



**OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
ANNUAL REPORT
FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019**

At a Glance

WILLIAM TONG,
Attorney General

MARGARET Q. CHAPPLE,
Deputy Attorney General

Established – 1897

Statutory authority: Conn. Gen. Stat. §§3-124 to 3-131

Central Office: 55 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106

Average number of full-time employees: 288

Recurring General Fund operating expenses: \$ 29,005,031

Revenues Generated: \$ 773,612,334

Mission

The critical missions of this office are to represent and vigorously advocate for the interests of the state and its citizens by performing, with diligence and integrity, the duties and directives assigned to the Attorney General by law, to ensure that state government acts within the letter and spirit of the law, to protect public resources for present and future generations, to safeguard the rights of all consumers, including our most vulnerable citizens, and to preserve and enhance the quality of life of all citizens of the State of Connecticut.

Statutory Responsibility

The Attorney General is the chief civil legal officer of the state. The Office of the Attorney General (OAG) serves as legal counsel to all state agencies. The Connecticut Constitution, statutes and common law authorize the Attorney General to represent the people of the State of Connecticut to protect the public interest.

REVENUE ACHIEVED BY THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

During the 2018-2019 fiscal year, \$ 773,612,334 was generated by the Attorney General’s Office, as described below:

A. Revenue Generated for the General Fund

Tobacco Settlement Fund Collections	\$	124,507,7100
Child Support Collections		32,000,000
Department of Banking Penalties		30,000
Auto Emissions Settlements		4,359,614
Consumer Protection Civil Penalties		4,506,432
Penalties and Fines for Unregistered Businesses		1,660,002
Department of Social Services Collections/Civil		2,336,319
Charitable Trusts/Solicitations – Civil Penalties		46,000
Global Civil Settlements/Anti-Trust		3,047,798
Miscellaneous Collections		11,044,177
Total Revenue Generated for General Fund		\$ 183,538,052

B. Revenue Generated for Consumers and Businesses

Consumer Restitution -Home Improvement Contractors (HIC)	\$	119,534
Restitution to DCP Guaranty Fund - (HIC)		21,588
Refunds Obtained for CT Utility customers		195,000,000
Child Support Collected/Enforced for Families		286,638,802
Total Revenue Generated for Consumers and Businesses		\$ 481,779,924

C. Revenue Protected for Consumers and Businesses

Charitable Funds Recovered or Preserved	\$	124,694
Charitable Trusts Protected		4,269,664
Utility Rate Requested Increase –Savings to Consumers		63,900,000
Total Revenue Protected		\$ 68,294,358

TOTAL REVENUE ACHIEVED **\$ 773,612,334**

PUBLIC SERVICE PROVIDED BY THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

The Office of the Attorney General is divided into 15 departments, each of which represents agencies that provide particular categories of service to state residents. The Attorney General also participates in the legislative process, represents the State in various lawsuits and claims, maintains an active communication with citizens, promotes the protection of personal data and information, and investigates violations of privacy and breaches of personal information. The overall work completed by this office in fiscal year 2018-19 is summarized as follows:

Trial Court Cases	
Instituted	17,189
Completed	18,499
Pending	17,428
Appeals	
Instituted	265
Completed	237
Pending	220
Administrative proceedings	
Instituted	942
Completed	1,992
Pending	4,198
Antitrust/Fraud Investigations	
Instituted	71
Completed	75
Pending	129
Consumer Investigations	
Instituted	19
Completed	12
Pending	36
Privacy Investigations	
Instituted	878
Completed	862
Pending	110
Miscellaneous Investigations	
Instituted	17
Completed	17
Pending	27
Legal Documents Examined	8,301

Public Inquiries Completed	4,147
Formal Opinions Issued	5
Informal Opinions Issued	81

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The Office of the Attorney General is firmly committed to equal employment opportunity. This fiscal year, 60% of the full-time attorney workforce consisted of women and minorities. Women and minorities comprised 69.4% of entry level attorneys and 56.8% of middle and higher level attorneys.

LEGISLATION

Throughout the 2019 legislative session the Attorney General supported and advised upon a wide range of bills. Many of the legislative proposals supported by the Attorney General were adopted by the legislature and signed into law by the Governor. Additionally, in many instances where legislative proposals raised legal concerns, the Office was able to work with policymakers and the legislature's non-partisan staff in an advisory role.

Some of the successful legislative proposals supported by the Office that are now law include raising the legal age for tobacco usage from 18 to 21, the shoring up of the Teachers' Retirement Fund through the creation of a special capital reserve fund, the adoption of new data and cyber security requirements for the insurance industry, requiring safe storage for firearms in homes and cars, and the expansion of the Trust Act, which instructs state and local law enforcement on how to handle civil immigration detainees.

The Attorney General offered testimony before various legislative committees on a total of 15 different bills. These bills addressed topics including consumer privacy, streamlining state contracts, gun safety, criminal justice reform, third party electric suppliers, crisis pregnancy centers and the preservation of the Uniform Administrative Procedure Act. Additionally, the Attorney General submitted two bills to expand and support the work of the Office, including a bill clarifying our standing to bring civil rights cases and a bill requiring the States' Attorney offices to notify us of qualifying pension revocation cases. Both bills passed the House of Representatives with bipartisan support, but were not taken up by the Senate.

Finally, the Attorney General has been included on a handful of legislative initiatives and task forces. We are tasked with consulting with the Governor, OPM and the Connecticut Lottery on the establishment of an online lottery system and have also been tasked with advising the

executive branch on data sharing across agencies. The Attorney General, or his designee, will sit on newly created task forces on consume privacy and debarment of state contractors.

SOLICITOR GENERAL

The Solicitor General is responsible for all appellate matters on behalf of the Office and for the preparation of all formal opinions. The Office issued five formal opinions in FY 2018-19, one for the Governor, one for the Treasurer, two for legislative leaders and one for the State Properties Review Board. The Office typically handles over 200 active appeals at any given time. In FY 2018-19, the Office participated in 265 new appeals, of which approximately 25% were in the capacity as amicus curiae to the courts. Connecticut participated as amicus curiae with regard to environmental, immigration, governmental, women's rights, civil rights, LGBTQ+ rights, constitutional rights, and health care matters.

The Office also closed 237 appeals. Of those 237 closed appeals, 54% were in the state appellate courts, and 46% were in the federal appellate courts. Excluding the cases where the State participated as amicus curiae, the Office completed 193 appeals as a party in FY 2018-2019, with 66% of party appeals conducted before the state appellate courts. Roughly ten percent of the completed appeals had been decided by the state Supreme Court, on cases concerning child protection, workers compensation, transportation and public safety. The Office also handled 107 completed appeals before the state Appellate Court, with 41% concerning child protection cases, 19% arising from public safety cases, 13% emerging from workers' compensation claims, 10% resulting from health/education claims, and the rest distributed among the remaining departments.

Before the federal courts, the majority of the completed appeals were before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. In the over 50 completed appeals before the Second Circuit, approximately half were handled by the Public Safety department, and 20% were handled by the Special Litigation department. In the U.S. Supreme Court, the Office successfully challenged five petitions for certiorari. Finally, Connecticut, along with seventeen other states, successfully challenged the addition of a citizenship question to the 2020 census, resulting in the U.S. Supreme Court decision in Department of Commerce v. New York.

AMICUS AND MULTISTATE ACTIONS

During FY 2018-19, the Office participated in approximately 180 amicus and multistate actions on behalf of the State of Connecticut, state officials and state agencies. This action encompassed a wide variety of issues, including, but not limited to, antitrust, environmental protection, consumer protection, immigration, health care, civil rights, constitutional rights and protecting our electoral process.

With respect to multistate matters, the Office has joined or led over 90 multistate actions, where approximately one-third are court cases where the state is a party, one-third where the state joined a multi-state investigation, and one-third where the state joined multistate comments on pending federal regulatory matters. Some of the highlights include multistate actions defending the Affordable Care Act (ACA). In State of Texas, et al v. United States, Texas challenged the constitutionality of ACA. The State of Connecticut was one of sixteen states serving as intervenor-defendant before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit to uphold the patient protection of the ACA, including the right to coverage for pre-existing conditions.

Additionally, in State of Connecticut, et al. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals, et al., the Office led a new multistate antitrust price fixing action against Teva Pharmaceuticals, 19 other drug manufacturers, and 15 individual senior executive defendants. The complaint alleges a multi-billion dollar conspiracy to coordinate price increases for over 100 different generic drugs, in some instances raising prices over 1,000 percent. The Office also joined a multistate antitrust action blocking the proposed megamerger between telecommunications giants T-Mobile US Inc. and Sprint Corporation, State of New York, et al. v. Deutsche Telekom AG, et al.

In FY 2018-19, the Office also led several multistate actions in the consumer protection and privacy realms, including investigations into the data breach at American Medical Collection Agency, which may have exposed personal information of nearly 12 million patients of Quest Diagnostics and 7.7 million Laboratory Corporation of America patients, and potential unfair and deceptive practices by Hyundai and Kia related to spontaneous vehicle fires. The Office participated on the leadership teams of multistate actions against Fiat-Chrysler, which resulted in a \$72.5 million settlement for unlawful use of software intended to circumvent emissions standards in certain trucks and sport utility vehicles, and Robert Bosch GmbH and its U.S. subsidiary Robert Bosch LLC, resulting in a \$98.7 million settlement for using unlawful "defeat devices" intended to conceal auto emissions that far exceeded state and federal standards. The State of Connecticut received \$4,359,614 from those two multistate settlements.

Environmental protection was another focus of our multistate activity. This included several challenges to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for various regulatory stances taken in FY 2018-19, including issues around asbestos reporting, energy efficiency standards, seismic testing, arctic drilling, and repeated efforts to rollback federal environmental pollutant standards. The Office worked with a coalition of states to uphold clean energy production including the Affordable Clean Energy Act, and submitted comment letters on federal executive orders that had a negative impact on the State of Connecticut's green energy sector. The Office intervened in SCCCL et al. v. Ross, litigation challenging seismic testing, in an effort to maintain the integrity of the Atlantic Ocean.

With respect to amicus submissions, through the Office, the State of Connecticut has participated as amicus curiae in federal court litigation involving other states, the federal government and private parties where important state interests are implicated. During FY 2018-19, the Office participated as amicus curiae in approximately 90 court cases, with approximately 28% pending

before the US Supreme Court, 50% submitted to the various U.S. Courts of Appeals, and 22% submitted to the federal district courts. Acting as amicus curiae, the Office has submitted arguments in federal court cases to protect reproductive rights, to advocate for LGBTQ+ rights, to defend the Affordable Care Act, including maintaining coverage for pre-existing conditions, to fight against climate change and for clean air and clean water regulations, to protect labor rights, to defend sensible firearm regulation, to contest illegal restrictions on the granting of Byrne-JAG grants to municipalities, to protect sanctuary city status, to challenge various extreme restrictions on immigration requirements, and to address court cases impacting various state sovereignty and finance issues.

Some of the highlights of the various FY 2018-19 amicus curiae submissions to the federal courts include challenging laws passed in five states that sought to eliminate a women's right to choose. The Office also supported other states facing elimination of coverage for contraception and similar efforts to limit funding for women's health. Through amicus curiae briefs, the state protected Connecticut residents' access to the Affordable Care Act, challenging several actions by the federal executive branch to reverse the policy, including Moda Health v. US in the U.S. Supreme Court and California v. Azar in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Office also defended civil rights, including LGBTQ+ rights, by supporting inclusion of gender identity under Title VII, and permitting inclusion of LGBTQ+ individuals as foster parents and in the military. In the realm of immigration and travel, the Office successfully opposed the federal government's travel ban, challenged the federal government's efforts to restrict and/or eliminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), fought to have Connecticut's pardon process recognized by immigration courts, and challenged various due process violations in the immigration process.

The Office has fought to protect and maintain environmental protections through amicus arguments in support of climate change litigation, clean air and clean water cases, including Clean Wisconsin v. EPA, Oakland v. British Petroleum, and NRDC v. EPA on mercury reporting levels. The Office joined an amicus curiae brief in the case of Mexichem Fluor v. EPA in the U.S. Supreme Court to prevent additional hydrofluorocarbon chemicals from being released into the environment at the risk of Connecticut residents. The Office also led a multistate coalition defending clean energy, protecting state programs to encourage carbon-free power generation in Coalition v. Ziebelman and Village of Old Creek v. Star. In FY 2018-2019, the Office has made several successful attempts to restrict access to large capacity firearm magazines, and assault rifles through amicus briefs filed in the cases of Duncan v. Becerra, NJ Rifle & Pistol Clubs, Inc. v. New Jersey, and Worman v. Healy.

