FINAL DECISION

March 27, 2012 Government Records Council Meeting

Louis P. Toscano
Complainant

v.
NJ Department of Labor,
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services
Custodian of Record

At the March 27, 2012 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the March 20, 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 Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the Complainant’s OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial of the Complainant’s OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g., N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i., and Kelley v. Township of Rockaway, GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).


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 27th Day of March, 2012

Robin Berg Tabakin, Chair
Government Records Council

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

Catherine Stargsill, Executive Director
Government Records Council

Decision Distribution Date: April 4, 2012
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
March 27, 2012 Council Meeting

Louis P. Toscano v. NJ Department of Labor, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Services

Records Relevant to Complaint: A copy of the case file of Louis P. Toscano.

Request Made: June 26, 2010
Response Made: July 16, 2010
Custodian: Wanda Rivera
GRC Complaint Filed: November 9, 2010

Background

June 26, 2010
Complainant’s Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request. The Complainant requests the records relevant to this complaint listed above on an official OPRA request form.

July 16, 2010
Custodian’s response to the OPRA request. The Custodian responds in writing via letter to the Complainant’s OPRA request on the eleventh (11th) business day following receipt of such request. The Custodian states that a copy of the requested case record is attached to this letter.

November 9, 2010
Denial of Access Complaint filed with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant states that the records provided by the Custodian do not contain certain interoffice communications that the Custodian considered “divisive.” The Complainant states that there are additional e-mails responsive to his request that have not been disclosed. The Complainant states that the main e-mail he seeks is from Mr. Brian Fitzgibbons, addressed to Mr. Joseph Jennings, and is dated October 28, 2009. The Complainant argues that the missing e-mail contains evidence of harassing behavior.

1 No legal representation listed on record.
2 Represented by DAG Donald Palombi, on behalf of the NJ Attorney General.
3 The GRC received the Denial of Access Complaint on said date.
4 The Custodian certifies in the Statement of Information that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on June 30, 2010.
The Complainant does not agree to mediate this complaint.

**November 26, 2010**
Request for the Statement of Information (“SOI”) sent to the Custodian.

**December 9, 2010**
Custodian’s SOI with the following attachments:

- Department of Labor Records Retention and Disposition Schedule dated December 12, 1996
- E-mail from Brian Fitzgibbons to Joseph Jennings dated October 28, 2009
- Complainant’s OPRA request dated June 26, 2010
- Custodian’s response to the OPRA request dated July 16, 2010
- Department of Labor Records Retention and Disposition Schedule dated October 16, 1991

The Custodian certifies in the SOI that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on June 30, 2010. The Custodian certifies that she provided the Complainant with a copy of his case file as requested. The Custodian certifies that she provided the Complainant with a complete copy of the case file that included the October 29, 2009 interoffice e-mail. The Custodian argues that the Complainant must have misplaced the copy that she sent to him or that the copy of the case file that she sent to the Complainant must have somehow not included this e-mail. The Custodian asserts that it is very possible that while copying the numerous records included in the case file, the October 29, 2009 e-mail may have inadvertently been omitted. The Custodian certifies that she provided the Complainant with a new copy of this e-mail which she attached to the Statement of Information and sent to the Complainant. The Custodian asserts that if the Complainant had informed her that the e-mail was omitted, she would gladly have forwarded another copy.

**Analysis**

**Whether the Custodian timely responded to the Complainant’s OPRA request?**

OPRA provides that:

“[i]f the custodian is unable to comply with a request for access, the custodian shall indicate the specific basis therefore on the request form and promptly return it to the requestor. The custodian shall sign and date the form and provide the requestor with a copy thereof …” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g.

Further, OPRA provides that:

“[u]nless a shorter time period is otherwise provided by statute, regulation, or executive order, a custodian of a government record shall grant access … or deny a request for access … as soon as possible, but not later than
seven business days after receiving the request … In the event a custodian fails to respond within seven business days after receiving a request, the failure to respond shall be deemed a denial of the request …” (Emphasis added.) N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i.

