CONSTABLE, III  
Acting Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

February 28, 2012 Government Records Council Meeting

Jesse Wolosky  
Complainant

Complaint No. 2010-243

v.

Township of Boonton (Morris)  
Custodian of Record

At the February 28, 2012 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the February 21, 2012 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 Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to specifically name identifiable individual senders and recipients and because the request requires research beyond the scope of a custodian’s duties pursuant to MAG Entertainment, LLC v. Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Department, 381 N.J. Super. 30 (App. Div. 2005); New Jersey Builders Association v. New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009). *See also* Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint Nos. 2009-07 and 2009-08 (March 2010) and Wolosky v. Township of Dover (Morris), GRC Complaint No. 2010-206 (October 25, 2011).
2. Pursuant to Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423 (App. Div. 2006), 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. Additionally, pursuant to Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51 (2008), no factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Specifically, the Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to identify with reasonable clarity the recipients and/or senders of the e-mails sought. *See* Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint Nos. 2009-07 and 2009-08 (March 2010). Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, *supra*, and Mason, *supra*.

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 28<sup>th</sup> Day of February, 2012

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., Chair  
Government Records Council

I attest the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the Government Records Council.

Denise Parkinson Vetti, Esq., Secretary  
Government Records Council

**Decision Distribution Date: March 1, 2012**

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director  
February 28, 2012 Council Meeting**

**Jesse Wolosky<sup>1</sup>  
Complainant**

**GRC Complaint No. 2010-243**

v.

**Township of Boonton (Morris)<sup>2</sup>  
Custodian of Records**

**Records Relevant to Complaint:** Copies of every e-mail sent or received by the Municipal Clerk's office to or from every other Municipal Clerk in Morris County regarding the Complainant, his OPRA request and/or other OPRA matters from June 29, 2010 through September 3, 2010.

**Request Made:** September 3, 2010

**Response Made:** September 7, 2010

**Custodian:** Barbara Sheppard

**GRC Complaint Filed:** September 15, 2010<sup>3</sup>

**Background**

**September 3, 2010**

Complainant's Open Public Records Act ("OPRA") request. The Complainant requests the records relevant to this complaint listed above in an e-mail referencing OPRA. The Complainant indicates that the preferred method of delivery is via e-mail.

**September 7, 2010**

Custodian's response to the OPRA request (with attachments). The Custodian responds in writing via e-mail to the Complainant's OPRA request on the first (1<sup>st</sup>) business day following receipt of such request. The Custodian states that attached are the responsive records.

**September 15, 2010**

Denial of Access Complaint filed with the Government Records Council ("GRC") with the following attachments:

- Complainant's OPRA request dated September 3, 2010.
- E-mail from the Custodian to the Complainant dated September 7, 2010.
- E-mails disclosed by the Township of Boonton's ("Township") Custodian.
- E-mails disclosed by the Township of Chatham's Custodian.

---

<sup>1</sup> Represented by Walter M. Luers, Esq., of the Law Offices of Walter M. Luers, Esq., LLC (Clinton, NJ).

<sup>2</sup> Represented by John P. Jansen, Esq. (Boonton, NJ).

<sup>3</sup> The GRC received the Denial of Access Complaint on said date.

The Complainant's Counsel states that the Complainant submitted an OPRA request to the Custodian on September 3, 2010. Counsel states that the Custodian responded in writing via e-mail on September 7, 2010 providing access to records.

Counsel contends that the Complainant acquired evidence that at least thirteen (13) additional e-mails (four (4) of which include attachments) were not provided to the Complainant. Counsel states that the Complainant acquired this evidence by submitting a similar OPRA request to the Township of Chatham. Counsel states that the Township of Chatham provided the thirteen (13) missing e-mails. Counsel states that the Custodian is listed as a recipient of the e-mails, of which one circulated a draft resolution regarding "frivolous OPRA requests" and another that urges clerks to send e-mails regarding the Complainant to the president of the Municipal Clerk's Association of New Jersey.

