

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
ATLANTIC COUNTY**

Re: *Barber v. Township of Hamilton, et al.*

**Docket No.: ATL-L-003252-25*

Dear Clerk of the Court:

Please accept for filing the enclosed documents submitted by Plaintiff Devon Tyler Barber, pro se, in the above-captioned matter:

1. **Request for Judicial Notice of Official State Oversight Reports (N.J.R.E. 201);**
2. **Certification of Authenticity of Public Records;**
3. **Exhibit Index;** and
4. **Certification of Service.**

This submission seeks judicial notice of official, publicly available oversight reports issued by the Office of the State Comptroller and the Office of the State Auditor, offered for limited institutional context pursuant to N.J.R.E. 201. No immediate substantive relief is requested by this filing.

All parties have been served in accordance with the New Jersey Court Rules, as reflected in the enclosed Certification of Service.

Thank you for your attention to this filing. Please do not hesitate to contact me if any administrative clarification is required.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Devon Tyler Barber
Devon Tyler Barber, Pro Se
3536 Pacific Avenue, Apt. A5
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
Telephone: (609) 862-8808
Email: dTb33@PM.Me

Date: **December 19, 2025**

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff/Movant, Pro Se
3536 Pacific Avenue, Apt. A5
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
Telephone: (609) 862-8808
Email: dTb33@PM.Me

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
ATLANTIC COUNTY**

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff, Pro Se,

v.

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Docket No.: ATL-L-003252-25

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
OF OFFICIAL STATE OVERSIGHT
REPORTS**

(N.J.R.E. 201)

Plaintiff Devon Tyler Barber respectfully requests that this Court take **judicial notice** of the following **official publications of the State of New Jersey**, pursuant to **N.J.R.E. 201(b)**, as adjudicative facts **not subject to reasonable dispute** because they are derived from **authoritative public records** issued by constitutionally authorized State oversight bodies.

I. MATERIALS SUBJECT TO JUDICIAL NOTICE

Plaintiff requests judicial notice of the **existence, issuance, and contents** (but not the ultimate truth of every underlying factual assertion) of the following public records:

**1. Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) — Police Accountability Project
Supplemental Report (January 9, 2025)**

Title: *Hundreds of NJ Police Departments Wasted More Than \$1 Million on Private Police Training That Promoted Unconstitutional Tactics*

URL: <https://www.nj.gov/comptroller/reports/2025/approved/20250109.shtml>

This report identifies **377 New Jersey government entities**, including **Hamilton Township, Galloway Township, and South Bound Brook Borough**, that expended public funds on **Street**

Cop Training between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023, and documents findings that the training promoted tactics described by the Office of the State Comptroller as **dangerous**, **discriminatory**, and likely unconstitutional.

2. Office of the State Comptroller — Police Accountability Project Report (December 2023)

(Referenced and incorporated by the January 9, 2025 Supplemental Report.)

This report documents deficiencies in the oversight and regulation of private, post-academy police training in New Jersey and identifies **constitutional concerns associated with Street Cop Training materials**, including tactics described as dangerous, discriminatory, and inconsistent with established legal standards.

3. Office of the State Auditor — Department of Law and Public Safety

Attorney General's Law Enforcement Forfeiture Account (AGLEFA) Audit

Audit Period: July 1, 2021 – June 30, 2025

Auditor: David J. Kaschak, State Auditor

This audit identifies systemic deficiencies in the management and transparency of civil asset forfeiture funds, including accounting failures, misuse of funds intended for training, inadequate tracking of non-cash assets such as vehicles, and long-unresolved deficiencies previously identified as early as 2010.

4. Appendix A to the OSC January 9, 2025 Supplemental Report identifies Hamilton

Township, Galloway Township, and South Bound Brook Borough as entities that expended public funds on Street Cop Training during the relevant period.

II. BASIS FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE

Under **N.J.R.E. 201(b)**, a court may judicially notice facts that are:

1. Generally known within the court's territorial jurisdiction; or
2. Capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.

The above materials:

- Are official publications of the **State of New Jersey**;
- Were issued by constitutionally authorized oversight offices;
- Are publicly available on official State websites; and
- Have been acknowledged and cited by the Attorney General and members of the Legislature.

Courts routinely take judicial notice of:

- Auditor reports;
- Comptroller findings; and
- Government accountability publications, without the need for foundational testimony.

III. LIMITED PURPOSE OF NOTICE

Plaintiff does **not** offer these materials to establish that any individual officer committed misconduct in this case solely because of the reports.

Rather, Plaintiff offers these materials for the limited and proper purposes of establishing:

1. The **existence** of documented, statewide deficiencies in:
 - Police training oversight;
 - Supervision;
 - Asset tracking; and
 - Civil forfeiture transparency;
2. The **institutional environment** in which municipal law-enforcement agencies operated during the period relevant to Plaintiff's claims; and
3. The **foreseeability** of constitutional violations where training and oversight failures have been formally identified by State authorities.

This constitutes a restrained and proper use of judicial notice.

IV. RELEVANCE TO THIS ACTION

Plaintiff's claims involve:

- Vehicle seizure and continued retention;
- Law-enforcement discretion;
- Procedural due process;
- Proportionality; and
- Municipal supervision and training.

The noticed materials are relevant to:

- Evaluating assertions of good-faith safeguards;
- Assessing claims of isolated error versus systemic risk; and
- Contextualizing municipal responsibility under **Monell v. Department of Social Services**, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), and analogous New Jersey doctrines.

Procedural Context (Offered Solely for Background; Not for Merits Determination).

Plaintiff further notes the following contextual facts for case-management, discovery preservation, and to explain the present state of the record—without seeking any adjudication of those matters within this Request for Judicial Notice:

1. **South Bound Brook proceedings.** South Bound Brook Borough appears in Appendix A during the same general period in which Plaintiff's driver's license suspension arose from remote proceedings conducted without counsel present and without a meaningful explanation or understanding of plea consequences. This is offered solely as background context relevant to Plaintiff's related procedural posture and is not advanced as proof of any disputed fact herein.
2. **Related proceedings involving Officer Boyd.** Plaintiff provides notice that separate proceedings involving Defendant Officer Stephen Boyd and law-enforcement conduct

occurring in 2024 are currently pending on appeal. Plaintiff does not seek adjudication of those matters in this action, but identifies their existence solely for discovery preservation and institutional context.

3. **OPRA access history.** Plaintiff timely requested body-worn camera footage through OPRA on May 9, 2024. The request was not denied on the merits, but was conditioned on payment of a special service charge that Plaintiff did not pay. Plaintiff states this procedural history solely to explain the absence of body-worn camera footage in the present record.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court:

1. Take judicial notice of the above-identified State oversight reports pursuant to **N.J.R.E. 201**; and
2. Permit Plaintiff to reference these materials as institutional context in support of pending and future motions.

VI. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Plaintiff reserves all rights to:

- Seek discovery related to training, retraining, supervision, and compliance;
- Supplement the record as permitted by rule; and
- Assert additional claims consistent with the evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Devon Tyler Barber
Devon Tyler Barber, Pro Se
Atlantic County, New Jersey

Date: 12/19/2025

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff/Movant, Pro Se
3536 Pacific Avenue, Apt. A5
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
Telephone: (609) 862-8808
Email: dTb33@PM.Me

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
ATLANTIC COUNTY**

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff, Pro Se,

v.

