Exemption 7(C)

Exemption 7(C) provides protection for law enforcement information the disclosure of which "could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy."[1] Exemption 7(C) is the law enforcement counterpart to Exemption 6.[2] (See the discussions of the primary privacy-protection principles that apply to both exemptions under Exemption 6, above.)

Despite the similarities in language between Exemptions 6 and 7(C), the relative sweep of the two exemptions can be significantly different. Whereas Exemption 6 routinely requires identification and balancing of the relevant privacy and public interests, Exemption 7(C) can be applied on a categorical basis.[3] In DOJ v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press, the Supreme Court found that a third party's request for law enforcement records pertaining to a private citizen categorically invades that citizen's privacy, and that where a request seeks no official information about a government agency, the privacy invasion is unwarranted.[4] Indeed, the Court of Appeals

---

[1] 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(7)(C) (2006 & Supp. IV 2010); see also Presidential Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies Concerning the Freedom of Information Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 4683 (Jan. 21, 2009) (emphasizing that Freedom of Information Act reflects "profound national commitment to ensuring an open Government" and directing agencies to "adopt a presumption in favor of disclosure"); accord Attorney General Holder's Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies Concerning the Freedom of Information Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 51879 (Oct. 8, 2009); *FOIA Post*, "OIP Guidance: President Obama's FOIA Memorandum and Attorney General Holder's FOIA Guidelines – Creating a 'New Era of Open Government'" (posted 4/17/09).

[2] See Seized Prop. Recovery, Corp. v. U.S. Customs & Border Prot., 502 F. Supp. 2d 50, 56 (D.D.C. 2007).

[3] See DOJ v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749, 777 (1989).

[4] 489 U.S. at 780; see also Martin v. DOJ, 488 F.3d 446, 456 (D.C. Cir. 2007) ("The Supreme Court has observed that the statutory privacy right protected by Exemption 7(C) is not so limited as others." (citing Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 762)), reh'g en banc denied, Nos. 05-5207 & 06-5048 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 3, 2007); FOIA Update, Vol. X, No. 2, at 3-7 ("OIP Guidance: Privacy Protection Under the Supreme Court's Reporters Committee Decision" &

for the District of Columbia Circuit held in SafeCard Services v. SEC[5] that based upon the traditional recognition of the strong privacy interests inherent in law enforcement records, and the logical ramifications of Reporters Committee, the categorical withholding of information that identifies third parties in law enforcement records will ordinarily be appropriate under Exemption 7(C).[6]

"FOIA Counselor: Exemption 6 and Exemption 7(C): Step-by-Step Decisionmaking") (discussing mechanics of privacy-protection decisionmaking process employed under Exemptions 6 and 7(C)).

[5] 926 F.2d 1197 (D.C. Cir. 1991).

[6] 926 F.2d at 1206; see, e.g., Thomas v. DOJ, 260 F. App'x 677, 679 (5th Cir. 2007) (recognizing that "[t]he Supreme Court has held as a categorical matter that a third party's request for law-enforcement records about a private citizen can reasonably be expected to invade that citizen's privacy"); Blanton v. DOJ, 64 F. App'x 787, 789 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (protecting identities of third parties contained in FBI files categorically, including those assumed to be deceased); Fiduccia v. DOJ, 185 F.3d 1035, 1047-48 (9th Cir. 1999) (protecting categorically records concerning FBI searches of houses of two named individuals); Nation Magazine v. U.S. Customs Serv., 71 F.3d 885, 896 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (restating that portions of records in investigatory files which would reveal subjects, witnesses, and informants in law enforcement investigations are categorically exempt (citing SafeCard)); Schoenman v. FBI, 575 F. Supp. 2d 136, 159 (D.D.C. 2008) (quoting SafeCard for proposition that names and addresses of private individuals can be categorically protected under Exemption 7(C), but noting that "the same categorical conclusion does not necessarily apply under Exemption 6"); Carp v. IRS, No. 00-5992, 2002 WL 373448, at *4-5 (D.N.J. Jan. 28, 2002) (holding that all information that identifies third parties is categorically exempt); Coolman v. IRS, No. 98-6149, 1999 WL 675319, at *5 (W.D. Mo. July 12, 1999) (finding categorical withholding of third-party information in law enforcement records to be proper), summary affirmance granted, 1999 WL 1419039 (8th Cir. 1999); McNamera v. DOJ, 974 F. Supp. 946, 957-60 (W.D. Tex. 1997) (allowing categorical withholding of information concerning criminal investigation of private citizens); Straughter v. HHS, No. 94-0567, slip op. at 5 (S.D. W. Va. Mar. 31, 1995) (magistrate's recommendation) (affording per se protection under Exemption 7(C) for witnesses and third parties when requester has identified no public interest), adopted, (S.D. W. Va. Apr. 17, 1995). But see Kimberlin v. DOJ, 139 F.3d 944, 948 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (eschewing categorical rule of nondisclosure for OPR files, and suggesting use of case-by-case balancing test involving consideration of "rank of public official involved and the seriousness of misconduct alleged"); Davin v. DOJ, 60 F.3d 1043, 1060 (3d Cir. 1995) (ruling that "government must conduct a document by document fact-specific balancing"); Konigsberg v. FBI, No. 02-2428, slip op. at 5-7 (D.D.C. May 27, 2003) (refusing to apply categorical rule to records on informant who allegedly was protected from prosecution by FBI, based upon exceptional circumstances presented); Balt. Sun v. U.S. Marshals Serv., 131 F. Supp. 2d 725, 730 n.5 (D. Md. 2001) (declining to accord categorical protection to third parties who purchased federally forfeited property), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 01-1537 (4th Cir. June 25, 2001).

Certain other distinctions between Exemption 6 and Exemption 7(C) are apparent: in contrast with Exemption 6, Exemption 7(C)'s language establishes a lesser burden of proof to justify withholding in two distinct respects.[7] First, it is well established that the omission of the word "clearly" from the language of Exemption 7(C) eases the burden of the agency and stems from the recognition that law enforcement records are inherently more invasive of privacy than "personnel and medical files and similar files."[8] Indeed, the "'strong interest' of individuals, whether they be suspects, witnesses, or investigators, 'in not being associated unwarrantedly with alleged criminal activity'" has been repeatedly recognized.[9]

---

[7] See NARA v. Favish, 541 U.S. 157, 165-66 (2004) (distinguishing between Exemption 6's and Exemption 7(C)'s language).

[8] See Cong. News Syndicate v. DOJ, 438 F. Supp. 538, 541 (D.D.C. 1977) (stating that "an individual whose name surfaces in connection with an investigation may, without more, become the subject of rumor and innuendo"); see also, e.g., Iglesias v. CIA, 525 F. Supp. 547, 562 (D.D.C. 1981).

[9] Fitzgibbon v. CIA, 911 F.2d 755, 767 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (quoting Stern v. FBI, 737 F.2d 84, 91-92 (D.C. Cir. 1984)); see also Roth v. DOJ, 642 F.3d 1161, 1175 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (noting that "being associated with a quadruple homicide would likely cause [third parties] precisely the type of embarrassment and reputational harm that Exemption 7(C) is designed to guard against"), reh'g en banc denied, No. 09-5428 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 14, 2011); Neely v. FBI, 208 F.3d 461, 464-66 (4th Cir. 2000) (finding that FBI Special Agents and third-party suspects have "substantial interest[s] in nondisclosure of their identities and their connection[s] to particular investigations"); Quiñon v. FBI, 86 F.3d 1222, 1230 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (ruling that "'[p]ersons involved in FBI investigations -- even if they are not the subject of the investigation -- "have a substantial interest in seeing that their participation remains secret"'" (quoting Fitzgibbon, 911 F.2d at 767 (quoting, in turn, King v. DOJ, 830 F.2d 210, 233 (D.C. Cir. 1987)))); Schiffer v. FBI, 78 F.3d 1405, 1410 (9th Cir. 1996) (stating that persons named in FBI files have "strong interest in 'not being associated unwarrantedly with alleged criminal activity'" (quoting Fitzgibbon, 911 F.2d at 767)); Computer Prof'ls for Soc. Responsibility v. U.S. Secret Serv., 72 F.3d 897, 904 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (finding that release of names of individuals, including nonsuspects, who attended public meeting that attracted attention of law enforcement officials would impinge upon their privacy); Hunt v. FBI, 972 F.2d 286, 288 (9th Cir. 1992) (finding that association of FBI "agent's name with allegations of sexual and professional misconduct could cause the agent great personal and professional embarrassment"); Dunkelberger v. DOJ, 906 F.2d 779, 781 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (refusing to confirm or deny existence of letter of reprimand or suspension of named FBI Special Agent); Bast v. DOJ, 665 F.2d 1251, 1254-55 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (ruling that government officials do not surrender all rights to personal privacy by virtue of public appointment); Leveto v. IRS, No. 98-285E, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5791, at *17-18 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 10, 2001) (recognizing privacy interests of suspects, witnesses, interviewees, and investigators); Morales Cozier v. FBI, No. 1:99 CV 0312, slip op. at 16-17 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 25, 2000) (protecting identities of FBI support personnel and individuals who provided information to FBI; citing 'well-recognized and substantial privacy interest' in nondisclosure (quoting Neely, 208 F.3d at 464)); Franklin v. DOJ, No. 97-1225, slip op. at 10 (S.D. Fla. June 15, 1998) (magistrate's recommendation) (stating law enforcement officers, suspects, witnesses, innocent third parties, and individuals named in investigative files have substantial privacy

Second, the Freedom of Information Reform Act of 1986 further broadened the protection afforded by Exemption 7(C) by lowering the risk-of-harm standard from "would" to "could reasonably be expected to."[10] This amendment to the Act eased the standard for evaluating a threatened privacy invasion through disclosure of law enforcement records.[11] One court, in interpreting the amended language, observed that it affords the agency "greater latitude in protecting privacy interests" in the law enforcement context.[12] The District Court for the District of Columbia noted that the amendments resulted in "a more elastic standard; exemption 7(C) [became] more comprehensive."[13]

Privacy Considerations

Under the balancing test that traditionally has been applied to both Exemption 6 and Exemption 7(C), the agency must first identify and evaluate the privacy interest(s), if any, implicated in the requested records.[14] In DOJ v. Reporters Committee for

---

interests in nondisclosure (citing Wichlacz v. U.S. Dep't of Interior, 938 F. Supp. 325, 330 (E.D. Va. 1996))), adopted, (S.D. Fla. June 26, 1998), aff'd per curiam, 189 F.3d 485 (11th Cir. 1999); Buros v. HHS, No. 93-571, slip op. at 10 (W.D. Wis. Oct. 26, 1994) (refusing to confirm or deny existence of criminal investigatory records concerning county official, even though subject's alleged mishandling of funds already known to public; "confirming . . . federal criminal investigation brushes the subject with an independent and indelible taint of wrongdoing"). But see Davin v. DOJ, No. 92-1122, slip op. at 9 (W.D. Pa. Apr. 9, 1998) (concluding that individuals' privacy interests became diluted during more than twenty years that had passed since investigation was conducted), aff'd, 176 F.3d 471 (3d Cir. 1999) (unpublished table decision).

[10] Pub. L. No. 99-570, § 1802, 100 Stat. 3207, 3207-48; see Attorney General's Memorandum on the 1986 Amendments to the Freedom of Information Act 9-12 (Dec. 1987).

[11] See Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 756 n.9; Stone v. FBI, 727 F. Supp. 662, 665 (D.D.C. 1990) (stating that 1986 FOIA amendments have "eased the burden of an agency claiming that exemption"), aff'd, No. 90-5065 (D.C. Cir. Sept. 14, 1990).

[12] Wash. Post Co. v. DOJ, No. 84-3581, 1987 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14936, at *32 (D.D.C. Sept. 25, 1987) (magistrate's recommendation), adopted, (D.D.C. Dec. 15, 1987), rev'd on other grounds & remanded, 863 F.2d 96 (D.C. Cir. 1988).

[13] Id.; see also Keys v. DOJ, 830 F.2d 337, 346 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (finding that "government need not 'prove to a certainty that release will lead to an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy,'" at least not after the 1986 FOIA amendments (quoting Reporters Comm., 816 F.2d 730, 738 (D.C. Cir. 1987), rev'd on other grounds, 489 U.S. 749 (1989))); Nishnic v. DOJ, 671 F. Supp. 776, 788 (D.D.C. 1987) (holding phrase "could reasonably be expected to" to be more easily satisfied standard than phrase "likely to materialize").

[14] See, e.g., Associated Press v. DOD, 554 F.3d 274, 284 (2d Cir. 2009) ("The first question to ask in determining whether Exemption 7(C) applies is whether there is any privacy

Freedom of the Press, the Supreme Court found that substantial privacy interests can exist in personal information even though the information has been made available to the general public at some place and point in time.[15] Applying a "practical obscurity" standard,[16] the Court observed that if such items of information actually "were 'freely available,' there would be no reason to invoke the FOIA to obtain access to [them]."[17] Subsequent cases have delineated the limits of this doctrine.[18]

---

interest in the information sought."); Albuquerque Publ'g Co. v. DOJ, 726 F. Supp. 851, 855 (D.D.C. 1989) ("Our preliminary inquiry is whether a personal privacy interest is involved."); see also Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P. v. DOJ, 503 F. Supp. 2d 373, 383 (D.D.C. 2007) (cautioning that even though more protection is afforded information compiled for law enforcement purposes, agency must still prove that it is reasonably expected that disclosure would result in-unwarranted invasion of privacy); FOIA Update, Vol. X, No. 2, at 7 ("FOIA Counselor: Exemption 6 and Exemption 7(C): Step-by-Step Decisionmaking") (advising that there first must be viable privacy interest of identifiable, living person in requested information for any further consideration of privacy-exemption protection to be appropriate).

[15] 489 U.S. 749, 770-71 (1989) (finding "substantial" privacy interest in rap sheets even though they contain information previously disclosed to public).

[16] See id. at 757-71 (recognizing certain events may "have been wholly forgotten," and noting that information in requested compilation, even though publicly available in various places, was "hard-to-obtain" and "web of federal statutory and regulatory provisions limited its disclosure").

[17] Id. at 764; see also Prison Legal News v. EOUSA, 628 F.3d 1243, 1249-50 (10th Cir. 2011) (finding "strong privacy interest" in video and photographs where "images are no longer available to the public; they were displayed only twice (once at each [defendant's] trial); only those physically present in the court room were able to view the images; and the images were never reproduced for public consumption beyond those trials"), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 473 (2011); Fiduccia v. DOJ, 185 F.3d 1035, 1047 (9th Cir. 1999) (protecting FBI records reflecting information that is also available in "various courthouses"); Abraham & Rose, P.L.C. v. United States, 138 F.3d 1075, 1083 (6th Cir. 1998) (stating that clear privacy interest exists with respect to names, addresses, and other identifying information, even if already available in publicly recorded filings (citing DOD v. FLRA, 510 U.S. 487, 500 (1994) (Exemption 6))); McGehee v. DOJ, 800 F. Supp. 2d 200, 234 n.6 (D.D.C. 2011) (noting "it is clear that in our Circuit a privacy interest may be implicated by 'practically obscure' information"); Leadership Conference on Civil Rights v. Gonzales, 404 F. Supp. 2d 246, 257-59 (D.D.C. 2005) (finding privacy interest in information concerning private individuals even though documents were previously distributed in unredacted form to symposium participants), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 06-5055, 2006 WL 1214937 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 28, 2006); Harrison v. EOUSA, 377 F. Supp. 2d 141, 147-48 (D.D.C. 2005) (protecting names and addresses of criminal defendants, case captions and numbers, attorney names and addresses, and case initiation, disposition, and sentencing dates even though information could be found by searches of public records); Times Picayune Publ'g Corp. v. DOJ, 37 F. Supp. 2d 472, 478-79 (E.D. La. 1999) (holding that public dissemination of "mug shot" after trial would trigger renewed publicity and renewed invasion of privacy of subject); Billington v. DOJ, 11 F. Supp. 2d 45, 61 (D.D.C. 1998) (finding that "agency is not

In the case of records related to investigations by criminal law enforcement agencies, courts have long recognized, either expressly or implicitly, that "'the mention of an individual's name in a law enforcement file will engender comment and speculation and carries a stigmatizing connotation.'"[19]

---

compelled to release information just because it may have been disclosed previously"), aff'd in pertinent part, 233 F.3d 581 (D.C. Cir. 2000); Greenberg v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury, No. 87-898, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9803, at *55 (D.D.C. July 1, 1998) (finding third party's privacy interest not extinguished because public may be aware he was target of investigation); Balt. Sun Co. v. U.S. Customs Serv., No. 97-1991, slip op. at 4 (D. Md. Nov. 12, 1997) (holding that inclusion of poor copy of defendant's photograph in publicly available court record did not eliminate privacy interest in photo altogether); Lewis v. USPS, No. 96-3467, slip op. at 2 (D. Md. Apr. 30, 1997) (holding that fact that complainant's name is already known, whether disclosed by investigating agency or otherwise, is irrelevant; declaring that "limited oral disclosure" does not constitute waiver of exemption).

