



**Historical, Precedent-Setting  
Litigation and the Impact of  
FOIA Amendments**

ASAP FOIA – Privacy Act Workshop  
September 4-6, 2024  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

*Presented by  
Ryan P. Mulvey and William H. Holzerland*

1

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Envtl. Prot. Agency v. Mink,  
410 U.S. 73 (1973), abrogated by statute***

No obligation to segregate Exemption 1 nonclassified portions; no obligation for court to examine Exemption 5 records in *in camera*; abrogated in large part by 1974 FOIA Amendments

2

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Vaughn v. Rosen, 484 F.2d 820  
(D.C. Cir. 1973), cert. denied,  
415 U.S. 977 (U.S. Mar. 18, 1974)***

In litigation an agency must provide an itemized index correlating each withheld portion with a specific exemption in order to even the playing field between the parties and give the court an adequate basis for determining whether to grant an agency's motion for summary judgment

3

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Nat'l Labor Relations Bd. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 421 U.S. 132 (1975)**

Interaction between Exemption 5 and the FOIA's proactive disclosure obligations; noting the danger of "secret law," and holding the exemption and deliberative-process privilege cannot apply to "final opinions"; explaining Exemption 5 incorporates the attorney work-product privilege to protect materials prepared in contemplation of litigation and setting strategy for a case

4

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Dep't of the Air Force v. Rose, 425 U.S. 352 (1976)**

Exemption 2 applies only to "minor or trivial matters" and did not protect information about Ethics Code violations at the Air Force Academy; Exemption 6 requires an agency to balance the possible invasion of privacy against the public's interest in disclosure and, in this case, the agency must disclose the requested records in a form that would not lead to any Air Force cadet being individually identified

5

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Chrysler Corp. v. Brown, 441 U.S. 281 (1979)**

Since "Congress did not design the FOIA exemptions to be mandatory bars to disclosure" and agencies may discretionarily release records that could be withheld; further ruling that a submitter of records covered by Exemption 4 may sue under the Administrative Procedure Act—but not the Trade Secrets Act—if an agency's disclosure would, among other things, be "not in accordance with law."

6

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Open Am. v. Watergate Special  
Prosecution Force, 547 F.2d 605  
(D.C. Cir. 1976), superseded by statute**

District court properly granted an extension of time to the agency when it was deluged with requests for information vastly in excess of that anticipated by Congress, and the agency was processing the requests with due diligence on a first-in, first-out basis; superseded, in large part, by the Electronic FOIA Amendments of 1996

7

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Phillippi v. Cent. Intelligence Agency,  
546 F.2d 1009 (D.C. Cir. 1976)**

CIA's refusal to confirm or deny the existence of records of a CIA connection to the *Hughes Glomar Explorer*, a submarine retrieval ship, based on Exemption 1 because doing so would itself divulge classified information

8

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Grolier,  
462 U.S. 19 (1983)**

Exemption 5 test for the use of civil discovery privileges is whether the records at issue would be "routinely" disclosed "upon a showing of relevance," thus eliminating any distinction between absolute or qualified privileges in the FOIA context; also attorney work-product remains exempt regardless of whether the litigation for which it was generated has ended

9

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press, 489 U.S. 749 (1989)***

Under Exemption 7(C) discussing the scope of the protected personal privacy interests; ruling that, with respect to the required balancing test, an agency may only consider the public interest in knowing what the government is "up to" and if records are not informative of the operations and activities of the agency, there is no public interest in their release; agencies may "categorically" weigh public interest; holding that because criminal history rap sheets reveal nothing about the government, they may be withheld

10

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Dep't of Justice v. Tax Analysts, 492 U.S. 136 (1989)***

Copies of tax court decisions the agency received in the course of litigation were "agency records" because they were (1) "create[d] or obtain[ed]" by the agency and (2) under its "control" at the time of the request; despite the records being publicly available elsewhere, albeit on an oft-delayed basis, they were still "improperly" "withheld."

