From:	FMarshall@njslom.org
To:	mcerra@njlm.org; lbuckelew@njlm.org
Cc:	williamkearns@helmerlegal.com; Trishka@mgplaw.com
Subject:	Bozzi v. Jersey City (Dog License OPRA Case) - Supreme Court Decision
Date:	Monday, September 20, 2021 10:36:01 AM
Attachments:	image001.png image003.png 2021 09 20 - Bozzi v Jersey City NJSC Decision.pdf

---

All,

The NJ Supreme Court released its opinion in Bozzi v. Jersey City, a matter which directly asked the court to review the disclosure of dog licenses under OPRA and whether doing so would violate OPRA's direction to safeguard personal information.

In short, the Court found that there is no reasonable expectation of privacy in owning a dog, therefore there is no reason to exempt the disclosure of this information under OPRA. Owners frequently walk their dogs in public, take them to public places like grooming sessions and vet visits, and because there is no specific exemption in the law preventing disclosure of dog ownership information the Court refuses to create one judicially.

Justin Peierre-Louis wrote a dissenting opinion in which Justice Albin joined. The two dissenting justices have stronger beliefs in protecting privacy and that OPRA "should recognize every citizen's right not to have each and every piece of information provided to the government divulged for reasons that do not further the purpose of OPRA, and the fact that information may be available elsewhere does not eliminate a person's reasonable expectation of privacy altogether."

I will have additional analysis once I more fully review the opinion.

Frank

Frank Marshall, Esq. | Associate General Counsel
New Jersey State League of Municipalities
222 West State Street, Trenton, NJ 08608
609-695-3481 x. 137

NJLM is subject to the Open Public Records Act; any email sent or received may be subject to a records request.