[18] See ACLU v. DOJ, 655 F.3d 1, 9-10 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (finding that "unlike the rap sheet information in Reporters Committee," docket information compiled into single list by agency from cases pertaining to various individuals was "not practically obscure" on grounds that docket information contained only small amount of information regarding individual's criminal history rather than compilation, there was no "web of statutory or regulatory policies obscuring that information," and no "logistical difficulty in gathering" the information); CNA Holdings, Inc. v. DOJ, No. 07-2084, 2008 WL 2002050, at *6 (N.D. Tex. 2008) (finding demonstration that documents at issue were filed in courthouse sufficient to show their location in public domain and ordering production); Lardner v. DOJ, No. 03-0180, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5465, at *61 n.30 (D.D.C. Mar. 31, 2005) (rejecting agency argument that release of names of unsuccessful pardon applicants was analogous to rap sheets in Reporters Committee and finding "[i]t would stretch Reporters Comm. well past recognition to apply it to a case where information is sought that does not compile sensitive information, but might only remind one of public sensitive information") (Exemption 6).

[19] Fitzgibbon v. CIA, 911 F.2d 755, 767 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (quoting Branch v. FBI, 658 F. Supp. 204, 209 (D.D.C. 1987)); accord Massey v. FBI, 3 F.3d 620, 624 (2d Cir. 1993) (same); Miller v. Bell, 661 F.2d 623, 631-32 (7th Cir. 1981) ("real potential for harassment"); see also Associated Press, 554 F.3d at 286-88 (finding that disclosure of Guantanamo detainees' identities, "both those who have suffered abuse and those who are alleged to have perpetrated abuse" "could subject them to embarrassment and humiliation" and whether detainees would want to voluntarily disclose information publicly is "inapposite to the privacy interests at stake"); Lesar v. DOJ, 636 F.2d 472, 488 (D.C. Cir. 1980) ("'It is difficult if not impossible, to anticipate all respects in which disclosure might damage reputation or lead to personal embarrassment and discomfort.'" (quoting Lesar v. DOJ, 455 F. Supp. 921, 925 (D.D.C. 1978))); Kortlander v. Bureau of Land Mgmt., 816 F. Supp. 2d 1001, 1014 (D. Mont. 2011) (noting that "[c]ourts addressing Exemption 7(C) have found that the stigma of being associated with a law enforcement investigation, the potential for harassment and potential to prejudice law enforcement personnel in carrying out law enforcement functions, generally outweighs the public interest"); Brady-Lunny v. Massey, 185 F. Supp. 2d 928, 932 (C.D. Ill. 2002) (deciding that release of names of federal inmates, some of whom had not been charged with or convicted of crimes, would "stigmatize these individuals and cause

Thus, Exemption 7(C) has been regularly applied to withhold references to persons who are not targets of investigations and who were merely mentioned in law enforcement files,[20] as well as to persons of "investigatory interest" to a criminal law

---

what could be irreparable damage to their reputations"); Perlman v. DOJ, No. 00 Civ. 5842, 2001 WL 910406, at *6 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2001) (finding that release of names of individuals who provided information during investigation would subject them to "embarrassment, harassment or threats of reprisal"), aff'd in pertinent part, 312 F.3d 100, 106 (2d Cir. 2002) (recognizing that witnesses and third parties have "strong privacy interests" in not being identified as having been part of law enforcement investigation), vacated & remanded, 541 U.S. 970, on remand, 380 F.3d 110, 111-12 (2d Cir. 2004) (per curiam) (affirming previous holding); Times Picayune, 37 F. Supp. 2d at 477 (recognizing that "mug shot's stigmatizing effect can last well beyond the actual criminal proceeding"); Abraham & Rose, P.L.C. v. United States, 36 F. Supp. 2d 955, 957 (E.D. Mich. 1998) (noting that filing of tax lien against individual could cause "comment, speculation and stigma"); Anderson v. USPS, 7 F. Supp. 2d 583, 586 (E.D. Pa. 1998) (disclosing identities of interviewees and witnesses may result in embarrassment and harassment), aff'd, 187 F.3d 625 (3d Cir. 1999) (unpublished table decision); Cujas v. IRS, No. 1:97-00741, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6466, at *9 (M.D.N.C. Apr. 15, 1998) (finding that "third parties named in these law enforcement records have a very strong privacy interest in avoiding the stigma and embarrassment resulting from their identification as a person that is or was under investigation"), summary affirmance granted, No. 98-1641, 1998 WL 539686 (4th Cir. Aug. 25, 1998); Hamilton v. Weise, No. 95-1161, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18900, at *20 (M.D. Fla. Oct. 1, 1997) (protecting third-party names to avoid harassment, embarrassment, and unwanted public attention); McNamera v. DOJ, 974 F. Supp. 946, 958 (W.D. Tex. 1997) (rejecting argument that individual already investigated by one agency cannot be stigmatized by acknowledgment of investigation by another agency); Southam News v. INS, 674 F. Supp. 881, 887 (D.D.C. 1987) (finding disclosure of identities of individuals excludable from U.S. "would result in derogatory inferences about and possible embarrassment to those individuals"); cf. Cerveny v. CIA, 445 F. Supp. 772, 776 (D. Colo. 1978) (finding mere mention of individual's name as subject of CIA file could be damaging to his or her reputation) (Exemption 6). But see Blanton v. DOJ, No. 93-2398, 1994 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21444, at *8-12 (W.D. Tenn. July 14, 1993) (holding that there is no privacy interest in mere mention of defense attorney's name in criminal file or in validity of law license when attorney represented requester at criminal trial) (Exemptions 6 and 7(C)).

[20] See Peltier v. FBI, 563 F.3d 754, 766 (8th Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (affirming district court's determination that third parties mentioned within released records were properly withheld); Fabiano v. McIntyre, 146 F. App'x 549, 550 (3d Cir. 2005) (per curiam) (affirming district court decision protecting names of victims in child pornography photographs); Rugiero v. DOJ, 257 F.3d 534, 552 (6th Cir. 2001) (protecting identifying information about third parties); Shafizadeh v. ATF, No. 99-5727, 2000 WL 1175586, at *2 (6th Cir. Aug. 10, 2000) (protecting names of, and identifying information about, private individuals); Neely v. FBI, 208 F.3d 461, 464 (4th Cir. 2000) (withholding names of third parties mentioned or interviewed in course of investigation); Halpern v. FBI, 181 F.3d 279, 297 (2d Cir. 1999) (same); Johnston v. DOJ, No. 97-2173, 1998 U.S. App. LEXIS 18557, at *2 (8th Cir. Aug. 10, 1998) (same); Gabel v. IRS, No. 95-15215, 1998 WL 21992, at *1 (9th Cir. Jan. 15, 1998) (protecting third-party names in Department of Motor Vehicles computer printout included in plaintiff's IRS file); Computer Prof'ls for Soc. Responsibility v. U.S.

enforcement agency.[21] In Reporters Committee, the Supreme Court placed strong emphasis on the propriety of broadly protecting the interests of private citizens whose

---

Secret Serv., 72 F.3d 897, 904 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (finding that release of names of any individuals who attended public meeting that attracted attention of law enforcement officials would impinge upon their privacy); SafeCard Servs. v. SEC, 926 F.2d 1197, 1206 (D.C. Cir. 1991) (protecting names of third parties); Berger v. IRS, 487 F. Supp. 2d 482, 501 (D.N.J. 2007) (stating that "even if a document 'concerns' only Plaintiffs, any third party information nonetheless contained in that document would be properly withheld"), aff'd, 288 F. App'x 829 (3d Cir. 2008); Sutton v. IRS, No. 05-7177, 2007 WL 30547, at *6 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 4, 2007) (finding that third-party taxpayers and IRS personnel have interest in maintaining privacy of their personal information); Bogan v. FBI, No. 04-C-532-C, 2005 WL 1367214, at *7 (W.D. Wis. June 7, 2005) (protecting names of third parties merely mentioned in investigative file); Chourre v. IRS, 203 F. Supp. 2d 1196, 1201 (W.D. Wash. 2002) (holding that redaction of third-party taxpayer information was proper); Diaz v. BOP, No. 01-40070, slip op. at 6 (D. Mass. Dec. 20, 2001) (magistrate's recommendation) (withholding audiotape of monitored telephone conversation between plaintiff (a prison inmate) and his former trial attorney), adopted, (D. Mass. Feb. 7, 2002), aff'd, 55 F. App'x 5 (1st Cir. 2003); Amro v. U.S. Customs Serv., 128 F. Supp. 2d 776, 787 (E.D. Pa. 2001) (withholding names of "non-suspects arising during investigations"); W. Ctr. for Journalism v. IRS, 116 F. Supp. 2d 1, 12 (D.D.C. 2000) (protecting address of complainant and "unrelated, incidental medical information about a third party"), aff'd, 22 F. App'x 14 (D.C. Cir. 2001); Murphy v. IRS, 79 F. Supp. 2d 1180, 1185 (D. Haw. 1999) (protecting identities of third parties); Feshbach v. SEC, 5 F. Supp. 2d 774, 785 (N.D. Cal. 1997) (withholding identities of third parties against whom SEC did not take action); Ajluni v. FBI, 947 F. Supp. 599, 604-05 (N.D.N.Y. 1996) (protecting identities of third parties merely mentioned in FBI files); Fritz v. IRS, 862 F. Supp. 234, 236 (W.D. Wis. 1994) (protecting name and address of person who purchased requester's seized car). But see Balt. Sun v. U.S. Marshals Serv., 131 F. Supp. 2d 725, 729 (D. Md. 2001) (rejecting protection of names and addresses of purchasers of forfeited property), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 01-1537 (4th Cir. June 25, 2001).

[21] See, e.g., Neely, 208 F.3d at 464 (withholding names and identifying information of third-party suspects); Halpern, 181 F.3d at 297 (finding strong privacy interest in material that suggests person has at one time been subject to criminal investigation); O'Kane v. U.S. Customs Serv., 169 F.3d 1308, 1309 (11th Cir. 1999) (protecting home addresses of individuals whose possessions were seized by government); Spirko v. USPS, 147 F.3d 992, 998-99 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (protecting suspects' palm and fingerprints, their interviews and discussions with law enforcement officers, and photographs of former suspects and their criminal histories); Computer Prof'ls, 72 F.3d at 904 (holding potential suspects would have their privacy impinged if names disclosed); McDonnell v. United States, 4 F.3d 1227, 1255 (3d Cir. 1993) (finding suspects have "obvious privacy interest in not having their identities revealed"); Massey, 3 F.3d at 624 (finding third parties' privacy interests in nondisclosure "potentially greater" than those of law enforcement officers "insofar as disclosure of their names might reveal that they were suspects in criminal investigations"); Maynard v. CIA, 986 F.2d 547, 566 (1st Cir. 1993) (reiterating "potential for harassment, reprisal or embarrassment" if names of individuals investigated by FBI disclosed); Davis v. DOJ, 968 F.2d 1276, 1281 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (deciding that "embarrassment and reputational harm" would result from disclosure of taped conversations of individuals with boss of New Orleans

names or identities are in a record that the government "happens to be storing."[22] It subsequently recognized, in NARA v. Favish,[23] that law enforcement files often contain information on individuals by "mere happenstance," and it strongly reinforced the protection available under Exemption 7(C).[24] Courts have found that privacy interests extend to foreign nationals, in addition to private citizens.[25] The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has held that even a convicted defendant retains some privacy interest in the facts of his conviction, but that "those interests are weaker than for individuals who have been acquitted or whose cases have been dismissed."[26]

The identities of federal, state, and local law enforcement personnel referenced in investigatory files are also routinely withheld, usually for reasons similar to those described by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit:

> One who serves his state or nation as a career public servant is not thereby stripped of every vestige of personal privacy, even with respect to the discharge of his official duties. Public identification of any of these

---

organized crime family); Silets v. DOJ, 945 F.2d 227, 230 (7th Cir. 1991) (en banc) (protecting associates of Jimmy Hoffa who were subjects of electronic surveillance); Fund for Constitutional Gov't v. Nat'l Archives & Records Serv., 656 F.2d 856, 861-66 (D.C. Cir. 1981) (withholding identities of persons investigated but not charged, unless "exceptional interests militate in favor of disclosure"); Del- Turco v. FAA, No. 04-281, slip op. at 6-7 (D. Ariz. July 11, 2005) (protecting information concerning airline employees who were investigated for safety violations but against whom charges never were brought); Garcia v. DOJ, 181 F. Supp. 2d 356, 371 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (protecting names, identities, addresses, and information pertaining to third parties who were of investigatory interest); Willis v. FBI, No. 99-CV-73481, slip op. at 18 (E.D. Mich. July 11, 2000) (magistrate's recommendation) (protecting identifying information concerning subject of FBI investigation), adopted, (E.D. Mich. Sept. 26, 2000).

[22] 489 U.S. at 780; see also id. at 774-75 (declaring that "it should come as no surprise that in none of our cases construing the FOIA have we found it appropriate to order a Government agency to honor a FOIA request for information about a particular private citizen").

[23] 541 U.S. 157 (2004).

[24] Id. at 166 (noting that "law enforcement documents obtained by Government investigators often contain information about persons interviewed as witnesses or initial suspects but whose link to the official inquiry may be the result of mere happenstance"); see also *FOIA Post*, "Supreme Court Rules for 'Survivor Privacy' in Favish" (posted 4/9/04).

[25] See, e.g., Graff v. FBI, 822 F. Supp. 2d 23, 34 (D.D.C. 2011).