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Docket No.: ATL-L-003252-25

**CERTIFICATION OF
AUTHENTICITY OF PUBLIC
RECORDS**

I, Devon Tyler Barber, certify as follows:

1. The official publications referenced herein and incorporated by reference as Exhibits A through E are **public records issued by the State of New Jersey**, available through publicly accessible State websites or official releases of the Office of the State Comptroller and the Office of the State Auditor.
2. To the extent copies of such publications are provided, they are true and correct copies. To the extent copies are **not physically attached**, Plaintiff relies on their public availability and requests judicial notice of their existence, issuance, and contents pursuant to **N.J.R.E. 201**.
3. Plaintiff submits this certification in good faith and without intent to mislead the Court. Plaintiff is proceeding **pro se and in forma pauperis**, and submits this certification to avoid unnecessary duplication of voluminous public materials already maintained by the State.

I certify that the foregoing statements are true. I am aware that if any statement is willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

/s/ Devon Tyler Barber
Date: 12/19/2025

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff/Movant, Pro Se
3536 Pacific Avenue, Apt. A5
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
Telephone: (609) 862-8808
Email: dTb33@PM.Me

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
ATLANTIC COUNTY**

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff, Pro Se,

v.

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Docket No.: **ATL-L-003252-25**

EXHIBIT INDEX

- **Exhibit A** – Office of the State Comptroller Report (Dec. 2023) – Street Cop Training
- **Exhibit B** – Office of the State Comptroller Supplemental Report (Jan. 9, 2025)
- **Exhibit C** – Appendix A (377 NJ Entities; highlighting Hamilton Township, Galloway Township, and South Bound Brook Borough)
- **Exhibit D** – Office of the State Auditor Report (AGLEFA – Civil Asset Forfeiture)
- **Exhibit E** – Index of Oversight Materials & Contextual Reporting (Media Summaries)

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff/Movant, Pro Se
3536 Pacific Avenue, Apt. A5
Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401
Telephone: (609) 862-8808
Email: dTb33@PM.Me

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
ATLANTIC COUNTY**

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff, Pro Se,

v.

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Docket No.: ATL-L-003252-25

**INDEX OF OVERSIGHT &
CONTEXTUAL MATERIALS
(EXHIBIT E)**

1. **OSC Supplemental Report (Jan. 9, 2025)**
<https://www.nj.gov/comptroller/reports/2025/approved/20250109.shtml>
2. **State Auditor Findings on AGLEFA**
<https://newjerseyglobe.com/state-government/state-auditor-finds-problems-with-attorney-generals-forfeiture-account/>
3. **OSC News Release (Jan. 9, 2025)**
<https://www.nj.gov/comptroller/news/2024/20250109.shtml>
4. **CBS News Coverage**
<https://www.cbsnews.com/newyork/news/new-jersey-police-departments-street-cop-training/>
5. **New Jersey Monitor Coverage**
<https://newjerseymonitor.com/2025/01/09/taxpayers-paid-over-1-million-for-dangerous-police-training-watchdog-finds/>
6. **NJ.com (Historical Asset Forfeiture Oversight)**
<https://www.nj.com/data/2020/01/nj-will-now-track-how-much-money-and-property-cops-take-using-asset-forfeiture.html>

**SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
LAW DIVISION – CIVIL PART
ATLANTIC COUNTY**

DEVON TYLER BARBER,
Plaintiff, Pro Se,

v.

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON, et al.,
Defendants.

Docket No.: ATL-L-003252-25

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

I, Devon Tyler Barber, certify as follows:

1. I am the Plaintiff/Movant in the above-captioned matter and make this certification pursuant to **R. 1:5-2 and R. 1:5-3.**
2. On **December 19, 2025**, I caused a true and correct copy of the following documents to be served upon all counsel of record and/or unrepresented parties in this matter:
 - Request for Judicial Notice of Official State Oversight Reports (N.J.R.E. 201);
 - Certification of Authenticity of Public Records;
 - Exhibit Index.
3. Service was effectuated by the following method(s), as applicable:

X Electronic filing and service through the New Jersey Judiciary Electronic Document Submission (JEDS) system, which provides electronic notice to all registered parties; and/or

X Electronic mail, addressed to counsel of record or designated recipients at the email addresses previously used for service in this matter.
4. This certification is made in good faith to comply with the New Jersey Court Rules governing service of filed papers.

I certify that the foregoing statements are true. I am aware that if any statement is willfully false, I am subject to punishment.

/s/ Devon Tyler Barber
Devon Tyler Barber, Pro Se
Atlantic County, New Jersey
Date: **December 19, 2025**



OSC Hotline: 1-855-OSC-TIPS (672-8477)

Supplemental Report on the High Price of Unregulated Private Police Training

Table of Contents

Posted on - 01/9/2025

- I. [Introduction](#)
- II. [Supplemental Findings](#)
- III. [Supplemental Recommendations](#)

Introduction

On December 6, 2023, the New Jersey Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) published its report, “The High Price of Unregulated Private Police Training to New Jersey” (the December 2023 Report). That Report focused on the 2021 Street Cop Conference hosted by the private police training company Street Cop Training (Street Cop) that was held in Atlantic City, New Jersey, between October 3, 2021 and October 8, 2021 (2021 Conference). As detailed in this report, OSC’s investigation uncovered alarming deficiencies in the police training provided at the 2021 Street Cop Conference and a dangerous and potentially costly gap in the oversight of private post-academy police training in New Jersey.

Since the publication of the December 2023 Report, OSC and the Police Accountability Project have received requests from organizations, out-of-state agencies, and individuals across the country for additional information about its findings. The widespread response to this report has reaffirmed that the lack of regulation of private police training is an issue that impacts not only New Jersey, but law enforcement agencies and communities nationwide.

After this report was published, the New Jersey Office of the Attorney General acted swiftly to develop a retraining program for attendees of the 2021 Conference. On February 18, 2024, the Attorney General issued a Memorandum directing “all current law-enforcement officers who attended, or in any way participated in, the October 2021 Street Cop Training” to attend a three-hour retraining session. He also required officers to “self-report” their attendance at or involvement with the 2021 Conference, and those who failed to do so or failed to attend the retraining could be subject to discipline. [1] On March 14, 2024, more than 240 officers in New Jersey who attended the 2021 Conference were retrained. Discussing this response in an interview, the Attorney General emphasized that it had now been made “very clear to all 38,000 sworn officers and their leadership that no one should be attending Street Cop Training in the State of New Jersey.” [2]

In continuing to investigate, OSC received and reviewed thousands of additional documents from Street Cop and other sources. Based on this information, OSC was able to compile a more comprehensive list of police departments and law enforcement agencies in New Jersey that used public funds to pay for training provided by Street Cop between January 2019 and March 2023. Among other things, the documents reviewed support Street Cop’s previous assertion that public funds are the primary source of funding for officers’ attendance at its training classes and the 2021 Conference. The documents also included a significant amount of information about public funds spent on Street Cop training by out-of-state law enforcement agencies.

In light of the significant public interest in disclosing this information and to further promote transparency and accountability, OSC has determined it is necessary to publish this supplemental report. [3] OSC also reiterates its recommendations from the original December 2023 Report and provides supplemental recommendations below to address its subsequent findings.

Supplemental Findings

A. Over one million dollars in public funds in New Jersey was spent on Street Cop training courses and events between January 2019 and March 2023.

Over one million dollars in public funds was spent by police departments and law enforcement agencies in New Jersey on courses and events hosted by Street Cop training between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023. This one million dollars represents at least 377 police departments and law enforcement agencies from New Jersey that spent some amount of public funds, predominantly for tuition costs, on Street Cop training during that timeframe. [4] This list includes municipalities from all 21 counties in New Jersey. [5] It also includes county and state agencies (including New Jersey State Police), as well as public universities and interstate agencies that provided some amount of public funds to Street Cop. [6]

For a list of the government entities in New Jersey that spent public funds to send their officers to Street Cop training, see **Appendix A** to this supplemental report.