Counsel states that OPRA mandates that "government records shall be readily accessible for inspection, copying, or examination by the citizens of this State, with certain exceptions, for the protection of the public interest, and any limitations on the right of access accorded [under OPRA] as amended and supplemented, shall be construed in favor of the public's right of access." Libertarian Party of Cent. New Jersey v. Murphy, 384 N.J. Super. 136, 139 (App. Div. 2006)(citing N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1). Further, Counsel states that "[t]he purpose of OPRA 'is to maximize public knowledge about public affairs in order to ensure an informed citizenry and to minimize the evils inherent in a secluded process.'" Times of Trenton Publ'g Corp. v. Lafayette Yard Cmty. Dev. Corp., 183 N.J. 519, 535 (2005)(quoting Asbury Park Press v. Ocean County Prosecutor's Office, 374 N.J. Super. 312, 329 (Law Div. 2004). Counsel states that in any action under OPRA, the burden of proof rests with the public agency. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

Counsel states that the custodian of record must bear the burden of proof in any proceeding under OPRA. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 and Paff v. Township of Lawnside (Camden), GRC Complaint No. 2009-155 (October 2010). Counsel contends that there is no doubt that the records requested by the Complainant are government records as defined under OPRA. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.

Counsel contends that because the Custodian failed to provide the thirteen (13) e-mails (four (4) with attachments) included in the Township of Chatham's response, the Custodian has unlawfully denied access to same. Counsel further contends that the Custodian could have also denied access to additional e-mails not copied to the Township of Chatham. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i. (requiring custodians to provide copies of records that are not archived or in storage within seven (7) business days after receiving an OPRA request).

Counsel requests the following:

1. A determination ordering the Custodian to disclose all e-mails and attachments that were not previously provided to the Complainant.
2. A determination that the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to reasonable attorney's fees. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

The Complainant does not agree to mediate this complaint.

**September 15, 2010**

Request for the Statement of Information (“SOI”) sent to the Custodian.

**September 20, 2010**

Custodian’s SOI with the following attachments:

- Complainant’s OPRA request dated September 3, 2010.
- Letter from the Custodian to the Complainant dated September 7, 2010 (with attachments).
- E-mails disclosed by the Township’s Custodian.

The Custodian certifies that her search for the requested records included doing a diligent search of e-mails in the time period identified in the Complainant’s OPRA request. The Custodian certifies that she reviewed all e-mails within that time period with the subject “Jesse Wolosky” or “OPRA Request.” The Custodian certifies that she next reviewed all e-mails to determine whether the sender was a Morris County Clerk and compiled the responsive records. The Custodian certifies that she located 29 e-mails that fit the criteria of the Complainant’s OPRA request.

The Custodian also certifies that whether any records responsive to the request were destroyed in accordance with the Records Destruction Schedule established and approved by New Jersey Department of State, Division of Archives and Records Management, is not applicable.

The Custodian certifies that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on September 3, 2010. The Custodian certifies that she provided the Complainant access to the responsive e-mails on September 7, 2010. The Custodian certifies that on September 16, 2010, following receipt of this complaint, the Custodian performed a second search of her e-mails attempting to locate the records identified by the Complainant in said complaint and any other e-mails. The Custodian certifies that thirteen (13) additional e-mails were located and provided to the Complainant on September 16, 2010.

The Custodian certifies that the date of one of the e-mails identified by the Complainant in his complaint preceded the specified time period. Additionally, the Custodian certifies that another e-mail identified by the Complainant was provided to him on September 7, 2010 as part of the Custodian’s initial response.

The Custodian contends that there was no intent to omit any e-mails from disclosure. The Custodian asserts that the Township has received numerous OPRA requests from the Complainant and has consistently made a good faith effort to provide all responsive records. The Custodian asserts that there has been no deliberate attempt to deny access to the records requested.

