

State Records Committee Decisions Addressing 63G-2-302(2)(d)

Decision	Case Name	Topics	Disposition of Appeal*	Synopsis
2013-05	Leishman v. Dep't of Corrections	Religious practices, security	Denied	Sought security clearance regarding religious practices of inmate
2012-22	Lawrence v. Dep't of Public Safety	IA files, unsustained	Denied	Sought IA investigative files in unsustained complaint
2012-21	Oram v. Granite School Dist.	witness/victim info, minors	Partially upheld	Investigation into teacher/student relationship - district permitted to redact names/info which could lead to identification of witnesses
2012-20	Alberty v. Dep't of Public Safety	OIS, unjustified	Partially upheld	Sought IA file, videos, etc - given all records unless it would disclose unknown source
2012-18	Probasco v. Dep't of Public Safety	Car accident, minor	Upheld	Identity of minor hit by vehicle must be disclosed - rejected increased privacy for minors
2012-09	Danysh v. Unified Police Dep't	Death images, photos, autopsy	Partially upheld	Sought photos, including death images, reports, etc - given photos of home exterior & suspect, denied photos of home interior and victim
2012-03	Dinger v. Cottonwood Heights	Complaint, race, identity	Partially upheld	Received conflict investigation file, with private info redacted, including individuals' race
2011-13	Gallup v. Bd. of Pardons & Parole	"confidential" letter	Denied	Author of letter to board requested that it be kept confidential
2011-12	Schroeder v. Utah AG	individuals' financial documents	Denied	financial documents of individuals are private
2011-04	Smith v. State Tax Comm'n	complainant, investigative files	Upheld	Documents must be disclosed, but private info redacted
2010-23	SL Tribune v. Dep't of Transportation	email, personal	Denied	Personal email for personal reasons, sent using gov't equipment, still retained expectation of privacy
2010-22	SL Tribune v. Bd of Pardons & Parole	letter, parole board	Upheld	Prisoner's preference in private designation does not control - privacy invasion must be "clearly unwarranted" - applying categorical denial is inappropriate - must weight status of record against interests

* The records committee does not use consistent terminology in its reports (upheld, granted, etc).

For purposes of this document, "upheld" generally means that the gov't was "reversed," and "denied" means it's decision was "affirmed"

State Records Committee Decisions Addressing 63G-2-302(2)(d)

2010-18	Uno v. SLC School Dist	personal email addresses	Denied	Personal email addresses receive same protection as home telephone
2009-18	Kneisley v. Dep't of Public Safety	files, private investigator	Partially upheld	Required to disclose, with private info (SSN, home address, etc) redacted
2009-14	McKittrick v. Attorney General	letter of recommendation	Upheld	Personal recommendation of AG regarding US Attorney deemed public
2009-13	SL Tribune v. Granite School Dist.	Personnel, birthdates	Partially upheld	Sought DOB for employees - district ordered to provide birth month/day, but not year
2008-13	Fazzini v. UTA	complaints, identity of	Partially upheld	Documents to be disclosed, but with personal/medical info redacted
2008-10	Maese v. Murray	IA, sustained, witness identification	Partially upheld	Access to disciplinary records for sustained violations - identification of witnesses is redacted - drew distinction between disciplinary letters/reports and investigatory reports
2007-14	Rizzo v. West Jordan	addresses, juvenile predators	Partially upheld	Proper classification of addresses as private, but public interest outweighed interests favoring restriction
2007-11	Onysko v. Dep't of Human Resource Management	interview scores	Partially upheld	Access to petitioner's raw score granted, but access to others' denied, also denied access to identity of interview panel
2006-06	Crowley v. Sandy	personnel, identification	Denied	Sought identification of complainants named in memo
2005-07	Whitney v. Dep't of Corrections	grievance, identification	Denied	Sought complainant information of those who filed grievances against him
2004-02	Stack v. Dep't of Corrections	offender management	Denied	Sought records related to communicating with female prisoners - inmate candidness essential to proper review - high likelihood of participant identification if redacted reports released
2002-09	Cramer v. Murray	minor, interview, sex abuse	Denied	Sought interview transcript of detective with minor regarding sexual abuse
2002-06	Mr. Pooper Scooper v. Murray & Sandy	addresses, dog licenses	Denied	Sought home addresses of licensed dog owners
2002-05	Disability Law Center v. UTA	accident, complaints, letters	Partially upheld	Disclosure required, but all personally identifying info redacted

* The records committee does not use consistent terminology in its reports (upheld, granted, etc).

For purposes of this document, "upheld" generally means that the gov't was "reversed," and "denied" means it's decision was "affirmed"

State Records Committee Decisions Addressing 63G-2-302(2)(d)

2000-04	Robot Aided Manufacturing Center v. Dept' of Public Safety	driver license, identifying info	Upheld	Driver license division required to produce database of drivers who have been cited to insurance contractor - public interests outweighed privacy interests
1999-13	Atkinson v. West Jordan	harassment investigation	Denied	Subject of record sought to restrict access to sustained finding of impropriety - records committee found it was public
1999-08	Dunn v. Tooele City	claims, names/addresses	Upheld	Inclusion of names/addresses of claimants does not render record "private"
1998-02	Hovey v. Dep't of Human Services	home telephone, address, minor	Upheld	Father entitled to telephone, address of minor son, in light of court order
1993-01	Nielsen v. Dep't of Natural Resources	licenses, addresses, names	Upheld	Division's past practice of using the lists for joint mailings with private entities degraded privacy interests in those records

* The records committee does not use consistent terminology in its reports (upheld, granted, etc).

For purposes of this document, "upheld" generally means that the gov't was "reversed," and "denied" means it's decision was "affirmed"