B. At least 32 departments and agencies in New Jersey spent additional public funds on Street Cop training after having an officer attend the 2021 Street Cop Conference.

OSC found that at least 32 New Jersey police departments and law enforcement agencies who had officers confirmed as having attended the 2021 Street Cop Conference continued to spend public funds on Street Cop training courses or events. In other words, because the officers in attendance at the 2021 Conference, many of whom were supervisors, failed to recognize or report that the training they received was problematic, many of their departments and agencies continued to spend public funds on courses and events hosted by the company. ^[7] Even state agencies were not immune from this problem. The State of New Jersey spent over \$3,000 for officers from three state agencies to attend additional training provided by Street Cop after the 2021 Conference, where not a single officer reported anything of concern. ^[8]

As discussed more fully in OSC's December 2023 Report, continuing to send officers to this kind of training could have implications under the New Jersey Law Prohibiting Discrimination, the New Jersey State Policy Prohibiting Discrimination in the Workplace, and other laws, directives, and policies intended to address these concerns.

For a list of law enforcement agencies that spent public funds to send their officers to Street Cop training after having an officer attend the 2021 Street Cop Conference, see **Appendix B** to this supplemental report.

C. Twenty New Jersey officers were registered to attend the 2024 Street Cop Conference.

Street Cop's records indicated that officers from New Jersey attended the 2024 Street Cop Conference even after it was made clear to them by the New Jersey Attorney General that, due to the problems identified with the training, they should not be attending Street Cop courses going forward. Despite this clear instruction, at least 20 New Jersey officers appeared on Street Cop's registration lists for the 2024 Street Cop Conference, which was held in Florida in April. This included New Jersey law enforcement officers from multiple municipal police departments, one county agency, and one state agency in New Jersey.

Some of those New Jersey officers came from departments and agencies that attended the 2021 Street Cop Conference in Atlantic City or that regularly attended other Street Cop training classes. Notably, nine of these officers used their official law enforcement email addresses to register for the 2024 Conference. OSC did not confirm attendance or whether public funds were spent to send them or if the officers paid for the training themselves. Both are problematic under the circumstances.

Given the serious implications of this information, the names of these officers and their departments and agencies have been provided to the Attorney General's Office for further investigation or action, as needed.

D. Street Cop's records indicate that problematic training and content was not limited to the 2021 Conference.

Given the extent of the unacceptable content at the 2021 Conference, and the fact that Street Cop training classes are typically paid for by an officer's sending agency, OSC sought to understand whether other trainings provided by Street Cop raised similar concerns. OSC has now reviewed a small sample of additional video clips of other classes hosted by Street Cop, as well as other documents, class surveys, and records from the company. While OSC has not been able to view video footage from all of the events and courses that New Jersey law enforcement officers have attended with Street Cop training since 2019, OSC found compelling evidence that the content of the 2021 Conference was largely representative of the company's training style. ^[9]

The information reviewed also presented additional concerns about New Jersey law enforcement officers' attendance at Street Cop trainings. One email exchange that OSC reviewed suggested that Street Cop would be willing to assist officers in hiding their attendance or non-attendance at Street Cop courses or events, if that request was made by the officer-attendee. In 2020, a company employee or instructor wrote they might have to deal with a law enforcement agency that "has told their people not to come to our training and could give them a hard time," lamenting that they "don't need guys who are trying to better themselves getting their balls busted at work." The same company employee or instructor also wrote that if an officer was registered to attend one of the company's courses, but ultimately did not attend, Street Cop would not disclose that information if contacted by the officer's department or agency regarding attendance.

Even more troubling, the new information raised red flags about Street Cop's instructors who are active law enforcement officers in New Jersey. Prior to and after OSC published its December 2023 Report, there were multiple communications from Street Cop instructors, including those that are active New Jersey law enforcement, to Street Cop administrative staff attempting to hide their involvement with the company and keep their training materials from getting "out there." In one instance, an instructor who is an active state trooper in New Jersey requested to continue to sell his on-demand courses through the company, but without having it publicly advertised on the company's website to "avoid any scrutiny from NJ." ^[10] OSC also became aware of multiple instances in which police departments or other agencies or entities had requested case law or other materials from Street Cop related to defending themselves in litigation or in support of the training that their officers had received from the company. One department that operates in New Jersey requested information from the company in 2023 because they were "working on defending officers in a lawsuit."

E. Nationally, 49 states spent public funds to send their officers to Street Cop training courses and events between January 2019 and March 2023.

In the course of its continuing investigation and in searching for information relevant to New Jersey, OSC encountered documents and records that pertained to out-of-state law enforcement agencies. OSC found records which indicated that 49 states, including New Jersey, provided some amount of public funds to Street Cop from January 1, 2019 to March 13, 2023. It appears that these funds came from at least 2,721 government entities nationwide. The only state not represented in the records that OSC reviewed was Hawaii.

OSC's statutes direct OSC to make referrals to "other appropriate authorities for further civil or administrative action." See N.J.S.A. 52:15C-12. In view of the importance of OSC's findings in the December 2023 Report and in this report, OSC has published the list of government entities on the OSC website as a public referral. This will allow any and all appropriate out-of-state authorities to confirm officer attendance and take any other action deemed necessary.

For the national list of government entities that appear to have sent public funds to Street Cop between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023, see **Appendix C** to this supplemental report.

Supplemental Recommendations

Given these supplemental findings, OSC has made additional referrals to the Office of the Attorney General and Division on Civil Rights. OSC also reiterates its previous recommendations as set out in the December 2023 Report, including the recommendation that post-academy police training should be regulated. Multiple police departments emphasized to OSC that they were unaware of the deficiencies with the training provided by Street Cop and lacked effective mechanisms and resources to vet appropriate police training for their officers. This further underscores that there is a need for a dedicated entity to oversee post-academy training, including establishing uniform standards and reviewing and approving training courses provided by private companies, instructors, and vendors who receive public funds in New Jersey. OSC also extends its previous recommendation about the need to retrain New Jersey law enforcement attendees of the 2021 Conference to apply to all attendees of other Street Cop training classes.