DEPARTMENTS

ANTITRUST AND GOVERNMENT PROGRAM FRAUD DEPARTMENT

The Antitrust and Government Program Fraud Department has two distinct and critical

missions: (a) ensure that companies and individuals that do business in Connecticut compete fairly and vigorously; and (b) protect Connecticut's health and human service programs from fraudulent and abusive conduct. In that vein the department has the primary responsibility to enforce two important state laws: the Connecticut Antitrust Act and the Connecticut state False Claims Act.

The Department's Antitrust Section has responsibility for administering and enforcing the Connecticut Antitrust Act, and has authority to enforce major provisions of the federal antitrust laws as well. It also relies on other state laws, including the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act, to support the Attorney General's overall responsibility to maintain open and competitive markets in Connecticut. Utilizing these statutes, the section investigates and prosecutes antitrust and other competition-related actions on behalf of Connecticut's consumers, businesses and governmental entities. In addition, the section provides advice and counsel to the Attorney General on proposed legislation and various issues regarding competition policy.

The primary focus of the Department's Health Care Fraud Section is to detect, investigate and prosecute healthcare provider fraud that results in financial loss to the State of Connecticut's health and human services' programs, including the Medicaid Program and the State Employee and Retiree Health Plan. The section develops cases independently and in conjunction with other state and federal law enforcement and regulatory agencies. The Connecticut state False Claims Act, which makes the submission of a false claim to certain Connecticut health and human service agencies illegal, is the department's chief tool to fight health care fraud.

The department also investigates "whistleblower" complaints made to the Auditors of Public Accounts or the Attorney General regarding corruption, unethical practices, violation of state laws or regulations, mismanagement, gross waste of funds, abuse of authority and danger to the public safety occurring in any state agency or large state contractor.

Antitrust Enforcement

The Antitrust Section's mandate is focused on identifying and deterring anticompetitive conduct and obtaining restitution and injunctive relief for injured "consumers", including state agencies and government programs, small businesses and individual consumers. During the past year the Section focused significant resources to ensuring competition in Connecticut's healthcare markets, with a primary emphasis on generic pharmaceuticals. The benefits to consumers from competitive and efficient healthcare markets usually take the form of transparent and competitive pricing, sufficient consumer choice, access to providers, and high quality care.

In July 2014, the Office of the Attorney General initiated an investigation into the reasons behind suspicious price increases of certain generic pharmaceuticals. In the fall of 2016, after accumulating significant evidence of potential violations, the Attorney General organized a bi-

partisan working group of state Attorneys General to assist him with the investigation, which had broadened considerably since the inception of the investigation. In December 2016 Connecticut and nineteen other states, represented by their Attorneys General, filed a federal antitrust lawsuit in Connecticut against six generic pharmaceutical manufacturers alleging the companies engaged in a well-coordinated and long-running conspiracy to fix prices and allocate markets for two generic pharmaceuticals: doxycycline hyclate delayed release and glyburide. The lawsuit was subsequently transferred to federal court in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. In October 2017, the Attorney General's working group asked the federal court for permission to file a new complaint in the states' pending lawsuit that increased the number of generic drug manufacturer defendants from six to 18 in the case and the number of drugs at issue in the litigation from two to 15. The court granted the Attorney General's request on June 5, 2018.

On May 12, 2019 the Attorney General led an expanded 44-state coalition that marked a significant broadening of the investigation by filing a lawsuit against Teva Pharmaceuticals and 19 of the nation's largest generic drug manufacturers, alleging a vast conspiracy to artificially inflate and manipulate prices, reduce competition and unreasonably restrain trade for more than 100 different generic drugs. The lawsuit, which was filed in U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut and subsequently transferred to federal court in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, also names 15 individual senior executive defendants at the heart of the conspiracy who were responsible for sales, marketing, pricing and operations. The drugs at issue account for billions of dollars of sales in the United States, and the alleged schemes increased prices affecting the health insurance market, taxpayer-funded healthcare programs like Medicare and Medicaid, and individuals who must pay artificially-inflated prices for their generic prescriptions drugs. The antitrust investigation is still ongoing with respect to a number of additional generic pharmaceutical manufacturers.

In early 2012 the Attorney General, along with the Office of the New York Attorney General, opened an investigation into alleged anticompetitive conduct engaged in by a number of financial institutions into the suspected rigging of the London Interbank Offered Rate – more commonly referred to as LIBOR. The LIBOR investigation ultimately grew to include over forty Attorneys General.

On December 21, 2018, the Attorney General announced that he joined 40 other states and the District of Columbia in a \$64.6 million settlement with UBS AG (UBS). The settlement resolved allegations that UBS manipulated the LIBOR, and misrepresented the integrity of LIBOR at various times in 2008 and 2009. Most of the proceeds of the settlement will be directed as restitution to government and nonprofit entities with LIBOR-linked swaps and other investment contracts with UBS. Approximately \$700,000 is going to Connecticut entities.

The states previously reached LIBOR-related settlements with Barclays in 2016, Deutsche Bank in 2017, and Citibank in 2018. Together the LIBOR investigation has recovered restitution totaling approximately \$480 million nationwide.

Merger enforcement continues to be a high priority in the Attorney General's antitrust enforcement efforts and this year was no exception. In 2018 the Attorney General joined with other state Attorneys General to investigate the potential competitive effects of the proposed merger of the telecom carriers T-Mobile and Sprint. On June 11, 2019 the Attorney General joined with 9 other states and filed a lawsuit to halt the proposed merger. The complaint, which was filed in federal court in the Southern District of New York, alleges that the merger of two of the four largest national mobile network operators would deprive consumers of the benefits of competition and drive up prices for cellphone services. The trial is expected to commence sometime in October 2019.

Connecticut, like many Northeastern states, is in the midst of combating an unprecedented increase in heroin related overdoses and deaths. Naloxone is a medication used by many first-responders to counter the effects of a heroin overdose. In early 2015, Amphastar Pharmaceuticals, Inc. dramatically - - and without explanation - - increased the price it charged for naloxone, which imposed a significant financial burden on the state and its municipalities that were already grappling with dire budget challenges. Accordingly, in September 2015, the Attorney General contacted Amphastar's Chief Executive Officer and sought to negotiate an agreement with the company that would result in Connecticut governmental purchasers obtaining a rebate for their purchases of Amphastar's naloxone product. On April 5, 2016, the state entered into an agreement with Amphastar that provided a \$6 per-dose rebate for the purchase of the company's naloxone product. Given the critical need for first-responders continued access to naloxone, the Attorney General has negotiated three additional contract extensions with Amphastar in order to continue to obtain the rebate. To date, first-responders have obtained close to \$150,000 in savings from the agreement.

Government Program Fraud Enforcement

The Government Program Fraud Section achieved significant success this year by settling a string of investigations and obtaining several large monetary recoveries for the Medicaid program. In addition, the Section continued to participate in numerous multi-state health care fraud settlements with pharmaceutical companies and other healthcare providers related to violations of the false claims act that affected the Medicaid program. In all, the Attorney General entered into nine (9) multi-state settlements with healthcare companies yielding a total recovery (federal and state) of approximately \$3 million for the Medicaid program.

In addition to the multi-state pharmaceutical settlements, the section filed one state False Claims Act lawsuit and entered into several Connecticut-specific false claims act settlements this past fiscal year that provided restitution to the Medicaid program. These actions include the following:

- In July of 2018, the Attorney General, along with the Connecticut U.S. Attorney's Office, entered into a \$126,000 settlement with a Waterford psychologist to resolve allegations that

she violated the false claims act by submitting false claims for behavioral health services she never provided to her Connecticut Medicaid patients.

- In July 2018, the Attorney General entered into a false claims act settlement with a Norwich behavioral health practice and its co-owners, who are both licensed clinical social workers. The \$300,000 settlement resolved allegations that the providers violated the state False Claims Act by billing the Connecticut Medicaid Program for services performed by unlicensed individuals employed by the practice. The settlement also required the providers to enter into a five (5) year compliance program designed to prevent and detect fraud, waste and abuse occurring in the Connecticut Medicaid Program.
- On September 11, 2018 the Attorney General filed a false claims act lawsuit against a Florida compounding pharmacy and several individual defendants, many of whom are current and former State of Connecticut employees, alleging the defendants engaged in a scheme to file false claims with the Connecticut Pharmacy Benefit Plan, which provides prescription drug benefits to enrolled state employees and eligible family members. The lawsuit was filed in Superior Court in Hartford and is still ongoing.
- In January 2019 the Attorney General entered into a \$100,000 false claims act settlement with a New Haven-based behavioral health clinician group and its owner for allegedly submitting false claims to the Connecticut Medicaid Program for psychotherapy services provided by unlicensed persons, or services never provided. In addition to the monetary settlement, the provider was suspended from providing services to the Medicaid Program for ten (10) years.
- On January 29, 2019 the Attorney General entered into a \$20,000 false claims act settlement with a West Haven behavioral analyst who purported to provide Autism Spectrum Disorder services to Medicaid program recipients. The settlement resolved allegations that the provider submitted false claims for direct observation of the patient by the analyst when, in fact, he never treated the Medicaid patients on the date of service. In addition to the monetary settlement, the provider was suspended from providing services to the Medicaid Program for three (3) years.
- In March 2019 the office, along with the Connecticut U.S. Attorney's Office, entered into a \$467,090 settlement with Orange-based Med Tech LLC and its owner to resolve allegations that the provider billed the Connecticut Medicaid Program for stimulator devices and back braces that were not medically necessary and/or never provided to Medicaid recipients.
- On March 15, 2019 the Attorney General and the Connecticut U.S. Attorney's Office, entered into a \$3.3 million false claims act settlement with a New London psychiatrist and his medical practice, which provides behavioral health and addiction medicine services to Medicare and Medicaid recipients in Connecticut. The settlement resolves allegations that the provider submitted false claims for drug screening tests billed to both federal healthcare

programs. In addition to the settlement, the provider entered into a three-year billing Integrity Agreement with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The Integrity Agreement is designed to ensure the provider's future compliance with the requirements of federal healthcare programs.

- In April 2019 the office, along with the Connecticut U.S. Attorney's Office, entered into a \$252,913 settlement with a New Haven dentist to resolve allegations that he violated the false claims act by submitting false claims to the Medicaid Program for oral surgery and maxillofacial services that he did not perform or were already reimbursed as part of other covered services.
- On April 10, 2019 the Attorney General and the Connecticut U.S. Attorney's Office entered into a \$145,855 false claims act settlement with a Waterbury-based licensed clinical social worker for allegedly submitting false claims to the Connecticut Medicaid Program for psychotherapy services provided by unlicensed persons. In addition to the monetary settlement, the provider was suspended from providing services to the Medicaid Program for three (3) years.

Whistleblower Matters

The Whistleblower Section, in cooperation with the Auditors of Public Accounts, continued to investigate a variety of complaints alleging corruption, unethical practices, mismanagement, gross waste of funds and abuse of authority.

CHILD PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

The Child Protection Department is responsible for representing the Connecticut Department of Children and Families (DCF) in state and federal court proceedings brought in the interest of abused and neglected children. DCF's most prominent mandate is to investigate reports of child abuse or neglect and, based on the outcome of the investigations, to provide the proper protection for children and to assist families in retaining or regaining the care and custody of their children by enhancing the safety of children's family environments and improving parenting skills. DCF's interventions in serious cases of abuse or neglect are always subject to judicial scrutiny. The vast majority of civil child protection cases before the Superior Court of Juvenile Matters are initiated by DCF through neglect petitions, applications for orders of temporary custody, review of permanency plans, petitions for termination of parental rights, adoptions and other civil proceedings.

Attorneys in the Child Protection Department regularly represent DCF in all twelve (12) juvenile courts statewide, as well as in federal court. In addition, this department defends DCF in all administrative appeals to the Superior Court, and represents the State before the Office of the Claims Commissioner.

The Child Protection Department also successfully represented DCF in a large number of appeals to the state Appellate and Supreme Courts, including several positive outcomes in appeals concerning abused and neglected children and youths.

