

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

IN THE MATTER OF : ***APPEAL OF***
“MIR-MIR” AND “NINA” : ***DISPOSAL ORDERS***
DOGS OWNED BY TERRY BOWDEN : ***May 8, 2015***

PROPOSED FINAL DECISION

I

SUMMARY

On August 5, 2014, the Hamden Animal Control Officer, Christopher Smith, acting under the provisions of Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) §22-358(h), issued Disposal Orders to Terry Bowden, owner of the dogs named “Mir-Mir” and “Nina”. Terry Bowden timely requested a hearing before the Commissioner of Agriculture pursuant to C.G.S. §22-358(h). A formal administrative hearing was held on May 8, 2015, with the undersigned, Bruce A. Sherman, serving as Hearing Officer pursuant to designation by Steven K. Reviczky, the Commissioner of Agriculture. At said hearing, Attorney Brendan Sharkey, representing the City of Hamden, presented testimony, exhibits and arguments. Although properly notified, Terry Bowden, the respondent dog owner, did not appear and was not represented by counsel at said hearing. Based on the testimony presented and a full review of the entire record, the Hearing Officer is, therefore, recommending that the final decision maker *affirm* the Disposal Order issued on the dog named “Mir-Mir” and *revoke* the Disposal Order issued on the dog named “Nina” owned by Terry Bowden.

II

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Commissioner Steven K. Reviczky appointed Bruce A. Sherman, an employee of the Department of Agriculture (the Department), to act as Hearing Officer and to issue to him a proposed final decision in the matter of the appeal of a Disposal Order issued by the Town of Hamden (the Town) on the dogs named “Mir-Mir” and “Nina” owned¹ by Terry Bowden (Mr. Bowden) of 46 Glenbrook Ave., Hamden, CT. Hearing Officer Exhibit [Ex.] HO-3.
2. The Department gave proper notice of the hearing to both parties. Ex. HO-4. Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes (C.G.S.) §22-358(h), an administrative hearing was held and concluded on May 8, 2015. There was no request by either party to continue the hearing, to call additional witnesses or for any other reason. (*See* transcript in its entirety).
3. Because Mr. Bowden, the respondent dog owner, did not make an appearance at the hearing, the Hearing Officer presented Dawn-Barrett Walsh, Administrative Assistant of the Department’s Bureau of Regulation and Inspection, as a witness who, in her testimony, described the actions taken by the Department to provide proper and timely notice to Mr. Bowden. Transcript (Tr.) at pages 19 – 22 inclusive. Ex. HO-5.
4. The Town presented the testimony of Christopher Smith who is the Animal Control Officer for the Town of Hamden and has served in that position for eight years. Exhibits T-1 through T-10 inclusive were admitted into evidence as full exhibits.

¹ Terry Bowden claimed that the dogs “Mir-Mir”, “Nina”, and “Noni” were owned by a son in the military but provided no supporting information to the Town of Hamden. Therefore, for the purposes of this administrative procedure, Terry Bowden is considered the owner, not the keeper, of the three dogs. Tr. at page 55.

5. The dog named “Mir-Mir” is described as a male Pit Bull mix brown in color and less than one year of age (on June 4, 2014). Tr. at page 27. Exs. T-1 and T-10.
6. The dog named “Nina” is described as a female Pit Bull mix white in color with brown spots and 7 years of age (on June 4, 2014) and is the mother of “Mir-Mir”. Tr. at pages 27 and 52. Exs. T-1 and T-10.
7. “Mir-Mir” and “Nina”, along with a third dog named “Noni” owned by Mr. Bowden, were the offending dogs acting together in two off-property dog bite attack incidents on other dogs that occurred on June 4, 2014 and on July 9, 2014. “Mir-Mir”, acting alone, was the offending dog in an off-property dog bite attack incident that occurred on August 3, 2014.
8. On June 4, 2014, Mr. Bowden’s three pit bull type dogs named “Mir-Mir”, “Nina”, and “Noni” escaped from his residence and property at 46 Glenbrook Ave., Hamden , CT (46 Glenbrook Ave.) and attacked a neighbor’s, Michael Kelly’s, black female pit bull dog named “Midnight” while on his property at 56 Glenbrook Ave., Hamden, CT. Hamden Police Officer Timothy McKeon, who responded to the incident, reported that Michael Kelly’s sister Jaime Kelly witnessed the attack and that she stated that “Midnight” was pinned under a pickup truck in the driveway while being repeatedly bitten by the three dogs. Officer McKeon reported that he observed “Midnight” to have multiple puncture wounds and was bleeding heavily from her torso. The dog “Midnight” was treated for her injuries at Cheshire Veterinary Hospital. Tr. at pages 25 – 27 inclusive. Exs. T-1 and T-2.