Footnotes

- [1] According to the February 18, 2024 memorandum from the Attorney General to all New Jersey law enforcement, the retraining was to include “legal training on the Fourth Amendment and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination,” as well as “discussion between the Attorney General and guest presenters who will speak about their experience as survivors of law enforcement shootings.”
- [2] Attorney General Matthew J. Platkin discussed in a CBS NY television interview the response by the NJ Office of Attorney General to the findings in OSC’s December 2023 Report. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l8lhimw84E8>.
- [3] OSC sent a discussion draft of this Supplemental Report to Street Cop and to the Office of the Attorney General, as well as notice to county, municipal, university, and interstate law enforcement agencies throughout New Jersey that are named in Appendix A or B.
- [4] Records OSC reviewed revealed that ten additional law enforcement officers from New Jersey appear to have attended the 2021 Street Cop Conference that were not included in documents previously provided to OSC. The additional names have been provided to the Attorney General’s Office to ensure an appropriate response to the extent that these officers did not self-report their attendance.
- [5] Some police departments in New Jersey are part of shared services agreements to provide services to two or more municipalities. For this reason, the list of government entities that spent public funds on Street Cop training does not necessarily reflect all of the municipalities in New Jersey that are impacted by having officers trained by the company.
- [6] It is important to note that some agencies may have sent a single officer to train with Street Cop during this timeframe. This was the case with one state university’s police department, which reported to OSC that it only sent a single officer in 2019 and that officer is no longer employed by the university. By contrast, OSC found that other agencies repeatedly sent multiple officers to attend Street Cop training classes over the same time period.
- [7] Notably, a Camden County-based police department reached out to OSC to report the substantial efforts it has undertaken to address concerns about attendance by its officers at Street Cop training classes and events. These efforts included creating a customized remedial training program within the department that went beyond the retraining mandated by the Attorney General, retraining all officers from the department who attended any Street Cop training course in addition to the 2021 Conference, and implementing command reviews of private police training vendors attended by their officers, among other measures.
- [8] Records reviewed by OSC reflect that, since 2018, the State of New Jersey has spent over \$10,000 to send law enforcement officers from New Jersey State Police (NJSP), the New Jersey Department of Human Services, and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection - State Park Police to Street Cop training courses and events.
- [9] As noted in OSC’s December 2023 Report, Street Cop itself represented in a sworn court filing in a lawsuit against OSC that the Conference was “standard fare” for the company. The CEO of Street Cop also made comments during his presentation at the 2021 Conference that he “stick[s] to [his] program” and that his presentation—that was found to include numerous discriminatory and harassing remarks about protected categories and legally incorrect statements about the import of a suspect’s refusal to consent to a search—would act as a “good refresher, a good reminder” for those who had seen it before.
- [10] Records reviewed by OSC reflect that, in early 2022, the trooper was given approval by NJSP to teach with Street Cop. That approval was not revoked by NJSP until the end of November 2023—just over a week before OSC published its initial report. In denying continuing approval for the trooper to subcontract as an instructor with Street Cop, NJSP explained “there is a conflict of interest ethically in the opinions and comments that have been made by some Street Cop instructors and opinions that have been previously publicly endorsed by Street Cop Training.” Because the “views that have been discussed touched on discriminatory, harassing, and lewd behaviors as well as being contradictory to state mandated training and policing initiatives,” NJSP found the training and approval of outside employment through Street Cop Training by NJSP employees to be inconsistent with both NJSP and Attorney General standards of conduct and the State Uniform Ethics Code.

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Atlantic (15)	Absecon City
Atlantic	Atlantic City
Atlantic	Brigantine City
Atlantic	Egg Harbor City
Atlantic	Egg Harbor Township
Atlantic	Galloway Township
Atlantic	Hamilton Township
Atlantic	Hammonton Town
Atlantic	Linwood City
Atlantic	Longport Borough
Atlantic	Mullica Township
Atlantic	Northfield City
Atlantic	Pleasantville City
Atlantic	Somers Point City
Atlantic	Ventnor City
Bergen (59)	Allendale Borough
Bergen	Bergen County
Bergen	Bergenfield Borough
Bergen	Carlstadt Borough
Bergen	Cliffside Park Borough
Bergen	Cresskill Borough
Bergen	Demarest Borough
Bergen	Dumont Borough
Bergen	East Rutherford Borough
Bergen	Edgewater Borough
Bergen	Elmwood Park Borough
Bergen	Emerson Borough
Bergen	Englewood Cliffs Borough
Bergen	Fort Lee Borough
Bergen	Franklin Lakes Borough
Bergen	Garfield City
Bergen	Glen Rock Borough
Bergen	Hackensack City
Bergen	Hasbrouck Heights Borough
Bergen	Haworth Borough
Bergen	Hillsdale Borough
Bergen	Ho-Ho-Kus Borough
Bergen	Leonia Borough
Bergen	Little Ferry Borough
Bergen	Lodi Borough
Bergen	Lyndhurst Township
Bergen	Mahwah Township
Bergen	Maywood Borough
Bergen	Midland Park Borough
Bergen	Montvale Borough

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Bergen	Moonachie Borough
Bergen	New Milford Borough
Bergen	North Arlington Borough
Bergen	Northvale Borough
Bergen	Oakland Borough
Bergen	Old Tappan Borough
Bergen	Oradell Borough
Bergen	Palisades Park Borough
Bergen	Paramus Borough
Bergen	Park Ridge Borough
Bergen	Ramsey Borough
Bergen	Ridgefield Borough
Bergen	Ridgefield Park Village
Bergen	Ridgewood Village
Bergen	River Edge Borough
Bergen	River Vale Township
Bergen	Rochelle Park Township
Bergen	Rutherford Borough
Bergen	Saddle River Borough
Bergen	South Hackensack Township
Bergen	Teaneck Township
Bergen	Tenafly Borough
Bergen	Upper Saddle River Borough
Bergen	Waldwick Borough
Bergen	Wallington Borough
Bergen	Washington Township
Bergen	Woodcliff Lake Borough
Bergen	Wood-Ridge Borough
Bergen	Wyckoff Township
Burlington (21)	Beverly City
Burlington	Bordentown Township
Burlington	Burlington County
Burlington	Burlington Township
Burlington	Cinnaminson Township
Burlington	Delanco Township
Burlington	Eastampton Township
Burlington	Edgewater Park Township
Burlington	Florence Township
Burlington	Lumberton Township
Burlington	Mansfield Township
Burlington	Maple Shade Township
Burlington	Medford Township
Burlington	Moorestown Township
Burlington	Mount Holly Township
Burlington	Mount Laurel Township

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Burlington	New Hanover Township
Burlington	North Hanover Township
Burlington	Pemberton Township
Burlington	Riverside Township
Burlington	Willingboro Township
Camden (22)	Audubon Borough
Camden	Barrington Borough
Camden	Bellmawr Borough
Camden	Berlin Borough
Camden	Berlin Township
Camden	Brooklawn Borough
Camden	Camden County
Camden	Cherry Hill Township
Camden	Chesilhurst Borough
Camden	Collingswood Borough
Camden	Gloucester City
Camden	Gloucester Township
Camden	Haddon Heights Borough
Camden	Haddon Township
Camden	Mount Ephraim Borough
Camden	Oaklyn Borough
Camden	Pennsauken Township
Camden	Pine Hill Borough
Camden	Runnemede Borough
Camden	Stratford Borough
Camden	Waterford Township
Camden	Winslow Township
Cape May (4)	Avalon Borough
Cape May	North Wildwood City
Cape May	Wildwood City
Cape May	Wildwood Crest Borough
Cumberland (2)	Millville City
Cumberland	Vineland City
Essex (19)	Belleville Township
Essex	Bloomfield Township
Essex	Cedar Grove Township
Essex	East Orange City
Essex	Essex County
Essex	Essex Fells Borough
Essex	Fairfield Township
Essex	Glen Ridge Borough
Essex	Livingston Township
Essex	Maplewood Township
Essex	Millburn Township
Essex	Montclair Township

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Essex	Newark City
Essex	North Caldwell Borough
Essex	Nutley Township
Essex	Orange Township City
Essex	Roseland Borough
Essex	Verona Township
Essex	West Orange Township
Gloucester (18)	Clayton Borough
Gloucester	Deptford Township
Gloucester	East Greenwich Township
Gloucester	Elk Township
Gloucester	Franklin Township
Gloucester	Glassboro Borough
Gloucester	Greenwich Township
Gloucester	Harrison Township
Gloucester	Logan Township
Gloucester	Mantua Township
Gloucester	Paulsboro Borough
Gloucester	South Harrison Township
Gloucester	Washington Township
Gloucester	West Deptford Township
Gloucester	Westville Borough
Gloucester	Woodbury City
Gloucester	Woodbury Heights Borough
Gloucester	Woolwich Township
Hudson (11)	Bayonne City
Hudson	Guttenberg Town
Hudson	Harrison Town
Hudson	Hoboken City
Hudson	Hudson County
Hudson	Kearny Town
Hudson	North Bergen Township
Hudson	Secaucus Town
Hudson	Union City
Hudson	Weehawken Township
Hudson	West New York Town
Hunterdon (8)	Clinton Township
Hunterdon	Flemington Borough
Hunterdon	Frenchtown Borough
Hunterdon	High Bridge Borough
Hunterdon	Holland Township
Hunterdon	Hunterdon County
Hunterdon	Lebanon Township
Hunterdon	Readington Township
Mercer (12)	East Windsor Township