COLLECTIONS/CHILD SUPPORT DEPARTMENT

The Collections/Child Support Department is dedicated to the expeditious recovery of monies owing to the State, as well as the establishment of orders for the support of children. The department represents the Department of Administrative Services/Collection Services in matters involving the recovery of debts owed to the state, including reimbursable public assistance benefits, other state aid and care, and costs of incarceration. The department also represents the Office of Child Support Services within the Department of Social Services (DSS-OCSS), to establish child support orders. Additionally, the department provides legal services to enforce child support orders at the request of the Support Enforcement Services division of the Connecticut Judicial Branch (SES). Department staff also provide a full range of litigation services to collect, on a case-by-case basis, monies owed to various state agencies, including the Departments of Social Services, Revenue Services, Correction and Higher Education, as well as the Unemployment Division of the Labor Department, John Dempsey Hospital, the Second Injury Fund, the Connecticut State University System, the Office of the Secretary of the State, the State Elections Enforcement Commission and various other state agencies, boards and commissions.

In fiscal year 2018-2019, department attorneys recovered millions of dollars in cash payments on debts owed to the state. The department's activities on child support orders continue to create exceptionally large and increased caseloads. During the fiscal year, nearly 10,000 cases were opened in all child-support categories. These cases are handled in both the J.D. Superior Court-Family Division, the Family Support Magistrate Division, Probate Court, and involve the establishment of paternity and/or financial orders for the support of minor children. Additionally, the Department argued some child support related matters in the state appellate courts.

The State of CT-Title IV-D partnership, comprised of the Attorney General's office, DSS-OCSS, and SES, successfully enforced/collected approximately \$ 287 million in child support for families, and of that amount, \$32 million was paid to the state General Fund under the state's assignment of rights.

Department attorneys actively argued cases on behalf of children who resided in the State of Connecticut, as well as children residing in other states and cooperating countries, pursuant to the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act. In addition to their work establishing paternity and support orders for children, department attorneys appeared and successfully argued hundreds of cases in Probate Court and Superior Court-Juvenile Court, to protect the State's interest and to preserve the legal rights of children to receive financial support from their parents. The Probate Court matters generally involve non-custodial parents seeking to terminate their own parental

rights, or the custodial parent seeking to terminate the rights of the non-custodial parent. These matters are often transferred or appealed to Superior Court.

Outside the child-support area, department attorneys engaged in excess of 1,100 collection-related litigation matters and managed a large diverse case load, in numerous venues including state superior court, probate court, federal district court, and federal bankruptcy court proceedings in Connecticut and throughout the country. The department concluded several litigation collection matters involving the recovery of debts owed to numerous state agencies, boards and commissions.

The Department's collections efforts resulted in a recovery of \$100,000 or more in approximately 14 cases, for a total Department litigation collection recovery in excess of \$ 8 million for the state's General Fund. The largest of these matters involved recoveries of \$ 413,000, \$400,000, and \$275,000 respectively, arising out of claims on behalf of DAS and DSS seeking reimbursement for public assistance from various Trust matters in Probate Court, \$ 304,000 recovery from the enforcement of a DAS public assistance claim on a decedent estate in Probate Court, \$ 169,000 successfully enforced from a state statutory lien filed against a lawsuit settlement, approximately \$135,000 recovery arising out of a unpaid tax claim filed on behalf of DRS in federal bankruptcy court, and \$ 100,000 from Superior Court civil lawsuit against an inmate whom was the beneficiary of a life insurance policy.

The Department also recovered approximately \$165,000 on behalf of the Department of Correction for cost of incarceration debt statutorily owed by inmates, and recovered nearly \$287,000 for unpaid medical care provided by John Dempsey Hospital. The Department also successfully collected in excess of \$1.6 million in penalties/fines from foreign (unregistered) businesses, working in cooperation with the Secretary of the State's Commercial Recording Division

Of the numerous bankruptcy claims that were successfully prosecuted in federal bankruptcy courts, the Department collected approximately \$ 812,000 this fiscal year

Additionally, within the Department's bankruptcy case load, staff continue to litigate complicated questions of law involving matters of first impression. First, the Department is defending a sudden increase in Chapter 7 bankruptcy trustees seeking to recover or "clawback" tuition payments made by parents of students who subsequently filed bankruptcy on the theory that parents are not legally liable for college tuition and therefore did not receive reasonably equivalent value for the payments. This is an area of first impression in Connecticut that may impact state colleges and universities, and a number of actions have been both threatened and initiated against the state various state universities.

The Department is also defending a complicated bankruptcy matter involving a question of law when/whether sole members of an LLC can be held liable for unpaid taxes when the level of control they had over the business operations is in dispute.

The Department also actively litigated numerous appeals filed in both the Superior Court, as well as the state Appellate Court. This past year, the Department obtained an appellate decision of significant programmatic interest to the State's Title IV-D child support program. The Department is also actively defending an appeal filed by a legally liable child support lien stakeholder. All of these appeals involved complex questions of law that would have had a negative impact on either the State's Title IV-D child support program and/or our client agencies charged with collections of state debts. Of particular importance is the fact the Department successfully safeguarded the state child support program's ability to expeditiously establish and enforce child support cases for the neglected children the program serves.

All told, Department staff instituted and litigated approximately 11,000 child support and civil collections cases this past year in state and federal courts throughout the state, and successfully recovered approximately of \$6.6 million dollars for the state's General Fund. Department staff worked tirelessly in coordination with our Title IV-D child support client agencies and partners to collect approximately \$287 million in child support payments- of which the vast majority was collected for needy families.

CONSUMER PROTECTION DEPARTMENT

The Consumer Protection Department protects Connecticut's consumers by investigating and litigating consumer protection matters under the authority of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act ("CUTPA") and other state and federal statutes. The Department advises the Attorney General and the Commissioner of the Department of Consumer Protection on consumer protection matters and represents and defends the Department of Consumer Protection in court. The Department also advocates on behalf of Connecticut's energy and utility ratepayers in state and federal fora. In addition, the Department educates consumers on how to avoid becoming victims of unfair and deceptive trade practices and, where possible, mediates disputes. Some highlights from the 2018-2019 fiscal year are described below.

Multistate Activities

Automobile Cases

Connecticut continued to play a leading role in ensuring that automobile manufacturers and their suppliers comply with state consumer protection laws. This year, this office served on the executive committee of multistate working groups investigating possible emissions fraud by FCA US, LLC (formerly Fiat Chrysler) as well as Robert Bosch, LLC and its German parent, Robert Bosch GmbH (collectively, "Bosch"). Similar to Volkswagen, FCA US was suspected of incorporating "defeat devices" into the engine control systems of RAM 1500 diesel pickup trucks and Jeep Grand Cherokees. Bosch supplied both FCA and Volkswagen with the engine control systems the companies used in their light duty passenger vehicles, and the states asserted that it

knew of and perhaps facilitated the installation of the defeat devices used by both FCA US and Volkswagen. In January 2019, the working group announced settlements with FCA US and with Bosch to resolve the multistate investigations. Connecticut received \$1,398,892 from the FCA US settlement and \$2,960,664 under the Bosch agreement. These settlements were achieved through the joint efforts of this department and the Environment department.

Hip Implant

A multi-state investigation of Johnson & Johnson and its wholly owned subsidiary, DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc. (the Company) was formed in July 2013. The investigation concerned whether the Company violated state Unfair and Deceptive Acts or Practices (UDAP) statutes in its marketing of metal-on-metal hip implant devices. The Judgment resulted in a payment of \$1,804,665.99 to the State and contains general prohibitions against false, misleading or deceptive practices as well as terms that are tailored to address the Company's actions in its deceptive promotion of the ASR XL and Pinnacle Ultamet.

Other Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practice Cases

State v. Lifetime Excursions, LLC, et al

The Consumer Protection Department of the Attorney General's Office obtained a stipulated judgment against defendants Lifetime Excursions LLC and Christopher Noel Ashford in May 2019. The defendants advertised two chartered high school class trips which included airfare, hotels, guided tours, all-inclusive insurance, meals and chartered round trip bus transfers. Parents of 52 high school students paid between \$3,000 and \$3,625 each to the defendants. In total, Lifetime Excursions LLC and Ashford collected \$185,000 in funds relating to the two chartered high school trips. Days before the scheduled trips, Ashford emailed the teachers who were serving as trip advisors at the respective schools cancelling the trips without offering refunds. The judgment permanently bans Lifetime Excursions LLC and Ashford from owning, operating or participating in any Connecticut business that offers services to consumers relating to travel tours or arrangements. The final judgment would also require the defendants to pay \$75,000 into a restitution fund for aggrieved consumers.

Buckmiller Brothers Funeral Home, Inc. and Terry Buckmiller

From 1998 to 2014, defendants Buckmiller Brothers Funeral Home, Inc. and Terry Buckmiller were alleged to have failed to comply with various provisions of Connecticut law pertaining to funeral service contracts. Specific allegations included, among other things, failing to timely deposit prepaid funeral contract funds into escrow accounts, failing to keep proper records of prepaid funeral contracts and overcharging consumers.

In July 2018, the Attorney General's Office obtained a stipulated judgment against the defendants. The judgment permanently enjoined Terry Buckmiller from operating or being employed by a funeral home in Connecticut. The court also entered judgment in the amount of

\$600,000 against the defendants. In addition, the court ordered Terry Buckmiller to reimburse the current owners of the funeral home for a period of eight years, for any shortfalls that may occur with respect to prepaid funeral contracts entered into when Mr. Buckmiller still owned the business.

Utility Cases

Docket No. 18-01-15, Review of Rate Adjustments Related to Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act

As a result of the Federal Tax Cuts and Jobs Act utilities, federal tax rates dropped from 35 percent to 21 percent. Because ratepayers are generally responsible for paying utility taxes, and because utilities are no longer required to pay federal taxes at the 35 percent rate that was built into rates, the rates that ratepayers pay should be reduced to account for the lower costs resulting from a reduced tax rate. The Attorney General argued that rates should be reduced and that rates collected from January 1, 2018 be returned to customers. This effort helped secure rate reductions (retroactively) of approximately \$95 million a year from January 2018 onward.

PURA Investigation into Direct Energy Services, LLC

In 2017, the Connecticut Public Utilities Regulatory Authority ("PURA") opened an investigation into Direct Energy, a retail electric supplier. The Attorney General was an active participant in this case, and advocated for PURA to take strong enforcement measures against Direct Energy for repeatedly and flagrantly employing illegal marketing tactics that harmed consumers. On May 1, 2019, PURA issued a final decision imposing a \$1.5 million civil penalty against Direct Energy, which is the largest civil penalty that PURA has ever imposed on an electric supplier. In addition, PURA's Final Decision prohibited Direct Energy from enrolling new customers, except by online enrollment, for six months and required Direct Energy to undergo a compliance audit for another year after that.

Other

In addition, the Attorney General successfully argued against Yankee Gas Service Company's proposed rate increase totaling \$90 million over three years, which resulted in PURA approving a more reasonable increase of about \$30 million over three years, advocated for improved transparency and adequacy of information available to consumers concerning their electric supply rates and successfully argued against United Illuminating's request to recover ratepayer funded incentive bonuses for its construction of a new Pequonnock substation.

Consumer Assistance Unit

The Department includes the Consumer Assistance Unit ("CAU") which is dedicated to fielding, logging, tracking consumer complaints, and resolving consumer complaints through voluntary mediation. In addition, CAU refers cases involving respondents with a pattern of substantiated complaints to Consumer Protection for further investigation and litigation. During the past fiscal

year, CAU received and responded to 3,345 written consumer inquiries and many more telephone inquiries. More than \$600,000.00 was refunded or credited to Connecticut Consumers due to CAU's mediation efforts.

CAU also plays a central role in the Attorney General's Office's efforts to educate consumers. During the past fiscal year, outreach efforts by CAU included consumer information fairs in Bethany, Ansonia, Danielson, Griswold, and Westbrook as well as consumer fraud presentations in Woodbridge, Hamden, Bethany, and Southington. CAU staff also participated monthly on Spanish language radio shows to help educate the Latino community on consumer issues.

THE EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS DEPARTMENT

The Employment Rights Department devotes a substantial amount of its resources to defending state agencies, including the University of Connecticut, the UCONN Health, the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities, and state officials in employment related litigation and administrative complaints. Its staff continues to work to effectively defend employment claims against the state and state officials – thereby limiting or avoiding the state's exposure to financial liability and other costs associated with litigation -- while ensuring protection of employees' legitimate legal rights.