## Analysis

### **Whether the Complainant's records request is valid under OPRA?**

OPRA provides that:

"...government records shall be readily accessible for inspection, copying, or examination by the citizens of this State, *with certain exceptions...*" (Emphasis added.) N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.

Additionally, OPRA defines a government record as:

"... any paper, written or printed book, document, drawing, map, plan, photograph, microfilm, data processed or image processed document, information stored or maintained electronically or by sound-recording or in a similar device, or any copy thereof, that has been *made, maintained or kept on file ... or that has been received* in the course of his or its official business ..." (Emphasis added.) N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1.

OPRA places the onus on the Custodian to prove that a denial of access is lawful. Specifically, OPRA states:

"...[t]he public agency shall have the burden of proving that the denial of access is authorized by law..." N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

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.

In the instant complaint, of issue is whether the Complainant's request for a "[c]opies of every e-mail sent or received by the Municipal Clerk's office to or from every other Municipal Clerk in Morris County regarding the Complainant, his OPRA request and/or other OPRA matters from June 29, 2010 through September 3, 2010." is a valid request under OPRA. Here, the Complainant's request is invalid under OPRA because it requires the Custodian to perform research to locate and identify responsive records.

The New Jersey Superior Court has held that "[w]hile OPRA provides an alternative means of access to government documents not otherwise exempted from its reach, *it is not intended as a research tool litigants may use to force government officials to identify and siphon useful information. Rather, OPRA simply operates to make identifiable government records 'readily accessible for inspection, copying, or examination.'*" N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1. (Emphasis added.) MAG Entertainment, LLC v. Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534, 546 (App. Div. 2005). As the court noted in invalidating MAG's request under OPRA:

“Most significantly, the request failed to identify with any specificity or particularity the governmental records sought. MAG provided neither names nor any identifiers other than a broad generic description of a brand or type of case prosecuted by the agency in the past. Such an open-ended demand required the Division's records custodian to manually search through all of the agency's files, analyze, compile and collate the information contained therein, and identify for MAG the cases relative to its selective enforcement defense in the OAL litigation. Further, once the cases were identified, the records custodian would then be required to evaluate, sort out, and determine the documents to be produced and those otherwise exempted.” *Id.* at 549.

The Court further held that “[u]nder OPRA, agencies are required to disclose only ‘identifiable’ government records not otherwise exempt ... In short, OPRA does not countenance open-ended searches of an agency's files.” (Emphasis added.) *Id.*

Further, in Bent v. Stafford Police Department, 381 N.J. Super. 30, 37 (App. Div. 2005),<sup>4</sup> the Superior Court references MAG in that the Court held that a requestor must specifically describe the document sought because OPRA operates to make identifiable government records “accessible.” “As such, a proper request under OPRA must identify with reasonable clarity those documents that are desired, and a party cannot satisfy this requirement by simply requesting all of an agency's documents.”<sup>5</sup>

Additionally, in New Jersey Builders Association v. New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007), the Court enumerated the responsibilities of a custodian and a requestor as follows:

“OPRA identifies the responsibilities of the requestor and the agency relevant to the prompt access the law is designed to provide. The custodian, who is the person designated by the director of the agency, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1, must adopt forms for requests, locate and redact documents, isolate exempt documents, assess fees and means of production, identify requests that require ‘extraordinary expenditure of time and effort’ and warrant assessment of a ‘service charge,’ and, when unable to comply with a request, ‘indicate the specific basis.’ N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(a)-(j). The requestor must pay the costs of reproduction and submit the request with information that is essential to permit the custodian to comply with its obligations. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5(f), (g), (i). *Research is not among the custodian's responsibilities.*” (Emphasis added.) NJ Builders, 390 N.J. Super. at 177.

Moreover, the Court cited MAG by stating that “...when a request is ‘complex’ because it fails to specifically identify the documents sought, then that request is not ‘encompassed’ by OPRA...” The Court also quoted N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g in that “[i]f a request for access to a government record would substantially disrupt agency operations,

---

<sup>4</sup> Affirmed on appeal regarding Bent v. Stafford Police Department, GRC Case No. 2004-78 (October 2004).