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Mercer	Ewing Township
Mercer	Hamilton Township
Mercer	Hightstown Borough
Mercer	Hopewell Township
Mercer	Lawrence Township
Mercer	Mercer County
Mercer	Pennington Borough
Mercer	Princeton Municipality
Mercer	Robbinsville Township
Mercer	Trenton City
Mercer	West Windsor Township
Middlesex (17)	Carteret Borough
Middlesex	Dunellen Borough
Middlesex	East Brunswick Township
Middlesex	Edison Township
Middlesex	Highland Park Borough
Middlesex	Jamesburg Borough
Middlesex	Metuchen Borough
Middlesex	Middlesex Borough
Middlesex	Middlesex County
Middlesex	Milltown Borough
Middlesex	New Brunswick City
Middlesex	North Brunswick Township
Middlesex	Old Bridge Township
Middlesex	Perth Amboy City
Middlesex	Plainsboro Township
Middlesex	South Amboy City
Middlesex	South River Borough
Monmouth (33)	Aberdeen Township
Monmouth	Allenhurst Borough
Monmouth	Allentown Borough
Monmouth	Asbury Park City
Monmouth	Avon-By-The-Sea Borough
Monmouth	Belmar Borough
Monmouth	Brielle Borough
Monmouth	Colts Neck Township
Monmouth	Eatontown Borough
Monmouth	Fair Haven Borough
Monmouth	Freehold Township
Monmouth	Hazlet Township
Monmouth	Highlands Borough
Monmouth	Holmdel Township
Monmouth	Howell Township
Monmouth	Keyport Borough
Monmouth	Long Branch City

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Monmouth	Marlboro Township
Monmouth	Matawan Borough
Monmouth	Middletown Township
Monmouth	Monmouth Beach Borough
Monmouth	Monmouth County
Monmouth	Ocean Township
Monmouth	Oceanport Borough
Monmouth	Red Bank Borough
Monmouth	Sea Bright Borough
Monmouth	Sea Girt Borough
Monmouth	Shrewsbury Borough
Monmouth	Spring Lake Borough
Monmouth	Spring Lake Heights Borough
Monmouth	Tinton Falls Borough
Monmouth	Union Beach Borough
Monmouth	West Long Branch Borough
Morris (36)	Boonton Town
Morris	Boonton Township
Morris	Butler Borough
Morris	Chatham Borough
Morris	Chatham Township
Morris	Chester Township
Morris	Denville Township
Morris	Dover Town
Morris	East Hanover Township
Morris	Florham Park Borough
Morris	Hanover Township
Morris	Harding Township
Morris	Jefferson Township
Morris	Kinnelon Borough
Morris	Lincoln Park Borough
Morris	Long Hill Township
Morris	Madison Borough
Morris	Mendham Borough
Morris	Mendham Township
Morris	Montville Township
Morris	Morris County
Morris	Morris Plains Borough
Morris	Morris Township
Morris	Morristown Town
Morris	Mount Arlington Borough
Morris	Mount Olive Township
Morris	Mountain Lakes Borough
Morris	Netcong Borough
Morris	Parsippany Township

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Morris	Pequannock Township
Morris	Randolph Township
Morris	Riverdale Borough
Morris	Rockaway Borough
Morris	Rockaway Township
Morris	Roxbury Township
Morris	Wharton Borough
Ocean (23)	Barneget Township
Ocean	Bay Head Borough
Ocean	Beach Haven Borough
Ocean	Beachwood Borough
Ocean	Brick Township
Ocean	Harvey Cedars Borough
Ocean	Lacey Township
Ocean	Lakewood Township
Ocean	Lavallette Borough
Ocean	Little Egg Harbor Township
Ocean	Manchester Township
Ocean	Ocean County
Ocean	Ocean Gate Borough
Ocean	Ocean Township
Ocean	Plumsted Township
Ocean	Point Pleasant Beach Borough
Ocean	Point Pleasant Borough
Ocean	Seaside Park Borough
Ocean	Ship Bottom Borough
Ocean	South Toms River Borough
Ocean	Stafford Township
Ocean	Surf City Borough
Ocean	Toms River Township
Passaic (12)	Bloomingdale Borough
Passaic	Haledon Borough
Passaic	Hawthorne Borough
Passaic	Little Falls Township
Passaic	North Haledon Borough
Passaic	Passaic County
Passaic	Pompton Lakes Borough
Passaic	Prospect Park Borough
Passaic	Wanaque Borough
Passaic	Wayne Township
Passaic	West Milford Township
Passaic	Woodland Park Borough
Salem (5)	Carneys Point Township
Salem	Penns Grove Borough
Salem	Pennsville Township

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Salem	Salem City
Salem	Woodstown Borough
Somerset (16)	Bedminster Township
Somerset	Bernards Township
Somerset	Bernardsville Borough
Somerset	Branchburg Township
Somerset	Bridgewater Township
Somerset	Far Hills Borough
Somerset	Hillsborough Township
Somerset	Manville Borough
Somerset	Montgomery Township
Somerset	North Plainfield Borough
Somerset	Peapack and Gladstone Borough
Somerset	Raritan Borough
Somerset	Somerset County
Somerset	South Bound Brook Borough
Somerset	Warren Township
Somerset	Watchung Borough
Sussex (10)	Andover Township
Sussex	Byram Township
Sussex	Franklin Borough
Sussex	Hamburg Borough
Sussex	Hardyston Township
Sussex	Hopatcong Borough
Sussex	Newton Town
Sussex	Sparta Township
Sussex	Sussex County
Sussex	Vernon Township
Union (16)	Berkeley Heights Township
Union	Clark Township
Union	Cranford Township
Union	Elizabeth City
Union	Fanwood Borough
Union	Garwood Borough
Union	Hillside Township
Union	Kenilworth Borough
Union	Linden City
Union	New Providence Borough
Union	Plainfield City
Union	Rahway City
Union	Roselle Borough
Union	Summit City
Union	Union County
Union	Westfield Town
Warren (8)	Belvidere Town

Appendix A:
377 NJ Entities That Spent Public Funds on Street Cop Training
Between January 1, 2019 and March 13, 2023

Counties (21)	Local Governments (367)
Warren	Blairstown Township
Warren	Hackettstown Town
Warren	Independence Township
Warren	Lopatcong Township
Warren	Phillipsburg Town
Warren	Pohatcong Township
Warren	Warren County

State Department/ Agency (4)
New Jersey Department of Human Services
New Jersey State Park Police
New Jersey State Police
New Jersey Transit

State Colleges and Universities (4)
Rutgers State University of New Jersey- New Brunswick
William Paterson University
New Jersey Institute of Technology
Rowan University

Interstate Agencies (2)
Delaware River Port Authority of Pennsylvania and New Jersey
Palisades Interstate Parkway Police

Hundreds of NJ Police Departments Wasted More Than \$1 Million on Private Police Training That Promoted Unconstitutional Tactics

A supplemental report by the Office of State Comptroller finds far more police departments in New Jersey – and across the country – paid for Street Cop Training than previously known.