[26] ACLU v. DOJ, 655 F.3d at 7.

individuals could conceivably subject them to harassment and annoyance in the conduct of their official duties and in their private lives.[27]

---

[27] Nix v. United States, 572 F.2d 998, 1006 (4th Cir. 1978); see, e.g., Favish, 541 U.S. at 171 (finding privacy interests to be undiminished by deceased's status as high-level public official); Hulstein v. DEA, 671 F.3d 690, 695-96 (8th Cir. 2012) (protecting names and signatures of DEA agents); Moore v. Obama, No. 09-5072, 2009 WL 2762827, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 24, 2009) (per curiam) (protecting names and a phone number of FBI employees); Fabiano, 146 F. App'x at 549 (affirming withholding of names and telephone numbers of FBI Special Agent, FBI support employees, and non-FBI federal employee); Rugiero, 257 F.3d at 552 (upholding nondisclosure of identifying information about DEA agents and personnel); Robert v. Nat'l Archives, 1 F. App'x 85, 86 (2d Cir. 2001) (protecting government employee's name); Neely, 208 F.3d at 464 (withholding FBI Special Agents' names); Fiduccia, 185 F.3d at 1043-45 (withholding DEA and INS agents' names); Halpern, 181 F.3d at 296 (protecting identities of nonfederal law enforcement officers); Manna v. DOJ, 51 F.3d 1158, 1166 (3d Cir. 1995) (finding law enforcement officers have substantial privacy interest in nondisclosure of names, particularly when requester held high position in La Cosa Nostra); Jones v. FBI, 41 F.3d 238, 246 (6th Cir. 1994) (protecting names of FBI Special Agents and federal, state, and local law enforcement personnel); Becker v. IRS, 34 F.3d 398, 405 n.23 (7th Cir. 1994) (protecting initials, names, and phone numbers of IRS employees); Church of Scientology Int'l v. IRS, 995 F.2d 916, 920-21 (9th Cir. 1993) (deciding privacy interest exists in handwriting of IRS agents in official documents); Maynard, 986 F.2d at 566 (protecting names and initials of low-level FBI Special Agents and support personnel); Hale v. DOJ, 973 F.2d 894, 902 (10th Cir. 1992) (finding FBI employees have substantial privacy interest in concealing their identities), vacated & remanded on other grounds, 509 U.S. 918 (1993); Davis, 968 F.2d at 1281 (holding that "undercover agents" have protectible privacy interests); New England Apple Council v. Donovan, 725 F.2d 139, 142-44 (1st Cir. 1984) (finding that inspector general investigator has "interest in retaining the capability to perform his tasks effectively by avoiding untoward annoyance or harassment"); Miller, 661 F.2d at 630 ("It is not necessary that harassment rise to the level of endangering physical safety before the protections of 7(C) can be invoked."); Lesar, 636 F.2d at 487-88 (finding that FBI agents "have a legitimate interest in preserving the secrecy of matters that conceivably could subject them to annoyance or harassment"); Tamayo v. DOJ, No. 07-21299, slip op. at 8 (S.D. Fla. June 18, 2010) (finding that identities of law enforcement personnel were properly withheld); O'Keefe v. DOD, 463 F. Supp. 2d 317, 324 (E.D.N.Y. 2006) (protecting identities of DOD investigators); Mettetal v. DOJ, No. 2:04-CV-410, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 64157, at *10-12 (E.D. Tenn. Sept. 7, 2006) (protecting names of local law enforcement and non-FBI government personnel involved in plaintiff's criminal prosecution) (Exemptions 6 and 7(C)); Aldridge v. U.S. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, No. 7:00-CV-131, 2001 WL 196965, at *2 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 23, 2001) (withholding IRS employees' social security numbers, home addresses, phone numbers, birthdates, and direct dial telephone number of acting chief of IRS's Examinations Division); Morales Cozier v. FBI, No. 99-CV-0312, slip op. at 17 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 25, 2000) (withholding identities of FBI Special Agents who investigated requester after her professional contact with Cuban citizen citing potential for "harassment, surveillance, or [undue] investigation of these [Special A]gents by foreign governments").

Moreover, agencies' redaction of the identities of law enforcement personnel who perform clerical or administrative duties with respect to requested records, are routinely upheld as courts recognize that the access these employees have to information regarding official law enforcement investigations creates a unique privacy interest.[28] Indeed, courts have held that identities of both clerical personnel and investigators are properly withheld as a routine matter under Exemption 7(C), even when they take part in a highly publicized investigation.[29]

All but one court of appeals to have addressed the issue have found protectible privacy interests in the identities of individuals who provide information to law enforcement agencies.[30] Consequently, the names of witnesses and their home and business addresses have been held properly protectible under Exemption 7(C).[31]

---

[28] See, e.g., Council on Am.-Islamic Relations v. FBI, 749 F. Supp. 2d 1104, 1120 (S.D. Cal. 2010) (upholding agency's redaction of support personnel); Skinner v. DOJ, 744 F. Supp. 2d 185, 210-11 (D.D.C. 2010) (concluding that names and identification of law enforcement support staff were properly withheld); Fischer v. DOJ, 596 F. Supp. 2d 34, 47 (D.D.C. 2009) (upholding Exemption 7(C) to protect agency employees, including "support personnel," as "[t]he D.C. Circuit has consistently held that Exemption 7(C) protects the privacy interests of all persons mentioned in law enforcement records"); Adamowicz v. IRS, 552 F. Supp. 2d 355, 370 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (characterizing privacy interest of IRS personnel as "well-recognized").

[29] See Lahr v. NTSB, 569 F.3d 964, 977-79 (9th Cir. 2009) (holding names of FBI agents involved in investigation of crash of TWA Flight 800 were protected from disclosure and noting "courts have recognized that agents retain an interest in keeping private their involvement in investigation of especially controversial events"); Stone v. FBI, 727 F. Supp. 662, 663 n.1 (D.D.C. 1990) (protecting identities of FBI Special Agents and clerical employees who participated in investigation of assassination of Robert F. Kennedy); Wichlacz v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, 938 F. Supp. 325, 334 (E.D. Va. 1996) (protecting names of Park Police officers who investigated suicide of former Deputy White House Counsel, as well as psychiatrists who were listed on paper found in his wallet, because disclosure would cause "onslaught of media attention" and could cause camera crews to "besiege" their workplaces and homes), aff'd per curiam, 114 F.3d 1178 (4th Cir. 1997) (unpublished table decision); Exner v. DOJ, 902 F. Supp. 240, 243-45 (D.D.C. 1995) (protecting identities of deceased former FBI Special Agent and his two sons, one of whom may have been involved in break-in of requester's apartment, which requester claimed to have been searched for reasons relating to her alleged relationship with former president), appeal dismissed, No. 95-5411, 1997 WL 68352 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 15, 1997); cf. Armstrong v. Executive Office of the President, 97 F.3d 575, 581-82 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (finding that agency had not adequately defended categorical rule for withholding identities of low-level FBI Special Agents) (Exemption 6).

[30] See, e.g., Fiduccia, 185 F.3d at 1044 (withholding names of informants); Quiñon v. FBI, 86 F.3d 1222, 1227, 1231 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (protecting informants' identities); Schiffer, 78 F.3d at 1410 (protecting names of persons who provided information to FBI); Computer Prof'ls, 72 F.3d at 904-05 (protecting names of informants, including name of company that reported crime to police, because disclosure might permit identification of corporate officer who reported crime); Beard v. Espy, No. 94-16748, 1995 U.S. App. LEXIS 38269, at *2 (9th

Cir. Dec. 11, 1995) (protecting complaint letter); Manna, 51 F.3d at 1166 (holding that interviewees and witnesses involved in criminal investigation have substantial privacy interest in nondisclosure of their names, particularly when requester held high position in La Cosa Nostra); Jones, 41 F.3d at 246 (protecting informants' identities); McCutchen v. HHS, 30 F.3d 183, 189 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (protecting names of individuals alleging scientific misconduct); Koch v. USPS, No. 93-1487, 1993 U.S. App. LEXIS 26130, at *2 (8th Cir. Oct. 8, 1993) ("The informant's interest in maintaining confidentiality is considerable [because] the informant risked embarrassment, harassment, and emotional and physical retaliation."); McDonnell, 4 F.3d at 1256 (protecting identities of witnesses and third parties involved in criminal investigation of maritime disaster); Massey, 3 F.3d at 624 (declaring that disclosure of names of cooperating witnesses and third parties, including cooperating law enforcement officials, could subject them to "embarrassment and harassment"); Nadler v. DOJ, 955 F.2d 1479, 1490 (11th Cir. 1992) ("Disclosure of the identities of the FBI's sources will disclose a great deal about those sources but in this case will disclose virtually nothing about the conduct of the government."); KTVY-TV v. United States, 919 F.2d 1465, 1469 (10th Cir. 1990) (per curiam) (withholding interviewees' names as "necessary to avoid harassment and embarrassment"); Cleary v. FBI, 811 F.2d 421, 424 (8th Cir. 1987) (deciding disclosure would subject "sources to unnecessary questioning concerning the investigation [and] to subpoenas issued by private litigants in civil suits incidentally related to the investigation"); Cuccaro v. Sec'y of Labor, 770 F.2d 355, 359 (3d Cir. 1985) (holding that "privacy interest of . . . witnesses who participated in OSHA's investigation outweighs public interest in disclosure"); L&C Marine Transp., Ltd. v. United States, 740 F.2d 919, 923 (11th Cir. 1984) (reasoning that disclosure of identities of employee-witnesses in OSHA investigation could cause "problems at their jobs and with their livelihoods"); New England Apple, 725 F.2d at 144-45 ("Disclosure could have a significant, adverse effect on this individual's private or professional life."); Holy Spirit Ass'n v. FBI, 683 F.2d 562, 564-65 (D.C. Cir. 1982) (concurring opinion) (citing "risk of harassment" and fear of reprisals); Alirez v. NLRB, 676 F.2d 423, 427 (10th Cir. 1982) (holding that disclosure would result in "embarrassment or reprisals"); Lesar, 636 F.2d at 488 ("'Those cooperating with law enforcement should not now pay the price of full disclosure of personal details.'" (quoting Lesar, 455 F. Supp. at 925)); Coleman v. DOJ, No. 02-79-A, slip op. at 11 (E.D. Va. Oct. 7, 2002) (protecting names and identifying information of people who aided in investigation of Ruby Ridge incident); Gabrielli v. DOJ, 594 F. Supp. 309, 313 (N.D.N.Y. 1984) (protecting complainant's privacy interest even where "information provided to law enforcement authorities was knowingly false"); But see Cooper Cameron Corp. v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, 280 F.3d 539, 554 (5th Cir. 2002) (rebuffing idea of retaliation against employees who gave statements to OSHA investigator, and ordering disclosure of source-identifying content of statements despite fact that identifiable employee-witnesses' names already had been released in separate civil proceeding).

[31] See Lahr, 569 F.3d at 975-77 (reversing district court and holding that eyewitnesses in investigation of crash of TWA Flight 800 have cognizable privacy interest in nondisclosure of their names to avoid unwanted contact by plaintiff and other entities); Coulter v. Reno, No. 98-35170, 1998 WL 658835, at *1 (9th Cir. Sept. 17, 1998) (protecting names of witnesses and of requester's accusers); Spirko, 147 F.3d at 998 (protecting notes and phone messages concerning witnesses); Computer Prof'ls, 72 F.3d at 904 (protecting names of witnesses); Manna, 51 F.3d at 1166 (deciding witnesses in La Cosa Nostra case have "substantial" privacy interest in nondisclosure of their names); L&C Marine, 740 F.2d at

Courts have generally found that trial testimony does not eliminate Exemption 7(C) protection.[32] Similarly, courts have found privacy protection for individuals identified as potential witnesses.[33]

---

922 (noting that "employee-witnesses . . . have a substantial privacy interest"); Antonelli v. Sullivan, 732 F.2d 560, 562 (7th Cir. 1984) ("[The requester] has mentioned no legitimate need for the witnesses' phone numbers and we can well imagine the invasions of privacy that would result should he obtain them."); Jarvis v. ATF, No. 07-00111, 2008 WL 2620741, at *12 (N.D. Fla. June 30, 2008) (protecting "names and specifics of those who gave evidence in the investigation" due to risk of "impassioned acts of retaliation directed by Plaintiff through the agency of others, even though he is now in prison"); Dean v. FDIC, 389 F. Supp. 2d 780, 794-96 (E.D. Ky. 2005) (withholding identifying information of third parties and witnesses in IG investigation); Wayne's Mech. & Maint. Contractor, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, No. 1:00-CV-45, slip op. at 9 (N.D. Ga. May 7, 2001) ("In the context of OSHA investigations, employee-witnesses have a substantial privacy interest regarding statements given about a work-related accident in light of the potential for embarrassment and retaliation that disclosure of their identity could cause."); Foster v. DOJ, 933 F. Supp. 687, 692 (E.D. Mich. 1996) (protecting prospective witnesses); Crooker v. Tax Div. of the DOJ, No. 94-30129, 1995 WL 783236, at *18 (D. Mass. Nov. 17, 1995) (magistrate's recommendation) (holding names of witnesses and individuals who cooperated with government protected to prevent "undue embarrassment and harassment"), adopted, (D. Mass. Dec. 15, 1995), aff'd per curiam, 94 F.3d 640 (1st Cir. 1996) (unpublished table decision); Cappabianca v. Comm'r, U.S. Customs Serv., 847 F. Supp. 1558, 1566 (M.D. Fla. 1994) (ruling that witnesses, investigators, and other subjects of investigation have "substantial privacy interests"); Farese v. DOJ, 683 F. Supp. 273, 275 (D.D.C. 1987) (protecting names and number of family members of participants in Witness Security Program, as well as funds authorized to each, because disclosure "would pose a possible danger to the persons named" or "might subject those persons to harassment"). But see Cooper Cameron, 280 F.3d at 545, 554 (holding names of three employee-witnesses exempt, yet ordering release of source-identifying content of their statements); Lipman v. United States, No. 3:97-667, slip op. at 3 (M.D. Pa. June 3, 1998) (releasing names of witnesses who testified at trial based upon assumption defendant had already received information under Jencks v. United States, 353 U.S. 657 (1957)), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 98-7489 (3d Cir. Feb. 23, 1999).

[32] See Hawkins v. DEA, 347 F. App'x 223, 225 (7th Cir. 2009) (finding that testifying at requester's trial "did not wholly extinguish [witnesses'] privacy interests"); Jones, 41 F.3d at 247 (holding fact that law enforcement employee chose to testify or was required to testify or otherwise come forward in other settings does not amount to waiver of personal privacy); Burge v. Eastburn, 934 F.2d 577, 579 (5th Cir. 1991) (affirming refusal, under Exemption 7(C), to confirm or deny existence of information in FBI files regarding individuals who testified at plaintiff's murder trial); Melville v. DOJ, No. 05-0645, 2006 WL 2927575, at *9 (D.D.C. Oct. 9, 2006) (emphasizing that privacy interest of law enforcement personnel or other third parties mentioned in responsive records is not diminished by fact they may have testified at trial); McDade v. EOUSA, No. 03-1946, slip op. at 11 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 2004) ("A witness who testifies at a trial does not waive personal privacy."), summary affirmance granted, No. 04-5378, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 15259 (D.C. Cir. July 25, 2005); Boyd v. U.S. Marshals Serv., No. 99-2712, slip op. at 5 (D.D.C. Mar. 30, 2001) (finding that plaintiff's assertion that informant and others who testified at his criminal trial waived their right to

Moreover, courts have repeatedly recognized that the passage of time will not ordinarily diminish the privacy protection afforded by Exemption 7(C).[34] This has been

---

privacy by testifying is "simply wrong"); Galpine v. FBI, No. 99-1032, slip op. at 12 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 28, 2000) (reiterating that Exemption 7(C) protects "identities of individuals who testified at [requester's] criminal trial"); Rivera v. FBI, No. 98-0649, slip op. at 5 (D.D.C. Aug. 31, 1999) ("Individuals who testify at trial do not waive their privacy interest[s] beyond the scope of the trial record."); Robinson v. DEA, No. 97-1578, slip op. at 9 (D.D.C. Apr. 2, 1998) (stating that "[t]he disclosure during a trial of otherwise exempt information does not make the information public for all purposes"); Balt. Sun, No. 97-1991, slip op. at 5 (D. Md. Nov. 21, 1997) (reasoning that request for original photograph of defendant because court's copy was not reproducible is evidence that "substance of photograph had not been fully disclosed to the public," so defendant retained privacy interest in preventing further dissemination); Dayton Newspapers v. Dep't of the Navy, No. C-3-95-328, slip op. at 42 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 12, 1996) (finding that victims who testified at trial retain privacy interests in their identities). But see Linn v. DOJ, No. 92-1406, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9321, at *17 (D.D.C. May 29, 1997) (finding no justification for withholding identities of witnesses who testified against requester at trial) (Exemptions 7(C) and 7(F)), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 97-5122 (D.C. Cir. July 14, 1997).

[33] See North v. DOJ, 774 F. Supp. 2d 217, 224 (D.D.C. 2011) (finding that agency properly withheld names of potential witnesses in grand jury proceeding); Rosenglick v. IRS, No. 97-747-18A, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 3920, at *9 (M.D. Fla. Mar. 10, 1998) ("the chance of revealing the names of potential witnesses . . . counsels against forced disclosure"); Watson v. DOJ, 799 F. Supp. 193, 196 (D.D.C. 1992) (finding that names of potential witnesses may be withheld).

