FINAL DECISION

June 26, 2012 Government Records Council Meeting

David Goff Complaint No. 2011-156
Complainant

v.

New Jersey Department of Labor,
State Board of Mediation
Custodian of Record

At the June 26, 2012 public meeting, the Government Records Council ("Council") considered the June 19, 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. Because the Custodian failed 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, the Custodian’s violation of OPRA 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).


3. Although the Custodian failed to provide a written response to the Complainant’s OPRA request, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. In addition, the Council has found that the Complainant’s request is invalid, as the Complainant failed to request specifically identifiable records. Therefore, it is concluded that the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.
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 26th Day of June, 2012

Steven F. Ritardi, Esq., Acting Chair
Government Records Council

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

Denise Parkinson Vetti, Secretary
Government Records Council

Decision Distribution Date: June 28, 2012
STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL

Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
June 26, 2012 Council Meeting

David Goff1
Complainant

v.

New Jersey Department of Labor,
State Board of Mediation2
Custodian of Records

Records Relevant to Complaint:
“The status of the letter/request dated August 4, 2010 and November 13, 1999”

Request Made: April 27, 2011
Response Made: None
Custodian: Tina Carpenter
GRC Complaint Filed: May 12, 20113

Background

April 27, 2011
Complainant’s Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request. The Complainant requests the records relevant to this complaint listed above in a letter.

May 12, 2011
Denial of Access Complaint filed with the Government Records Council (“GRC”) with an attached copy of the Complainant’s OPRA request dated April 27, 2011.4

The Complainant does not make any arguments in support of his Denial of Access Complaint. The Complainant agrees to mediate this complaint.

May 13, 2011
Offer of Mediation sent to the Custodian.

May 25, 2011
The Custodian agrees to mediate the complaint.

1 No legal representation listed on record.
2 Represented by DAG Donald Palombi, Esq. on behalf of the NJ Attorney General.
3 The GRC received the Denial of Access Complaint on said date.
4 The Complainant attached additional documentation to his complaint that is not relevant to the adjudication of this matter.
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June 29, 2011
The Complaint is referred back from mediation.

July 8, 2011
Request for the Statement of Information (“SOI”) sent to the Custodian.

August 1, 2011
Custodian’s SOI attaching a copy of the Complainant’s letter to the Custodian dated Complainant’s OPRA request dated April 27, 2011.5

The Custodian certifies that the State Board of Mediation (“Board”) has not received an OPRA request from the Complainant and accordingly there is no applicable record retention schedule or responsive records for which to search. The Custodian certifies that the Complainant has made numerous requests that date back to 1999. The Custodian argues that the Complainant is continually seeking the status of an Opinion and Award Decision that relates to grievance arbitration proceedings the Complainant had before the Board. The Custodian maintains that the Board has never received an actual OPRA request from the Complainant and that the Complainant’s April 27, 2011 letter is not an OPRA request. The Custodian further certifies that regardless of the Complainant’s April 27, 2011 letter, there are no records that correspond to anything the Complainant seeks from the Board.

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

OPRA also provides that:

“[i]f the custodian is unable to comply with a request for access, the custodian shall indicate the specific basis therefor 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.

5 The Complainant attached additional documentation to his complaint that is not relevant to the adjudication of this matter.
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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.⁶ 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 Complainant filed an OPRA request on April 27, 2011. The Custodian failed to bear his burden of proof under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6 that he provided a written response to the Complainant’s request. Accordingly, the Custodian’s failure to respond in writing to the Complainant’s request is in violation of the duties placed upon Custodian’s in OPRA.

Therefore, because the Custodian failed 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, the Custodian’s violation of OPRA 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).

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.

---

⁶ 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.
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 seeking “the status of the letter/request dated August 4, 2010 and November 13, 1999” is a valid request pursuant to OPRA. Here, the Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because he has failed to name a specific identifiable record sought.

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

---

7 Affirmed on appeal regarding Bent v. Stafford Police Department, GRC Case No. 2004-78 (October 2004).
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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, 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.

In the instant matter, the Complainant’s request does not seek a specifically
identifiable record. Instead, the Complainant has merely requested the status of letters
the Complainant has sent to the State Board of Mediation. Accordingly, the
Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because said request fails to specify an
identifiable government record sought.

Therefore, the Complainant’s request is invalid under OPRA because it fails to
specify an identifiable government record 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) and New Jersey

---

8 As stated in Bent, supra.

Whether the Custodian’s actions rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances?

OPRA states that:

“[a] public official, officer, employee or custodian who knowingly or willfully violates [OPRA], and is found to have unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances, shall be subject to a civil penalty …” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-11.a.

OPRA allows the Council to determine a knowing and willful violation of the law and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances. Specifically, OPRA states:

“… If the council determines, by a majority vote of its members, that a custodian has knowingly and willfully violated [OPRA], and is found to have unreasonably denied access under the totality of the circumstances, the council may impose the penalties provided for in [OPRA]…” N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7.e.

Certain legal standards must be considered when making the determination of whether the Custodian’s actions rise to the level of a “knowing and willful” violation of OPRA. The following statements must be true for a determination that the Custodian “knowingly and willfully” violated OPRA: the Custodian’s actions must have been much more than negligent conduct (Alston v. City of Camden, 168 N.J. 170, 185 (2001); the Custodian must have had some knowledge that his actions were wrongful (Fielder v. Stonack, 141 N.J. 101, 124 (1995)); the Custodian’s actions must have had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing (Berg v. Reaction Motors Div., 37 N.J. 396, 414 (1962)); the Custodian’s actions must have been forbidden with actual, not imputed, knowledge that the actions were forbidden (Berg); the Custodian’s actions must have been intentional and deliberate, with knowledge of their wrongfulness, and not merely negligent, heedless or unintentional (ECES v. Salmon, 295 N.J. Super. 86, 107 (App. Div. 1996).

Although the Custodian failed to provide a written response to the Complainant’s OPRA request, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. In addition, the Council has found that the Complainant’s request is invalid, as the Complainant failed to request specifically identifiable records. Therefore, it is concluded that the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. Because the Custodian failed 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, the Custodian’s violation of OPRA 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).


3. Although the Custodian failed to provide a written response to the Complainant’s OPRA request, the evidence of record does not indicate that the Custodian’s violation of OPRA had a positive element of conscious wrongdoing or was intentional and deliberate. In addition, the Council has found that the Complainant’s request is invalid, as the Complainant failed to request specifically identifiable records. Therefore, it is concluded that the Custodian’s actions do not rise to the level of a knowing and willful violation of OPRA and unreasonable denial of access under the totality of the circumstances.

Prepared By: Darryl C. Rhone
Case Manager

Approved By: Karyn Gordon, Esq.
Acting Executive Director

June 19, 2012