Posted on - 01/9/2025



TRENTON—A report finds that 377 New Jersey police departments and law enforcement agencies together paid more than \$1 million for private police training hosted by Street Cop Training, a company previously found to have taught discriminatory and likely unconstitutional tactics, [according to a supplemental report by the Office of the State Comptroller](#) (OSC).

[A December 2023 report](#) by OSC’s Police Accountability Project revealed that Street Cop Training’s 2021 training conference, attended by nearly 1,000 officers, many from New Jersey, taught dangerous, improper, and likely illegal policing tactics. As a result, the New Jersey Attorney General required that all New Jersey attendees be retrained and said New Jersey officers should not attend any Street Cop Training courses and events in the future.

OSC’s new, supplemental report was based on a review of thousands of documents, including many produced by Street Cop after protracted litigation. OSC found that [police departments from all 21 New Jersey counties, as well as from public universities, and state-wide, county, and interstate agencies](#), spent more than \$1 million in public funds on Street Cop Training courses and events from December 1, 2019 through March 13, 2023. Records revealed that at least 20 New Jersey officers apparently disregarded the Attorney General’s instruction and registered for the 2024 Street Cop Conference in Florida. (OSC has made referrals to the Attorney General.)

Overall, [2,721 government entities from 49 states, including New Jersey, have paid for Street Cop Training courses and events](#), OSC found. OSC has published the list of entities as a public referral.

“Our original report exposed the dangerous gap in regulation and oversight of private, post-academy police training in New Jersey. This supplemental report shows the problem is bigger than we previously reported, and it has not gone away,” said **Acting State Comptroller Kevin Walsh**. “When there are hundreds of law enforcement agencies spending public funds on clearly subpar training, and some are even repeat customers, the risks to public safety are high.”

“It is critical that the training our law enforcement officers receive corresponds to the directives, policies, and best practices that have been implemented. I commend the Office of the State Comptroller and Acting Comptroller Kevin Walsh for investigating and bringing to light the use of public funds on trainings that endorse unconstitutional policing tactics, glorification of violence, and denigration of women and people of color,” said **Attorney General Matthew J. Platkin**. “In response to the original report by the Office of the State Comptroller, I mandated all law enforcement personnel who attended Street Cop Training to receive supplemental instruction. My office also ordered that LPS not fund any attendance at Street Cop Training and encouraged all local law enforcement to cease participation as well. In addition, I also directed the Division on Civil Rights (DCR) to review the report for any potential civil rights violations. The updated information in the recent OSC report will be referred to DCR for additional consideration and to the employing agencies to implement any additional retraining.”

Currently, the State of New Jersey relies on officers to report when private police training is improper, but OSC’s supplemental report shows this strategy is ineffective. Among the findings:

- [At least 32 New Jersey police departments and agencies](#) were repeat customers spending funds on Street Cop Training even after officers attended the 2021 Conference, where [the presentations were riddled with discriminatory, harassing, and lewd remarks](#), among other problematic content. (Street Cop Training’s CEO has previously said that the 2021 conference was “standard fare” for the company.)
- Internal company records indicated that Street Cop was willing to help officers hide their attendance at courses/events or their involvement as instructors. In one instance, an active New Jersey State Police trooper requested to continue to sell his on-demand courses without it being advertised on the company website to “avoid any scrutiny” from New Jersey.
- Internal records show multiple police departments and agencies, including an agency that operates in New Jersey, requested case law or other materials from Street Cop to help defend officers from lawsuits, OSC found.

I am requesting body camera footage and copies of oaths of office for agents, officers, and supervisors involved in an incident on May 7, 2024, at 4620 Black Horse Pike, Mays Landing, NJ.



X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family) made this OPRA request to [Hamilton Township \(Atlantic\)](#).

Automatic anti-spam measures are in place for this older request. Please [let us know](#) if a further response is expected or if you are having trouble responding.

Follow

1 follower



Waiting for an **internal review** by [Hamilton Township \(Atlantic\)](#) of their handling of this request.



X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family) May 08, 2024



Unknown

To Whom It May Concern at the Township of Hamilton in Hamilton Township, Atlantic County, New Jersey State:

I hereby submit a request for public records under the New Jersey Open Public Records Act (OPRA) and the common law right of access. I am not required to use an official form for this request; however, please acknowledge receipt of this message.

SUBJECT: Formal OPRA Request for Public Records Concerning Incident on May 7, 2024

Dear Court Clerk and Custodian of Records,

I am formally requesting access to public records pursuant to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1 et seq., related to an incident that occurred on May 7, 2024, during the early afternoon hours. Specifically, I seek the following records:

1. Body camera footage from each responding unit, officer, and supervisor present at the scene of the incident at 4620 Black Horse Pike, Mays Landing, New Jersey, United States of America.
2. Copies of the oath of office for all responding Township of Hamilton public employees, officers, foreign agents, and supervisors present at the scene of the incident at 4620 Black Horse Pike, Mays Landing, New Jersey, United States of America.

I am willing to cover any reasonable fees associated with the search and copying of these records. However, I request a waiver of these fees on the basis that the release of this information serves the public interest and will significantly

12/19/25, 10:18 AM

I am requesting body camera footage and copies of oaths of office for agents, officers, and supervisors involved in an incident on...

enhance public understanding of the incident in question, particularly concerning allegations of excessive force.

According to the New Jersey Open Public Records Act, you are required to respond to this request within seven business days. Should there be any expected delay beyond this period, I would appreciate timely communication regarding the revised timeline for fulfilling this request.

Should any portion of this request be denied, please provide specific details regarding the exemptions being applied and instructions for the appeals process as stipulated by law.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter and for your cooperation in processing my request.

Sincerely,
Barber, Devon Tyler

— Smith, Wade, May 14, 2024

Sir,

The Township of Hamilton received your Open Public Records Act request on May 9, 2024. Your response is being provided on May 14, 2024.

Request:

1. Body camera footage from each responding unit, officer, and supervisor present at the scene of the incident at 4620 Black Horse Pike on May 7, 2024
2. Copies of the oath of office for all responding Township of Hamilton public employee, officer, foreign agent, and supervisors present at the scene of the incident at 4620 Black Horse Pike on May 7, 2024.

Response:

1. In order for your request for body worn camera video from the incident to be released there is a fee required in order to review, redact, and supervisory review the video footage. In this case there is 153 minutes of footage which requires a fee of \$267.78 (including disk, envelope, and postage). Please submit payment made to the order of the Township of Hamilton in this amount for the video to be provided. In your reply kindly reference OPRA 1962.
2. Your request for the Oath of Office is denied pursuant to NJSA 47:1A1.1 Personal information. However, the names of the Officers, title and date of oath are being provided below.