[34] See, e.g., Halpern, 181 F.3d at 297 ("Confidentiality interests cannot be waived through . . . the passage of time."); McDonnell, 4 F.3d at 1256 (deciding that passage of forty-nine years does not negate individual's privacy interest); Maynard, 986 F.2d at 566 n.21 (finding effect of passage of time upon individual's privacy interests to be "simply irrelevant"); Fitzgibbon, 911 F.2d at 768 (concluding that passage of more than thirty years irrelevant when records reveal nothing about government activities); Keys v. DOJ, 830 F.2d 337, 348 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (holding that passage of forty years did not "dilute the privacy interest as to tip the balance the other way"); King v. DOJ, 830 F.2d 210, 234 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (rejecting argument that passage of time diminished privacy interests at stake in records more than thirty-five years old); Diamond v. FBI, 707 F.2d 75, 77 (2d Cir. 1983) (noting that "the danger of disclosure may apply to old documents"); Franklin v. DOJ, No. 97-1225, slip op. at 12 (S.D. Fla. June 15, 1998) (magistrate's recommendation) (rejecting argument that passage of time vitiates individual's privacy interest in nondisclosure), adopted, (S.D. Fla. June 26, 1998); Stone, 727 F. Supp. at 664 (explaining that FBI Special Agents who participated in investigation over twenty years earlier, even one as well known as RFK assassination, "have earned the right to be 'left alone' unless an important public interest outweighs that right"); see also Exner, 902 F. Supp. at 244 n.7 (holding that fact that incidents in question "occurred more than thirty years ago may, but does not necessarily, diminish the privacy interest"); Branch, 658 F. Supp. at 209 (holding that "privacy interests of the persons mentioned in the investigatory files do not necessarily diminish with the passage of time"); cf. Schrecker v. DOJ, 349 F.3d 657, 664-65 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (approving FBI's use of "100-year rule," which presumes that individual is dead if birthdate appeared in

found even in instances in which the information was obtained through past law enforcement investigations that are now viewed critically by the public.[35] In fact, the "practical obscurity" concept embraced by the Supreme Court expressly recognizes that the passage of time may actually increase the privacy interest at stake when disclosure would revive information that was once public knowledge, but has long since faded from memory.[36]

Courts have held that an individual's Exemption 7(C) privacy interest likewise is not extinguished merely because a requester might on his own be able to "piece together" the identities of third parties whose names have been protected.[37] Similarly,

---

documents responsive to request and was more than 100 years old, to determine if subject of requested record is still alive and has privacy interest). But see Davin v. DOJ, 60 F.3d 1043, 1058 (3d Cir. 1995) (finding that for some individuals, privacy interest may become diluted by passage of over sixty years, though under certain circumstances potential for embarrassment and harassment may endure); Outlaw v. U.S. Dep't of the Army, 815 F. Supp. 505, 506 (D.D.C. Mar. 25, 1993) (ordering release of twenty-five-year-old photographs of murder victim with no known surviving next of kin).

[35] See, e.g., Dunaway v. Webster, 519 F. Supp. 1059, 1079 (N.D. Cal. 1981) ("[The target of a McCarthy era investigation] may . . . deserve greater protection, because the connection to such an investigation might prove particularly embarrassing or damaging."); see also Campbell v. DOJ, 193 F. Supp. 2d 29, 40-41 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (finding that "the persons who were involved in [investigation of 1960s writer and civil rights activist] deserve protection of their reputations as well as recognition that they were simply doing a job that the cultural and political climate at the time dictated").

[36] See Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 767 ("[O]ur cases have also recognized the privacy interest inherent in the nondisclosure of certain information even when the information may at one time have been public."); Rose v. Dep't of the Air Force, 495 F.2d 261, 267 (2d Cir. 1974) (noting that "a person's privacy may be as effectively infringed by reviving dormant memories as by imparting new information") (Exemption 6), aff'd, 425 U.S. 352 (1976); Judicial Watch v. DHS, 736 F. Supp. 2d 202, 211 (D.D.C. 2010) (finding "that the passage of time has not diluted the privacy interest at stake and, if anything, has actually increased [the] privacy interest as the events surrounding the . . . prosecution have faded from memory"); Assassination Archives & Research Ctr. v. CIA, 903 F. Supp. 131, 133 (D.D.C. 1995) (finding that passage of thirty or forty years "may actually increase privacy interests, and that even a modest privacy interest will suffice" to protect identities). See generally Favish, 541 U.S. at 173-74 (according privacy protection, notwithstanding passage of ten years since third party's death).

[37] Weisberg v. DOJ, 745 F.2d 1476, 1491 (D.C. Cir. 1984); see also Carpenter v. DOJ, 470 F.3d 434, 440 (1st Cir. 2006) (finding that privacy interest of subject is not terminated even if his identity as an informant could arguably be determined from another source); Ford v. West, No. 97-1342, 1998 WL 317561, at *3 (10th Cir. June 12, 1998) (holding fact that requester obtained some information through other channels does not change privacy protection under FOIA); L&C Marine, 740 F.2d at 922 ("An individual does not lose his privacy interest under 7(C) because his identity . . . may be discovered through other means."); Lawyer's Comm. for Civil Rights v. U.S. Dep't of the Treasury, No. 07-2590, 2008

courts have found that publicity regarding a matter does not eliminate privacy interests in preventing further disclosures[38] or preventing disclosures of related information.[39]

WL 4482855, at *21 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2008) (finding one's privacy interest in potentially embarrassing information is not lost "by the possibility that someone could reconstruct that data from public files"); Schoenman v. FBI, 573 F. Supp. 2d 119, 149 (D.D.C. 2008) ("Plaintiff's claim that he personally 'knows' that the individual at issue would not object to the release of his name is legally irrelevant."); Gavin v. SEC, No. 04-4522, 2007 WL 2454156, at *12 (D. Minn. Aug. 23, 2007) (noting that "it is inconsequential that [plaintiff] or the public could deduce the identities of staff members and third parties whose name and personal information have been redacted"); Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FBI, No. 00-745, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25732, at *20 (D.D.C. Apr. 20, 2001) ("The fact that the requester might be able to figure out the individuals' identities through other means or that their identities have been disclosed elsewhere does not diminish their privacy interests . . . ."); Voinche v. FBI, No. 99-1931, slip op. at 13 n.4 (D.D.C. Nov. 17, 2000) ("The fact that Mr. Voinche [might have] learned of the identity of these individuals by reading a publication does not impair the privacy rights enjoyed by these three people."); Cujas, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6466, at *9 (reiterating fact that information available elsewhere does not diminish third-party privacy interests in such law enforcement records); Smith v. ATF, 977 F. Supp. 446, 500 (D.D.C. 1997) (finding fact that plaintiff "can guess" names withheld does not waive privacy interest); Master v. FBI, 926 F. Supp. 193, 198-99 (D.D.C. 1996) (protecting subjects of investigative interest even though plaintiffs allegedly know their names), summary affirmance granted, 124 F.3d 1309 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (unpublished table decision). But see Cooper Cameron, 280 F.3d at 553 (refusing to protect content of three employee-witness statements after release of witnesses' names, even though disclosure would result in linking each employee to his or her statement).

[38] See, e.g., Lane v. Dep't of the Interior, 523 F.3d 1128, 1137 (9th Cir. 2008) (concluding that "notions of privacy in the FOIA exemption context encompass information already revealed to the public"); Fiduccia, 185 F.3d at 1047 (concluding that privacy interests are not lost by reason of earlier publicity); Schiffer, 78 F.3d at 1410-11 (deciding fact that much of information in requested documents was made public during related civil suit does not reduce privacy interest); Fitzgibbon, 911 F.2d at 768 (concluding fact that CIA or FBI may have released information about individual elsewhere does not diminish individual's "substantial privacy interests"); Bast, 665 F.2d at 1255 (finding that "previous publicity amounting to journalistic speculation cannot vitiate the FOIA privacy exemption"); Berger, 487 F. Supp. 2d at 502 (finding that agency's prior release of a list of names of third parties contacted during investigation does not allow for further disclosure of identifying information); Wiggins v. Nat'l Credit Union Admin., No. 05-2332, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 6367, at *21 (D.D.C. Jan. 30, 2007) ("Prior disclosure of personal information does not eliminate the privacy interest in avoiding further disclosure by the government"); Swope v. DOJ, 439 F. Supp. 2d 1, 6 (D.D.C. 2006) (stating that individual's awareness that telephone conversation is being monitored does not negate privacy rights in further disclosure of personal information); Odle v. DOJ, No. 05-2711, 2006 WL 1344813, at *10 (N.D. Cal. May 17, 2006) (finding that public's knowledge of subject's involvement in trial does not eliminate any privacy interest in further disclosure); Thomas v. Office of U.S. Attorney, 928 F. Supp. 245, 250 & n.8 (E.D.N.Y. 1996) (holding that despite public disclosure of some information about attorney's connection with crime family, he still retains privacy interests in preventing further disclosure), appeal dismissed, No. 93-CV-3128 (2d Cir. Oct. 29, 1996).

Courts have further held that an inadvertent failure to redact information regarding a third party does not eliminate the individual's privacy interest.[40]

The issue of whether a mug shot may be properly withheld under Exemption 7(C) has been addressed by three appellate courts, with the two most recent decisions finding that such photographs may be appropriately protected, and the earliest decision denying protection when specific circumstances are met.[41]

But cf. Grove v. CIA, 752 F. Supp. 28, 32 (D.D.C. 1990) (ordering FBI to further explain Exemption 7(C) withholdings in light of highly publicized nature of investigation and fact that CIA and Secret Service released other records pertaining to same individuals).

[39] See Favish, 541 U.S. at 171 (holding that "the fact that other pictures had been made public [does not] detract[] from the weighty privacy interests" in remaining pictures); Karantsalis v. DOJ, 635 F.3d 497, 503 (11th Cir. 2011) (per curiam) (finding that agency's publishing of driver's license photograph did not eliminate individual's privacy interest in his mug shot), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 1141 (2012); Kimberlin, 139 F.3d at 949 (reasoning that merely because subject of investigation acknowledged existence of investigation -- thus precluding Glomar response -- does not constitute waiver of subject's interest in keeping contents of OPR report confidential); Hunt v. FBI, 972 F.2d 286, 288 (9th Cir. 1992) (holding that "public availability" of accused FBI Special Agent's name does not defeat privacy protection in substance of FBI's internal investigation). But see Lissner v. U.S. Customs Serv., 241 F.3d 1220, 1224 (9th Cir. 2001) (finding disclosure of physical description of state law enforcement officers does not implicate privacy interests because officers' identities have already been released); Steinberg v. DOJ, 179 F.R.D. 366, 371 (D.D.C. 1998) (holding content of sources' interviews must be disclosed once agency disclosed their identities).

[40] See, e.g., Canning v. DOJ, 567 F. Supp. 2d 85, 95 (D.D.C. 2008) (finding that agency's inadvertent failure to redact does not strip third party of privacy interests); Billington v. DOJ, 69 F. Supp. 2d 128, 137 (D.D.C. 1999) (deciding that disclosure of unredacted records due to administrative error did not "diminish the magnitude of the privacy interests of the individuals" involved), aff'd in pertinent part, 233 F.3d 581, 583 (D.C. Cir. 2000) (stating there was "nothing to add to the district court's sound reasoning" with respect to the withholdings under Exemption 7(C)).

[41] Compare World Pub'g Co. v. DOJ, 672 F.3d 825, 827-32 (10th Cir. 2012) (finding that agency properly withheld mug shots after balancing sensitive nature of such photographs with requester's failure to show how release would inform public about operations of government), and Karantsalis, 635 F.3d at 504 (same), with Detroit Free Press, Inc. v. DOJ, 73 F.3d 93 (6th Cir. 1996) (ordering release of mug shots if request made during "an ongoing criminal proceeding, in which the names of the defendants have already been divulged and in which the defendants themselves have already appeared in open court," but not deciding whether they should be released in other situations).

Courts have found that death diminishes, but might not eliminate an individual's privacy interest.[42] Further, they have at times reviewed the procedures agencies use to determine whether a person is still living or has died. For instance, the D.C. Circuit approved the FBI's methods for making this determination in Schrecker v. DOJ.[43] As described in Schrecker, the FBI used several steps to determine whether an individual mentioned in a record was alive or dead, including looking up the individual's name in Who Was Who, employing its "100-year rule" (which presumes that an individual is dead if his or her birthdate appears in the responsive documents and he or she would be over 100 years old), and using previous FOIA requests (institutional knowledge), a search of the Social Security Death Index (when the Social Security number appears in the responsive documents), and other "internal" sources.[44] When these methods failed to reveal that an individual was deceased the D.C. Circuit upheld the FBI's use of Exemption 7(C).[45]

In Davis v. DOJ[46] the D.C. Circuit revisited the issue of agency methods for determining whether a person is still living. In Davis, the D.C. Circuit was presented with an unusual fact pattern in which the request was for audiotapes, not documents.[47] It accordingly determined that the steps outlined in Schrecker were insufficient when analyzing the tapes, as there is "virtually no chance that a speaker will announce" any

---

[42] Schrecker v. DOJ, 254 F.3d 162, 166 (D.C. Cir. 2001) ("one's own and one's relations' interests in privacy ordinarily extend beyond one's death"); Vest v. Dep't of the Air Force, 793 F. Supp. 2d 103, 122 (D.D.C. 2011) ("An individual's death diminishes, but does not eliminate, his privacy interest in the nondisclosure of any information about him contained in law enforcement records"); Clemente v. FBI, 741 F. Supp. 2d 64, 85 (D.D.C. 2010) ("[e]ven after death, a person retains some privacy interest in her identifying information").

[43] 349 F.3d at 663 (approving FBI's usual method of determining whether individual is living or dead); see also Davis v. DOJ, 460 F.3d 92, 103 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (clarifying that court's holding in Schrecker did not purport to affirm any set of search methodologies as per se sufficient); Johnson v. EOUSA, 310 F.3d 771, 775 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (approving agency's inquiries concerning subject of request, and refusing to establish "brightline set of steps for an agency" to determine whether he or she is living or dead).

[44] Schrecker, 349 F.3d at 663-66; see also Peltier v. FBI, No. 02-4328, slip op. at 21 (D. Minn. Oct. 24, 2006) (magistrate's recommendation) (finding that FBI properly determined whether individuals were living or deceased by following steps set out in Schrecker), adopted, (D. Minn. Feb. 9, 2007), aff'd, 563 F.3d 754 (8th Cir. 2009); Piper v. DOJ, 428 F. Supp. 2d 1, 3-4 (D.D.C. 2006) (same), aff'd, 222 F. App'x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2007); Peltier v. FBI, No. 03-905, 2005 WL 735964, at *14 (W.D.N.Y. Mar. 31, 2005) (same).

[45] Schrecker, 349 F.3d at 665.

[46] 460 F.3d 92.

[47] Id. at 95.

personal identifiers during an oral conversation.[48] The court concluded that in determining whether an agency has made a reasonable effort to ascertain whether an individual is deceased, courts must consider several factors, specifically "the likelihood that it will yield the sought-after information, the existence of readily available alternatives, and the burden of employing those alternatives."[49] The court remanded the case in Davis "to permit the agency an opportunity to evaluate the alternatives and either to conduct a further search [to determine whether individuals were deceased] or to explain satisfactorily why it should not be required to do so."[50]

The District Court for the District of Columbia's holding in Schoenman v. FBI[51] provides a detailed example of the steps agencies can take to comply with the D.C. Circuit's precedent.[52] In Schoenman, the Navy explained that to the extent the information is discernable from the file, it normally uses either the birth date and applies the "100-year rule," as described above, or uses a Social Security number to consult the list of deceased persons published by the Social Security Administration.[53] The records at issue in Schoenman did not contain birth dates or Social Security numbers, so the Navy conducted further research on the Internet using the third parties' names as they appeared in the records.[54] The Navy also articulated the steps taken to determine whether a former employee, whose name appeared in the record, was deceased. Specifically, the Navy contacted the center that stores personnel information for former employees; the Office of Personnel Management, which is responsible for federal civil retired pay; and the president of the Association of Retired Naval Investigative Service Agents to see if he or one of his members knew the individual.[55] The Navy also conducted numerous searches, including several news searches via LEXIS-NEXIS for obituaries, searches in two human resources databases used by the Navy personnel department, and a search of the AUTO-TRACK database, which is a general public records database.[56] While the Navy was unable to ascertain whether

---

[48] Id. at 104.