The department also regularly provides legal advice and counsel, both orally and in writing, to state agencies on a variety of employment matters. The department's role continues to increase in this regard as the issues facing state agencies become more complex. The department staff also participates in training agency staff in employment laws including the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Department staff is currently defending the State in approximately 71 employment cases in the state and federal courts, including 3 cases at Second Circuit Court appeals and 1 Connecticut Appellate Court. In addition to these cases, the department is defending approximately 104 complaints before the Connecticut Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities ("CHRO"), Office of Public Hearings, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and Freedom of Information Commission ("FOIC"). The department is also defending 17 claims in the Office of the Claims Commissioner.

During the past year, the department successfully defended state agencies in numerous cases in the state and federal courts. Significantly, the department was able to obtain judgment in favor of the state and its officials on 9 summary judgment motions that were filed in court, eliminating the need for trials in those cases. These victories are important as they eliminate not only the need to expend resources at trial, but also eliminate the uncertainty and exposure the state has to large jury awards. The department also filed approximately 9 additional summary judgment motions, 5 in federal court and 4 in state court during fiscal year 2018-2019, which are pending rulings by the court. The department also has 1 summary judgment motion pending from last fiscal year, for an overall total of 10 which are awaiting rulings from the court.

During fiscal year 2018-2019, the department represented the state in 6 trials. The department also tried 3 matters at the Office of Public Hearings. In addition, the department successfully defended 3 federal district court decisions in appeals before the federal Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

The department was also successful in avoiding the state's exposure to financial liability by entering into several favorable settlement agreements, and by filing various motions in several cases, which resulted in dismissals by the Courts and CHRO.

THE ENERGY DEPARTMENT

The Energy Department provides legal services to the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority (PURA) and the Connecticut Siting Council (Council). The Department defends the state's interests in energy and utility issues in regional and national organizations, before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), before state and federal courts and before state agencies. The Department also represents PURA in telecommunications issues before the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and the federal courts.

At FERC, the Energy Department contested an expensive cost-of-service contract imposed on New England ratepayers to support a natural gas-based electric generating facility and its connected liquefied natural gas terminal. The litigation has reduced the cost of this two-year contract by an estimated \$22 million (\$11 million for both years of the contract). Litigation continues regarding other aspects of the cost-of-service contract (the return on equity), and more cost reductions for the two-year contract are possible.

The Energy Department also helped negotiate settlements reducing the rates of interstate natural gas pipeline companies. The approximate ratepayer value associated with two such settlements ranges from \$5 million per year to \$7 million per year.

During the past fiscal year, the Energy Department successfully defended PURA before the Appellate Court in PMC Property Group, Inc. v. Public Utilities Regulatory Authority, 189 Conn.App. 268 (2019), where the Court upheld PURA's orders determination that PMC illegally submetered electricity and that tenants/consumers were entitled to recover payments made to an escrow fund. That fund is now over \$130,000.00.

The Energy Department also successfully dismissed an administrative appeal against PURA by a developer who sought to obtain the same contract rates as energy producers who prevailed in a competitive bidding process without even participating in the competitive processes.

The Energy Department also participated in important federal cases delineating state authority under the Federal Power Act ("FPA"). In these cases, New York and Illinois acted separately to ensure the continued operation of nuclear generating facilities these states found critical to achieving greenhouse gas emission goals. Both states created financial support mechanisms which

depend on zero emission certificates (“ZEC”). ZECs are a state-created property right. In both cases, electric generators challenged the state actions as, inter alia, preempted by the Federal Power Act. These cases reached the Second and Seventh Circuit Courts of Appeal. The Energy Department submitted amicus briefs in both appeals to support the important state programs and the state authority under the FPA permitting such programs. In both cases, Coalition for Competitive Electricity, Dynergy, Inc. v. Zibelman, 906 F.3d 41 (2d Cir. 2018), cert. den., Electric Power Supply Association v. Rhodes, 139 S.Ct. 1547 (2019), and Electric Power Supply Association v. Star, 904 F.3d 518 (7th Cir. 2018), cert. den., 139 S.Ct. 1547 (2019), the Courts of Appeal affirmed favorable District Court decisions and in both cases the U.S. Supreme Court denied certiorari.

During this fiscal year, the Energy Department defended the Connecticut Siting Council’s approval of solar energy electric generating facilities in Simsbury and New Milford, Connecticut. These facilities will bring additional renewable energy to New England's grid and reduce the region's dependence on greenhouse gas emitting fossil fuels. The Council's decisions were appealed to the Superior Court. The Town of Simsbury v. Connecticut Siting Council and Flammini v. Connecticut Siting Council cases were settled, clearing the way for construction of the Simsbury facility. The Energy Department continues to represent the Connecticut Siting Council in three administrative appeals stemming from the approval of the solar electric generating facility in New Milford. Additionally, the Energy Department defended an administrative appeal to the New Britain Superior Court of the Connecticut Siting Council’s approval of an electric substation in Greenwich, Connecticut. The parties entered into settlement discussions and both the Energy Department and the Office of Consumer Counsel insisted that Connecticut's ratepayers not pay for any settlement. Accordingly, the parties settled the Town of Greenwich v. Connecticut Siting Council case without additional cost to Connecticut's ratepayers.

ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT

The Environment Department represents the state Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and the Department of Agriculture in court and administrative proceedings. The department continues to have important success in abating pollution and in enforcing environmental laws. This year the department initiated and participated in a number of cases that sought to protect the environment and the citizens of the State of Connecticut. The department also continued to coordinate with other states on national efforts to keep Connecticut's air clean and help protect its citizens from the impacts of air pollution transported to our state and from climate change.

In the continuing effort to improve Connecticut's air quality, the department participated in a number of legal actions to enforce the Clean Air Act, including actions seeking to reduce the impact in Connecticut from air pollution generated in other states. For example, the department also continued efforts to defend the Clean Power Plan, which includes rules intended to reduce emissions of CO₂ (the main greenhouse gas that causes climate change). In addition, the

Department worked with other states to support and defend federal rules intended to promote cleaner air in Connecticut, including rules that establish more stringent controls on vehicle emissions.

This year the department secured a number of legal victories on behalf of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection ("DEEP") that furthered the State's efforts to enforce and defend environmental laws. In conjunction with a coalition of states, Connecticut entered into settlements with FCA, LLC (formerly Fiat Chrysler) and Robert Bosch, LLC to resolve a number of air pollution violations. These settlements were reached through the joint efforts of this department and the OAG Consumer Protection department.

For FCA, LLC, the violations arose from the incorporation of illegal and undisclosed emissions defeat devices designed to circumvent emissions standards on 87,350 MY 2013 through 2016 Jeep Grand Cherokee SUVs and RAM 1500 pickups sold throughout the US (excluding California), of which 598 were sold or leased in Connecticut. The settlement addressed both Uniform Deceptive Acts and Practices (UDAP) and environmental violations. The total settlement was \$1,398,892 of which \$475,142 was for environmental civil penalties. (The remainder was attributable to \$373,750 in UDAP penalties and a \$550,000 bonus for being a lead state in the investigation). In addition, the settlement required FCA to modify affected vehicles to comply with applicable emissions requirements and extended the consumer warranty on emissions control equipment.

For Bosch, the violations arose from its development and deployment of illegal emissions defeat devices into electronic engine control units incorporated into 573,438 Volkswagen, Audi, and Porsche Model Year 2009 through 2016 2- and 3-liter diesel-powered passenger vehicles (of which 11,911 were located in Connecticut) and the FCA vehicles above. The total settlement of \$98,713,378, yielding \$2,960,722 for Connecticut divided evenly between UDAP and environmental civil penalties.

The department also worked with the DEEP to negotiate Consent Orders and resolve outstanding administrative proceedings that are intended to protect the environment and remediate pollution.

The department's representation of the DEEP in bankruptcy proceedings continues to thwart polluters' efforts to avoid environmental liability by filing bankruptcy. The department attorneys handled numerous bankruptcy filings this year, representing DEEP's interests in bankruptcy courts. The department's attorneys' work in bankruptcy court seeks to ensure that contaminated properties are not abandoned and left to taxpayers to clean up.

The department continues to represent and assist the Department of Agriculture ("DoAg") in animal cruelty cases, working with DoAg to protect neglected and cruelly treated animals. This past year the department also continued to defend challenges to DoAg decisions intended to protect the public from vicious animals. The department also provided legal support to DoAg in preserving valuable Connecticut farmland by acquiring the development rights through the Farmland Preservation Program, thereby protecting the land from commercial or residential development.

The department continues to provide legal support to DoAg's Aquaculture Division and assists DoAg in leasing hundreds of acres for oyster farming and other commercial aquaculture activities, thereby generating millions of dollars for the State's economy.

In addition, the Environment Department continues to provide a full range of legal services to both DEEP and DoAg, including defense of Claims Commissioner matters, contract review, opinions, legal advice and counsel.

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

The Finance Department provides legal services to several state agencies, including the Department of Banking, the Department of Economic and Community Development, the Department of Insurance, the Department of Revenue Services, the Office of Policy and Management, the Office of Health Strategy, and the State Insurance Risk Management Board. The department handles litigation in federal and state courts for these agencies, including regulatory enforcement actions, administrative appeals, actions requiring the defense of state laws, and in proceedings before the Freedom of Information Commission and the Claims Commissioner. The department also provides advice to the agencies it represents on a wide variety of legal and regulatory issues that arise in their daily operations, including the review of agency contracts and regulations for legal sufficiency.

During the past fiscal year, the department's work on behalf of state agencies included representing the Department of Revenue Services in 748 tax warrant proceedings seeking to collect overdue and delinquent state taxes, representing the Department of Banking in numerous administrative enforcement actions and other litigation matters, providing the Department of Economic and Community Development with legal assistance regarding grant, loan, and economic development programs, and assisting the Office of Health Strategy by providing legal advice with respect to its statutory responsibilities and guidance on state contract requirements.

Along with the work it does directly on behalf of state agencies, the department focuses on consumer financial protection and investor protection by conducting investigations, leading multistate enforcement committees, negotiating settlements, commencing litigation, drafting and reviewing regulatory comment letters, and handling consumer inquiries. Areas of focus include financial services, residential mortgage loan origination and servicing, for-profit education, student loans, and debt collection.

Department attorneys led a multistate negotiation of a \$575 million, fifty-state settlement with Wells Fargo. Connecticut received over \$5.2 million as its share of the settlement. The settlement resolved claims that the bank violated state consumer protection laws by (1) opening millions of unauthorized accounts and enrolling customers into online banking services without their knowledge or consent, (2) improperly referring customers for enrollment in third-party renters and life insurance policies, (3) improperly charging auto loan customers for force-placed and

unnecessary collateral protection insurance, (4) failing to ensure that customers received refunds of unearned premiums on certain optional auto finance products, and (5) incorrectly charging customers for mortgage rate lock extension fees. Wells Fargo committed to provide restitution to consumers in excess of \$600 million through its agreements with federal regulators. The multistate settlement also required the bank to implement a program through which consumers may be reviewed for additional redress.

In addition, department attorneys co-led a multistate negotiation with for-profit college operator Career Education Corporation to resolve state claims related to abusive and misleading recruitment and enrollment practices. The resulting settlement provided nearly \$494 million in debt relief for 179,529 students nationwide, including 1,415 in Connecticut. The settlement also required the company to reform its practices and report to an independent monitor. Connecticut received a settlement payment of over \$264,000.

The Finance Department is also responsible for enforcement of the Master Settlement Agreement ("MSA") between fifty-two states and territories, including Connecticut, and more than forty participating tobacco product manufacturers. Department attorneys work to ensure that Connecticut receives the monetary payments it is owed under the MSA, and that tobacco manufacturers also comply with the public health provisions of the MSA and other requirements of state law. In addition, department attorneys collaborate with the Department of Revenue Services to carry out the state's enforcement responsibilities pursuant to the MSA and related state statutes. During the past year, Connecticut received over \$124 million in payments from tobacco manufacturers that participate in the MSA.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

The Health and Education Department provides legal services and representation to a broad spectrum of state agencies, including the University of Connecticut, the University's Health Care Center and John Dempsey Hospital, the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities composed of the four Connecticut State Universities and the sixteen Connecticut Community Colleges, the Office of Higher Education, the State Library, the State Department of Education and the Connecticut Technical High Schools. This department also represents the Department of Public Health, the Department of Social Services, the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, the Department of Rehabilitation Services, the Department of Developmental Services, the Department of Veterans' Affairs, the Office of Early Childhood, the Psychiatric Security Review Board, the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner and the sixteen health licensing boards and commissions.

