

COURT OPINIONS LIST
(As of September 16, 2016)

To assist in your own legal research and analysis, OIP prepared this list of important court cases relating to the UIPA and/or Sunshine Law, with citations and brief descriptions. As a neutral third party, OIP does not provide legal advice or representation to anyone.

UIPA Cases:

Peer News LLC v. City & County of Honolulu, 138 Haw. 53, 376 P.3d 1 (2016) (holding that under HRS § 92F-14(b)(4) police officers have a significant privacy interest in their suspension, but not discharge, records, which must be balanced against the public interest in disclosure in a case by case analysis to determine whether such records may fall within the exception to disclosure found in HRS § 92F-13(1)).

Molfino v. Yuen, 134 Haw. 181, 339 P.3d 679 (2014) (holding that the Uniform Information Practices Act, HRS Chapter 92F, does not create a legal duty to maintain government records that would allow someone to sue in a tort action for negligence if the government records were not filed in an accurate, relevant, timely, and complete condition at all times)

Justice v. Fuddy, 125 Haw. 104, 253 P.3d 665 (Haw. Ct. App. 2011) (affirming motion to dismiss because plaintiff failed to prove that there were “compelling circumstances affecting the health or safety of any individual” under HRS 92F-12(b)(3) to obtain access to President Obama’s birth certificate)

In re Honolulu Community-Media Council, 121 Haw. 179, 215 P.3d 411 (2009) (concluding that Judicial Financial Disclosure Statements are not subject to disclosure under the UIPA or to OIP review based on the separation of powers principle)

County of Kauai v. Office of Information Practices, 120 Haw. 34, 200 P.3d 403 (Haw. Ct. App. 2009) (affirmed by Hawaii Supreme Court in memorandum opinion on October 26, 2009) (allowing the county to withhold executive session minutes due to the attorney-client privilege)

Nuuanu Valley Association v. City and County of Honolulu, 119 Haw. 90, 194 P.3d 531 (2008) (holding that engineering reports submitted to but not accepted by the county planning department, and which had been returned to the applicant, were not “maintained” and thus did not constitute government records subject to disclosure by the department)

‘Olelo: The Corp. for Cmty. Television v. Office of Information Practices, 116 Haw. 337, 173 P.3d 484 (2007) (concluding that ‘Olelo was not an “agency” subject to the UIPA)

Hawai’i Org. of Police Officers v. Society of Prof. Journalists Univ. of Hawai’i, 83 Haw. 378, 927 P.2d 386 (1996) (holding that collective bargaining agreements under HRS Chapter 89 do not preempt the statutory rights and responsibilities under the UIPA, HRS Chapter 92F)

Mehau v. Reed, 76 Haw. 101, 869 P.2d 1320 (1994) (interpreting the UIPA’s predecessor’s civil remedies for personal records violations)

Kaapu v. Aloha Tower Dev. Corp., 74 Haw. 365, 846 P. 882 (1993) (holding that neither the Sunshine Law nor the UIPA required the agency to disclose development proposals before the execution of a long-term lease)

Painting Indus. of Hawaii Mkt. Recovery Fund v. Alm, 69 Haw. 449, 746 P.2d 79 (1987) (defining “personal record” under the statute preceding the UIPA)

Sunshine Law Cases:

Kanahele v. Maui County Council, 130 Haw. 228, 307 P.3d 1174 (2013) (holding that multiple continuances of public meetings did not violate the Sunshine Law, but the distribution of memoranda between councilmembers was a violation)

County of Kauai v. Office of Information Practices, 120 Haw. 34, 200 P.3d 403 (Haw. Ct. App. 2009) (affirmed by Hawaii Supreme Court in memorandum opinion on October 26, 2009) (allowing the county to withhold executive session minutes due to the attorney-client privilege)

Right to Know Comm. v. City Council, City & County of Honolulu, 117 Haw. 1, 175 P.3d 111 (Haw. Ct. App. 2007) (applying the palpably erroneous standard of review in upholding OIP Op. Ltr. No. 05-15 and concluding that council members’ serial communications resulted in a discussion of council business that was not permitted by the Sunshine Law)

Kaapu v. Aloha Tower Dev. Corp., 74 Haw. 365, 846 P. 882 (1993) (holding that neither the Sunshine Law nor the UIPA required the agency to disclose development proposals before the execution of a long-term lease)

Chang v. Planning Commission, 64 Haw. 431, 643 P.2d 55 (1982) (holding that closed deliberations were permissible because the commission was exercising its adjudicatory functions and that another 30-day notice period to reschedule a meeting was not required)

Case of Interest:

E & J Lounge Operating Co. v. Liquor Commission, 118 Haw. 320, 189 P.3d 432 (Haw. Ct. App. 2008) (concluding that a hearing on a liquor license application was a contested case) (relevant to the issue of a Sunshine Law exemption for a board’s exercise of adjudicatory functions)