Officer Name Oath Date
 Officer Stephen Boyd 1/2/2020
 Sergeant Craig Clayton 9/18/2006
 Officer Samantha Liepe 7/31/2023
 Special Officer Arthur Train 9/25/2013

Detective Lawrence Murray 7/15/2013

Officer John McColgan 7/29/2019

Sgt. Wade Smith

Sgt. Wade Smith

1. All government records are subject to public access under the Open Public Records Act ("OPRA"), unless specifically exempt.
2. A request for access to a government record under OPRA must be in writing, hand-delivered, mailed, transmitted electronically, or otherwise conveyed to the appropriate custodian. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.g. The seven (7) business day response time does not commence until the records custodian receives the request form. If you submit the request form to any other officer or employee of the Township of Hamilton, that officer or employee must either forward the request to the appropriate custodian, or direct you to the appropriate custodian. N.J.S.A. 47:1A-5.h.
3. Requestors may submit requests anonymously. If you elect not to provide a name, address, or telephone number, or other means of contact, the custodian is not required to respond until you reappear before the custodian seeking a response to the original request.
4. The fees for duplication of a government record in printed form are listed on the front of this form. We will notify you of any special service charges or other additional charges authorized by State law or regulation before processing your request. Payment shall be made by cash, check or money order payable to the Township of Hamilton.
5. You may be charged a 50% or other deposit when a request for copies exceeds \$25. The Township of Hamilton custodian will contact you and advise you of any deposit requirements. You agree to pay the balance due upon delivery of the records. Anonymous requests in excess of \$5.00 require a deposit of 100% of estimated fees.

6. Under OPRA, a custodian must deny access to a person who has been convicted of an indictable offense in New Jersey, any other state, or the United States, and who is seeking government records containing personal information pertaining to the person's victim or the victim's family. This includes anonymous requests for said information.

7. By law, the Township of Hamilton must notify you that it grants or denies a request for access to government records within seven (7) business days after the agency custodian of records receives the request. If the record requested is not currently available or is in storage, the custodian will advise you within seven (7) business days after receipt of the request when the record can be made available and the estimated cost for reproduction.

8. You may be denied access to a government record if your request would substantially disrupt agency operations and the custodian is unable to reach a reasonable solution with you.

9. If the Township of Hamilton is unable to comply with your request for access to a government record, the custodian will indicate the reasons for denial on the request form or other written correspondence and send you a signed and dated copy.

10. Except as otherwise provided by law or by agreement with the requester, if the agency custodian of records fails to respond to you within seven (7) business days of receiving a request, the failure to respond is a deemed denial of your request.

11. If your request for access to a government record has been denied or unfilled within the seven (7) business days required by law, you have a right to challenge the decision by the Township of Hamilton to deny access. At your option, you may either institute a proceeding in the Superior Court of New Jersey or file a complaint with the Government Records Council ("GRC") by completing the Denial of Access Complaint Form. You may contact the GRC by toll-free telephone at 866-850-0511, by mail at PO Box 819, Trenton, NJ, 08625, by e-mail at [1][**email address**], or at their web site at [2]www.state.nj.us/grc. The Council can also answer other questions about the law. All questions regarding complaints filed in Superior Court should be directed to the Court Clerk in your County.

12. Information provided on this form may be subject to disclosure under the Open Public Records Act.

12/19/25, 10:18 AM

I am requesting body camera footage and copies of oaths of office for agents, officers, and supervisors involved in an incident on...

References

Visible links

1. mailto:[**email address**]

2. <http://securemail.townshipofhamilton.com...> (http://securemail.townshipofhamilton.com:32224/?

dmVyPTEuMDAxJiY4NjA5MzdYWFkOWI4ZDdhNz02MDA3MEEyRV80MzEzMV81OTgxXzEmJjU4NDcyOGRhZGFhODJmND0xMjZiZiZ1cmw9aHR0cCUzQSUYRiUyRnd3dyUyRXN0YXRlJTJFbmolMkV1cyUyRmdyYw==)



X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family) **May 14, 2024**



Unknown

Dear SGT. Smith, Wade,

Subject: Re: OPRA Request 1962 – Fee Dispute and Access to Oath of Office

I am writing in response to your communication regarding the fee for access to body-worn camera footage and the denial of my request for the complete Oath of Office documents.

1. Regarding the Fee for Body-Worn Camera Footage:

The imposed fee of \$267.78 for the processing of 153 minutes of footage seems excessively high and potentially prohibitive. Supreme Court case law supports the notion that such fees should not be unreasonable or burdensome. In multiple rulings, the Court has emphasized that access to public records and transparency should not be hindered by excessive fees. Therefore, I kindly request a detailed breakdown of these charges and ask for reconsideration to ensure that the fee reflects only the reasonable direct cost of producing the footage.

2. Regarding the Oath of Office:

I must contest the decision to classify the Oath of Office as personal information. An Oath of Office is a public declaration of a public servant's commitment to uphold the law and serve the community. As such, it does not qualify as personal information under NJSA 47:1A-1.1 or any other statute. It is a document that is inherently public and should be readily accessible to the citizens whom the officeholder has sworn to serve. I respectfully request that you provide the full document as per the stipulations of the Open Public Records Act (OPRA).

I appreciate your attention to these matters and look forward to your prompt and favorable resolution. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family)



X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family) **May 17, 2024**



Unknown

Thank you for your response and for providing the names, titles, and dates of the oaths of office for the officers listed.

However, I would like to clarify and reiterate my request for the full copies of the oaths of office. According to N.J.S.A. 47:1A-1.1, specifically under the Open Public Records Act (OPRA), the statute states:

12/19/25, 10:18 AM

I am requesting body camera footage and copies of oaths of office for agents, officers, and supervisors involved in an incident on...

> "Any copy of an oath of allegiance, oath of office or any affirmation taken upon assuming the duties of any public office, or that oath or affirmation, taken by a current or former officer or employee in any public office or position in this State or in any county or municipality of this State, including members of the Legislative Branch, Executive Branch, Judicial Branch, and all law enforcement entities, except that the full name, title, and oath date of that person contained therein shall not be deemed confidential."

This section of the statute clearly indicates that the full copy of the oath of office itself is not confidential, except for the full name, title, and oath date, which must be disclosed.

Therefore, I respectfully request that you provide the full copies of the oaths of office for the officers and agents listed below:

1. Officer Stephen Boyd - Oath Date: 1/2/2020
2. Sergeant Craig Clayton - Oath Date: 9/18/2006
3. Officer Samantha Liepe - Oath Date: 7/31/2023
4. Special Officer Arthur Train - Oath Date: 9/25/2013
5. Detective Lawrence Murray - Oath Date: 7/15/2013
6. Officer John McColgan - Oath Date: 7/29/2019

I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to receiving the requested documents. Please let me know if there are any additional steps I need to take or if there are any concerns regarding this request.

Thank you for your cooperation.

— Smith, Wade, May 28, 2024

1 Attachment

14 point analysis OPRA 1962 Copy.docx

29K [Download](#) [View as HTML](#)

Devon,

Please find attached the Government Records Council 14 Point Analysis for the special service charge regarding the fee for body worn camera footage.

Regards,

Sgt. Wade Smith

From: X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family)

<[OPRA #61522 email]>

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2024 3:09 PM

To: Smith, Wade <[\[email address\]](#)>

Subject: Internal review of OPRA request - I am requesting body camera footage and copies of oaths of office for agents, officers, and supervisors involved in an incident on May 7, 2024, at 4620 Black Horse

12/19/25, 10:18 AM

I am requesting body camera footage and copies of oaths of office for agents, officers, and supervisors involved in an incident on...

Pike, Mays Landing, NJ.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Dear SGT. Smith, Wade,

Subject: Re: OPRA Request 1962 – Fee Dispute and Access to Oath of Office

I am writing in response to your communication regarding the fee for access to body-worn camera footage and the denial of my request for the complete Oath of Office documents.

1. Regarding the Fee for Body-Worn Camera Footage:

The imposed fee of \$267.78 for the processing of 153 minutes of footage seems excessively high and potentially prohibitive. Supreme Court case law supports the notion that such fees should not be unreasonable or burdensome. In multiple rulings, the Court has emphasized that access to public records and transparency should not be hindered by excessive fees. Therefore, I kindly request a detailed breakdown of these charges and ask for reconsideration to ensure that the fee reflects only the reasonable direct cost of producing the footage.