The department's workload addresses the entire spectrum of litigation in federal and state courts for these clients, including but not limited to class action lawsuits, administrative appeals, regulatory enforcement actions, non-employee discrimination claims, civil rights actions, probate

proceedings, bankruptcy and receivership actions. The department also is involved in a variety of administrative proceedings representing the adjudicating agency (*e.g.* licensing boards), the prosecuting agency (*e.g.* day care and health care facility prosecutions) and defending agencies in proceedings before the Office of the Claims Commissioner, the Freedom of Information Commission and the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. The department advises and counsels client agencies on wide spectrum of issues, including, for example, regulatory issues for health care facilities and professions, emergency medical services, child day care services and environmental health such as public water supply, lead paint, and asbestos; Medicaid and other welfare programs such as food stamps; nursing home and hospital rates; health care facility certificates of need; confidentiality of medical and education records; civil commitment law, medical/psychiatric treatment at state facilities, property acquisitions, state contract law, disability accommodations for students; federal higher education law, and oversight of public and private educational entities. The department also reviews and approves for legal sufficiency regulations and contracts for its client agencies.

The department worked with the Department of Public Health (DPH) to further its role as a health regulatory and enforcement agency. These activities included, among others, defending a number of challenges to the regulatory authority of DPH and decisions of the licensing boards for health care professionals. For example, the department secured compliance with a DPH order that a physician undergo a medical examination to determine his fitness to practice.

The department also provided assistance in securing numerous consent orders between DPH and health care facilities securing regulatory compliance including with nursing homes, a hospital laboratory, and a residential care home. The department assisted DPH in securing a cease and desist consent order against an operator providing home health care services without a license. The department also secured a consent order against a blood collection facility operating without DPH approval including a \$55,000 civil penalty. The department assisted DPH the issuance of emergency orders against a residential care home when inspectors found numerous physical plant and services violations and coordinated with the Long Term Care Ombudsman and local fire officials resulting in the closure of the home and the safe transfer of its residents to new homes. In addition to surrender of their license, the operators of the home also agreed to restrictions on their ability to secure a residential care home license in the future. The department also aided DPH in obtaining emergency orders for the immediate correction of environmental hazards at a nursing home that posed hazards to its residents.

On behalf of the Office of Early Childhood, the department obtained a voluntary surrender of a license of a child care facility due to numerous regulatory violations. After filing an action for an injunction, the department secured the shutdown of a recalcitrant unlicensed day care provider.

The department handled a substantial amount of litigation for the Department of Social Services (DSS). In addition to resolving court cases involving issues of Medicaid eligibility, the department also assisted DSS with the negotiation of an agreement in principle to settle the multibillion dollar

litigation involving challenges to hospital taxes and rates. The department continues to represent DSS in stabilizing and attempting to achieve the sale of a nursing home in the bankruptcy. The department also represented DSS in securing the sale of two nursing homes in receivership to new operators avoiding the displacement of residents and employees of the homes. The department successfully defended a federal lawsuit by a Medicaid provider claiming that DSS violated his rights when DSS required that the provider execute a new provider agreement requiring compliance with revised regulations.

In Anderson v. Dike, the Appellate Court affirmed the trial court's judgment in a case where the department successfully defended the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services from a lawsuit brought by a patient who falsely claimed that one of its employees intentionally injured him. In Doe v. Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, the Appellate Court affirmed the trial court's decision that the care and services provided to the plaintiff did not violate the psychiatric patient bill of rights.

The department addressed a variety of issues for the State Board of Education and the Department of Education (SDE). The department successfully brought suit against a contractor who provided surrogate parent services for special education students who failed to return the students' education records to SDE. The department continues to work with SDE on the Sheff v. O'Neil case. The department was also able to secure court decisions rejecting challenges to decisions of the Department of Developmental Disabilities (DDS) placing persons on its abuse and neglect registry. The department continues to represent DDS in ongoing settlement compliance in the Southbury Training School litigation.

The department provides legal services on a broad array of issues to the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities. Some of these issues included contract questions, real property matters, requests for access to student information, discrimination claims, Title IX claims, due process rights and issues arising under the Freedom of Information Act.

The department also provides services for the wide variety of legal matters involving the University of Connecticut. This responsibility continues to increase as the University grows and higher education matters become more complex involving litigation and administrative proceedings. The department attorneys expend substantial time on legal review, negotiation and approval of highly complex transactions and contracts. In University of Connecticut v. Office of State Ethics, the court overturned a formal opinion that expanded the application of the code of ethics to time periods before an employee began working for the State and thus removing a substantial impediment to UCONN's ability to attract new faculty and executive staff. The University of Connecticut Health Center continues to present broad and challenging legal issues that arise from the operation of an academic health center. The department secured the dismissal of a claim from a terminated contractor who asserted that the Center had breached its contract. This same contractor's federal litigation was also successfully defended by the department. The department also secured the withdrawal of a federal class action lawsuit seeking damages against

the Center for a data breach that resulted in access to some email accounts, but not medical records of the Center.

PRIVACY AND DATA SECURITY DEPARTMENT

The Privacy and Data Security Department handles matters related to the protection of Connecticut residents' personal information and data. The Department enforces state laws governing notification of data breaches, safeguarding of personal information, and protection of social security numbers and other sensitive information. The Department is also responsible for enforcement of federal laws under which the Attorney General has enforcement authority, including the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA), the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA), and the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA). In addition, this Department provides the Attorney General with advice and counsel on proposed legislation and other matters regarding privacy and data security, and it engages in extensive outreach to citizens and businesses on matters relating to data protection and privacy.

Education

The Privacy and Data Security Department provides education and outreach with public and private entities that have a role or strong interest in privacy and data protection. In addition to small business roundtable or industry-specific events, Privacy and Data Security Department staff have spoken on national panels, including at the Practicing Law Institute's Annual Privacy Seminar, and presented continuing legal education in addition to other discussions and presentations regarding data security and privacy.

Legislation

In consultation with the Privacy and Data Security Department the Attorney General submitted testimony on Senate Bill 1108, An Act Concerning Consumer Privacy. The legislation sought to strengthen and enhance the privacy protections afforded to Connecticut consumers. The Attorney General's testimony raised concerns about discrete issues with the proposed legislation, but supported the concept behind the bill. The Department also monitored Federal legislation impacting the Fair Credit Reporting Act as well as numerous proposals in other states. Staff serve on legislative panels relating to the State Data Plan and privacy issues in education.

Data Breaches

In fiscal year 2018-19 the office logged in approximately 822 data breaches. The Privacy and Data Security Department reviews and triages all breach notifications submitted to the office, and conducts all necessary follow-up with the reporting company, including requests for further information about the incident itself, copies of consumer notice letters, and/or requests for extended protection services where warranted under the circumstances. The Department also

conducted investigations into data breaches involving violations of state consumer protection and privacy laws and/or federal laws protecting personal information. Of note:

Uber: On September 26, 2018, the office announced a \$148 million multi-state settlement with Uber Technologies Inc. that the Department co-led and that focused on Uber's delay in reporting the breach to states and affected drivers.

Although Uber learned in 2016 that hackers had gained access to personal information, including driver's license information for approximately 600,000 drivers nationwide, and 3,549 in Connecticut, it failed to report the breach until November 2017 – well outside of the requirement under Connecticut law that requires notice without unreasonable delay and within 90 days.

Under the Stipulated Judgment, Uber must take precautions to protect any user data stored on third-party platforms; employ strong password policies for employee access; develop and implement a strong data security policy for all user data; hire a qualified, independent third-party to regularly assess Uber's data security efforts; and develop and implement a corporate integrity program to ensure that Uber employees can bring forward any ethics concerns.

For its leadership role, Connecticut's share of the settlement funds totaled \$4,506,432.22. Of that amount, \$400,000.00 was deposited into the Attorney General's Consumer Protection Fund to support the office's consumer protection work, and \$250,000.00 into the state Department of Consumer Protection's consumer protection enforcement fund. From Connecticut's remaining settlement funds, the state reserved an amount of \$100.00 for each eligible Connecticut Uber driver to be paid in the next fiscal year.

Aetna: In October of 2018, the Department successfully resolved a multistate investigation of a data breach with Aetna caused by two 2017 mailings that improperly disclosed the medical diagnosis information of its customers. Under the resolution, Aetna paid \$99,959 to Connecticut and agreed to enact a series of policies and reforms, including implementing policies and procedures to safeguard patient information sent via mail, using only the minimum necessary information when sending mailings to members, entering into Business Associate Agreements with any vendors they use that create, maintain or transmit patient health information, initiating new procedures and training that includes review and approval of anything printed on envelopes or positioned anywhere near an envelope's window, establishing specialized policies for litigation involving heightened privacy concerns, and providing audit reports from an independent consultant to the Attorney General for at least two years.

Stamford Podiatry Group et al.: In December, the Department obtained an Assurance of Voluntary Compliance (AVC) from Stamford Podiatry Group (SPG), and ICS Software, Ltd. (ICS), which was the provider of SPG's electronic health records database, and U.S. Computer Connection (USCC), which was SPG's information technology service provider. The AVC resolved an investigation into a data breach involving unauthorized access to SPG's electronic health records database. All three parties played a role in the breach, and all three were subject to potential claims under the Health Insurance Portability & Accountability Act (HIPAA) and state law.

The AVC provided a global resolution with an assurance from each of the entities. Among other things, it requires them to enter into written "business associate agreements" (BAAs) that pass along to their business associates the duty and responsibility to prevent the unauthorized use or disclosure of the electronic protected health information (e-PHI) when business arrangements require the handling of and exposure to such information. The AVC also requires enhanced encryption and password policies and procedures. As part of the agreement, the parties made a \$60,000.00 payment to the state.

Neiman Marcus: On January 8, 2019, the office announced a \$1.5 million multi-state settlement with Neiman Marcus relating to a 2013 data breach that involved malware used to extract personal data from over 370,000 customers' credit cards. Neiman Marcus agreed to a number of injunctive provisions aimed at preventing similar breaches in the future, including complying with Payment Card Industry Data Security Standard (PCI DSS) requirements, maintaining an appropriate system to collect and monitor network activity, and ensuring logs are regularly reviewed and monitored; maintaining working agreements with two, separate, qualified Payment Card Industry forensic investigators; updating all software associated with maintaining and safeguarding personal information, and creating written plans for replacement or maintenance of software that is reaching its end-of-life or end-of-support date; implementing appropriate steps to review industry-accepted payment security technologies relevant to the company's business; hiding payment card information, using technologies like encryption and tokenization; and retaining a third-party professional to conduct an assessment and to detail any corrective actions that the company may have taken or plans to take as a result of the third-party report. The Department served in a leadership role in the investigation, and received \$102,144.91 as part of the settlement.

PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT

This past year the Public Safety Department represented the Department of Correction; the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection, including the Division of State Police, the Division of Emergency Management and Homeland Security; the Military Department; the State Marshal's Commission and the Department of Consumer Protection Liquor Control Division. The Department also provides legal services and representation to a number of associated boards, commissions and agencies, including the Division of Criminal Justice, the Division of Public Defender Services, the Office of Adult Probation, the Governor's Office (Interstate Extradition), the Statewide Emergency 9-1-1 Commission, the State Police Special Licensing and Firearms Unit, the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners, the Commission on Fire Prevention and Control, the Board of Pardons and Paroles and the Police Officer Standards and Training Council. Within the last year, attorneys in the department have also represented the Judicial Branch and in various litigation matters.