<sup>5</sup> As stated in Bent, *supra*.

the custodian may deny access to the record after attempting to reach a reasonable solution with the requestor that accommodates the interests of the requestor and the agency.” The Court further stated that “...the Legislature would not expect or want courts to require more persuasive proof of the substantiality of a disruption to agency operations than the agency’s need to...generate new records...”

Furthermore, in Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009), the Council held that “[b]ecause the Complainant’s OPRA requests # 2-5 are not requests for identifiable government records, the requests are invalid and the Custodian has not unlawfully denied access to the requested records pursuant to [MAG] and [Bent].”

The test under MAG then, is whether a requested record is a *specifically identifiable* government record. If so, the record is disclosable, barring any exemptions to disclosure contained in OPRA. The GRC established the criteria deemed necessary to specifically identify an e-mail communication in Sandoval v. NJ State Parole Board, GRC Complaint No. 2006-167 (October 2008). In Sandoval, the Complainant requested “e-mail...between [two individuals] from April 1, 2005 through June 23, 2006 [using seventeen (17) different keywords].” The Custodian denied the request, claiming that it was overly broad. The Council determined:

“The Complainant in the complaint now before the GRC requested specific e-mails *by recipient, by date range and by content*. Based on that information, the Custodian has identified [numerous] e-mails which fit the specific recipient and date range criteria Complainant requested.” (Emphasis added.) *Id.*

Moreover, in Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint Nos. 2009-07 and 2009-08 (March 2010), the Council examined what constitutes a valid request for e-mails under OPRA. The Council determined that:

***“In accord with MAG, supra, and its progeny, in order to specifically identify an e-mail, OPRA requests must contain (1) the content and/or subject of the e-mail, (2) the specific date or range of dates during which the e-mail was transmitted or the e-mails were transmitted, and (3) a valid e-mail request must identify the sender and/or the recipient thereof.”*** (Emphasis in original). *Id.*

In the instant matter, although the Complainant’s request provided a specific range of dates in which the requested e-mails were transmitted, the request failed to name a specific identifiable sender and recipient: the request seeks e-mails from and to a specific *class* of employee (specifically, Morris County Municipal Clerks) and not individually named senders and recipients. See Elcavage, supra. In order for the Custodian to respond to this request, the Custodian would be required to evaluate all e-mails in her database which contained the particular key words sought by the Complainant in order to determine whether the named recipients of such communications were Morris County Municipal Clerks. Such a request is not feasible as Morris County itself has thirty-nine (39) municipalities and no specific employees were named in the



Complainant's request. The Custodian's failure to initially identify and provide every responsive record reinforces the infeasibility of the Complainant's request.

Pursuant to Elcavage and MAG, it is not the Custodian's duty to discern which e-mails in her database have been received by or sent to a Morris County Municipal Clerk. A search for the individual employees' names and related e-mail addresses would constitute *research* that is not the statutory duty of a Custodian. Such a request is not in accordance with the requirements of MAG. Accordingly, the Complainant's request is invalid.

Therefore, the Complainant's request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to specifically name identifiable individual senders and recipients and because the request requires research beyond the scope of a custodian's duties pursuant to MAG, *supra*; Bent, *supra*; New Jersey Builders, *supra*; Schuler, *supra*. See also Elcavage, *supra* and Wolosky v. Township of Dover (Morris), GRC Complaint No. 2010-206 (October 25, 2011).