9. Officer McKeon made contact with Mr. Bowden after Jaime Kelly pointed out his house as being the one from which the three attacking dogs came. Mr. Bowden had the three dogs back at his house and confined to a room in the house. He stated the dogs actually belonged to his son Richard who, at the time was in the Army stationed in Georgia. Mr. Bowden told Officer McKeon that the three dogs escaped through a hole in a fence in his backyard; that the dogs were not licensed with the Town; and he thought all three dogs were current on their vaccinations (rabies) but he was not able to produce any records to substantiate his claims. Ex. T-1.
10. Officer McKeon advised Mr. Bowden to keep all three dogs quarantined in his house until an animal control officer came out to investigate the incident; to only let the dogs outside while on a leash; and to compile all vaccination records for the animal control officer. Officer McKeon reported that Mr. Bowden said he would comply. Ex. T-1
11. On June 5, 2014, Hamden Assistant Animal Control Officer Steven Gimler (AACO Gimler) met with Mr. Bowden at his residence at 46 Glenbrook Ave. Mr. Bowden was not able to provide documentation that any of his three dogs, “Mir-Mir”, “Nina”, and “Noni”, was currently vaccinated for rabies. AACO Gimler issued a 14-day on-property quarantine order to Mr. Bowden on all three dogs and left two copies of the order with him for his review, to sign and to return one copy. AACO Gimler reported that Mr. Bowden agreed to the quarantine order for all 3 dogs. Tr. at page 28. Ex. T-2.
12. In his Hamden Police Department Case/Incident Report, AACO Gimler reports that he issued the following infractions to Mr. Bowden (Complaint Ticket P716336): 3 counts of nuisance (C.G.S. §22-363)²; 3 counts of roaming (C.G.S. §22-364(a)); and 2 counts of

² The statutory provision for issuance of an infraction for nuisance was incorrectly cited as C.G.S. §22-339 in the Hamden Police Department Case/Incident Report dated 6/11/14. Ex. T-2.

failure to vaccinate for rabies (C.G.S. §22-339b). He further reports that he issued a written warning to Mr. Bowden for failure to license his dogs (C.G.S. §22-349). This was corroborated by ACO Smith in his testimony. Tr. at page 28. Ex. T-2

13. A second bite attack incident occurred on July 9, 2014. Mr. Bowden's dogs, "Mir-Mir", "Nina" and "Noni" escaped past him through an open stockade gate in his fenced backyard and pursued a retreating, medium sized, brown and tan, male, Terrier/Poodle mix dog named "Cody" owned by Leo Mitchell of 60 Rochford Ave., Hamden, CT. ACO Smith testified that "Cody" had wandered onto the driveway at the Bowden residence. Mr. Bowden's three dogs caught up with "Cody" and attacked him in the backyard of property at 36 Glenbrook Ave. where Hamden Animal Control Officer Christopher Smith (ACO Smith) observed "Cody", the victim of the attack, with his resultant injuries. ACO Smith testified that that "Cody" had a really bad laceration on one of his hind legs and some internal damage. The attack was broken up by three adult men who responded to the scene as did Mr. Bowden who returned his three dogs to his property. Transcript at pages 30 – 31 inclusive. Ex. T-3.
14. ACO Smith transported "Cody" to his owner, Leo Mitchell, at his residence at 60 Rochford Ave. Mitchell informed ACO Smith that he was not aware that "Cody" had escaped from his backyard. Mitchell transported "Cody" to Merryfield Animal Hospital for medical treatment. Transcript at page 32. Ex. T-3
15. ACO Smith interviewed Mr. Bowden and determined that none of the three dogs were current on their rabies vaccinations. He informed Bowden that he did not comply with the order given to him to have his dogs vaccinated for rabies upon completion of the quarantine issued as a result of the June 4, 2014 bite attack incident. ACO Smith also

informed Mr. Bowden of his intention of impounding all three dogs (“Mir-Mir”, “Nina” and “Noni”) to serve an off-property quarantine because there was no proof of any of the dogs three dogs being currently vaccinated for rabies. At Mr. Bowden’s request, ACO Smith decided that the three dogs would not be removed from the Bowden residence until the next day, July 10, 2015, to serve out the off-property quarantine. Tr. at pages 32 - 33 inclusive. Ex. T-3.