[49] See id. at 105.

[50] Id.

[51] 575 F. Supp. 2d 166 (D.D.C. 2008).

[52] Id. at 177 (advising agency that "it is required to make efforts to ascertain an individual's life status before invoking a privacy interest in connection with FOIA Exemption 7(C)"); see also Schoenman v. FBI, 576 F. Supp. 2d 3, 10 (D.D.C. 2008) (reminding another agency of same).

[53] Schoenman, 575 F. Supp. 2d at 177.

[54] Id.

[55] Id. at 178.

[56] Id.

certain individuals were alive or dead, the court found that the agency had taken reasonable steps in compliance with D.C. Circuit precedent to determine whether these individuals were deceased, and so appropriately protected their identities.[57]

Finally, the privacy interest protected under Exemption 7(C), as under Exemption 6, has been found to be applicable only to "individual" privacy interests.[58] Where disclosure concerning the financial makeup of a closely held corporation or small business would reveal the owner's personal finances, courts have found that the owner may have a personal privacy interest in such information.[59] This expectation of privacy can be diminished, however, with regard to matters in which that individual is acting in a business capacity.[60]

---

[57] Id.; see also Schoenman, 576 F. Supp. 2d at 11 (approving efforts to determine whether FBI legal attache was alive or dead, and even though no determination was reached, upholding redaction of name).

[58] See, e.g., Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 764 n.16 (citing various authorities supporting proposition that privacy rights belong to individuals); Sims v. CIA, 642 F.2d 562, 572 n.47 (D.C. Cir. 1980) ("Exemption 6 is applicable only to individuals."); see also FLRA v. VA, 958 F.2d 503, 509 (2d Cir. 1992) (holding that same degree of privacy interest is required to trigger balancing under Exemptions 6 and 7(C)); cf. Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA, 449 F.3d 141 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (upholding the redaction of business's names and addresses, as well as names of business employees as necessary to protect the privacy interests of individuals to be safe from physical violence) (Exemption 6).

[59] See, e.g., Consumers' Checkbook, Ctr. for the Study of Servs. v. HHS, 554 F.3d 1046, 1051 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (stating that D.C. Circuit has "recognized substantial privacy interests in business-related financial information for individually-owned or closely-held businesses") (Exemption 6); Multi Ag Media LLC v. USDA, 515 F.3d 1224, 1230 (D.C. Cir. 2008) (finding privacy interest in data concerning farms because disclosure would reveal private personal financial information of owners) (Exemption 6); see also Campaign for Family Farms v. Glickman, 200 F.3d 1180, 1189 (8th Cir. 2000) ("An overly technical distinction between individuals acting in a purely private capacity and those acting in an entrepreneurial capacity fails to serve the exemption's purpose of protecting the privacy of individuals.") (Exemption 6).

[60] See, e.g., Or. Natural Desert Ass'n v. U.S. Dep't of the Interior, 24 F. Supp. 2d 1088, 1089 (D. Or. 1998) (concluding that cattle owners who violated federal grazing laws have "diminished expectation of privacy" in their names when that information related to their commercial interests) (Exemptions 6 and 7(C)); Wash. Post Co. v. USDA, 943 F. Supp. 31, 34-36 (D.D.C. 1996) (finding that farmers who received subsidies under cotton price support program have only minimal privacy interest in home addresses from which they also operate businesses), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 96-5373 (D.C. Cir. May 19, 1997) (Exemption 6).

The issue of whether a corporation may have "personal privacy" interests under Exemption 7(C) was recently addressed by the Supreme Court in FCC v. AT&T.[61] In that case, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit had found that a corporation may have personal privacy interests because the Administrative Procedure Act defined the word "person" to include corporations, and noted that "[i]t would be very odd indeed for an adjectival form of a defined term not to refer back to that defined term."[62] In reversing the Third Circuit, the Supreme Court explained that "[a]djectives typically reflect the meaning of corresponding nouns, but not always."[63] Citing various examples,[64] the Court noted that such adjectives sometimes "acquire distinct meanings of their own."[65] The Court found that Exemption 7(C) presented such an instance, and that because the word "personal" was not defined by Congress, it should be given its ordinary meaning, which "refers to individuals" but not to corporations.[66] Ultimately, the Supreme Court unanimously held that "the protection in FOIA against disclosure of law enforcement information on the ground that it would constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy does not extend to corporations."[67]

Public Interest

Under the traditional Exemption 7(C) analysis, once a privacy interest has been identified and its magnitude has been assessed, it is balanced against the magnitude of any recognized public interest that would be served by disclosure.[68] In NARA v. Favish,

---

[61] 131 S. Ct. 1177 (2011); see also *FOIA Post*, "Supreme Court Rejects Argument that Corporations Have 'Personal Privacy' Interests" (posted 3/2/11).

[62] AT&T v. FCC, 582 F.3d 490, 497 (3d Cir. 2009), rev'd, 131 S. Ct. 1177 (2011).

[63] FCC v. AT&T, 131 S. Ct. at 1181.

[64] See id. (comparing "crab" with "crabbed," "corn" with "corny," and "crank" with "cranky").

[65] Id.

[66] Id. at 1181-82.

[67] Id. at 1185.

[68] See Schiffer v. FBI, 78 F.3d 1405, 1410 (9th Cir. 1996) (explaining that once agency shows that privacy interest exists, court must balance it against public's interest in disclosure); Computer Prof'ls for Soc. Responsibility v. U.S. Secret Serv., 72 F.3d 897, 904 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (finding that after privacy interest found, court must identify public interest to be served by disclosure); Massey v. FBI, 3 F.3d 620, 624-25 (2d Cir. 1993) (holding that once agency establishes that privacy interest exists, that interest must be balanced against value of information in furthering FOIA's disclosure objectives); Church of Scientology Int'l v. IRS, 995 F.2d 916, 921 (9th Cir. 1993) (remanding case because district court failed to determine whether public interest in disclosure outweighed privacy concerns); Grine v. Coombs, No. 95-342, 1997 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19578, at *19 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 10, 1997) (requiring

the Supreme Court explained that in order to balance the interests "and give practical meaning to the exemption, the usual rule that the citizen need not offer a reason for requesting the information must be inapplicable."[69] Instead, the Supreme Court held that unless a requester shows "that the public interest sought to be advanced is a significant one" and that "the information is likely to advance that interest," an invasion of privacy is necessarily unwarranted in the Exemption 7(C) context.[70] Where a request seeks information that categorically implicates a privacy interest, and the requester has failed to assert a cognizable public interest, courts have upheld agencies' use of Exemption 7(C) to categorically protect possibly responsive records, without the need to conduct a search.[71]

---

balancing of privacy interest and extent to which it is invaded against public benefit that would result from disclosure); Thomas v. Office of U.S. Attorney, 928 F. Supp. 245, 250 (E.D.N.Y. 1996) (observing that since personal privacy interest in information is implicated, court must inquire whether any countervailing factors exist that would warrant invasion of that interest); Lawyers Comm. for Human Rights v. INS, 721 F. Supp. 552, 571 (S.D.N.Y. 1989) (balancing plaintiff's interest in disclosure of names of individuals listed in INS Lookout Book on basis of ideological exclusion provision against excluded individuals' privacy interests); *FOIA Post*, "Supreme Court Rules for 'Survivor Privacy' in Favish" (posted 4/9/04) (discussing balancing of privacy interests and public interest); FOIA Update, Vol. X, No. 2, at 7 ("FOIA Counselor: Exemption 6 and Exemption 7(C): Step-by-Step Decisionmaking").

[69] Favish, 541 U.S. at 172; see also Graff v. FBI, 822 F. Supp. 2d 23, 33-34 (D.D.C. 2011) (recognizing "special burden" on requester in Exemption 7(C) context and noting "it would be inefficient and impractical, and ultimately, unfair to the requesters, to depend upon the government to guess what the requesters had in mind and to catalogue the possible public reasons for disclosure"); Lewis v. DOJ, No. 09-0746, 2011 WL 5222896, at *1 (D.D.C. Nov. 2, 2011) (holding that "[i]t is the requester's obligation to articulate a public interest sufficient to outweigh an individual's privacy interest, and the public interest must be significant").

[70] 541 U.S. 157, 172 (2004); see also Prison Legal News v. EOUSA, 628 F.3d 1243, 1251 (10th Cir. 2011) (noting that because alleged public interests already satisfied by materials viewed and reported on by media related to trial, any "incremental addition" to public knowledge was outweighed by privacy interest), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 473 (2011); Clemente v. FBI, 741 F. Supp. 2d 64, 85 (D.D.C. 2010) (finding that "[w]hile the Court agrees that the public has a significant interest in learning about any misuse of criminal informants by the FBI, [plaintiff] has failed to explain how that interest would be advanced by the release of the names and identifying information of all individuals mentioned in [the] file"); *FOIA Post*, "Supreme Court Rules for 'Survivor Privacy' in Favish" (posted 4/9/04) (discussing public interest standard adopted in Favish, as well as required "nexus" between requested information and public interest asserted); cf. CEI Wash. Bureau, Inc. v. DOJ, 469 F.3d 126, 129 (D.C. Cir. 2006) (remanding for possible "evidentiary hearing[]" needed to resolve "factual disputes" regarding "extent of" both privacy interests and public interests involved).

[71] See Blackwell v. FBI, 646 F.3d 37, 42 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (holding that agency "was correct in declining to search" for records pertaining to certain third parties because it "would have

Once a requester identifies a public interest in the requested information, however, an agency may be required to search for and review records in order to effect the balancing required under Exemption 7(C).[72]

Under Reporters Committee, the public interest recognized under the FOIA is specifically limited to the FOIA's "core purpose" of "shed[ding] light on an agency's performance of its statutory duties."[73] Accordingly, information that does not reveal the

---

added only information that [the court has] concluded is protected by Exemption 7(C)"); Boyd v. Crim. Div. of the DOJ, 475 F.3d 381, 388-89 (D.C. Cir. 2007) (finding that Exemption 7(C) protected information pertaining to third party even where "Glomar" response was improper and that it was unnecessary to find out whether government actually had the requested information); Graff v. FBI, 822 F. Supp. 2d 23, 33-34 (D.D.C. 2011) (noting that "[w]hen a request . . . specifically calls for law enforcement records related to a third party, all of the responsive records will fall within the scope of the categorical exemption unless it can be shown that the invasion of privacy is warranted" and approving of agency's policy of categorically denying such requests in absence of death certificate, privacy waiver, or showing of public interest that would be advanced); Lewis v. DOJ, 609 F. Supp. 2d 80, 85 (D.D.C. 2009) (stating that plaintiff did not demonstrate public interest in otherwise exempt third-party information, so whether defendant searched for records is "'immaterial'" as "'that refusal deprived plaintiff of nothing to which he is entitled'" (quoting Edwards v. DOJ, 04-5044, 2004 WL 2905342, at *1 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 14, 2004))), aff'd per curiam, No. 09-5225, 2010 WL 1632835 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 7 2010); see also Oguaju v. United States, 288 F.3d 448, 451 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (holding that third party's "privacy interest, however slight, necessarily outweighs the nil public interest in release" and so it was irrelevant whether agency erred in using "Glomar" response for request for law enforcement information pertaining to third party, as refusal to confirm or deny existence of responsive records "deprives [plaintiff] of nothing to which he is entitled"), vacated & remanded, 541 U.S. 970, on remand, 378 F.3d 1115 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (reaffirming prior decision). But cf., Venkataram v. Office of Info. Policy, No. 09-6520, 2011 WL 2038735, at *3 (D.N.J. May 25, 2011) (rejecting agency's assertion that records were categorically exempt after determining that underlying records may not entirely consist of "private information").

[72] See, e.g., Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Washington v. DOJ, No. 11-754, 2012 WL 45499, at *7 (D.D.C. Jan. 10, 2012) (rejecting agency's categorical denial of request for investigatory records pertaining to member of Congress where agency had been specifically directed by Congress to investigate particular project and stating "the American public has a right to know about the manner in which its representatives are conducting themselves and whether the government agency responsible for investigating and, if warranted, prosecuting those representatives for alleged illegal conduct is doing its job"); see also Bonilla v. DOJ, No. 10-22168, 2011 WL 122023, at *3 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 13, 2011) (rejecting categorical withholding and finding that "[d]efendant has not met its burden of showing the type of record requested by Plaintiff would not reveal any 'official information' about a government agency") (quoting DOJ v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749, 780 (1989)).

[73] Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 773; see also McGehee v. DOJ, 800 F. Supp. 2d 220, 234 (D.D.C. 2011) (noting that "the relevant question" in public interest analysis "is not whether the public would like to know the names . . . but whether knowing those names would shed

operations and activities of the government does not satisfy the public interest requirement.[74] As a result, courts have rarely recognized any public interest, as defined by Reporters Committee, in disclosure of information sought to assist someone in challenging their conviction.[75] Indeed, a FOIA requester's private need for information

---

light on the [agency's] performance of its statutory duties"); Dayton Newspapers, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of the Navy, 109 F. Supp. 2d 768, 775 (S.D. Ohio 1999) (concluding that questionnaire responses by court-martial members were properly withheld because "information contained therein sheds no light on the workings of the government").

[74] See Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at 773 (finding that purpose of FOIA "is not fostered by disclosure of information about private citizens that is accumulated in various government files but that reveals little or nothing about an agency's own conduct").

[75] See, e.g., Hawkins v. DEA, 347 F. App'x 223, 225 (7th Cir. 2009) (finding that "a prisoner's interest in attacking his own conviction is not a public interest"); Peltier v. FBI, 563 F.3d 754, 764 (8th Cir. 2009) (per curiam) (holding that "a prisoner may not override legitimate privacy interests recognized in Exemption 7(C) simply by pointing to the public's interest in fair criminal trials or the even-handed administration of justice"); Thomas v. DOJ, 260 F. App'x 677, 679 (5th Cir. 2007) (finding no public interest as plaintiff was "seek[ing] to learn about prosecutorial misconduct, not the [agency's] misconduct"); Oguaju, 288 F.3d at 450 (finding that plaintiff's "personal stake in using the requested records to attack his convictions does not count in the calculation of the public interest"); Neely v. FBI, 208 F.3d 461, 464 (4th Cir. 2000) (ruling that requester's wish to establish his own innocence does not create FOIA-recognized public interest); Hale v. DOJ, 973 F.2d 894, 901 (10th Cir. 1992) (finding no FOIA-recognized public interest in death-row inmate's allegation of unfair trial); Landano v. DOJ, 956 F.2d 422, 430 (3d Cir. 1991) (finding no public interest in disclosure of identities of individuals involved in murder investigation because such release would not shed light on how FBI fulfills its responsibilities); Burge v. Eastburn, 934 F.2d 577, 580 (5th Cir. 1991) (concluding that "requester's need, however significant, does not warrant disclosure"); Rimmer v. Holder, No. 10-1106, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 107883, at *22 (M.D. Tenn. Sept. 22, 2011) (noting that aiding requester "in his underlying state collateral review proceedings, is an illegitimate" public interest); Clifton v. U.S. Postal Inspection Serv., 591 F. Supp. 2d 10, 12 (D.D.C. 2008) (stating that "the plaintiff's Brady argument is both misplaced and ineffective"); Galpine v. FBI, No. 99-1032, slip op. at 13 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 28, 2000) (restating that requests for exculpatory evidence are "'outside the proper role of FOIA'" (quoting Colon v. EOUSA, No. 98-0180, 1998 WL 695631, at *5 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 1998))); Fedrick v. DOJ, 984 F. Supp. 659, 664 (W.D.N.Y. 1997) (magistrate's recommendation) (finding that requester's personal interest in seeking information for use in collateral challenge to his conviction does not raise "FOIA-recognized interest"), adopted, No. 95-558 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 28, 1997), aff'd sub nom. Fedrick v. Huff, 165 F.3d 13 (2d Cir. 1998) (unpublished table decision); Thomas, 928 F. Supp. at 251 (holding that prisoner's personal interest in information to challenge his conviction "does not raise a FOIA-recognized interest that should be weighed against the subject's privacy interests"). But see Roth v. DOJ, 642 F.3d 1161, 1175-76 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (suggesting that "the public might well have a significant interest in knowing whether the federal government engaged in blatant Brady violations in a capital case" and finding substantial public interest in determining whether agency was "withholding information that could corroborate a death-row inmate's claim of innocence"), reh'g en banc denied, No. 09-5428 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 14,

in connection with litigation has been found to play no part in determining whether disclosure is warranted.[76]

Significantly, however, in 2011 the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit found that there was a "substantial" public interest "in knowing whether [an agency] is withholding information that could corroborate a death-row inmate's claim of innocence."[77] In Roth v. DOJ, the court held that the requested information would advance that interest where the requester "show[ed] that a reasonable person could believe that the following might be true: (1) that the [subjects of the request] were the real killers, and (2) that the [agency was] withholding information that could corroborate that theory."[78] The D.C. Circuit, after finding that the requester had made

---

2011); Lipman v. United States, No. 3:97-667, slip op. at 4 (M.D. Pa. June 3, 1998) (making exceptional finding of public interest in plaintiff's quest to discover whether government withheld Brady material).