The Department of Correction

The Department of Correction ("DOC") is the Department's largest client agency. With over 6,000 employees, 13,000 inmates and another 6,000 offenders supervised in community placements, all of the attorneys in the department devote at least some of their time to representation of the DOC. Much of this work is done in defense of the agency and its employees in lawsuits brought by and on behalf of prisoners. The department continues to defend a large number of lawsuits in state and federal court challenging conditions of confinement in state correctional facilities and the administration of community programs. The pending corrections cases in the U.S. Federal District Court alone continue to represent more than 15% of the overall federal court docket. These lawsuits collectively seek millions of dollars in money damages and seek to challenge and restrict the statutory authority and discretion of the Department of Correction. The department's efforts in defense of these cases save the State of Connecticut millions of dollars in damages claims, and preserve the state's authority to safely and securely manage an extremely difficult prison population free of costly and onerous court oversight as has been the experience in other states. Significant areas of litigation in the last year include: continued defense of the DOC's classification of former death row inmates; defense of various challenges to limitations on access to courts by inmates; defense of policy restrictions on the ability of restrictive housing inmates to move out of cell without restraints; class action litigation regarding the provision of treatment for Hepatitis C, litigation challenging DOC's pornography ban and limitations on inmate access to gang materials, and handling ongoing challenges by certain violent groups that seek to be recognized as religious organizations.

Because the inmate population continues to present exceptionally challenging medical and mental health issues, we have seen a considerable increase in the number of complex medical cases involving issues such as suicides; the alleged misdiagnosis of cancer and other serious chronic illnesses; viral infections allegedly resulting in blindness; loss of organ function; medical claims of individuals impacted by the opioid epidemic; and even the birth of a child at the women's facility. Additionally, at least once a month we initiate emergency proceedings to allow for extraordinary measures to reverse the physical effects of inmates actively engaged in hunger strikes. This department continues to work with the Department of Correction, the University of Connecticut Health Center, and outside medical and mental health experts to defend litigation, develop policies addressing inmate patient care and identify systemic deficiencies in an effort to improve medical care and reduce the state's exposure to substantial damages awards.

A great number of inmate claims addressing conditions of confinement continue to be brought as habeas corpus cases. Thus, the department continues to defend inmate challenges to prison conditions and the application of the "good time" statutes to multiple sentences. The DOC utilizes a "Risk Reduction Earned Credit" program to reduce the inmate population by awarding sentence credits for participation in designated inmate programming. Inmates who feel they have not received a sentence decrease frequently litigate these claims by means of habeas corpus cases. In each of the last several legislative sessions, statutory changes have altered the calculation of the award of discretionary sentence credits. This has resulted in a significant increase in habeas cases.

The legislature has also implemented numerous changes to parole and pardon eligibility. There has been a resulting rapid increase in the number of parole eligibility cases defended by the attorneys in this department. We also continue to see an increase in medical claims in habeas court.

In addition to our litigation commitments, department staff continues to advise the Commissioner of Correction on the legal aspects of a myriad of policy initiatives and legal issues, including: transfer of oversight for medical care from UCONN to DOC and to contract providers outside of government; provision of necessary services to inmates discharging from custody; management of high profile inmates; maintaining appropriate services for mentally ill offenders; developing and maintaining appropriate administrative directives; and implementing safety and security procedures that protect staff and the public while also accommodating evolving constitutional standards as articulated in developing case law.

The department also continues to monitor compliance with agreements resolving litigation regarding the conditions of confinement in the women's prison and treatment of HIV infected inmates. As the DOC continues to shift its focus to increasing community placements and reducing the number of inmates assigned to restrictive housing settings, the department works closely with the agency to implement policies governing these new initiatives that comport with statutory and constitutional mandates. Department attorneys also provide instruction at the DOC training academy on legal issues arising in corrections. These obligations will continue to challenge the department as budget constraints take a toll on the correctional system.

Board of Pardons and Paroles

The department continues to defend a number of cases involving the Board of Pardons and Paroles ("BOPP"). These cases involve challenges to the Board's authority relative to the granting, rescission and revocation of paroles, as well as parole eligibility and changes to the parole statutes. More recently, as the standards for the granting of pardons have been relaxed by the legislature, we are seeing an increase in pardon-related litigation. The Public Safety Department continues to provide the Board with advice and training on legal issues involving its hearing procedures and developing legal trends.

Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection

Department attorneys defend all lawsuits involving the State Police, a division of the department of Emergency Services and Public Protection ("DESPP"), where plaintiffs seek money damages arising from the exercise of police powers. The Department caseload of police litigation continues to grow in both number and complexity. The cases include false arrest and excessive force claims, wrongful death claims arising from police shootings, and contract claims arising from the agency's relationships with outside service providers. During the past year, the department successfully litigated a number of cases in federal court and received favorable decisions in many of those cases. In addition to the department's litigation efforts, department attorneys meet regularly with State Police command staff and in-house counsel to review the agency's policies and procedures

and to address legal issues relating to release of confidential information, compliance with subpoenas, and relations with other agencies.

This department continues to represent DESPP in revocation proceedings relating to firefighters, private investigators and certain tradesmen involved in fireworks and demolition and to give advice to agency attorneys who prosecute and sit as hearing officers in these administrative proceedings. Department attorneys also routinely appear on behalf of DESPP in state and federal court and before the Freedom of Information Commission to address the many different statutory provisions that mandate confidentiality, and even erasure, of police records. Our attorneys also appear on behalf of DES PP in matters before the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities in matters relating to racial profiling and discrimination based on past criminal history.

Board of Firearms Permit Examiners

During the past year, the department provided legal advice and representation to the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners on a number of issues, including appeals from denials of permits based on mental health and medicinal marijuana use. The department has handled several appeals to the Superior Court from the Board's decisions, including efforts to compel towns to issue permits in accordance with the orders of the Board. The department also continues to field many public inquiries related to the concealed and open carrying of firearms under Connecticut law and the recently enacted firearms legislation as it relates to the licensing of firearms owners and their purchases of firearms and ammunition. The department continues to work with the Board to enforce the firearms laws of the State of Connecticut.

Liquor Control Division

During the past year, the department has handled a number of administrative appeals involving permits and licenses that are within the purview of the Liquor Control Division. In addition, department staff provided the Division with advice on legal issues concerning enforcement of the state's liquor laws.

State Marshal Commission

During the past year, the department continued to provide legal advice to the State Marshal Commission on several matters, particularly with respect to the duties of state marshals and the removal of state marshals. The department's efforts have included developing protocols and appropriate training for marshals who have authority to serve criminal process, and developing guidelines for serving process on behalf of pro se litigants.

Division of Criminal Justice & Division of Public Defender Services

The department continues to defend numerous cases involving the Division of Criminal Justice and the Division of Public Defender Services. These cases often raise constitutional questions involving governmental immunity, and relate to the core duties of prosecutors and public defenders

throughout the criminal justice process. In addition, the department works closely with the Office of the Chief State's Attorney and several state's attorneys in areas of overlapping jurisdiction, such as complex habeas corpus matters in state and federal courts. The department has also seen an increase in Freedom of Information matters involving the Office of the Chief Public Defender and the Division of Criminal Justice and has provided legal advice and representation in this area, particularly involving requests for access to documents and evidence in pending criminal matters. Finally, the Department oversees the contract between the Office of the Chief State's Attorney and outside labor counsel.

Military Department

The department continues to work closely with the Military Department on a variety of issues, particularly in claims from one of the ceremonial military units challenging the authority of the Military Department and in approval of substantial contracts and funding programs from the U.S. Department of Defense.

Prosecution of Home Improvement Contractors

An Assistant Attorney General in the Public Safety Department oversees the Attorney General's program for prosecution of fraudulent and/or unlicensed home improvement contractors. Under this program, several of the office's attorneys are appointed as special assistant state's attorneys to prosecute new home construction contractors and home improvement contractors for various crimes including failure to obtain proper licensing and refusing to refund deposits. The program's attorneys review and approve warrant applications leading to the arrest of individuals who violate the laws governing home improvement and new home construction contractors. The Assistant Attorneys General then prosecute the cases to completion in criminal court and recover restitution for victims of unscrupulous home improvement contractors.

Wrongful Incarceration Claims

The department continues to represent the State in claims for wrongful incarceration brought in the Claims Commission pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 54-102uu. Since the legislature created this remedy, more than 40 individuals have filed claims seeking millions of dollars in damages for being wrongfully convicted of, and incarcerated for, crimes they did not commit. This department reviews each claim to determine whether a claimant is eligible for damages, which requires examination of the underlying criminal case files and consultation with prosecutors. In several of the cases where it appeared the claimants were not eligible for damages, the department contested the claim in litigation before the Claims Commissioner. Defense of these claims usually requires lengthy discovery and administrative proceedings before the Commissioner.

Contracts

Each year, the department works closely with its client agencies, including DOC, DESPP, DEMHS, and the Military Department, to review and approve contracts for the Commissioners'

and Major General's signature. Included are memoranda of understanding, grants, and agreements with service providers as well as with local/federal government entities. The contracts are carefully reviewed to ensure compliance with all applicable statutes and regulations. This year the department reviewed over 100 contracts, requiring authorization of the Commissioners and Major General for expenditures totaling in excess of \$50 million dollars.

The department reviewed and provided advice to DESPP on contracts and MOUs, including agreements relating to the licensing of telecommunication facilities to effect consolidation of dispatch services around the state, as well as all resident trooper agreements between the department and the more than forty municipalities participating in the resident trooper program. The department also reviewed and provided advice to the DOC on contracts, including those related to administration of temporary supportive housing, medical care for inmates, outpatient treatment, and rehabilitative services to offenders on parole. An Assistant Attorney General in the department advises the agencies in the negotiation of problematic contractual provisions to ensure agency policies and practices are effectuated, as well as educating and training its agency staff in contract law.

Appeals

This department has a substantial appellate practice in state and federal courts. More than 25% of all appeals in this agency are handled by attorneys in this department. The cases range from Second Circuit appeals, raising complex constitutional issues, to State Appellate and Supreme Court cases arising from habeas court and the regular session of the Superior Court. Our attorneys work closely with the Solicitor General on these appeals.

SPECIAL LITIGATION & CHARITIES DEPARTMENT

The Special Litigation and Charities Department represents the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the General Assembly, the Judicial Branch, the Secretary of the State, the Treasurer, the Comptroller, the Auditors of Public Accounts, the State Elections Enforcement Commission, the Office of State Ethics, the Department of Consumer Protection, the Department of Revenue Services, the Office of Governmental Accountability, the State Contracting Standards Board, the State Properties Review Board, the Judicial Review Council, the Judicial Selection Commission, the Statewide Grievance Committee, the Probate Court Administrator, the Office of Child Advocate, and the Office of the Victims Advocate. In addition, through its Public Charities Unit, the Department protects the public interest in gifts, bequests and devises for charitable purposes, and in conjunction with the Department of Consumer Protection, enforces state laws regulating charities and professional fundraisers who solicit from the public.

In the past year, the department represented the State's interests in a number of important matters, including:

- the successful and ongoing litigation opposing the Trump administration's efforts to include a citizenship question on the 2020 census that would have the intended effect of suppressing the response to the census to the detriment of Connecticut and its citizens;
- litigation, now before the U.S. Supreme Court, challenging the Trump administration's decision to terminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program for noncitizens who came to this country as children;
- the challenge to the imposition of a cap on state and local tax deductions for the federal income tax;
- several multistate cases challenging actions by the Trump administration to reproductive rights, including a constitutional challenge to the Title X "gag rule" prohibiting nondirective counseling, an action to enjoin a rule that would permit health care providers to deny lawful services based on the provider's personal views; and a challenge to a rule that would permit employers to opt out of mandated birth control insurance coverage;
- a constitutional challenge to the legislature's budget decision to transfer energy-environmental related funds to the General Fund;
- defense of an ongoing lawsuit challenging the manner in which prisoners are counted for purposes of legislative redistricting;
- litigation aimed at preventing the distribution of software technology for 3D printed guns;
- a challenge to the Trump administration's efforts to impose immigration-related conditions on unrelated federal criminal justice grants;
- the successful defense of the state constitutional provisions providing that election contests in legislative races are resolved exclusively by the legislature;
- advice to the Governor and legislative leaders regarding complex legal issues related to existing and proposed gaming within the State, including sports betting, online gaming, and the development of a gaming facility jointly owned and operated by the Mohegan and Mashantucket Pequot tribes, and related federal court litigation;
- assistance in the implementation of the SEBAC v. Rowland settlement;
- defense of first amendment based challenges to decisions of the State Elections Enforcement Commission relating to campaign finance regulation;
- the ongoing lawsuit by the Schaghticoke Tribal Nation alleging that the State breached its duties to the Schaghticoke tribe since the early 1800s;

- pursuit of a resolution of unique title questions pertaining to the historic Lebanon town green; and
- the successful resolution of questions about the use of funds designated for first responders involved in the Sandy Hook shooting.

