



128 Dorrance Street, Suite 400
Providence, RI 02903
Phone: (401) 831-7171
Fax: (401) 831-7175
www.riaclu.org
info@riaclu.org

ACLU OF RI POSITION: AMEND

TESTIMONY ON 26-H 7154, RELATING TO ACCESS TO PUBLIC RECORDS March 31, 2026

The ACLU of Rhode Island is well aware of the threats that judicial officers across the country have increasingly faced in recent years, threats that certainly warrant proactive measures. In response, Congress enacted legislation a few years ago that protects the home addresses of judges from disclosure. To the extent there is any remaining concern that Rhode Island's Access to Public Records Act doesn't explicitly provide similar protection, which we believe it does, we appreciate and welcome efforts to clarify the law to address that. However, we do not believe that the law should also make secret the *municipality* in which judges reside.

We believe there is some public benefit to knowing information about judicial officers' city or town of residence. To give an example, members of the public should be able to know, as a matter of transparency, if a judge handling a case involving a municipality also lives in that city or town. One need not argue that this is likely to affect a judge's impartiality to nonetheless believe it should not be hidden from the public.

Further, in most cities and towns, people know these judicial officials as their neighbors in the community. That is not surprising in a state like Rhode Island, which is not only extremely small, but it is also where everybody seems to know or be connected to everybody else. It would not surprise us if judicial officers sometimes tout their home community when speaking in public, so this broader restriction seems excessive. Indeed, with a number of judicial officers being former legislators, their street address, not to mention their community, has likely been public information for years.

Four years ago, we opposed the adoption of legislation which made secret the name of the municipality where law enforcement officers reside. We argued that while touted as a safety measure, this exemption to the open records law provided a false sense of security, weakened transparency under the Access to Public Records Act, and – as evidenced by this bill – created a troubling precedent that could lead to dozens of other occupations seeking similar protection.

While we acknowledge the goal of shielding from disclosure under APRA the home addresses of judges, we oppose as unnecessary and ineffective any further expanding of the secrecy to encompass their municipality of residence as well.

Thank you for your consideration of our views.