Government of the District of Columbia
Office of the Chief Financial Officer

Glen Lee
Chief Financial Officer

MEMORANDUM

TO:	**The Honorable Phil Mendelson** **Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia**
FROM:	**Glen Lee** **Chief Financial Officer**
DATE:	**November 20, 2026**
SUBJECT:	**Fiscal Impact Statement – Protecting Judicial Privacy Act of 2026**
REFERENCE:	**Bill 26-655, Draft Committee Print as provided to the Office of Revenue Analysis on November 18, 2026**

Conclusion

Funds are not sufficient in the fiscal year 2027 through fiscal year 2030 budget and financial plan to implement the bill. The Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) requires $85,800 in fiscal year 2027.

Background

The bill prohibits District government agencies[1], individuals, businesses, and private associations and organizations from publicly disclosing[2] a judicial officer's personal information after receiving a written request from the judicial officer to protect that information.

The bill defines judicial officers as actively employed or former:

- Justices of the United States Supreme Court;
- Judges of the United States Court of Appeals;
- Judges and Magistrate Judges of the United States District Court;
- Judges of the United States Bankruptcy Court;
- Judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals;
- Judges and Magistrate Judges of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; and
- Administrative Law Judges of the District of Columbia Office of Administrative Hearings.

[1] The bill defines this as any agency, employee, or instrumentality of the District government.
[2] The bill defines this as to make available to the general public, including through publication on the Internet or any other medium.

The bill defines personal information to include a judicial officer or at-risk individual's[3] home address, including primary or secondary residences, telephone numbers, personal email address, Social Security number, financial account information, vehicle identifiers, driver's license number, marital status, full date of birth, information regarding children under age 18, school or daycare information, employment location information for the at-risk individuals, and related routing or schedule information. Information regarding employment with a government agency is excluded from the definition.

The bill prohibits government agencies from publicly disclosing an at-risk individual's personal information after receiving a valid written request. Agencies must remove[4] the information from publicly available content within five business days and may not subsequently disclose the information, including in response to a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)[5] for as long as the request remains valid. A judicial officer or immediate family member may seek injunctive or declaratory relief in Superior Court if a government agency fails to comply. The bill also permits the judicial officer to proceed under a pseudonym and authorizes the Superior Court to seal filings containing protected information.

The bill prohibits private individuals, businesses, associations, and other organizations from publicly disclosing a judicial officer's personal information after receiving a written request. The bill also prohibits selling, trading, or transferring[6] the information on the internet or through any other medium, with the intent to pose an imminent or serious threat to the health or safety of a judicial officer or immediate family member. Such entities must remove any previously disclosed personal information within 72 hours, ensure that the information does not appear on media or platforms under their control, and may not transfer, solicit, sell, or trade the information after receiving the request. Judicial officers or their immediate family members[7] may seek injunctive or declaratory relief, and prevailing officers may recover costs and reasonable attorney's fees. The bill also permits the judicial officer to proceed under a pseudonym and authorizes the Superior Court to seal filings containing protected information. Any person, business, association, or private organization that knowingly or recklessly violates the bill may be held liable to the judicial officer or immediate family member. In addition to attorney's fees and costs, a court may award actual damages, with a minimum of $1,000 in liquidated damages per violation; punitive damages if the violation was willful or showed reckless disregard for the law; and other appropriate injunctive or equitable relief as determined by the court.

The bill's prohibitions do not apply to information disclosed in news reporting, commentary, editorials, or other speech involving matters of public concern; information voluntarily published by the judicial officer or immediate family after the bill's enactment; or transfers requested by the

[3] The bill defines at-risk individual to mean a judicial officer; or any immediate family member identified by a judicial officer in a written request to protect personal information pursuant to the bill.
[4] The bill defines this to mean to delete or permanently redact personal information so that it is no longer publicly displayed or accessible to the general public; provided that government agencies preserve the complete record for official and legal purposes.
[5] Effective March 29, 1977 (D.C. Law 1-96; D.C. Official Code § 2-531 et seq.). The bill makes a conforming change in Section 204(a) of the Freedom of Information Act of 1976, effective March 29, 1977 (D.C. Law 1-96; D.C. Official Code § 2-534(a)).
[6] The bill defines this to mean to sell, license, trade, or exchange for consideration.
[7] The bill defines this to include a judicial officer's spouse, child, parent, or any blood relative of the judicial officer or the judicial officer's spouse who lives in the same household as the judicial officer.

judicial officer or immediate family member. The bill also preserves lawful press investigations and reporting, reporting on matters of public concern, public access to judicial decisions and opinions, and access to personal information for review[8] of judicial officers' compliance with recusal and disclosure rules. Consumer reporting agencies[9] may continue to furnish consumer reports for permissible purposes under federal law, provided they do not otherwise violate the bill's provisions.

The bill authorizes a written request to be submitted in paper or electronic form. Under the bill, the written request is valid until the at-risk individual provides the Mayor, government agency, person, business, association, or other private organization with written permission to release the personal information. The bill requires the Mayor to establish procedures for receiving requests, transmitting requests to government agencies, providing the judicial officer with a list of agencies notified, confirming agency compliance within five business days, and annually reporting to the Council the number of requests received, granted, denied, and pending; the number of requests not completed within five business days; the total number of at-risk individuals covered under the bill; and the categories of publicly available content from which personal information was redacted or removed.

The bill authorizes a representative of the judicial officer's employer to submit a request on the judicial officer's behalf if the judicial officer provides written consent and a copy of that consent is furnished when the request is made.

Financial Plan Impact

Funds are not sufficient in the fiscal year 2027 through fiscal year 2030 budget and financial plan to implement the bill. MPD requires $85,800 in fiscal year 2027.

The Daniel Anderl Judicial Security and Privacy Act of 2022[10] is a federal law that restricts the public disclosure and commercial sale of personally identifiable information for federal judges and their immediate families. The Office of Tax and Revenue (OTR) will amend the forms and processes utilized to comply with this law to incorporate the bill's provisions. OTR does not require additional resources to implement these revisions. The Mayor can establish procedures for processing requests and completing the annual reporting requirements utilizing existing resources.

MPD utilizes a comprehensive records management system (RMS) that stores reports of offenses in violation of local or federal law, reports made by members of the community, and reports detailing other actions taken by MPD members. MPD policy requires a report to be filed for all reported offenses and certain incidents brought to the attention of the police. MPD will need to modify its RMS to implement a confidentiality marker to comply with the bill. MPD requires $85,800 in fiscal year 2027 to complete this update and implement the bill.

[8] By the Commission on Judicial Disabilities and Tenure or the Judicial Nomination Commission.
[9] As defined in section 603(f) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. § 1681a(f)).
[10] Pub. L. No. 117-263, div. E, tit. LIX, subtit. D, §§ 5931–5939, 136 Stat. 2395, 3458 (2022).