



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
101 SOUTH BROAD STREET
PO BOX 819
TRENTON, NJ 08625-0819

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

SHEILA Y. OLIVER
Lieutenant Governor

KIMBERLY K. HOLMES
Acting Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

August 29, 2023 Government Records Council Meeting

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (o/b/o African American
Data & Research Institute)
Complainant

Complaint No. 2021-274

v.

Harrington Park Police Department (Bergen)
Custodian of Record

At the August 29, 2023 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the August 22, 2023 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 unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking agreements between the Borough of Harrington Park and former police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013) (citing Schneble v. N.J. Dep’t of Env’tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008)). Specifically, the Custodian’s failure to locate responsive records until after she conducted an additional search following receipt of the Denial of Access Complaint resulted in an insufficient search. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure of the agreements because the Custodian disclosed same to the Complainant on December 6, 2021, as part of the Statement of Information.
2. The Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian located responsive records when conducting an additional search after the instant complaint was filed. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. **Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13(c).**

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 29th Day of August 2023

Robin Berg Tabakin, Esq., Chair
Government Records Council

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

Steven Ritardi, Esq., Secretary
Government Records Council

Decision Distribution Date: September 5, 2023

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
August 29, 2023 Council Meeting**

**Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American
Data & Research Institute)¹
Complainant**

GRC Complaint No. 2021-274

v.

**Harrington Park Police Department (Bergen)²
Custodial Agency**

Records Relevant to Complaint: Electronic copies via e-mail of: Names, date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, salary, payroll record, amount and type of pension of individuals who either resigned or retired or terminated or otherwise separated from 2014 to present. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10.

- a. This request includes any agreement entered with each one of the separated police officer(s).
- b. When stating the reason for separation, please note that some police officers separate due to plea deal, criminal convictions, criminal charges, sentences, and or other court agreement or court proceedings that require officers to be separated from your police department and or law enforcement jobs.
- c. Some police officers separate due to internal affairs investigations within the police departments.

Custodian of Record: Ann H. Bistriz³

Request Received by Custodian: October 14, 2021

Response Made by Custodian: November 2, 2021

GRC Complaint Received: November 8, 2021

Background⁴

Request and Response:

On October 14, 2021, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Custodian seeking the above-mentioned records. On November 2, 2021, the

¹ The Complainant represents the African American Data & Research Institute.

² Represented by John R. Dineen, Esq., of Netchert, Dineen & Hillmann, Esqs. (Closter, NJ).

³ The current Custodian of Record is Leena Abaza.

⁴ The parties may have submitted additional correspondence or made additional statements/assertions in the submissions identified herein. However, the Council includes in the Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director the submissions necessary and relevant for the adjudication of this complaint.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Harrington Park Police Department (Bergen), 2021-274 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Custodian responded in writing, providing a spreadsheet containing the requested information. The Custodian also stated there were no separation agreements responsive to subpart (a) of the request.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On November 8, 2021, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the provided records did not provide the reasons for separation. The Complainant contended that simply stating “terminated”, “resigned”, or “retired,” was insufficient under N.J.S.A. 47:1A-10.

The Complainant requested that the GRC compel the Custodian to comply fully with the OPRA request and award counsel fees.

Statement of Information:

On December 6, 2021, the Custodian filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that she received the Complainant’s OPRA request on October 14, 2021. The Custodian certified that her search included requesting all information from the Borough of Harrington Park (“Borough”) CFO, who handled personnel records for all departments. The Custodian certified she responded in writing on November 2, 2021, providing a spreadsheet containing the requested information, and stating that no separation agreements exist.

As part of the SOI, the Custodian provided additional responsive records, including separation agreements for some of the officers listed in the spreadsheet. The Custodian certified that due to the Borough’s small size, she was unaware of the existence of the separation agreements, relying only on what the CFO provided to her at the time. The Custodian asserted that she now knows what to look for and provide in future requests.

Additional Submissions:

On December 10, 2021, the Complainant submitted a brief in response to the Custodian’s SOI. The Complainant asserted that the Custodian failed to provide the “real reasons” for separation in response to his OPRA request.

The Complainant initially argued that the terms “terminated”, “retired”, or “resigned,” did not sufficiently provide the “reason for separation” because they were merely types of employment separations and did not adequately describe the underlying basis thereof. The Complainant argued that the “reason” for separation was likely located within a separate document constituting a government record, and the Custodian was obligated to retrieve that record, rather than create a spreadsheet or list containing the words “terminated”, “retired”, or “resigned.”