In the area of charitable trusts and gifts, the department was active in investigations or court actions to ensure that charitable gifts are used for the purposes for which they were given. In several matters involving private organizations, department attorneys mediated and successfully resolved, without resort to litigation, complaints about mishandling or misuse of charitable funds. Members of the charities unit regularly offer guidance on best practices for governance of charitable organizations, with the goal of avoiding problems that often inflict such organizations where good governance is lacking. In addition, members of the department have been actively involved in a multistate effort to develop a single portal website for public charity registration.

The attorneys in the Special Litigation Department provide ongoing advice to the Governor's office, the legislature, constitutional officers, commissioners and others on a wide variety of constitutional and other important legal questions. The department also provides advice and guidance to state officials and agencies on Freedom of Information Act matters.

The department represents the interests of the State in matters related to federal tribal recognition and provides advice to numerous state agencies regarding issues of Indian law and issues connected to the two federally recognized Indian tribes in Connecticut and the operation of their casinos, as well as issues relating to gaming generally.

The department also plays a leading role in the preparation of appeals and opinions in the Office. The department often participates as amicus curiae in litigation involving other states, the federal government and private parties in which important state interests are implicated. In addition, a considerable portion of the department's resources is committed to defending the State's interests in self-represented litigation against judges and other state officials.

TORTS DEPARTMENT

The Torts/Civil Rights Department defends state agencies and employees in tort and civil rights actions, including high exposure personal injury and wrongful death actions. Many of the department's cases are brought by parties alleging injuries or civil rights violations at state facilities or while receiving services from state agencies. The department's cases reflect the wide and varied activities and programs in which the state is involved: administering technical high schools and colleges; providing care and assistance to persons with mental illness, substance abuse disorders, and intellectual or developmental disabilities; maintaining recreational parks and swimming areas; owning buildings and land; protecting abused or neglected children; and providing numerous other

services. Claimants often seek large sums of monetary damages. The department has saved the state and its taxpayers millions of dollars through the years by obtaining favorable judgments and fair settlements in the state and federal courts, as well as at the Office of the Claims Commissioner ("OCC").

Of the 61 cases the department closed this fiscal year, the state prevailed in 22 after department attorneys filed dispositive motions or defended the state in trials or hearings on the merits; and obtained withdrawals in 19. In eight cases, department attorneys were successful in negotiating reasonable and just settlements. Of the remaining 12 cases, eight were not pursued by the claimant, three were transferred to the state's insurance counsel, and one was the review of an amicus brief. The department defended the state, its employees or officials from 40 state agencies and institutions this fiscal year; and successfully argued in most that the claims lacked merit, had jurisdictional defects, or failed to state a legally sufficient cause of action.

During the year, the department continued to defend several complex, high-exposure, wrongful death, medical malpractice, constitutional, intentional tort, and personal injury cases. Much effort has gone into preparing these cases by engaging in extensive discovery, including conducting complicated electronic forensic investigations, retaining appropriate expert witnesses, and filing motions and briefs. One hundred seventy-nine of the department's cases are ongoing, 20 more than last year. Sixty-seven of these cases involve a death, assault or serious injury. Most of these cases are pending in the U.S. District Court, Connecticut Appellate Court, Connecticut Superior Court, and the OCC.

As an outgrowth of defending the many premises liability claims filed, the department advises agencies on issues relating to physical or policy changes designed to increase safety or ameliorate unsafe conditions or practices in the future. This advice contributes to reduced risk of state liability, thereby resulting in substantial savings of state taxpayer funded resources.

When plaintiffs owe money to the state, the department has been successful in recovering that money or reducing settlements by the amounts owed. It does so by consulting with the Department of Administrative Services for the outstanding figures and asserting set-offs in the claims brought by parties who have uncollected debt to the state.

Where an alleged injury may be an insurable event under an insurance policy that a private party purchased as a term and condition of a contract or lease with a state agency -- or when a state contract requires a private contractor to indemnify the state -- the department seeks insurance coverage to ensure that the state is held harmless and/or reimbursed for expenses. In such cases, the department has been successful in persuading contractors or their insurance carriers to settle and pay claims against the state, thereby saving the state thousands of dollars. Indeed, most of the 19 withdrawals the department obtained resulted from our convincing state contractors to assume liability for the claims. When state contractors and/or their insurers have not quickly come forward

to defend and indemnify the state, department attorneys have sought and obtained compensation for their time and costs in defending the claims.

Similarly, the department has saved the state considerable expense by obtaining dismissals of claims brought at the OCC by employees of private companies with state contracts who were injured and were awarded workers' compensation from their employers, based on the argument that, because the state contributed to such compensation by requiring that the contractors obtain workers' compensation insurance and factoring the expense into the overall cost of the contract, additional compensation for the claims would not be just and equitable.

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

The Transportation Department (“Department”) of the Office of the Attorney General provides representation for the following state agencies: Department of Transportation (“DOT”), Department of Administrative Services (“DAS”), Bureau of Enterprise Systems and Technology (“BEST”) part of DAS, Division of Construction Services (“DCS”) part of DAS, Department of Motor Vehicles (“DMV”), Department of Housing (“DOH”), Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (“DEEP”) for real property matters, and the State Historic Preservation Office. In addition, the Transportation Department provides representation for various occupational licensing boards within the Department of Consumer Protection (“DCP”). The representation of the foregoing state agencies/boards includes, but is not limited to, counseling and advice on legal issues, the prosecution or defense of lawsuits or claims in both federal and Connecticut courts and before various administrative entities, including the defense of claims filed with the Office of the Claims Commissioner pursuant to Chapter 53 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Contracting matters

As a result of the large number of public works projects undertaken by the State during any given year, and the broad scope and complexity of many of these projects, there is a continuing need for the attorneys in the Transportation Department to provide legal assistance to the DOT, DCS, DAS, DMV, Housing and other state agencies, such as the General Assembly’s Joint Committee on Legislative Management (“JCLM”). The Department also provides counsel on and drafting of many of the state’s significant transactional matters. In conjunction with agency staff, the department has been assisting with the development and amendment of various master contracts for use in all areas of contracting at the DOT, DAS, DCS and DOH with the goal of streamlining the State’s contracting process.

This past year, the department continued to review and work with DOT in negotiating on a number of contracts related to DOT's rail service, including DOT's new Hartford/Springfield rail line. These included several amendments among the State, MetroNorth and Amtrak for service along

various passenger rail lines relating to the requirements of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 as well as the following: review and approval of a CTrail ticket vending machine lease with the Town of Windsor, a review and approval of an agreement with the Housatonic Railroad company for the rehabilitation of four bridges located on the Berkshire rail line, a review and approval of an agreement with the Housatonic Railroad Company relating to the transfer of surplus material to the Company and the upgrade of the Berkshire rail line, a review and approval of a lease with Amtrak by which DOT leased certain premises for the construction and repair of a pedestrian overpass and railroad station in Clinton, a review and approval of an agreement with Providence and Worcester Railroad Company for the upgrade of railroad signaling devices at public railroad-highway crossings, and a review and approval of an agreement with the Springfield Redevelopment Authority to permit CTrail passengers access to the Springfield Union Station Transportation Center and to permit DOT to install CTrail ticket vending machines in the Transportation Center.

In addition, the department reviewed contracts for substance and form and provided substantive advice in connection with the negotiation of a number of significant State transactions, including:

- a) Assisted DOT with the review and approval of agreements with United States Geological Survey relating to the study of the quality of stormwater run-off discharged from Connecticut highways.
- b) Assisted DOT with the review and approval of agreements with the State of Washington DOT relating to a program for the testing of certain guiderails and guardrails located along Connecticut highways.
- c) Assisted and assisting DOT with the review and approval of various construction and consultant contracts.
- d) Assisted and assisting DOT with various property transfers, easements, and leases.
- e) Assisted DOH with the review and approval of a new Memorandum of Agreement with the OAG relating to the use of certain standard form contract documents.
- f) Assisted DOH with the review of a contract with Connecticut Foundation Solutions Indemnity Company to provide funding for homeowners impacted by crumbling foundations due to the presence of pyrrhotite.
- g) Assisting DOH with the negotiation and review of a contract with Connecticut Children's Medical Center pertaining to education about the presence of lead paint in homes and the remediation of such homes.
- h) Assisted DOH with the development of form contracts for the provision of certain youth homelessness services.

- i) Assisted and assisting DOH with the review and approval of various personal service agreements, assistance agreements, infrastructure agreements, and amendments to the same.

Other legal assistance involving contracts is provided in resolving public contracting bid protests, interpreting and drafting contract language, and addressing problems that arise during the course of large construction and statewide procurement projects.

Litigation Matters and Construction Claims

In addition to prosecuting and defending lawsuits in court, the department continues to regularly assist agency personnel with early analysis and settlement negotiations in an attempt to avoid litigation, with the goal of quickly resolving disputes to avoid or minimize the potential adverse financial impact of such claims on the public treasury.

During the past fiscal year the department mediated a claim filed against DOT by O&G Industries for \$4,094,719.63 with the American Arbitration Association pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 4-61. The parties reached a settlement agreement following mediation in the amount of \$2,350,000.00, a total savings to the State of \$1,744,719.63. The department is representing DOT and DAS in several pending claims against the State.

During the past fiscal year, department staff has been involved in the prosecution and defense of several major lawsuits and appeals. The department argued one case at the Connecticut Supreme Court, three at the Appellate Court and one at the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

The department defended a construction claim against the University of Connecticut filed by Milton C. Beebe & Sons in an arbitration hearing in which the contractor challenged a Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) sanction. The arbitrator ruled that while the Contractor's subcontractor failed to perform a commercially useful function under the DBE program, the DBE sanction was excessive and therefore reduced the sanction.

In DOT v. Lagosz, an appeal of a condemnation matter, the Appellate Court upheld the trial court's determination after an Audubon hearing that the parties had reached a binding settlement.

The department continues to provide assistance to DOT regarding litigation involving Certificates of Public Convenience and Necessity for various bus companies. These bus companies, in four separate actions, claim that they have exclusive authority to run certain routes and in certain locations based on the Certificates. All of the cases are currently pending at the Complex Litigation Docket of the Connecticut Superior Court. The Department successfully convinced the judge to reexamine and overrule a previous decision in the case by a different judge.

In addition, the department successfully defended an injunction action brought by Mohawk against the DOT. Mohawk was a low bidder who challenged DOT's decision to cancel an award under a RFP and issue a new RFP.

In White Oak v. Department of Transportation, the department argued at the Connecticut Supreme Court that setoffs applied to an arbitration award against DOT for the Department of Labor and Department of Revenue Services were proper. The parties are awaiting a decision.

In a matter involving Tesla, Inc., the department defended DMV in an appeal of a declaratory ruling that found that Tesla, Inc. was required to have a new dealer's license for the activities it engaged in at their Gallery. The trial court agreed with the DMV and the case is on appeal to the Connecticut Supreme Court.

Finally, in the case of DO v. Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, the Connecticut Supreme Court overturned the Appellate Court's Decision and agreed with the department that a police report is admissible in a DUI hearing as long as it meets the minimum statutory requirements.

Property Matters

The department's representation of DOT also includes the provision of legal services and advice relating to: eminent domain; rights-of-way; surplus property divestitures; service plazas and other properties and facilities along I-95 and the Merritt Parkway; Transit Oriented Development projects in various towns; public transit and rails; the State Traffic Commission; and environmental matters involving permitting, salt shed and maintenance facilities located throughout the State. We also counseled the DOT regarding the divestiture of surplus properties.

The department resolved 3 eminent domain appeals filed against DOT by trial and 12 by stipulated judgment. There are currently 17 eminent domain appeals in litigation. The litigation outcomes of the concluded eminent domain appeals resulted in savings to the State of \$1,307,500.00.

The department is currently defending a claim against DAS brought by Seaside of Waterford alleging that DAS wrongfully terminated a Purchase and Sale agreement for the Seaside Regional Center in Waterford owned by the State.

