



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

88-4  
88-9

June 7, 1988

P R E S S   R E L E A S E

On May 2, 1988, Ethics Commission Staff Attorney Rachel S. Rubin filed a Complaint (Docket No. 88-9) against Mr. W. Lee Palmer, former Director of Leasing and Property Transfer for the Department of Public Works. The Complaint, in part, alleged that Mr. Palmer had violated the revolving door provisions of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials. A copy of the Complaint is attached.

On June 6, 1988, the Ethics Commission and the Respondent settled this matter by entering into a Stipulation and Order. A copy of the agreement is attached. As part of the Stipulation, Mr. Palmer must leave his current employment with Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership and pay the maximum civil penalty of \$1,000. Mr. Palmer admitted he acted negligently in failing to seek the Commission's advice regarding post-employment job opportunities. As part of the settlement, an additional allegation that Mr. Palmer used his public office to obtain financial gain was dismissed for insufficient evidence.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL:

Rachel S. Rubin, Esq. or Alan S. Plofsky, Esq.  
State Ethics Commission  
566-4472

97 Elm Street — Rear

Phone: (203) 566-4472

30 Trinity Street Hartford, Connecticut 06106

An Equal Opportunity Employer

000153



STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

C O N F I D E N T I A L

DOCKET NUMBER 88-9	)	STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF A	)	97 ELM STREET (REAR)
COMPLAINT AGAINST	)	HARTFORD, CONN. 06106
MR. W. LEE PALMER	)	MAY 25, 1988

STIPULATION

1. The Commission finds that the Respondent violated Chapter 10, Part II, General Statutes, as alleged in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the attached complaint.

2. The Respondent admits he unintentionally violated subsection 1-84b(d) of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes, by accepting employment with Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership. The Respondent denies any intentional violation but admits he should have obtained a proper construction of the relevant statutory sections prior to accepting employment with Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership.

3. The Commission dismisses paragraphs 5 and 6 of the attached complaint for lack of sufficient evidence that a violation of the Code occurred.

4. The Respondent waives any rights he may have under Sections 1-82 and 1-82a, General Statutes, including the right to a hearing in this case; and agrees with the Commission to an informal disposition of this matter as authorized by subsection 4-177(d), General Statutes.

WHEREFORE, the State Ethics Commission enters, and Mr. W. Lee Palmer, Jr. agrees to, these orders: In lieu of any other action it is authorized to take with respect to this matter, the Commission orders the Respondent to (1) pay a civil penalty of \$1,000 within thirty days, (2) terminate his consulting agreement with Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership upon acceptance of this agreement by the

97 Elm Street — Rear ~~302 Family Office~~ Phone: (203) 566-4472 Hartford, Connecticut 06106  
An Equal Opportunity Employer

000154

Commission, and (3) henceforth, comply with the requirements of Section 1-84b of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes.

W. Lee Palmer, Jr.  
Respondent

6/3/88  
Dated

William A. Elwick  
Chairperson  
State Ethics Commission

6-6-88  
Dated

CONFIDENTIAL

CONNECTICUT STATE ETHICS COMMISSION  
97 ELM STREET (REAR)  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106  
TELEPHONE NUMBER 566-4472

COMPLAINT

THE STATE ETHICS COMMISSION ISSUES A COMPLAINT ALLEGING A VIOLATION OF:

\_\_\_\_\_xx\_\_\_\_\_ THE CODE OF ETHICS FOR PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND STATE EMPLOYEES, CHAPTER 10, PART I, GENERAL STATUTES

\_\_\_\_\_ THE CODE OF ETHICS FOR LOBBYISTS, CHAPTER 10, PART II, GENERAL STATUTES

TIME AND DATE MATTERS COMPLAINED OF OCCURRED: January 1, 1987 through January 31, 1988

PLACE VIOLATION OCCURRED: Hartford, Connecticut

PERSONS INVOLVED: W. Lee Palmer, Former Director of Leasing and Property Transfer, Department of Public Works.

PROBABLE

WITNESSES: Past and present employees of the Department of Public Works, Thomas Standish, Linda Wildes, Peter Gillies, Shirley Pardee.

CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH INDICATE THAT THE CODE OF ETHICS DESIGNATED ABOVE WAS VIOLATED ARE AS FOLLOWS (A SHORT, PLAIN STATEMENT ALLEGING A VIOLATION OF CHAPTER 10, GENERAL STATUTES):

(see attached)

(OVER)

000156

*Rachel S. Rubin*

SIGNATURE

5-2-88

DATE

COMPLAINANT'S NAME AND ADDRESS: STATE ETHICS COMMISSION  
97 ELM STREET (REAR)  
HARTFORD, CT 06106

COMPLAINANT'S TELEPHONE NUMBER: 566-4472

000157

It is hereby alleged that:

1. Mr. W. Lee Palmer (Hereinafter the "Respondent") was from January 1, 1987 until January 21, 1988 Director of Leasing and Property Transfer of the Department of Public Works. By virtue of his position, the Respondent was a "state employee" (subsection 1-79(k), General Statutes) subject to the requirements of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials (Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes), including the post-employment restrictions of section 1-84b.

2. Sometime between January 1, 1987 through January 21, 1988, the Respondent either participated substantially in or supervised the negotiation or award of a state contract with Hartford Square Associates, of which Thomas K. Standish is a general partner. This contract obligated the State to pay an amount of fifty thousand dollars or more to lease space at Hartford Square West.

3. On or about January 25, 1988, the Respondent began employment with Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership in which Thomas K. Standish is a partner. Furthermore, Thomas K. Standish was acting at all times relevant to this complaint as a general partner of Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership.

4. The activities alleged in paragraphs 2 and 3 are in violation of section 1-84b(d), General Statutes.

5. On or about December 28, 1987, the Respondent, in violation of departmental policy, sent the Insurance Commissioner, Peter Gillies, to inspect personally office space available at Hartford Square North. A purpose of the Respondent's action was to enhance his employment prospects with Hartford Square North Associates Limited Partnership, thereby, using his public office to obtain financial gain for himself.

6. The activity alleged in paragraph 5 is in violation of section 1-84(c), General Statutes.

000158