



State of New Jersey

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

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

TAHESHA L. WAY
Lieutenant Governor

JACQUELYN A. SUÁREZ
Acting Commissioner

FINAL DECISION

March 26, 2024 Government Records Council Meeting

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

Complaint No. 2021-341

v.

Pine Valley Police Department (Camden)
Custodian of Record

At the March 26, 2024 public meeting, the Government Records Council (“Council”) considered the March 19, 2024 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. Ms. Amadio performed an insufficient search for responsive records containing the reasons for separation for police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Schneble v. N.J. Dep’t of Env’tl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian disclosed same to the Complainant on February 1, 2022 in conjunction with 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 additional responsive records 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 26th Day of March 2024

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: April 1, 2024

**STATE OF NEW JERSEY
GOVERNMENT RECORDS COUNCIL**

**Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director
March 26, 2024 Council Meeting**

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

GRC Complaint No. 2021-341

v.

**Pine Valley Police Department (Camden)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 the 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: Patricia Hendricks³

Request Received by Custodian: November 7, 2021

Response Made by Custodian: November 17, 2021

GRC Complaint Received: December 16, 2021

Background⁴

Request and Response:

On November 7, 2021, the Complainant submitted an Open Public Records Act (“OPRA”) request to the Borough of Pine Valley (“PV”) seeking the above-mentioned records. On November

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

² Represented by David C. Patterson, Esq., of Maressa Patterson, LLC (Berlin, NJ).

³ Ms. Henricks is the Custodian of Record for the Borough of Pine Hill.

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. Pine Valley Police Department (Camden), 2021-341 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

9, 2021, Dawn T. Amadio, the Records Custodian for PV, responded in writing providing a payroll printout containing personnel information, and stating that no other records exist.

Denial of Access Complaint:

On December 16, 2021, the Complainant filed a Denial of Access Complaint with the Government Records Council (“GRC”). The Complainant asserted that the 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 further asserted that the time to provide a response had elapsed.

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

Statement of Information:

On February 1, 2022, the Custodian for the Borough of Pine Hill (“PH”) filed a Statement of Information (“SOI”). The Custodian certified that as of January 1, 2022, PV was consolidated into PH, and no longer existed. The Custodian certified that no employees from PV were incorporated into PH. The Custodian further certified that PH had no knowledge of the OPRA request at issue until receiving the instant complaint by mail on January 20, 2022.

The Custodian further certified that upon receiving the instant complaint, she located resignation letters from each of the separated officers listed in the payroll record previously provided to the Complainant. The Custodian certified that copies of those letters have been attached to the SOI.

The Custodian argued that because PH had no knowledge of the OPRA request until receiving the complaint, her response should be treated as though PH just received the request. The Custodian argued that PH should not be held responsible for Ms. Amadio’s failure to adequately respond to the Complainant’s OPRA request and should not be assessed attorney’s fees.

Additional Submissions:

On February 4, 2022, the Complainant submitted a brief in response to the Complainant’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)⁵. 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 that PH 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.⁶

On February 9, 2022, Custodian’s Counsel submitted a reply to the GRC. Counsel asserted that the records at issue were PV’s and not PH’s. Counsel also noted that the Complainant failed to address the position taken by PH in the SOI, noting that the Complainant still captioned the matter as being against PV. Counsel further noted that the Complainant failed to inform the Custodian of his issues with the response prior to filing the instant complaint. Counsel therefore argued that sanctioning and assessing attorney’s fees against PV would be improper.

On February 2, 2024, the GRC submitted a request for additional information to the Complainant. Specifically, the GRC requested the Custodian provide copies of any merger agreement between PV and PH.

⁵ Subsequently reversed in Libertarians for Transparent Gov’t v. Cumberland Cnty., 250 N.J. 45 (2022).

⁶ 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. Pine Valley Police Department (Camden), 2021-341 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

On February 7, 2024, the Custodian provided copies of ordinances passed by PV and PH, outlining on the terms of the merger.

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 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).

In the instant matter, Ms. Amadio provided the Complainant with a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information on November 17, 2021. However, the Custodian certified in the SOI that upon receiving the instant complaint, she searched through PV's records and located the resignation letters that should have been included in the original response. Therefore, Ms. Amadio's initial search was incomplete since additional responsive records were located upon a subsequent search by the Custodian. Schneble, GRC 2007-220.

Accordingly, Ms. Amadio performed an insufficient search for responsive records containing the reasons for separation for police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Schneble, GRC 2007-220. However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian disclosed same to the Complainant on February 1, 2022 in conjunction with 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 at the time of separation who either resigned or retired or terminated or otherwise separated from 2014 to the present,” as well as any “agreements” providing the “reason for separation.” Ms. Amadio provided a spreadsheet containing the requested personnel information. The Complainant then filed the instant complaint on December 16, 2021, asserting Ms. Amadio 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. Ms. Amadio provided an insufficient response by conducting an insufficient search for responsive records. Furthermore, PH’s production of additional PV records created the causal nexus between the complaint and the Custodian’s conduct. Mason, 196 N.J. at 76. Accordingly, the Complainant is a prevailing party entitled to attorney’s fees. Although the Custodian argues that PH should not bear the cost of Ms. Amadio’s error, PH’s absorption of PV transfers its responsibilities as the sole existing entity.⁷

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 additional responsive records 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. Ms. Amadio performed an insufficient search for responsive records containing the reasons for separation for police officers. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-6; Schneble v. N.J. Dep’t of

⁷ 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. Pine Valley Police Department (Camden), 2021-341 – Findings and Recommendations of the Executive Director

Envtl. Protection, GRC Complaint No. 2007-220 (April 2008). However, the GRC declines to order disclosure because the Custodian disclosed same to the Complainant on February 1, 2022 in conjunction with 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 additional responsive records 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

March 19, 2024