11

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Dep't of the Interior v. Klamath Water Users Protective Ass'n, 532 U.S. 1 (2001)***

Exemption 5's threshold "inter-agency or intra-agency" requirement must have "independent vitality"; it is not satisfied when documents are created as a result of an agency's relationship with an outside consultant and the consultant is pursuing its own interests rather than the government's, or when it is seeking a benefit from the agency at the expense of competitors

12

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Nat'l Archives & Records Admin.  
v. Favish, 541 U.S. 157 (2003)**

Protecting death photos of Vince Foster, holding that Exemption 7(C) covers the personal privacy interests of a decedent's surviving family members; ruling when a requester attempts to argue the public interest in disclosure outweighs an invasion of personal privacy because disclosure would show government officials acted negligently or otherwise improperly in performing official duties, the requester must produce evidence of impropriety sufficient to convince a reasonable person it occurred

13

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Fed. Commc'ns Comm'n v.  
AT&T, Inc., 562 U.S. 397 (2011)**

Exception 7(C), which protects against the unwarranted invasion of "personal privacy" interests, does not protect the "privacy" interests of corporations

14

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Milner v. Dep't of the Navy,  
562 U.S. 562 (2011)**

In a case involving data and maps used to help store explosives at a naval base, greatly narrowing the scope of Exemption 2 by ruling it applies only to records reflecting "internal" "rules and practices" for "personnel"-related issues, *i.e.*, "employee relations and human resources"; eliminating the atextual, judicially created distinction between "Low 2" and "High 2" categories of the exemption

15

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Sack v. Dep't of Def.,  
823 F.3d 687 (D.C. Cir. 2016)**

Ruling students can qualify for the “educational institution” fee category because, “[l]ike teachers, students do research, seek background information for paper topics, gather primary documents, write papers, publish, and contribute to the development and dissemination of knowledge within the school and to the outside world”; holding the OMB Fee Guidelines, in relevant part, conflict with the FOIA

16

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Food Mktg. Inst. v. Argus Leader  
Media, 139 S. Ct. 2356 (2019)**

In invalidating the D.C. Circuit’s *National Parks* Exemption 4 “substantial competitive harm” test for determining when records are “confidential”; ruling instead that information is protected *at least* when it is (1) “customarily and actually treated as private by its owner” and (2) provided to an agency under an assurance of confidentiality

17

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**HIGHLIGHTS FROM KEY LEGISLATIVE ENACTMENTS**

**Act of Nov. 21, 1974, Pub. L. No. 93-502, 88 Stat. 1561 (1974)** — modifying procedural and judicial review provisions, *e.g.*, permitting *in camera* review of classified materials, requiring non-exempt reasonably segregable portions of records be disclosed, providing for public-interest fee waivers, creating the “reasonably described” requirement for requests, defining “agency,” and describing required contents of a determination; narrowing the scope of Exemption 1 by requiring records be “in fact properly classified”; also narrowing Exemption 7 by dividing it into six subsections based on specified types of harm.

18

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Freedom of Information Reform Act,***  
**Pub. L. No. 99-570, 100 Stat. 3207 (1986)**

Creating a multi-tiered structure of different fee categories and directing OMB to implement government-wide fee guidelines; creating “exclusions” for narrow criminal law enforcement and intelligence matters; and broadening the protections of Exemption 7 by lessening its harm standard

19

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***Electronic Freedom of Information Act,***  
**Pub. L. No. 104-231, 110 Stat. 3048 (1996)**

Applying many electronic records principles to FOIA operations, *e.g.*, defining “record” to include “an electronic format”; requiring disclosure “in any form or format requested,” if “readily reproducible”; providing for multitrack processing; requiring the Department of Justice to provide implementing guidance to agencies and for agencies to report annually on FOIA operations

20

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

***OPEN Government Act, Pub. L. No.***  
**110-175, 121 Stat. 2524 (2007)**

Defining a “requester of the news media” for fee purposes; defining “substantial prevailed” for purposes of the recovery of attorney fees and litigation costs; modifying time limits; expanding the definition of a “record” to include records held by a contractor “for the purposes of records management”; creating NARA’s Office of Government Information Services

21

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**OPEN FOIA Act, Pub. L. No. 111-83,  
123 Stat. 2142 (2009)**

Requiring that any future Exemption 3 statute specifically refer to Exemption 3 to be effective

22

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**FOIA Improvement Act, Pub. L. No. 114-185, 130 Stat. 538 (2016)**

Creating the “Rule of 3” for proactive disclosures; codifying a “foreseeable harm” standard to ensure agencies only withhold information if required by law or the agency reasonably foresees disclosure would harm an interest protected by an exemption; limiting use of the deliberative-process privilege with a 25-year “sunset” provision; requiring creation of a new, consolidated request portal

23

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---