The Transportation Department represented DEEP in real property matters. Of particular significance was the department's work with DEEP in connection with the procurement of conservation easements, resulting in the dedication of acres to public recreation. These conservation easements equal the value of the grants that DEEP provided for land purchases by other entities, specifically municipalities and land trusts. The department also regularly provides legal advice to DEEP on complex property law issues. During the past year, the department provided DAS and DCS with legal counsel and review of leases, agreements and contracts including:

- a) Assisted and assisting DAS with the review, negotiation, and approval of various agreements related to property purchases, sales, and leases.
- b) Assisting DAS with revisions to its form commercial lease.
- c) Assisted and assisting DAS with the review and approval of documentation for the sale of the Hartford Regional Market.
- d) Assisted DAS with the termination of a purchase agreement for property in Griswold that was to be used as the new State Police firing range and training facility.
- e) Assisted and assisting DEEP with the drafting, negotiation, and review of an amended and restated lease for the public use of a walkway along the Windsor Locks Canal.
- f) Assisting DEEP with the drafting, negotiation and review of a lease for the construction of hydroelectric generating facilities at the Upper Collinsville Dam.
- g) Assisted DEEP with the exchange of conservation easements with the Town of Groton.
- h) Assisting DEEP with the review and negotiation of an easement with the Town of West Hartford pertaining to State-owned lands located within the Town.
- i) Assisting DEEP with the review and negotiation of a lease with the Connecticut Audubon Society relating to State land located in Milford.
- j) Assisted and assisting DEEP with the review and approval of various grant agreements and conservation easements in connection with the statutory Open Space and Watershed Land Acquisition Grant Program.
- k) Assisting DEEP with the review of a construction agreement and easement relating to bridge repair on property located within the Sherwood Island State Park in Westport.
- l) Assisted DEEP with the legal analysis of various potential third party easement or encroachment rights over State-owned property.
- m) Assisted and assisting DEEP with the purchase of various properties pursuant to its statutory land acquisition authority.
- n) Assisted and assisting DEEP with various leases, easements and boundary line agreements.

Housing Matters

The Transportation Department is also responsible for representing the Department of Housing. These matters include representing the Department at the Commission of Human Rights and Opportunities for housing discrimination complaints, administrative appeals, and disputes with residents of state-owned residential properties and foreclosures involving real property in which the state has an interest in the property. The Department is currently defending DOH in several

construction claims brought by a contractor hired to renovate and rebuild properties as part of Superstorm Sandy.

State Historic Preservation Office

The Department represents the State Historic Preservation Office matters and is occasionally called upon to seek the court's protection of historic properties on the National Register of Historic Places (16 USC 470a, as amended) which face destruction by owners or developers. During this past year the Department achieved a settlement between the State and two property developers to preserve the historic (1926) Nathan Hale Hotel building and enhance the Main Street Historic District in Willimantic. The settlement permits the revitalization of Willimantic's historic district, while preserving many significant historic structures.

Department of Motor Vehicles

The department handles a variety of matters for DMV, including appeals of administrative suspensions or revocations of driving licenses of impaired drivers. The department also provides legal support to DMV in connection with dealers and repairer complaints, registration matters, the emissions program and safety inspections.

Environmental Matters

In addition, the department is deeply involved in various environmental matters associated with public works projects, road and bridge projects, and other activities of its client agencies. Staff continues to provide legal assistance and guidance to those agencies to ensure that there is compliance with applicable federal and state environmental laws in the planning of projects and the operation of state facilities. In particular, the department assists these agencies in complying with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"), the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act ("CEPA") and other federal and Connecticut regulations that have been enacted to balance the need to develop our state economy and governmental services with the need to protect the air, water and other natural resources of the state. In this regard, the Department assists the agencies in preparing and obtaining required environmental permits from both Connecticut and federal regulatory agencies, including the DEEP and the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The department also defends client agencies in court when environmental challenges are brought. Recently, the department successfully defended DOT in a NEPA case brought in the U.S. District Court by plaintiffs challenging DOT's Environmental Assessment pertaining to the Walk Bridge Replacement Project in Norwalk. In its decision, the District Court recognized that Connecticut DOT's selection of a vertical lift bridge, a rigorous process that spanned over a two-year period, complied with the requirements of NEPA. This favorable decision will allow DOT to move forward with the Project and replace the existing 120 year old swing span over the Norwalk River.

WORKERS' COMPENSATION & LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

The Workers' Compensation and Labor Relations Department represents the State Treasurer as the Custodian of the Second Injury Fund, the Workers' Compensation Commission and the Department of Administrative Services in its capacity as the administrator of the state employees' workers' compensation program, as well as DAS Personnel, the Labor Department, the Office of Labor Relations, the Office of the Claims Commissioner, the State Employees Retirement Commission, the Teachers' Retirement Board, and others. The department's workers' compensation attorneys and paralegals represent the Second Injury Fund in cases involving potential liability of the Fund for workers' compensation benefits and the State of Connecticut in contested workers' compensation claims filed by state employees, while the department's labor attorneys represent the Department of Labor in unemployment compensation appeals to the Superior Court. The department also represents the Department of Labor's Wage Enforcement Division, collecting unpaid wages due Connecticut employees in the private sector. The department's workers' compensation attorneys and paralegals also devote significant time to third party tortfeasor cases that result in the recovery of money for the State and the Fund, as well as handling a large number of appeals to the Compensation Review Board and the Appellate and Supreme Courts.

During the past fiscal year, department attorneys and paralegals appeared for the Fund and the State in 2,639 hearings before workers' compensation commissioners and in 151 new unemployment compensation cases in the Superior Court. The department also opened 91 new cases on behalf of Connecticut citizens who were not paid wages by their employers.

Department attorneys and paralegals were responsible for recouping \$548,838.03 for the State of Connecticut and \$100,923.00 for the Second Injury Fund through third party interventions in Superior Court and negotiated settlements in lieu of litigation. These sums represent reimbursements to the State or the Fund of money which has been paid out in workers' compensation benefits for injuries caused by third parties. Finally, department attorneys were responsible for the collection of \$401,036.00 in unpaid wages and civil penalties for Connecticut citizens whose employers failed to pay them in accordance with Connecticut's labor laws.

As part of a concerted effort to reduce paper in preparation for the agency's relocation to the state office building, department staff closed 1,659 dormant workers' compensation files.

During the fiscal year that ended on June 30, 2019, the Workers' Compensation & Labor Relations Department was involved in the following significant cases:

In Blossom's Escort, LLC v. Administrator, Unemployment Compensation Act, A.C. No. 40041 (August 28, 2018), the Appellate Court dismissed the plaintiff's appeal holding that a statutory amendment's prospective application which exempted escort drivers as employees under the Unemployment Compensation Act, did not affect the employer's liability for unemployment

compensation contributions for years before the amendment's effective date, notwithstanding the agency's initial decision on liability after the effective date.

In Re Norwalk Economic Opportunity Now, Inc., No. 14-50905 (U.S. Bankruptcy Court, District of Connecticut, September 5, 2018), the bankruptcy court litigation was concluded by a settlement with payment of \$150,000 in wages due 172 Connecticut employees. Substantial negotiations with the Chapter 7 Trustee were required to achieve this significant recovery for the employees.

In Lamberty v. Connecticut State Police Union, et al., No. 3:15-CV-00378-VAB (D.Conn. October 19, 2018), the department represented state defendants including the Comptroller and officials of the Office of Labor Relations. The federal court in Connecticut dismissed this constitutional litigation on the ground of mootness due to the U. S. Supreme Court's Janus decision in June, 2018, holding agency fees deductions for public employees not members of the union in violation of the First Amendment. This is a significant federal court precedent insofar as it declined to grant a judgment to plaintiffs against the constitutionality of a Connecticut statute providing such agency fees deductions, for purposes of a pending claim for attorney's fees by plaintiffs in the litigation.

In Labor Commissioner v. Fletcher-Thompson, Inc., No. HHD-CV-17-6081058-S (January 8, 2019), a stipulated judgment was rendered by the court for payment of wages due 21 Connecticut employees exceeding \$630,000. The judgment calls for monthly payments of \$10,000 to repay all employees' claims in full and was reached on the eve of trial and under threat of the employer's filing for bankruptcy.

In Manuel Lopez v. DePaz Carpentry, et al., WCC File No. 400106686 (January 28, 2019), an undocumented day laborer from Ecuador sustained serious injuries, including a fractured skull with traumatic brain injury, when he fell 8 to 10 feet onto a concrete floor at a jobsite on September 18, 2017. The claimant's injuries also included multiple fractures of facial bones, multiple fractured ribs, various internal injuries and respiratory failure. DePaz and its insurer defended the claim by asserting that the claimant was not its employee and was trespassing on the property when he sustained his injuries. After a formal hearing the trial commissioner issued a Finding and Award wherein she concluded that the claimant was, in fact, an employee of DePaz and, as such, its insurer, Hartford Underwriter Insurance Company c/o Traveler's Insurance Company, was liable to pay all of the claimant's indemnity and medical benefits which are anticipated to exceed \$2 million.

In the fall of 2018, a negotiated settlement was reached between the Department of Administrative Services, acting in its capacity as head of the state's workers' compensation program, and 8 Connecticut hospitals which claimed that the state underpaid the hospitals an aggregate total sum of \$3,165,410.40 for hospital services provided to 107 injured state employees during the period September 21, 2009 and March 27, 2015. The claimed underpayments arose as a consequence of multiple factors including 1) the issuance, pursuant to Conn. Gen. Stat. § 31-294d(d), of an official

fee schedule by the chairman of the Workers' Compensation Commission on April 1, 2015; the state Supreme Court's decision in Caraballo v. Electric Boat Corporation, 315 Conn. 704 (2015) and the legislature's enactment of Public Act 15-5 in response to the Caraballo decision. These developments had the effect of clarifying the amount of charges due state hospitals in workers' compensation cases. As a consequence of a number of meetings between the state's negotiating team and counsel for the hospitals, the number of cases in which underpayments were claimed was reduced from 107 to 101 and the amount demanded by the hospitals was reduced initially to \$1.7 million and finally to \$974,746.94, the final sum agreed to by the parties, saving the state roughly one-third of the original sum demanded by the hospitals. On June 25, 2019, the Chairman of the Commission approved the 8 settlement agreements which call for payment by the state in two installments over two fiscal years.

INTERNSHIP & VOLUNTEER PROGRAMS

One of the priorities of the new administration which took office in January, 2019, is to continue to support the robust internship program which began under the prior attorneys general. The program allows students, along with some mid-career and retired professionals, to volunteer their time in assisting the work of the Office of the Attorney General. One of the most unique aspects of the program is the variety of applicants which are placed into positions. Each year, the Office utilizes not only law students, but also high school, special needs, undergraduate, paralegal, graduate, and recently graduated students to assist on substantive projects in each of the 15 departments. In addition to students, the Office also uses retired professionals from the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) to assist with mediating consumer complaints. Currently the Office has five RSVP volunteers working on a part-time basis.

The student internship program is broken into three distinct periods (spring, summer, and fall), roughly following the college schedule. So far for calendar year 2019, the Office had over 50 applicants, 20 of which were selected and successfully completed the program during the spring session. One of the ultimate goals of the program is to create a pipeline for students interested in the law to learn about the fulfilling work of the Office and hopefully consider a career in public service.

The Office uses the most interns during the summer session. This year, the Office received over 150 summer internship applications from students from all over New England and representing 60 schools. From those applicants, over 50 students were selected. The current intern class is filled with highly accomplished and diverse students comprised of 30 law students, 20 graduate and undergraduate students and 4 high school students. Over half the group are female and a large portion of them are first generation citizens. The group accurately reflects the diverse makeup of the State which is helpful to address the wide variety of issues handled by the Office.

The selection process for the fall session begins in late summer and this year the Office anticipates approximately 30-40 interns being placed. The potential increase in fall interns is due to an

expanded partnership between the University of Connecticut Law School and the attorney general departments located at MacKenzie Hall, a building located on the UConn Law School campus. The UConn career development office is assisting in placing interested students into intern positions during the fall semester. The Office hopes this will lead to an ongoing partnership for the future which would be beneficial to both the OAG and the law school.

Each summer, aside from the daily tasks of the departments, the Office hosts a variety of educational seminars and field trips to improve the overall experience of the students. This summer, the interns took part in a Q&A session with the Attorney General and Deputy AG which provided them an amazing opportunity to discuss their individual goals and receive valuable insight on the legal profession and government service. There were several other seminars on various legal topics which were led by Assistant Attorneys General. Some of our interns also took part in trips to the state library, the State Supreme Court, and one of the state's prison.

The internship and volunteer program is coordinated by OAG staff. The application and placement process, has been streamlined which has resulted in efficiency and success of the program.