16. On July 10, 2014, ACO Smith spoke to Mr. Bowden’s wife, Lisa Bowden-Perry, after making numerous unsuccessful attempts to contact Mr. Bowden directly. Lisa Bowden-Perry informed ACO Smith that Mr. Bowden had left the state due to a death in the family and that the female Pit Bull dog “Noni” was no longer at their residence but was at an undisclosed location which Mr. Bowden would not reveal to Lisa Bowden-Perry. ACO Smith strongly urged Lisa Bowden-Perry to have all three dogs ready for removal from their residence at 10:00 AM the next day, July 11, 2014, to be taken to the North Haven Animal Shelter to serve out the quarantine with a release date of July 22, 2104. Exs. T-3 and T-4.

17. On July 11, 2014, ACO Smith and AACO Gimler removed the dogs “Mir-Mir” and “Nina” from the Bowden residence at 46 Glenbrook Ave. and transported them for impoundment to the North Haven Animal Shelter to serve an off-property quarantine with a release date of July 22, 2014. While at the Bowden residence, Lisa Bowden-Perry, who ACO Smith reported to be extremely cooperative, informed ACO Smith that Mr. Bowden had not yet returned and that she was still not aware of the whereabouts dog “Noni”. Tr. at pages 34 – 35. Ex. T-4

18. While impounded at the North Haven Animal Shelter, ACO Smith transported “Mir-Mir” to the North Haven Animal Hospital for treatment of puncture wounds as result of the July 9, 2014 dog bite attack incident. ACO Smith stated in a Hamden PD Case/Incident report and also testified that, due to the “Mir-Mir’s” aggressive nature, he required tranquilization before being transported. Lisa Bowden-Perry visited the two dogs at the pound on July 15, 2014 at which time ACO Smith attempted to discuss with her options for the two dogs, which he described to her as dog aggressive, after their release from quarantine. She was unsure as to what the future was for the dogs but agreed that they were causing problems in the neighborhood. Ex. T-5.
19. Even though the quarantine release date for “Mir-Mir” and “Nina” was July 22, 2014, Mr. Bowden did not reclaim his dogs from the North Haven Animal Shelter until July 25, 2015. At that time, AACO Gimler informed him that (1) both dogs needed to be vaccinated for rabies immediately or further enforcement action would be taken (they were not vaccinated as AACO Gimler had instructed after the June 4, 2014 incident); (2) that he needed to repair the fence enclosing his yard to keep the dogs contained for the safety of the neighbors; and (3) keep basket muzzles on the dogs when they are outside to avoid future incidents. Tr. at pages 40 – 41. Ex. T-5
20. The record shows conflicting testimony and evidence as to whether infractions were issued to Mr. Bowden as a result of the second bite attack incident that occurred on July 9, 2014 incident. When questioned by Attorney Sharkey, ACO Smith testified that Mr. Bowden was not issued any infractions because it was unclear if Mr. Bowden was home at the time and who was taking care of the dogs when they escaped. (Tr. at pages 40 – 42 inclusive). When questioned by the Hearing Officer, ACO Smith stated that he issued

infractions for three counts of roaming, three counts of nuisance and three counts of failure to vaccinate. (Tr. at page 56.) ACO Smith indicated in a Hamden PD Case/Incident Report that he intended to issue an infraction on July 11, 2014, assigned to Terry Bowden, to Lisa Bowden-Perry as follows: 3 counts - Failure to Vaccinate (C.G.S. §22-339b); 3 counts – Roaming (C.G.S. §22-364(a)); 3 counts – Nuisance (C.G.S. §22-363); and 3 counts – Failure to License (C.G.S. §22-349)³. (Ex. T-3) No additional evidence was presented, however, to document that the above cited infractions were actually issued.