[76] See Massey, 3 F.3d at 625 ("[The] mere possibility that information may aid an individual in the pursuit of litigation does not give rise to a public interest."); Joslin v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, No. 88-1999, slip op. at 8 (10th Cir. Oct. 20, 1989) (finding no public interest in release of documents sought for use in private tort litigation); Del Rio v. Miami Field Office of the FBI, No. 08-21103, 2009 WL 2762698, at *5 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 27, 2009) (holding that "[a] FOIA litigant's private interest in obtaining materials for personal reasons plays no part in the required balancing of interests"); Rogers v. Davis, No. 08-177, 2009 WL 213034, at *2-4 (E.D. Mo. Jan. 28, 2009) (finding no public interest in documents sought for use in employment discrimination action against agency); Sakamoto v. EPA, 443 F. Supp. 2d 1182, 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2006) (finding no public interest in disclosure of documents sought for use in plaintiff's employment discrimination case); Meserve v. DOJ, No. 04-1844, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56732, at *23-24 (D.D.C. Aug. 14, 2006) (holding that request seeking information in order to pursue motion for new trial and motion to vacate or set aside sentence does not involve qualifying public interest); Garcia v. DOJ, 181 F. Supp. 2d 356, 372 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (holding that request seeking information in furtherance of private litigation falls outside "the ambit of FOIA's goal of public disclosure of agency action"); Exner v. DOJ, 902 F. Supp. 240, 244 & n.8 (D.D.C. 1995) (explaining requester's interest in pursuing legal remedies against person who entered her apartment does not pertain to workings of government); Bruscino v. BOP, No. 94-1955, 1995 WL 444406, at *9 (D.D.C. May 15, 1995) (concluding no public interest in release of information concerning other inmates sought for use in private litigation); Andrews v. DOJ, 769 F. Supp. 314, 317 (E.D. Mo. 1991) (deciding no public interest in satisfaction of private judgments). But see United Am. Fin., Inc. v. Potter, 667 F. Supp. 2d 49, 60 (D.D.C. 2009) (holding that "the potential use of [the responsive records] in a potential civil suit does constitute a recognized public interest under Exemption 7(C)"); Butler v. DOJ, No. 86-2255, 1994 WL 55621, at *5-6 (D.D.C. Feb. 3, 1994) (ordering identities of supervisory FBI personnel disclosed because of "significant" public interest in protecting requester's due process rights in his attempt to vacate sentence).

[77] Roth, 642 F.3d at 1175-76 (D.C. Cir. 2011).

[78] Id. at 1180-81.

such a showing in the case, ordered the government to reveal the existence of any records connecting three individuals with a specific criminal investigation.[79]

In NARA v. Favish, the Supreme Court addressed the showing necessary to demonstrate a public interest in disclosure where government wrongdoing is alleged.[80] Noting that "[a]llegations of misconduct are 'easy to allege and hard to disprove,'"[81] it ruled that a FOIA requester relying on such a public interest must do more than assert a "bare suspicion" and instead "must produce evidence that would warrant a belief by a reasonable person that the alleged government impropriety might have occurred" before there will "exist a counterweight on the FOIA scale to balance against the cognizable privacy interests in the requested records."[82] (See also the further discussions of Favish's privacy-protection principles under Exemption 6, above.)

---

[79] Id. at 1181-82.

[80] 541 U.S. 157.

[81] Id. at 175 (quoting Crawford-El v. Britton, 523 U.S. 574, 585 (1998)).

[82] Id. at 174-75; see, e.g., Blackwell, 646 F.3d at 41 (holding plaintiff had "not come close to meeting the demanding Favish standard"); CASA de Md., Inc. v. DHS, 409 F. App'x 697, 698-701 (4th Cir. 2011) (per curiam) (finding Favish misconduct standard satisfied); McLaughlin v. DOJ, No. 10-5050, 2011 WL 9080 (D.C. Cir. Jan 3, 2011) (per curiam) (holding plaintiff had not satisfied Favish misconduct standard); Peltier v. FBI, 563 F.3d 754, 765 (8th Cir. 2009) (emphasizing that requester's production of evidence that government improprieties might have occurred only establishes public interest that must then be weighed); Associated Press v. DOD, 554 F.3d 274, 289 (2d Cir. 2009) (finding plaintiff's argument "squarely foreclosed by Favish" as no evidence of abuse was produced); ACLU v. DOD, 543 F.3d 59, 88 (2d Cir. 2008) (noting, as government misconduct was conceded, that public interest in disclosure of photographs depicting prisoner abuse by government forces in Iraq and Afghanistan was "strong"), vacated & remanded on other grounds, 558 U.S. 1042 (2009); Boyd, 475 F.3d at 388 (agreeing that agency correctly applied Exemption 7(C) as plaintiff failed to make "'meaningful evidentiary showing'" as required by Favish (quoting Favish, 475 U.S. at 175)); see also Oguaju, 288 F.3d at 451 (holding that "bald accusations" of prosecutorial misconduct are insufficient to establish public interest); Spirko v. USPS, 147 F.3d 992, 999 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (finding no public interest in names and information pertaining to suspects and law enforcement officers absent any evidence of alleged misconduct by agency); Enzinna v. DOJ, No. 97-5078, 1997 WL 404327, at *1 (D.C. Cir. June 30, 1997) (finding that without evidence that AUSA made misrepresentation at trial, public interest in disclosure is insubstantial); Quiñon v. FBI, 86 F.3d 1222, 1227, 1231 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (holding that in absence of evidence FBI engaged in wrongdoing, public interest is "insubstantial"); Schiffer, 78 F.3d at 1410 (finding "little to no" public interest in disclosure when requester made unsubstantiated claim that FBI's decision to investigate him had been affected by "undue influence"); McCutchen v. HHS, 30 F.3d 183, 189 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (finding "negligible" public interest in disclosure of identities of agency scientists who did not engage in scientific misconduct); Beck v. DOJ, 997 F.2d 1489, 1492-94 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (holding that agency properly "Glomarized" request for records concerning alleged wrongdoing by two named employees; no public interest absent any evidence of wrongdoing or widespread publicity of investigation); Buros v. HHS, No.

In the seminal case of Stern v. FBI,[83] the D.C. Circuit established guidelines to differentiate between employees in this context, holding "that the level of responsibility held by a federal employee" and the type of wrongdoing committed by that employee "are appropriate considerations" in this privacy analysis.[84] Courts have found that disclosure must serve a public interest that is greater than the strong privacy interests of these employees and for lower level employees in particular, privacy protection is still often afforded.[85] At times courts have found a cognizable public interest in disclosure of

---

93-571, slip op. at 10 (W.D. Wis. Oct. 26, 1994) (holding even though subject's potential mishandling of funds already known to public, "confirming . . . federal criminal investigation brushes the subject with an independent and indelible taint of wrongdoing"); *FOIA Post*, "Supreme Court Rules for 'Survivor Privacy' in Favish" (posted 4/9/04) (discussing higher standard, as well as continued need for showing of Reporters Committee-type public interest even when requester successfully alleges government wrongdoing).

[83] 737 F.2d 84 (D.C. Cir. 1984).

[84] Id. at 92-94 (protecting identities of lower-level employees, who were found only to be negligent, but ordering disclosure of identity of higher-level official who knowingly participated in cover-up); see also, e.g., Perlman v. DOJ, 312 F.3d 100, 107-09 (2d Cir. 2002) (ordering release of extensive details concerning IG investigation of former INS general counsel who was implicated in wrongdoing, and enunciating five-factor test to balance government employee's privacy interest against public interest in disclosure, including employee's rank, degree of wrongdoing and strength of evidence, availability of information, whether information sheds light on government activity, and whether information is related to job function or is personal in nature); Homick v. DOJ, No. 98-00557, slip op. at 19-27 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2004) (ordering disclosure of identities of FBI Special Agents, government support personnel, and foreign, state, and local law enforcement officers as plaintiff produced specific evidence warranting a belief by a reasonable person that alleged government impropriety during three prosecutions might have occurred), reconsideration denied, (N.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2004), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 04-17568 (9th Cir. July 5, 2005); cf. Families for Freedom v. U.S. Customs & Border Prot., No. 10-2705, 2011 WL 6780896, at *4 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 27, 2011) (applying Perlman standard where government wrongdoing not at issue); Chang v. Dep't of the Navy, 314 F. Supp. 2d 35, 42-45 (D.D.C. 2004) (approving disclosure of details of nonjudicial punishment and letter of reprimand of commander of ship punished for dereliction of duty) (Privacy Act "wrongful disclosure" decision interpreting Exemption 6).

[85] See Trentadue v. Integrity Comm., 501 F.3d 1215, 1234-36 (10th Cir. 2007) (finding that protection of "low-level" employees "who committed serious acts of misconduct" was proper, as disclosure of their names "would shed little light on the operation of the government"), reh'g denied, No. 04-4200, 2007 WL 4800708 (Nov. 20, 2007); People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals v. USDA, No. 06-930, 2007 WL 1720136, at *6 (D.D.C. June 11, 2007) (protecting identities of "low-level [agency] inspectors who engaged in misconduct in performing slaughterhouse inspections," since inspectors were not "high-level employees" and it was not "well-publicized scandal"); Jefferson v. DOJ, No. 01-1418, slip op. at 11 (D.D.C. Nov. 14, 2003) (protecting details of IG investigation of government attorney-advisor with no decisionmaking authority as employee whose rank was not so high

information in cases that do not involve allegations of misconduct by government personnel.[86]

Courts have held that no public interest exists in federal records that pertain to alleged misconduct by state officials.[87] Moreover, any special expertise claimed by the requester is irrelevant in assessing any public interest in disclosure.[88]

---

that public interest in disclosure could outweigh personal privacy interest in learning of any investigated alleged misconduct).

[86] See, e.g., ACLU v. DOJ, 655 F.3d 1, 14 (D.C. Cir. 2011) (finding valid public interest where requesters sought to show nature, effectiveness, and intrusiveness of government's policy regarding warrantless cell phone tracking, and specifically noting that "plaintiffs are not (or at least not only) seeking to show that the government's tracking policy is legally improper"); Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Washington, 2012 WL 45499, at *7 (finding public interest in request for investigatory records pertaining to member of Congress and noting that as requester "made it very clear . . . it is not arguing that [the agency] engaged in misconduct . . . it is not correct that Plaintiff must provide compelling evidence of any such conduct"); Families for Freedom v. U.S. Customs & Border Prot., No. 10-2705, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63829, at *48-50 (S.D.N.Y. June 16, 2011) (finding that even if Exemption 7 threshold met, names of authors and recipients of two memoranda must be released because of the "substantial public interest in knowing whether the expectations and requirements articulated in the memoranda reflect high-level agency policy"); Finkel v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, No. 05-5525, 2007 WL 1963163, at *11 (D.N.J. June 29, 2007) (finding that public interest in information on beryllium sensitization and OSHA's response thereto outweighed limited privacy interest in inspection officers' identification numbers); Darby v. U.S. Dep't of the Air Force, No. CV-S-00-0661, slip op. at 11-12 (D. Nev. Mar. 1, 2002) (ordering release of names of DOD IG investigators and other government employees involved in investigation, as there "is a 'strong' public interest in ensuring the integrity of federal agency investigations"), aff'd sub nom. Darby v. DOD, 74 F. App'x 813 (9th Cir. 2003); Hardy v. FBI, No. 95-883, slip op. at 21 (D. Ariz. July 29, 1997) (releasing identities of supervisory ATF agents and other agents publicly associated with Waco incident, finding that public's interest in Waco raid "is greater than in the normal case where release of agent names affords no insight into an agency's conduct or operations"); Butler v. DOJ, No. 86-2255, 1994 WL 55621, at *5 (D.D.C. Feb. 3, 1994) (releasing identities of supervisory FBI personnel upon finding of "significant" public interest in protecting requester's due process rights).

[87] See Landano, 956 F.2d at 430 (discerning "no FOIA-recognized public interest in discovering wrongdoing by a state agency"); Garcia, 181 F. Supp. 2d at 374 ("The discovery of wrongdoing at a state as opposed to a federal agency . . . is not the goal of FOIA."); LaRouche v. DOJ, No. 90-2753, 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25416, at *20 (D.D.C. July 5, 2001) ("The possible disclosures of state government misconduct is not information that falls within a public interest FOIA [was] intended to protect."); Thomas, 928 F. Supp. at 251 (recognizing that FOIA cannot serve as basis for requests about conduct of state agency). But see Lissner v. U.S. Customs Serv., 241 F.3d 1220, 1223 (9th Cir. 2001) (finding that public interest exists in Custom Service's handling of smuggling incident despite fact that information pertained to actions of state law enforcement officers).

Courts have found a distinction between the public interest that can exist in an overall subject that relates to a FOIA request and the public interest that might or might not be served by disclosure of the particular records that are responsive to a given FOIA request.[89] The key consideration is whether disclosure of the particular record portions at issue would serve an identified public interest and whether the magnitude of such interest warrants the overriding of a personal privacy interest in the Exemption 7(C) balancing process.[90]

---

[88] See Hawkins, 347 F. App'x at 224 (noting that "the identity of the requesting party and the motivation for a FOIA request are irrelevant"); Ford v. West, No. 97-1342, 1998 WL 317561, at *3 (10th Cir. June 12, 1998) (holding that plaintiff's prior EEO successes against agency do not establish public interest in disclosure of third-party names in this investigation); Massey, 3 F.3d at 625 (finding that identity of requesting party and use that party plans to make of requested information have "no bearing on the assessment of the public interest served by disclosure"); Stone v. FBI, 727 F. Supp. 662, 668 n.4 (D.D.C. 1990) (stating that court looks to public interest served by release of information, "not to the highly specialized interests of those individuals who understandably have a greater personal stake in gaining access to that information"). But cf. Manna v. DOJ, 51 F.3d 1158, 1166 (3d Cir. 1995) (deciding that although court does not usually consider requester's identity, fact that requester held high position in La Cosa Nostra is certainly material to protection of individual privacy).

[89] See ACLU of N. Cal. v. DOJ, No. 04-4447, 2005 WL 588354, at *13 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 11, 2005) (ruling that "it was not sufficient for the plaintiffs to show [public] interest in only the general subject area of the request"); Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DOD, 355 F. Supp. 2d 98, 102 (D.D.C. 2004) (stating that "[t]he fact that [the requester] has provided evidence that there is some media interest in data mining as an umbrella issue does not satisfy the requirement that [it] demonstrate interest in the specific subject of [its] FOIA request").