The Complainant next asserted that in many instances where a police officer is charged for crimes, they may enter a plea agreement which may require them to leave the police department or be removed from employment because of a conviction. The Complainant argued that it was insufficient for the Custodian to merely state the terms “retired”, “resigned”, or “terminated” as the reason for separation if the “real reason” was that the officer was compelled to separate as part

of a plea agreement or sentence. The Complainant thus argued that the Custodian violated OPRA by not providing the “real reasons” for any of the separations listed.

The Complainant asserted that a guilty plea agreement between an officer and prosecutor is akin to a settlement agreement normally entered into in civil proceedings. Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Cumberland Cnty., 465 N.J. Super. 11 (App. Div. 2020). The Complainant argued that civil settlement agreements are subject to OPRA, and therefore guilty plea agreements should also be subject to OPRA in accordance with Libertarians.

The Complainant contended the Borough did not want to provide the “real reasons” for separation due to the pervasive culture and predisposition to protect officers convicted of misconduct. The Complainant argued that providing single word descriptions was only partially truthful and did not promote OPRA’s goal of transparency.

The Complainant asserted that as an example of police departments’ culture, he noted that in response to a similar OPRA request, Millville Police Department stated that two (2) officers “resigned” from the department. The Complainant asserted that in fact the officers pleaded guilty to criminal charges and as part of the agreement and sentencing they were required to be separated from the department.

The Complainant requested that the GRC compel the Custodian to comply fully and truthfully with the OPRA request. The Complainant also requested the GRC declare the Complainant a prevailing party and award counsel fees.⁵

On December 21, 2021, Custodian’s Counsel e-mailed the GRC. Counsel initially argued that the Custodian provided all available records that were responsive to the Complainant’s OPRA request. Counsel asserted that there were no other records which modified or altered the initial response. Counsel contended that officers who retired or resigned had clean records and therefore would not have the agreements the Complainant sought in his OPRA request. Counsel maintained that the Custodian was not obligated to create a record when one did not exist, citing Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Ocean Cnty. Prosecutor’s Office, 2018 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 25 (App. Div.), cert. denied, 235 N.J. 407 (2018).

Analysis

Sufficiency of Search

It is the custodian’s responsibility to perform a complete search for the requested records before responding to an OPRA request, as doing so will help ensure that the custodian’s response is accurate and has an appropriate basis in law. In Schneble v. N.J. Dep’t of Env’tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008), the custodian initially stated that no records responsive

⁵ The Complainant further noted that access to the records should have been granted under the “common law ‘right to access public records’.” However, the GRC does not have the authority to address a requestor’s common law right to access records. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-7(b); Rowan, Jr. v. Warren Hills Reg’l Sch. Dist. (Warren), GRC Complaint No. 2011-347 (January 2013); Kelly v. N.J. Dep’t of Transp., GRC Complaint No. 2010-215 (November 2011). Thus, the GRC cannot address any common law right of access to the requested records.

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Harrington Park Police Department (Bergen), 2021-274 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

to the complainant's OPRA request existed. The custodian certified that after receipt of the complainant's denial of access complaint, which contained e-mails responsive to the complainant's request, the custodian conducted a second search and found records responsive to the complainant's request. The GRC held that the custodian had performed an inadequate search and thus unlawfully denied access to the responsive records. See also Lebbing v. Borough of Highland Park (Middlesex), GRC Complaint No. 2009-251 (January 2011).

Moreover, in Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013), the custodian initially responded to the complainant's request, producing four (4) responsive records and stating that no other records existed. However, after receiving the denial of access complaint, the custodian performed another search and discovered several other records. Id. In accordance with Schneble, the Council held that the custodian failed to perform an adequate initial search and unlawfully denied access to those additional records. Id.

In the instant matter, the Custodian asserted that at the time of the response, no responsive records were located for the requested agreements between the Borough and former police officers. After receiving the instant complaint, the Custodian certified in the SOI that several agreements were located and provided on December 6, 2021, stating she was unaware of the records' existence at the time. The facts here are on point with those in Weiner, GRC 2013-52, and follows that an insufficient search occurred.

Accordingly, the Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant's OPRA request seeking agreements between the Borough and former police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner, GRC 2013-52 (citing Schneble, GRC 2007-220). Specifically, the Custodian's failure to locate responsive records until after she conducted an additional search following receipt of the Denial of Access Complaint resulted in an insufficient search. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure of the agreements because the Custodian disclosed same to the Complainant on December 6, 2021 as part of the SOI.