**Whether the Complainant is a “prevailing party” pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 and entitled to reasonable 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 Court held that a complainant is a “prevailing party” if he/she 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.*

In Teeters, the complainant appealed from a final decision of the Government Records Council which denied an award for attorney's fees incurred in seeking access to certain public records via two complaints she filed under the OPRA, N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 and N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7.f., against the Division of Youth and Family Services (“DYFS”). The records sought involved an adoption agency having falsely advertised that it was licensed in New Jersey. DYFS eventually determined that the adoption agency violated the licensing rules and reported the results of its investigation to the complainant. The

complainant received the records she requested upon entering into a settlement with DYFS. The Court found that the complainant engaged in reasonable efforts to pursue her access rights to the records in question and sought attorney assistance only after her self-filed complaints and personal efforts were unavailing. *Id.* at 432. With that assistance, she achieved a favorable result that reflected an alteration of position and behavior on DYFS's part. *Id.* As a result, the complainant was a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney's fee. Accordingly, the Court remanded the determination of reasonable attorney's fees to the GRC for adjudication.

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 (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." Mason, *supra*, at 71, (quoting Buckhannon Board & Care Home v. West Virginia Department of Health & Human Resources, 532 U.S. 598, 131 S. Ct. 1835, 149 L. Ed. 2d 855 (2001)). In Buckhannon, the Supreme Court stated that the phrase "prevailing party" is a legal term of art that refers to a "party in whose favor a judgment is rendered." (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, but also over 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.

As the New Jersey Supreme Court noted in Mason, Buckhannon is binding only when counsel fee provisions under federal statutes are at issue. 196 N.J. at 72, *citing* Teeters, *supra*, 387 N.J. Super. at 429; *see, e.g.*, Baer v. Klagholtz, 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 then examined the catalyst theory within the context of New Jersey law, stating that:

"New Jersey law has long recognized the catalyst theory. In 1984, this Court considered the term "prevailing party" within the meaning of the federal Civil Rights Attorney's Fees Awards Act of 1976, 42 U.S.C.A. § 1988. Singer v. State, 95 N.J. 487, 495, *cert. denied*, New Jersey v. Singer, 469 U.S. 832, 105 S. Ct. 121, 83 L. Ed. 2d 64 (1984). The Court adopted a two-part test espousing the catalyst theory, consistent with federal law at the time: (1) there must be "a factual causal nexus between plaintiff's litigation and the relief ultimately achieved;" in other words, plaintiff's efforts must be a "necessary and important factor in obtaining the relief," *Id.* at 494-95, 472 A.2d 138 (internal quotations and citations omitted); and (2) "it must be shown that the relief ultimately secured by plaintiffs

had a basis in law," *Id.* at 495. *See also* North Bergen Rex Transport v. TLC, 158 N.J. 561, 570-71 (1999)(applying Singer fee-shifting test to commercial contract).

Also prior to Buckhannon, the Appellate Division applied the catalyst doctrine in the context of the Law Against Discrimination, N.J.S.A. 10:5-1 to -49, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12101-12213. Warrington v. Vill. Supermarket, Inc., 328 N.J. Super. 410 (App. Div. 2000). The Appellate Division explained that "[a] plaintiff is considered a prevailing party 'when actual relief on the merits of [the] claim materially alters the relationship between the parties by modifying the defendant's behavior in a way that directly benefits the plaintiff.'" *Id.* at 420 (quoting Farrar v. Hobby, 506 U.S. 103, 111-12, 113 S. Ct. 566, 573, 121 L. Ed. 2d 494, 503 (1992)); *see also* Szczepanski v. Newcomb Med. Ctr., 141 N.J. 346, 355 (1995) (noting that Hensley v. Eckerhart "generously" defines "a prevailing party [a]s one who succeeds 'on any significant issue in litigation [that] achieves some of the benefit the parties sought in bringing suit'" (quoting Hensley v. Eckerhart, 461 U.S. 424, 433, 103 S. Ct. 1933, 1938, 76 L. Ed. 2d 40, 50 (1983))). The panel noted that the "form of the judgment is not entitled to conclusive weight"; rather, courts must look to whether a plaintiff's lawsuit acted as a catalyst that prompted defendant to take action and correct an unlawful practice. Warrington, supra, 328 N.J. Super. at 421. A settlement that confers the relief sought may still entitle plaintiff to attorney's fees in fee-shifting matters. *Id.* at 422.