[90] See, e.g., Peltier v. FBI, 563 F.3d 754, 765-66 (8th Cir. 2009) (upholding Exemption 7(C) redactions because court was "not convinced that there is a substantial nexus" between request and requester's asserted public interest, and finding that any public benefit from disclosure is "too uncertain and remote"); KTVY-TV v. United States, 919 F.2d 1465, 1470 (10th Cir. 1990) (rejecting assertion that "the public interest at stake is the right of the public to know" about controversial event, because on careful analysis particular record segments at issue "do not provide information about" that subject); Lopez v. EOUSA, 598 F. Supp. 2d 83, 89 (D.D.C. 2009) (holding that agency's Vaughn Index demonstrates that disclosure of specific information withheld is not likely to advance any significant public interest, "even if the plaintiff could establish that the public has a significant interest in the material he is seeking"); Seized Prop. Recovery, Corp. v. U.S. Customs and Border Prot., 502 F. Supp. 2d 50, 59 (D.D.C. 2007) (finding no "appropriate nexus" between disclosure of names and addresses of individuals whose property is seized and public interest in how Customs performs its duties); see also Halloran v. VA, 874 F.2d 315, 323 (5th Cir. 1989) (observing that "merely stating that the interest exists in the abstract is not enough; rather, the court should have analyzed how that interest would be served by compelling disclosure"). But see Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Secret Serv., 579 F. Supp. 2d 151, 154 (D.D.C. 2008) (finding that disclosure of names of those requesting access to White House would shed light on why visitors came to White House).

Balancing Process

If a requester fails to identify a public interest in disclosure and there is a privacy interest in the requested material, the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit has held "[w]e need not linger over the balance; something, even a modest privacy interest, outweighs nothing every time."[91]

If a requester does identify a public interest that qualifies for consideration under Reporters Committee,[92] the requester must also demonstrate that the public interest in disclosure is sufficiently compelling to, on balance, outweigh legitimate privacy interests.[93] When this burden is met, courts have found that release of third party information is justified.[94]

---

[91] Nat'l Ass'n of Retired Fed. Employees v. Horner, 879 F.2d 873, 879 (D.C. Cir. 1989) (Exemption 6) [hereinafter NARFE]; see also Beck v. DOJ, 997 F.2d 1489, 1494 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (observing that because request implicates no public interest at all, court "'need not linger over the balance; something . . . outweighs nothing every time'" (quoting NARFE, 879 F.2d at 879) (Exemptions 6 and 7(C)); Maynard v. CIA, 986 F.2d 547, 566 (1st Cir. 1993) (finding that court "need not . . . dwell upon the balance" where no public interest is implicated); Fitzgibbon v. CIA, 911 F.2d 755, 768 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (holding that where privacy interest but no public interest exists, court "'need not linger over the balance; something . . . outweighs nothing every time'" (quoting NARFE, 879 F.2d at 879)); Shoemaker v. DOJ, No. 03-1258, slip op. at 7 (C.D. Ill. May 19, 2004) (concluding that documents were properly withheld where plaintiff could not identify public interest, "let alone any substantial public interest to outweigh the privacy concerns claimed by [the government]"), aff'd, 121 F. App'x 127 (7th Cir. 2004); King v. DOJ, 586 F. Supp. 286, 294 (D.D.C. 1983) ("Where the requester fails to assert a public interest purpose for disclosure, even a less than substantial invasion of another's privacy is unwarranted."), aff'd, 830 F.2d 210 (D.C. Cir. 1987).

[92] DOJ v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749 (1989).

[93] See Lahr v. NTSB, 569 F.3d 964, 979 (9th Cir. 2009) (finding that where "only way that [third parties] mentioned . . . would have public value is if [they] were contacted directly by the plaintiff or by the media [value] is insufficient to override the witnesses' and agents' privacy interests, as the disclosure would bring about additional useful information only if direct contacts, furthering the privacy intrusion, are made"); Associated Press v. DOD, 554 F.3d 274, 284-91 (2d Cir. 2009) (reversing district court ruling and finding that Guantanamo detainees have substantial privacy interest that is not outweighed by any minimal public interest that might be served by disclosure); Associated Press v. DOJ, 549 F.3d 62, 66 (2d Cir. 2008) (finding plaintiff failed to demonstrate how disclosure of John Walker Lindh's commutation petition "would in any way shed light on the DOJ's conduct" in order to warrant disclosing "private, personal information" contained in petition); Senate of P.R. v. DOJ, 823 F.2d 574, 588 (D.C. Cir. 1987) (holding that general interest of legislature in "getting to the bottom" of a controversial investigation is not sufficient to overcome "substantial privacy interests"); Adamowicz v. IRS, 552 F. Supp. 2d 355, 369-70 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) (finding plaintiffs' asserted public interests "too speculative to overcome the well-recognized, weighty privacy interests of IRS personnel and third-parties"); Morales Cozier v. FBI, No. 99-CV-0312, slip op. at 18 (N.D. Ga. Sept. 25, 2000) (concluding that

public interest in knowing what government is up to in relation to investigation of individuals having contact with Cubans is not furthered by disclosing government employees' names and identifying information); Schrecker v. DOJ, 74 F. Supp. 2d 26, 34 (D.D.C. 1999) (finding requester's "own personal curiosity" about names of third parties and agents insufficient to outweigh privacy interests), rev'd on other grounds, 254 F.3d 162, 166 (D.C. Cir. 2001); Times Picayune Publ'g Corp. v. DOJ, 37 F. Supp. 2d 472, 482 (E.D. La. 1999) (describing public interest in public figure's "mug shot" as "purely speculative" and therefore readily outweighed by privacy interest); Ctr. to Prevent Handgun Violence v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury, 981 F. Supp. 20, 23-24 (D.D.C. 1997) (finding "minuscule privacy interest" in identifying sellers in multiple-sales gun reports in comparison to public interest in scrutinizing ATF's performance of its duty to enforce gun control laws and to curtail illegal interstate gun trafficking); Ajluni v. FBI, 947 F. Supp. 599, 605 (N.D.N.Y. 1996) ("In the absence of any strong countervailing public interest in disclosure, the privacy interests of the individuals who are the subjects of the redacted material must prevail."); Fitzgibbon v. U.S. Secret Serv., 747 F. Supp. 51, 59 (D.D.C. 1990) (holding public interest in alleged plot in United States by agents of now deposed dictatorship insufficient to overcome "strong privacy interests"); Stone v. FBI, 727 F. Supp. 662, 667-68 n.4 (D.D.C. 1990) ("[N]ew information considered significant by zealous students of the RFK assassination investigation would be nothing more than minutia of little or no value in terms of the public interest.").

[94] See, e.g., Cooper Cameron Corp. v. U.S. Dep't of Labor, 280 F.3d 539, 554 (5th Cir. 2002) (viewing "general public interest in monitoring" a specific OSHA investigation as sufficient to overcome employee-witnesses' privacy interests against employer retaliation); Rosenfeld v. DOJ, 57 F.3d 803, 811-12 (9th Cir. 1995) (ordering agency to release names of subjects of investigation after finding public interest in "knowing whether and to what extent the FBI investigated individuals for participating in political protests, not federal criminal activity" outweighed privacy interests); Providence Journal Co. v. U.S. Dep't of the Army, 981 F.2d 552, 567-69 (1st Cir. 1992) (finding public interest in disclosure of unsubstantiated allegations against senior officials outweighed privacy interests); Families for Freedom v. U.S. Customs & Border Prot., No. 10-2705, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 63829, at *49 (S.D.N.Y. June 16, 2011) (finding "substantial public interest in knowing whether the expectations and requirements articulated in the memoranda reflect high-level agency policy" greater than privacy interests of authors and recipients of memoranda); Hidalgo v. FBI, 541 F. Supp. 2d 250, 255-56 (D.D.C. 2008) (ordering disclosure of records reflecting any misconduct in agency's relationship with third party informant as case was "atypical" and "plaintiff has made enough of a showing to raise questions about possible agency misconduct"); Lardner v. DOJ, No. 03-0180, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 5465, at *62-64 (D.D.C. Mar. 31, 2005) (finding that release of identities of unsuccessful pardon applicants would shed light on government's exercise of pardon power in "important ways"); Homick v. DOJ, No. 98-00557, slip op. at 19-20, 22-23 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2004) (finding public interest in misconduct satisfying Favish standard warranted ordering disclosure of names of FBI and DEA Special Agents, and of state, local, and foreign law enforcement officers); Bennett v. DEA, 55 F. Supp. 2d 36, 41 (D.D.C. 1999) (ordering release of informant's rap sheet after finding "very compelling" evidence of "extensive government misconduct" in handling "career" informant); Or. Natural Desert Ass'n v. U.S. Dep't of the Interior, 24 F. Supp. 2d 1088, 1093-94 (D. Or. 1998) (finding that public interest in knowing how government

In Reporters Committee, the Supreme Court emphasized the appropriateness of "categorical balancing" under Exemption 7(C) as a means of achieving "workable rules" for processing FOIA requests.[95] In so doing, it recognized that entire categories of cases can properly receive uniform disposition "without regard to individual circumstances; the standard virtues of bright-line rules are thus present, and the difficulties attendant to ad hoc adjudication may be avoided."[96] This approach, in conjunction with other elements of Reporters Committee and traditional Exemption 7(C) principles, subsequently led the D.C. Circuit in SafeCard Services v. SEC to largely eliminate the need for case-by-case balancing in favor of "categorical" withholding of individuals' identities in law enforcement records.[97]

In SafeCard, the plaintiff sought information pertaining to an SEC investigation of manipulation of SafeCard stock, including "names and addresses of third parties mentioned in witness interviews, of customers listed in stock transaction records obtained from investment companies, and of persons in correspondence with the SEC."[98] Recognizing the fundamentally inherent privacy interest of individuals mentioned in any way in law enforcement files,[99] the D.C. Circuit found that the plaintiff's asserted public interest – providing the public "with insight into the SEC's conduct with respect to SafeCard" – was "not just less substantial [but] insubstantial."[100] Based upon the Supreme Court's endorsement of categorical rules in Reporters Committee, it then further determined that the identities of individuals who appear in law enforcement files would virtually never be "very probative of an agency's behavior or performance."[101] It observed that such information would serve a "significant" public interest only if "there is compelling evidence that the agency . . . is engaged in illegal activity."[102] Consequently, the D.C. Circuit held that "unless access to the names and

---

enforces and punishes violations of land-management laws outweighs privacy interests of cattle trespassers who admitted violations) (Exemptions 6 and 7(C)).

[95] 489 U.S. at 776-80.

[96] Id. at 780. But see Cooper Cameron, 280 F.3d at 553 (acknowledging that statements to OSHA by employee-witnesses are "a characteristic genus suitable for categorical treatment," yet declining to use categorical approach).

[97] SafeCard Servs. v. SEC, 926 F.2d 1197, 1206 (D.C. Cir. 1991).

[98] Id. at 1205.

[99] Id. (recognizing privacy interests of suspects, witnesses, and investigators).

[100] Id.

[101] Id.

[102] Id. at 1206; see also Oguaju v. United States, 288 F.3d 448, 451 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (finding that "exposing a single, garden-variety act of misconduct would not serve the FOIA's purpose of showing 'what the Government is up to'" (quoting Reporters Comm., 489 U.S. at

addresses of private individuals appearing in files within the ambit of Exemption 7(C) is necessary in order to confirm or refute compelling evidence that the agency is engaged in illegal activity, such information is [categorically] exempt from disclosure."[103]

The D.C. Circuit subsequently cautioned, however, that categorical rules may be employed "[o]nly when the range of circumstances included in the category 'characteristically support[s] an inference' that the statutory requirements for exemption are satisfied."[104]

More recently, the D.C. Circuit balanced the privacy and public interests where the record at issue consisted of aggregated docket information pertaining to 255 criminal cases in which warrantless cellular phone tracking was utilized by the government.[105] After finding that convicted defendants maintained a small but cognizable privacy interest in this information, the court found a "significant public interest in disclosure" that would result from the derivative use of the information, and

---

780)), vacated & remanded, 541 U.S. 970, on remand, 378 F.3d 1115 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (reaffirming prior decision); Quiñon, 86 F.3d at 1231 (finding insufficient public interest in revealing individuals mentioned in FBI files absent evidence of wrongdoing; even if individuals had engaged in wrongdoing, such misconduct would have to shed light on agency's action); McCutchen v. HHS, 30 F.3d 183, 188 (D.C. Cir. 1994) ("Mere desire to review how an agency is doing its job, coupled with allegations that it is not, does not create a public interest sufficient to override the privacy interests protected by Exemption 7(C)."); Davis v. DOJ, 968 F.2d 1276, 1282 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (holding that "when . . . governmental misconduct is alleged as the justification for disclosure, the public interest is 'insubstantial' unless the requester puts forward 'compelling evidence that the agency denying the FOIA request is engaged in illegal activity' and shows that the information sought 'is necessary in order to confirm or refute that evidence'" (quoting SafeCard, 926 F.2d at 1205-06)); McGhghy v. DEA, No. C 97-0185, slip op. at 10 (N.D. Iowa May 29, 1998) (holding that there is "no compelling public interest rationale" for disclosing the names of law enforcement officers, private individuals, investigative details, or suspects' names from DEA files).

[103] SafeCard, 926 F.2d at 1206; see also Neely v. FBI, 208 F.3d 461, 464 (4th Cir. 2000) (adopting SafeCard approach); But see Balt. Sun v. U.S. Marshals Serv., 131 F. Supp. 2d 725, 730 n.5 (D. Md. 2001) (determining that "plaintiff need not provide compelling evidence of government wrongdoing in light of the inapplicability of the categorical rule of SafeCard" to this case; deciding that "[a] more general public interest in what a government agency is up to is sufficient here"), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 01-1537 (4th Cir. June 25, 2001).

[104] Nation Magazine, 71 F.3d at 893 (quoting DOJ v. Landano, 508 U.S. 165, 177 (1993); see also Judicial Watch, Inc. v. DHS, 598 F. Supp. 2d 93, 96 (D.D.C. 2009) (rejecting agency's categorical approach where "the records could well be suffused . . . with information about [the agency's] performance of its duties").

[105] ACLU v. DOJ, 655 F.3d 1, 1-4 (D.C. Cir. 2011).

noted the widespread media, congressional, and judicial interest in the issue.[106] As a result "of the strength of the public interest . . . and the relative weakness of the privacy interests at stake," the court concluded that the balance tilted in favor of disclosure.[107]

As with Exemption 6, when applying Exemption 7(C), courts have required agencies to address whether they could redact the documents to protect individual privacy interests, while releasing the remaining information.[108] (See the further discussion of privacy redaction under Exemption 6, Balancing Process, above.)

The "Glomar" Response

Protecting the privacy interests of individuals who are named in investigatory records and are the targets of FOIA requests requires special procedures. Most agencies with criminal law enforcement responsibilities follow the approach of the FBI, which is

---

[106] Id. at 12-15.

[107] Id. at 16.