Prevailing Party 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 Appellate Division held that a complainant is a "prevailing party" if he 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.

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, 71 (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” (quoting Buckhannon Bd. & Care Home v. West Virginia Dep’t of Health & Human Res., 532 U.S. 598, 131 S. Ct. 1835, 149 L. Ed. 2d 855 (2001)). In Buckhannon, the Supreme Court held that the phrase “prevailing party” is a legal term of art that refers to a “party in whose favor a judgment is rendered.” Id. at 603 (quoting Black’s Law Dictionary 1145 (7th 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. Further, the Supreme Court expressed 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.

However, the Court noted in Mason that Buckhannon is binding only when counsel fee provisions under federal statutes are at issue. 196 N.J. at 72, citing Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 429; see, e.g., Baer v. Klagholz, 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 accepted the application of the catalyst theory within the context of OPRA, stating that:

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.

[196 N.J. at 73-76.]

The Court in Mason, further held that:

[R]equestors 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, New Jersey v. Singer, 469 U.S. 832 (1984).

[Id. at 76.]

Here, the Complainant sought “[n]ames, date of hire, date of separation and reason for separation, salary, payroll record, amount and type of pension of individuals who either resigned or retired or terminated or otherwise separated from 2014 to present,” as well as any “agreements” providing the “reason for separation.” The Custodian provided a list which stated the “reason for separation” for the officers, along with the other Section 10 information, and stated no separation agreements existed. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on November 8, 2021, asserting the Custodian failed to provide the “real reason” for the officers’ separations.

In determining whether the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney’s fees, the GRC is satisfied that the evidence of record supports a conclusion in the affirmative. The Custodian initially denied the Complainant’s request, stating that no responsive records exist regarding the request for agreements. However, the Custodian located several separation agreements after conducting an additional search. Thus, a causal nexus exists between this complaint and the change in the Custodian’s conduct. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Accordingly, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney’s fees.⁶

Therefore, the Complainant has achieved “the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian’s conduct.” Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432. Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant’s filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Specifically, the Custodian located responsive records when conducting an additional search after the instant complaint was filed. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney’s fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. **Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney’s fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney’s fees, Complainant’s Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13(c).**

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the Council find that:

1. The Custodian unlawfully denied access to the portion of the Complainant’s OPRA request seeking agreements between the Borough of Harrington Park and former police

⁶ The Council makes this determination with the understanding that the Complainant acted on behalf of a bona fide client at the time of the request. Although the Complainant’s status as representing an actual client has been previously challenged, the available evidence on the record is insufficient to address that issue herein. See Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Neptune City Police Dep’t (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-153 (April 2020) and Owoh, Esq. (O.B.O. AADARI) v. Freehold Twp. Police Dep’t (Monmouth), GRC Complaint No. 2018-155 (Interim Order dated September 29, 2020).

Rotimi Owoh, Esq. (on Behalf of African American Data & Research Institute) v. Harrington Park Police Department (Bergen), 2021-274 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Weiner v. Cnty. of Essex, GRC Complaint No. 2013-52 (September 2013) (citing Schneble v. N.J. Dep't of Env'tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008)). Specifically, the Custodian's failure to locate responsive records until after she conducted an additional search following receipt of the Denial of Access Complaint resulted in an insufficient search. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure of the agreements because the Custodian disclosed same to the Complainant on December 6, 2021, as part of the Statement of Information.

2. The Complainant has achieved "the desired result because the complaint brought about a change (voluntary or otherwise) in the custodian's conduct." Teeters v. DYFS, 387 N.J. Super. 423, 432 (App. Div. 2006). Additionally, a factual causal nexus exists between the Complainant's filing of a Denial of Access Complaint and the relief ultimately achieved. Mason v. City of Hoboken and City Clerk of the City of Hoboken, 196 N.J. 51, 76 (2008). Specifically, the Custodian located responsive records when conducting an additional search after the instant complaint was filed. Therefore, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to an award of a reasonable attorney's fee. See N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6, Teeters, 387 N.J. Super. at 432, and Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. **Based on this determination, the parties shall confer in an effort to decide the amount of reasonable attorney's fees to be paid to Complainant within twenty (20) business days. The parties shall promptly notify the GRC in writing if a fee agreement is reached. If the parties cannot agree on the amount of attorney's fees, Complainant's Counsel shall submit a fee application to the Council in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:105-2.13(c).**

Prepared By: Samuel A. Rosado
Staff Attorney

August 22, 2023