PETER L. FRITZ

414 KUWILI STREET, #104 HONOLULU, HAWAII 96817 TELEPHONE: (808) 532-7118 E-MAIL: PLFLEGIS@FRITZHQ.COM

TRANSMITTAL

Date: March 17, 2010

Jon Riki Karamatsu

TO:

I- 4	1st Representative Dis Iawaii State Capitol, R 15 South Beretania Str Ionolulu, HI 96813	oom 302		
Item	DATE		DESCRIPTION	
		Suppl	emental Testimony for SB2937 SD1	
TRANS	MITTED FOR:			
[] YO [] YO	UR INFORMATION UR FILES UR SIGNATURE & F PROVAL	ORWARDING	[] YOUR REVIEW & COMMENT [] NECESSARY ACTION [X] PER OUR CONVERSATION [] SEE "REMARKS" BELOW	
REMAR	KS:			
Dear Ho	norable Sir:			
	t to the Committee on applements my oral tes		attached is written testimony on SB 2937 SD1,	
Thank y	ou.			

PETER L. FRITZ

414 Kuwili Street, #104 Honolulu, Hawaii 96814 Telephone: (808) 532-7118 E-mail: plflegis@fritzhq.com

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THE TWENTY-FIFTH LEGISLATURE REGULAR SESSION OF 2010

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

Hearing March 16, 2010 Testimony on S.B. 2937 SD1

(Relating To Information Practices)

Chair Karamatsu, Vice Chair Ito and members of the Committee:

My name is Peter Fritz. This written testimony supplements my oral testimony at the hearing on March 16, 2010 before the House Committee on Judiciary. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in Hawaii. While my practice is primarily limited tax law, I have experience with due process claims arising under the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution as applied to the States under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. I am testifying in opposition to this measure because I believe that in order to hold government accountable for its actions, its citizens must know what those actions are and to that end, they must insist that government act openly and transparently to the greatest extent possible. This measure is contrary to my beliefs as well as the original purpose of the Uniform Information Practices act. I am opposed to this measure for the following reasons:

- Failure to Provide Adequate Due Process.
 - This bill provides that **an uncontested** hearing, a person may be declared a vexatious requestor. Such informal hearings do not offer the due process protection that formal contested hearings offer.
 - o There are no appeal rights for any imposition of bar on requesting documents. The bill does not set out any procedure or rights of appeal. It is likely that this will violate
- The OIP is a Biased Decision Maker. The Agency will have sought advice
 from the OIP on the request. Such communications would taint the OIP and if in
 a court system would be considered ex-parte communication. The measure does
 not provide for an independent decision maker and as such, raises issues of
 fairness.
- This Measure Will Not Survive a Constitutional Challenge When Less Burdensome Remedies Are Available.
 - Amend the UIPA Law to provide that an agency can inform a document requestor that the Agency will not be responding to duplicitous requests.

House Committee On Judiciary Testimony of Peter L. Fritz for S.B. 2937 SD1 Hearing March 16, 2010 Page 2

- Obtain and Publish an Opinion from the Attorney General. Upon information and belief, the attorney for the Department of Health is the Attorney General. Statements by the Department of Health regarding the allowable scope of document requests will not carry as much weight as a formal opinion by the Attorney General.
- O Bring an action in Circuit Court to Enjoin a Document Requestor. A Court decision on the matter, where attorney fees were awarded, would be notice to other requestors and would be stare decisis for other cases and would allow for quick disposition in future cases. It will provide for a decision by an independent decision maker using procedures established to protect an individual's right.
- o Pursue other Available Remedies in a Court.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter L. Fritz