This Court affirmed the catalyst theory again in 2001 when it applied the test to an attorney misconduct matter. Packard-Bamberger, supra, 167 N.J. at 444. In an OPRA matter several years later, New Jerseyans for a Death Penalty Moratorium v. New Jersey Department of Corrections, 185 N.J. 137, 143-44 (2005)(NJDPM), this Court directed the Department of Corrections to disclose records beyond those it had produced voluntarily. In ordering attorney's fees, the Court acknowledged the rationale underlying various fee-shifting statutes: to insure that plaintiffs are able to find lawyers to represent them; to attract competent counsel to seek redress of statutory rights; and to "even the fight" when citizens challenge a public entity. *Id.* at 153.

After Buckhannon, and after the trial court's decision in this case, the Appellate Division decided Teeters. The plaintiff in Teeters requested records from the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS), which DYFS declined to release. 387 N.J. Super. at 424. After the GRC preliminarily found in plaintiff's favor, the parties reached a settlement agreement leaving open whether plaintiff was a "prevailing party" under OPRA. *Id.* at 426-27.

The Appellate Division declined to follow Buckhannon and held that plaintiff was a "prevailing party" entitled to reasonable attorney's fees; in

line with the catalyst theory, plaintiff's complaint brought about an alteration in DYFS's position, and she received a favorable result through the settlement reached. *Id.* at 431-34. In rejecting Buckhannon, the panel noted that "New Jersey statutes have a different tone and flavor" than federal fee-shifting laws. *Id.* at 430. "Both the language of our statutes and the terms of court decisions in this State dealing with the issue of counsel fee entitlements support a more indulgent view of petitioner's claim for an attorney's fee award than was allowed by the majority in Buckhannon ... " *Id.* at 431, 904 A.2d 747. As support for this proposition, the panel surveyed OPRA, Packard-Bamberger, Warrington, and other cases.

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." (Footnote omitted.) Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 73-76 (2008).

The Court in Mason, *supra*, at 76, held that "requestors 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 (1984)."

The Complainant filed this complaint requesting that the GRC order the Custodian to disclose thirteen (13) e-mails and any other e-mails the Custodian failed to provide to him. However, the GRC has determined that the Complainant's request is invalid under OPRA because it failed to identify with reasonable clarity the individual senders and/or recipients of the e-mail's sought. *See* Elcavage and Wolosky. Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6.

Pursuant to Teeters, *supra*, 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. Additionally, pursuant to Mason, *supra*, no factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant's filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Specifically, the Complainant's request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to identify with reasonable clarity the recipients and/or senders of the e-mails sought. *See* Elcavage. Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, *supra*, and Mason, *supra*.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Complainant's request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to specifically name identifiable individual senders and recipients and because the request requires research beyond the scope of a custodian's duties pursuant to MAG Entertainment, LLC v. Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534 (App. Div. 2005); Bent v. Stafford Police Department, 381 N.J. Super. 30 (App. Div. 2005); New Jersey Builders Association v. New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, 390 N.J. Super. 166, 180 (App. Div. 2007); Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009). *See also* Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint Nos. 2009-07 and 2009-08 (March 2010) and Wolosky v. Township of Dover (Morris), GRC Complaint No. 2010-206 (October 25, 2011).
  
2. Pursuant to Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423 (App. Div. 2006), 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. Additionally, pursuant to Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51 (2008), no factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant's filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Specifically, the Complainant's request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to identify with reasonable clarity the recipients and/or senders of the e-mails sought. *See* Elcavage v. West Milford Twp., GRC Complaint Nos. 2009-07 and 2009-08 (March 2010). Therefore, the Complainant is not a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney's fee pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, *supra*, and Mason, *supra*.

Prepared By: Frank F. Caruso  
Senior Case Manager

Approved By: Catherine Starghill, Esq.  
Executive Director

February 21, 2012