[108] See, e.g., Church of Scientology Int'l v. DOJ, 30 F.3d 224, 230-31 (1st Cir. 1994) (deciding that Vaughn Index must explain why documents entirely withheld under Exemption 7(C) could not have been released with identifying information redacted); Lawyer's Comm. for Civil Rights v. U.S. Dep't of the Treasury, No. 07-2590, 2008 WL 4482855, at *21 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2008) (requiring parties to meet and confer regarding scope of Exemption 6 and 7(C) redactions to ensure only private information is withheld and alleviate need for Vaughn Index); Sussman v. DOJ, No. 03-3618, 2008 WL 2946006, at *9 (E.D.N.Y. July 29, 2008) (ordering in camera review to determine if third party criminal activity is inextricably intertwined with properly exempt personal identifiers); Maydak v. DOJ, 362 F. Supp. 2d 316, 325 (D.D.C. 2005) (ordering release of prisoner housing unit information, but withholding inmate names and register numbers because agency did not proffer evidence that released information could be used to identify inmates); Canning v. DOJ, No. 01-2215, slip op. at 19 (D.D.C. Mar. 9, 2004) (finding application of Exemption 7(C) to entire documents rather than to personally identifying information within documents to be overly broad); Prows v. DOJ, No. 90-2561, 1996 WL 228463, at *3 (D.D.C. Apr. 25, 1996) (concluding that rather than withholding documents in full, agency simply can delete identifying information about third-party individuals to eliminate stigma of being associated with law enforcement investigation); Aldridge v. U.S. Comm'r of Internal Revenue, No. 7:00-CV-131, 2001 WL 196965, at *2-3 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 23, 2001) (deciding that privacy of IRS employees could be adequately protected by redacting their names from recommendation concerning potential disciplinary action against them); Lawyers Comm. for Human Rights v. INS, 721 F. Supp. 552, 571 (S.D.N.Y. 1989) (finding middle ground in balancing of interest in disclosure of names in INS Lookout Book on basis of "ideological exclusion" provision against individuals' privacy interest by ordering release of only occupation and country of excluded individuals); see also Attorney General Holder's Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies Concerning the Freedom of Information Act, 74 Fed. Reg. 51879 (Oct. 8, 2009) (reminding agencies of requirement under FOIA to take reasonable steps to segregate and release nonexempt information).

generally to respond to FOIA requests for records concerning other individuals by refusing to confirm or deny whether such records exist. Such a response is necessary because, as previously discussed, members of the public may draw adverse inferences from the mere fact that an individual is mentioned in the files of a criminal law enforcement agency.[109]

Therefore, except when the third-party subject is deceased, provides a written waiver of his or her privacy rights, or there is an overriding public interest, law enforcement agencies ordinarily refuse to either confirm or deny the existence of responsive records, i.e., issue a "Glomar" response, in order to protect the personal privacy interests of those who are in fact the subject of, or mentioned in, investigatory files.[110] Indeed, courts have endorsed this "Glomar" response by an agency in a variety of law enforcement situations. For instance, this response has generally been found appropriate when responding to requests for documents regarding alleged government informants,[111] trial witnesses,[112] subjects of investigations,[113] or individuals who may

---

[109] See Ray v. DOJ, 778 F. Supp. 1212, 1215 (S.D. Fla. 1991); FOIA Update, Vol. X, No. 3, at 5 ("FOIA Counselor: Questions & Answers"); FOIA Update, Vol. VII, No. 1, at 3-4 ("OIP Guidance: Privacy 'Glomarization'"); FOIA Update, Vol. III, No. 4, at 2 ("Privacy Protection Practices Examined"); see also Antonelli v. FBI, 721 F.2d 615, 617 (7th Cir. 1983) (concluding that "even acknowledging that certain records are kept would jeopardize the privacy interests that the FOIA exemptions are intended to protect"); Burke v. DOJ, No. 96-1739, 1999 WL 1032814, at *5 (D.D.C. Sept. 30, 1999) (permitting agency to "simply 'Glomarize'" as to portion of request that seeks investigatory records); McNamera v. DOJ, 974 F. Supp. 946, 957-60 (W.D. Tex. 1997) (allowing FBI and INTERPOL to refuse to confirm or deny whether they have criminal investigatory files on private individuals who have "great privacy interest" in not being associated with stigma of criminal investigation).

[110] See, e.g., Antonelli, 721 F.2d at 617 (deciding that "Glomar" response is appropriate for third-party requests when requester has identified no public interest in disclosure); McDade v. EOUSA, No. 03-1946, slip op. at 11-12 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 2004) (holding that agency's "Glomar" response was appropriate for third-party request concerning ten named individuals); Boyd v. DEA, No. 01-0524, slip op. at 3-4 (D.D.C. Mar. 8, 2002) ("The FBI's Glomar response was appropriate because the subject of the FOIA request was a private individual in law enforcement records and plaintiff's claim of his misconduct would not shed light on the agency's conduct."); Daley v. DOJ, No. 00-1750, slip op. at 2-3 (D.D.C. Mar. 9, 2001) (holding "Glomar" response proper when request seeks information related to third party who has not waived privacy rights); McNamera, 974 F. Supp. at 954 (deciding that "Glomar" response concerning possible criminal investigatory files on private individuals is appropriate where records would be categorically exempt); see also FOIA Update, Vol. X, No. 3, at 5 ("FOIA Counselor: Questions & Answers"); FOIA Update, Vol. VII, No. 1, at 3-4 ("Privacy Protection Practices Examined"). But cf. Jefferson v. DOJ, 284 F.3d 172, 178-79 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (declining to affirm district court's approval of "Glomar" response to request for OPR records pertaining to AUSA, because of possibility that some non-law enforcement records were within scope of request).

[111] See, e.g., Freeman v. DOJ, No. 86-1073, slip op. at 2 (4th Cir. Dec. 29, 1986) (request for alleged FBI informant file of Teamsters president); Butler v. DEA, No. 05-1798, 2005 U.S.

Dist. LEXIS 40942 (D.D.C. Feb. 16, 2006) (finding that agency properly refused to confirm or deny existence of records pertaining to alleged DEA informants); Flores v. DOJ, No. 03-2105, slip op. at 4-5 (D.D.C. Feb. 7, 2005) (finding that agency properly gave "Glomar" response to third-party request for information on private individuals and alleged informants), summary affirmance granted, No. 05-5074, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 24159 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 8, 2005); Tanks v. Huff, No. 95-568, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7266, at *12-13 (D.D.C. May 28, 1996) (permitting FBI to refuse to confirm or deny existence of any law enforcement records, unrelated to requester's case, concerning informants who testified against requester), appeal dismissed voluntarily, No. 96-5180 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 13, 1996). But see Johnson v. DOJ, No. 06-1248, 2007 WL 3408458, at *4 (E.D. Wis. Nov. 14, 2007) (finding "Glomar" response not appropriate in response to request for statement provided by known government witness); Hidalgo v. FBI, No. 04-0562, slip op. at 4-5 (D.D.C. Sept. 29, 2005) (finding "Glomar" response to be inappropriate when informant is not stigmatized by public confirmation of his FBI file and plaintiff has provided evidence to support allegations of government misconduct).

[112] See, e.g., Oguaju v. United States, 288 F.3d 448, 451 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (approving "Glomar" response to request for any information on individual who testified at requester's trial when-requester provided no public interest rationale), vacated & remanded, 541 U.S. 970, on remand, 378 F.3d 1115 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (reaffirming prior decision); Enzinna v. DOJ, No. 97-5078, 1997 WL 404327, at *2 (D.C. Cir. June 30, 1997) (finding government's "Glomar" response appropriate because acknowledging existence of responsive documents would associate witnesses with criminal investigation); Fischer v. DOJ, 596 F. Supp. 2d 34, 48 (D.D.C. 2009) (finding "Glomar" response appropriate for request for information on third parties, including cooperating witnesses); Robinson v. Attorney Gen. of the U.S., 534 F. Supp. 2d 72, 83 (D.D.C. 2008) (holding "Glomar" response appropriate to request for information on individuals who testified at public trial and finding plaintiff's argument that testimony was false unavailing); see also Meserve v. DOJ, No. 04-1844, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56732, at *19-22 (D.D.C. Aug. 14, 2006) (concluding that while agency confirmed existence of records relating to third party's participation at public trial, it also properly provided "Glomar" response for any additional documents concerning third party).

[113] See, e.g., DOJ v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749, 775 (1989) (upholding FBI's refusal to confirm or deny that it maintained "rap sheets" on named individual); Schwarz v. INTERPOL, No. 94-4111, 1995 U.S. App. LEXIS 3987, at *7 (10th Cir. Feb. 28, 1995) (holding "Glomar" response proper for third-party request for file of requester's "alleged husband" when no public interest shown); Beck v. DOJ, 997 F.2d 1489, 1493-94 (D.C. Cir. 1993) (request for records concerning alleged wrongdoing by two named DEA agents);-Massey v. FBI, 3 F.3d 620, 624 (2d Cir. 1993) (declaring that "individuals have substantial privacy interests in information that either confirms or suggests that they have been subject to criminal investigations or proceedings"); Dunkelberger v. DOJ, 906 F.2d 779, 780-82 (D.C. Cir. 1990) (request for information that could verify alleged misconduct by undercover FBI Special Agent);-Strassman v. DOJ, 792 F.2d 1267, 1268 (4th Cir. 1986) (request for records allegedly indicating whether governor of West Virginia threatened to invoke Fifth Amendment); Schwarz v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury, 131 F. Supp. 2d 142, 150 (D.D.C. 2000) (finding that "Glomar" response is proper in connection with request for third party's law enforcement records); Claudio v. SSA, No. H-98-1911, slip op. at 16 (S.D. Tex. May 24, 2000) (holding "Glomar" response proper when request sought any

merely be mentioned in a law enforcement record.[114] In order for a "Glomar" response to be effective, it must be employed universally in situations where mere acknowledgment of records would reveal exempt information, even where no responsive records actually exist, for "[i]f a *Glomar* response is provided only when . . . records are found, the response would in fact be useless because it 'would unsurprisingly be interpreted as an admission that . . . responsive records exist.'"[115]

Courts have limited agencies' use of Glomar in a variety of circumstances. An agency may not be able to utilize the Glomar response where the subject of a request has already been publicly associated with the agency.[116] Courts have held that agencies may not use such a response once it is determined that an informant's status has been officially confirmed.[117] The Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit rejected

---

investigatory records about administrative law judge); Greenberg v. U.S. Dep't of Treasury, 10 F. Supp. 2d 3, 24 (D.D.C. 1998) (holding "Glomar" response appropriate when existence of records would link named individuals with taking of American hostages in Iran and disclosure would not shed light on agency's performance); Early v. OPR, No. 95-0254, slip op. at 3 (D.D.C. Apr. 30, 1996) (concluding that "Glomar" response concerning possible complaints against or investigations of judge and three named federal employees was proper absent any public interest in disclosure), summary affirmance granted, No. 96-5136, 1997 WL 195523 (D.C. Cir. Mar. 31, 1997); Triestman v. DOJ, 878 F. Supp. 667, 669 (S.D.N.Y. 1995) (request by prisoner seeking records of investigations of misconduct by named DEA agents); Latshaw v. FBI, No. 93-571, slip op. at 1 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 21, 1994) (deciding that FBI may refuse to confirm or deny existence of any law enforcement records on third party), aff'd, 40 F.3d 1240 (3d Cir. 1994) (unpublished table decision); Knight Publ'g Co. v. DOJ, No. 84-510, slip op. at 1-2 (W.D.N.C. Mar. 28, 1985) (request by newspaper seeking any DEA investigatory file on governor, lieutenant governor, or attorney general of North Carolina).

[114] See, e.g., Jefferson v. DOJ, 168 F. App'x 448 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (affirming district court judgment that agency, after processing responsive documents, could refuse to confirm or deny existence of any additional mention of third party in its investigative database); Nation Magazine v. U.S. Customs Serv., 71 F.3d 885, 894 (D.C. Cir. 1995) (stating that privacy interest in keeping secret the fact that individual was subject to law enforcement investigation extends to third parties who might be mentioned in investigatory files).

[115] Moore v. FBI, 883 F. Supp. 2d 155 (D.D.C. 2012) (quoting agency declaration and noting agency provided "reasonable explanation" for invoking "Glomar" regardless of whether responsive records existed) (Exemptions 1 and 3).

[116] See, e.g., Nation Magazine, 71 F.3d at 894-96 (holding categorical "Glomar" response concerning law enforcement files on individual inappropriate when individual had publicly offered to help agency); Venkataram v. Office of Info. Policy, 823 F. Supp. 2d 261, 266 (D.N.J. 2011) (rejecting agency's Glomar response as "without merit" where agency had indicted subject of request); see also FOIA Update, Vol. XVII, No. 2, at 3-4 ("OIP Guidance: The Bifurcation Requirement for Privacy 'Glomarization'").

[117] See Pickard v. DOJ, 653 F.3d 782, 787 (9th Cir. 2011) (finding that agency could not refuse to confirm or deny records pertaining to third party where "the government . . .

an agency's use of Glomar even where the underlying subjects had never been associated by the agency with a specific investigation, when it found an overriding public interest in knowing whether the individuals who were the subject of the request were the actual perpetrators of a crime for which the requester was convicted and on death row.[118]

For a request that seeks non-law enforcement records as well as law enforcement records, or which seeks acknowledged law enforcement files as well as unacknowledged files, courts have upheld agencies' use of a "bifurcated" or two-pronged approach in its response, i.e., using Glomar for part and addressing and processing separately other records that are located.[119] The "Glomar" response also has been found appropriate

---

intentionally elicited testimony from [the third party] and several DEA agents as to [the third party's] activities as a confidential informant in open court in the course of official and documented public proceedings"); Boyd v. Crim. Div. of the DOJ, 475 F.3d 381, 389 (D.C. Cir. 2007) ("Where an informant's status has been officially confirmed, a Glomar response is unavailable, and the agency must acknowledge the existence of any responsive records it holds"); Benavides v. DEA, 968 F.2d 1243, 1250 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (holding that if informant's status has been officially confirmed, agency must confirm or deny existence of responsive records), modified on other grounds, 976 F.2d 751, 752-53 (D.C. Cir. 1992); North v. DOJ, 810 F. Supp. 2d 205, 208-09 (D.D.C. 2011) (rejecting "Glomar" response where requester produced trial transcripts in which government referred to third party as informant, and that third party testified regarding his cooperation agreement with government).

[118] Roth v. DOJ, 642 F.3d 1161, 1181-82 (D.C. Cir. 2011), reh'g en banc denied, No. 09-5428 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 14, 2011).

[119] See, e.g., Jefferson, 284 F.3d at 178-79 (refusing to allow categorical Exemption 7(C) "Glomar" response to request for OPR records concerning AUSA because agency did not bifurcate for separate treatment its non-law enforcement records); Nation Magazine, 71 F.3d at 894-96 (deciding that "Glomar" response is appropriate only as to existence of records associating former presidential candidate with criminal activity), on remand, 937 F. Supp. 39, 45 (D.D.C. 1996) (finding that "Glomar" response as to whether candidate was subject, witness, or informant in law enforcement investigation appropriate after agency searched law enforcement files for records concerning candidate's efforts to assist agency), further proceedings, No. 94-00808, slip op. at 9-11 (D.D.C. Feb. 14, 1997) (ordering agency to file in camera declaration with court explaining whether it ever assigned informant code to named individual and results of any search performed using that code; agency not required to state on record whether individual was ever assigned code number), further proceedings, No. 94-00808, slip op. at 9-10 (D.D.C. May 21, 1997) (accepting agency's in camera declaration that search of its records using code number assigned to named individual uncovered no responsive documents); Meserve, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 56732, at *19-22 (concluding that while agency confirmed existence of certain records relating to third party's participation at public trial, it properly provided "Glomar" response for any additional documents concerning third party); Manchester v. FBI, No. 96-0137, 2005 WL 3275802, at *6 (D.D.C. Aug. 9, 2005) (finding that agency properly bifurcated request between information related to acknowledged investigation and third-party information outside scope of investigation); Burke, 1999 WL 1032814, at *5 (finding no need to bifurcate request that "specifically and exclusively" sought investigative records on third parties); Tanks, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 7266, at *4 (upholding privacy "Glomarization" after agency

when one government agency has officially acknowledged the existence of an investigation but the agency that received the third-party request has never officially acknowledged undertaking its own investigation into that matter.[120]

bifurcated between aspects of request); Grove v. DOJ, 802 F. Supp. 506, 510-11 (D.D.C. 1992) (finding agency properly conducted search for administrative records sought but "Glomarized" part of request concerning investigatory records). See generally FOIA Update, Vol. XVII, No. 2, at 3-4 ("OIP Guidance: The Bifurcation Requirement for Privacy 'Glomarization'") (providing guidance on how agencies should handle requests for law enforcement records on third-parties).

[120] See McNamera, 974 F. Supp. at 958 (finding that "Glomar" response is proper so long as agency employing it has not publicly identified individual as subject of investigation); cf. Frugone v. CIA, 169 F.3d 772, 774-75 (D.C. Cir. 1999) (finding that CIA properly "Glomarized" existence of records concerning plaintiff's alleged employment relationship with CIA despite allegation that another government agency seemingly confirmed plaintiff's status as former CIA employee) (Exemptions 1 and 3). See generally FOIA Update, Vol. X, No. 3, at 5 ("FOIA Counselor: Questions & Answers") (advising agencies that under Reporters Committee, Exemption 7(C) "Glomarization" can be undertaken without review of any responsive records, in response to third-party requests for routine law enforcement records pertaining to living private citizens who have not given consent to disclosure).