2. Regarding the Oath of Office:

I must contest the decision to classify the Oath of Office as personal information. An Oath of Office is a public declaration of a public servant's commitment to uphold the law and serve the community. As such, it does not qualify as personal information under NJSA 47:1A-1.1 or any other statute. It is a document that is inherently public and should be readily accessible to the citizens whom the officeholder has sworn to serve. I respectfully request that you provide the full document as per the stipulations of the Open Public Records Act (OPRA).

I appreciate your attention to these matters and look forward to your prompt and favorable resolution. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family)

show quoted sections



X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family) May 28, 2024



Unknown

Dear SGT Smith, Wade and Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to address the municipal corporation's charge for providing public records in response to my recent OPRA request for body-worn camera footage from the incident at 4620 Black Horse Pike, Mays Landing, New Jersey on May 7, 2024.

I firmly believe that this charge is absurd, burdensome, and unfair. It is unconstitutional for me to have to pay to review evidence that pertains to the violation of my rights. Public records should be accessible to all citizens without imposing financial barriers that prevent individuals from accessing information critical to their cases or understanding their legal standing.

According to the principles of public service, municipal employees are sworn to serve the public. Charging exorbitant fees for access to public records contradicts this principle and undermines transparency and accountability in government operations. Furthermore, the costs outlined in the 14-point analysis provided are excessive and do not justify the financial burden placed on a citizen seeking justice.

The argument that significant resources are needed for redaction and review is unconvincing, given the technological capabilities available today. Advanced software can expedite these processes, reducing both the time and cost involved. Additionally, many of the requested records have already been segregated and should be readily accessible without extensive manual labor.

Moreover, I cannot afford to pay these fees as requested. Bills and financial obligations cannot resolve themselves; therefore, placing such a financial strain on an individual seeking justice is not only impractical but also unjust [Article 1, Section 10, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, 12 U.S.C. 411, and 18 U.S.C. 8].

I respectfully request that the municipal corporation reconsider the imposition of these charges and provide the requested records without redaction and without additional cost. This request aligns with the principles of public service and the constitutional rights of citizens to access information held by the government.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to a prompt and fair resolution.

Truly,

X (Devon Tyler of the Barber-Materio Family)

Follow

1 follower

Re: CONFIRMED SERVICE – Court-Ordered OTSC with Temporary Restraints Barber v. Hamilton Twp. Police Dept., et al. ATL-L-003252-25

From dTb33@pm.me <dTb33@pm.me>

To Clerks.Office@hamiltonatlnj.gov, Administrators.Office@hamiltonatlnj.gov, HTPD.ia@hamiltonatlnj.gov, HTPD.Chief@hamiltonatlnj.gov, HTPD.Records<htpd.records@hamiltonatlnj.gov>, sales@dirkesautoparts.com

CC Mayor@hamiltonatlnj.gov, info@tillerstead.com

Date Friday, December 19th, 2025 at 10:31 AM

To: Clerks.Office@hamiltonatlnj.gov; Administrators.Office@hamiltonatlnj.gov; HTPD.ia@hamiltonatlnj.gov; HTPD.Chief@hamiltonatlnj.gov; htpd.records@hamiltonatlnj.gov; sales@dirkesauto.com

Cc: Mayor@hamiltonatlnj.gov; info@tillerstead.com

Good afternoon,

Please accept this email as service of the Plaintiff's filing in the matter of:

Barber v. Township of Hamilton, et al.

Docket No.: ATL-L-003252-25

Attached please find the following filed document:

Judicial Notice of State Comptroller and Auditor Reports (N.J.R.E. 201)

This submission includes:

1. Request for Judicial Notice of Official State Oversight Reports;
2. Certification of Authenticity of Public Records;
3. Exhibit Index;
4. Index of Oversight and Contextual Materials (if included); and
5. Certification of Service.

This filing requests judicial notice of official, publicly available State oversight materials for limited institutional context pursuant to N.J.R.E. 201. No immediate substantive relief is requested by this submission.

This email is transmitted in good faith to effect service in accordance with the New Jersey Court Rules.

Respectfully,

/s/ Devon Tyler Barber

Pro Se

3536 Pacific Avenue, Apt. A5

Atlantic City, New Jersey 08401

Telephone: (609) 862-8808

Email: dTb33@PM.Me

12/19/25, 10:32 AM

Sent | dTb33@pm.me | Proton Mail

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

On Tuesday, December 16th, 2025 at 11:42 AM, dTb33@pm.me <dTb33@pm.me> wrote:

SERVICE EMAIL

TO:

Clerks.Office@hamiltonatlnj.gov
Administrators.Office@hamiltonatlnj.gov
HTPD.ia@hamiltonatlnj.gov
HTPD.Chief@hamiltonatlnj.gov
htpd.records@hamiltonatlnj.gov
sales@dirkesauto.com

CC:

Mayor@hamiltonatlnj.gov
info@tillerstead.com

SUBJECT:

Service of Court Ordered OTSC with Temporary Restraints
Barber v Hamilton Township et al
ATL L 003252 25

EMAIL:

Good afternoon,

This email confirms service of the Court-ordered **Order to Show Cause with Temporary Restraints** entered on December 16, 2025, in the above-captioned matter.

This email serves the Court-ordered Order to Show Cause with Temporary Restraints upon **Hamilton Township** and provides **direct notice** to **Dirkes Auto LLC d/b/a Dirkes Used Auto Parts / Dirkes Towing** as custodian of the vehicle, as well as notice to any current custodian identified by the Court.

Attached please find the signed **Order to Show Cause with Temporary Restraints**.

As directed by the Court, all supporting papers (Verified Complaint, Certifications, Brief, and Exhibits) have been filed via JEDS and are part of the Court record under **Docket No. ATL-L-003252-25**, and are incorporated by reference.

Respondents are reminded that:

- Any opposition must be filed by **December 19, 2025**; and
- Respondents are ordered to appear on **December 22, 2025** to show cause why the relief set forth in the Order should not be entered.

Temporary restraints are in effect immediately, including but not limited to:

- No further towing or storage fees accruing;
- No sale, transfer, movement, or disposition of the vehicle;
- Immediate access for Plaintiff to retrieve personal property; and
- Preservation of all BWC, CAD, MDT, dispatch audio, impound, tow, GPS/AVL, and related records.

Please govern yourselves accordingly.

Respectfully,

/s/ Devon Tyler Barber
Devon Tyler Barber
Plaintiff pro se
3536 Pacific Avenue Apt A5
Atlantic City NJ 08401
dTb33@pm.me
(609) 862-8808

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

On Tuesday, December 16th, 2025 at 8:27 AM, dTb33@pm.me <dTb33@pm.me> wrote:

Subject: Barber v. Township of Hamilton, et al.

Docket No. ATL-L-003252-25 – Service of Notice of Amendment

Good Morning,

Please be advised that today I will file, via JEDS, a **Notice of Amendment to Clarify and Name Defendants** in the above-captioned matter.

A true and correct copy of the Notice to be simultaneously filed is attached for your records. This amendment clarifies the proper municipal defendant and identifies known individual defendants based on information presently available. No new claims are asserted.

This email is sent for notice and service purposes only.

Thank you.

Respectfully,
Devon Tyler Barber
Plaintiff, Pro Se
Atlantic County, New Jersey

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.

1.66 MB 1 file attached

12/19/25, 10:32 AM

Sent | dTb33@pm.me | Proton Mail

Request for Judicial Notice State Oversight Reports.pdf 1.66 MB