OPRA mandates that a custodian must either grant or deny access to requested records within seven (7) business days from receipt of said request. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i. As also prescribed under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i., a custodian’s failure to respond within the required seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial. Further, a custodian’s response, either granting or denying access, must be in writing pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g. Thus, a custodian’s failure to respond in writing to a complainant’s OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial of the complainant’s OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g., N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i., and Kelley v. Township of Rockaway, GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).

In the instant matter, the Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s request on June 30, 2010. Evidence in the record indicates that the Custodian did not respond to the Complainant’s request until July 16, 2010, the eleventh (11th) business day following the receipt of the Complainant’s request. The Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the Complainant’s OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial of the Complainant’s OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g., N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i., and Kelley, supra.

Therefore, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the Complainant’s OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial of the Complainant’s OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g., N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i., and Kelley, supra.

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,

---

5 It is the GRC’s position that a custodian’s written response either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days, even if said response is not on the agency’s official OPRA request form, is a valid response pursuant to OPRA.
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 is valid under OPRA. The Complainant requested “a copy of the case file of Louis P. Toscano.” Here, the Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because it requires the Custodian to perform research to locate and identify responsive records as the Complainant has failed to name specifically identifiable 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), 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.”

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, 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…” Accordingly, the test under MAG then, is whether a requested record is a specifically identifiable government record.

Under such rationale, the GRC has repeatedly found that blanket requests are not valid OPRA requests. In the matter of Schuler v. Borough of Bloomsbury, GRC Complaint No. 2007-151 (February 2009), the relevant part of the Complainant’s request sought:

6 Affirmed on appeal regarding Bent v. Stafford Police Department, GRC Case No. 2004-78 (October 2004).
7 As stated in Bent, supra.
Item No. 2: “From the Borough Engineer’s files: all engineering documents for all developments or modifications to Block 25, Lot 28; Block 25, Lot 18; Block 23, Lot 1; Block 23, Lot 1.02.

Item No. 3: From the Borough Engineer’s files: all engineering documents for all developments or modifications to North St., to the south and east of Wilson St.

Item No. 4: From the Borough Attorney’s files: all documents related to the development or modification to Block 25, Lot 28; Block 25, Lot 18; Block 23, Lot 1; Block 23, Lot 1.02.

Item No. 5: From the Borough Attorney’s files: all documents related to the development or modification to North Street, to the south and east of Wilson St.”

In reviewing the Complainant’s request, the Council found 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 Entertainment, LLC v. Division of Alcoholic Beverage Control, 375 N.J. Super. 534 (App. Div. 2005) and Bent v. Stafford Police Department, 381 N.J. Super. 30 (App. Div. 2005).”

In the instant matter, the Complainant’s request is overbroad in that it seeks an entire case file without naming specific identifiable government records. Consistent with Bent and MAG, a party seeking records cannot make a broad request for all of a state agency’s records and should properly name specific records so that a Custodian will not have to conduct research or fulfill an overly broad request that is outside the scope of their duties.

Therefore, the Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to specifically name identifiable government records 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).

Nonetheless, the Custodian searched for the requested records and provided the Complainant with a case file that she found was responsive to the Complainant’s request. Moreover, despite the request being invalid, the Custodian provided the Complainant with an additional record after the Complainant disputed the completeness of the previously provided case file. Arguments concerning the completeness or veracity of records are not within the Council’s jurisdiction, and are further negated by the invalidity of the Complainant’s request.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the Complainant’s OPRA request either granting access, denying access, seeking clarification or requesting an extension of time within the statutorily mandated seven (7) business days results in a “deemed” denial of the Complainant’s OPRA request pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g., N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.i., and Kelley v. Township of Rockaway, GRC Complaint No. 2007-11 (Interim Order October 31, 2007).


Prepared By: Darryl C. Rhone
Case Manager

Approved By: Catherine Starghill, Esq.
Executive Director

March 20, 2012