21. A third off-property bite attack incident occurred on August 3, 2014 in which Mr. Bowden’s dog “Mir-Mir” was the sole offending dog. “Mir-Mir” escaped through an open door from the Bowden house, charged across the street, and attacked an older German Shepard mix female dog named “April” owned by William Smith. At the time of the bite attack, he was walking with “April” on a leash on Glenbrook Ave. According to the investigating officer’s report, HPD Officer Jeremy Brewer, “April” suffered a 3-inch laceration on her abdomen that required treatment at Merryfield Animal Hospital. Exs. T-7 and T-8.
22. On August 5, 2014, ACO Smith, along with AACO Gimler, seized “Mir-Mir” and “Nina” from the Bowden residence at 46 Glenbrook Ave. and impounded them at the North Haven Animal Shelter. On the same day, ACO Smith issued Disposal Orders on both dogs. He testified that he believed the only outcome should be a disposal of the two dogs based on the three attacks and that, even though “Nina” was not involved in the third attack, she was a danger to the neighborhood. He further testified that, in

³ The statutory reference for issuance of an infraction for failure to license was incorrectly cited as C.G.S. §22-344 the Hamden Police Department Case/Incident Report dated 7/10/2014. Ex. T-3.

conversations with Terry Bowden's neighbors periodically, they would ask him to please do something about the dogs at 46 Glenbrook Ave. because they were of afraid of them.

Tr. at pages 45 – 47 inclusive, 59, 60, and 62. Exs. T-8, T-9 and T-10⁴.

23. In his testimony, ACO described "Mir-Mir" as highly dog aggressive and had shown signs of increased aggression since being impounded on August 5, 2014 to the point of being destructive with anything with which he has contact. He described "Nina's" behavior as less aggressive. He further testified that both are dangerous dogs and beyond the point of rehabilitation. Tr. at pages 50-53 inclusive.

24. At no time since their impoundment on August 5, 2014, has either Mr. Bowden or Lisa Bowden-Perry visited the dogs at the North Haven Animal Shelter even though ACO has requested that they do so. In his testimony, ACO Smith characterized Mr. Bowden and Lisa Bowden as irresponsible dog owners citing the fact that they didn't do anything that they had been asked to do. He stated that he didn't think he ever met anyone that cared so little about their dogs. Tr. at page 60.

25. ACO Smith testified that he has served as the Animal Control Officer for the Town of Hamden for a little over eight years. He also testified that is not common for him to issue disposal orders, issuing only two others previously, and considers them a kind of enforcement to be taken only under the worst conditions. Tr. at pages 24 and 49.

⁴ ACO Smith issued individual Disposal Orders on the dogs "Mir-Mir" and "Nina", copies of which are included in Ex. T-10.

III

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

C.G.S. §22-358(h)⁵ provides that a municipal animal control officer may make any order concerning the restraint or disposal of a dog that has bitten or attacked another dog [companion animal]. However, C.G.S. §22-358(h) prescribes certain standards that must be met for such order to be issued:

- The bite or attack incident must occur off the premises of the owner or keeper of the attacking dog.
- The dog that is attacked must be under the control of [the complainant] its owner or keeper when the attack occurs.
- [Or] The dog that is attacked must be on the property of [the complainant] its owner or keeper when the attack occurs.

⁵ The full subsection provides as follows: "A person who sustains damage by a dog to such person's poultry, ratite, domestic rabbit, companion animal or livestock as defined in section 22-278 shall make complaint concerning circumstances of the attack by such dog on any such animal or livestock to the Chief Animal Control Officer, any animal control officer or the municipal animal control officer or regional animal control officer of the town in which such dog is owned or kept. An officer to whom such complaint is made shall immediately investigate such complaint. If such officer finds that the complainant's animal has been bitten or attacked by a dog when the attacked animal was not on the premises of the owner or keeper of the attacking dog and provided the complainant's animal was under the control of the complainant or on the complainant's property, *such* officer, the commissioner, the Chief Animal Control Officer or any animal control officer may make any order concerning the restraint or disposal of such attacking dog as the commissioner or such officer deems necessary. An owner or keeper of such dog who fails to comply with such order shall be guilty of a class D misdemeanor. If the owner or keeper of such dog fails to comply with an order made pursuant to this subsection, the Chief Animal Control Officer or any animal control officer, municipal animal control officer or regional animal control officer may seize the dog to ensure such compliance, and the owner or keeper of such dog shall be responsible for any expenses resulting from such seizure. A person aggrieved by an order of the Chief Animal Control Officer or any animal control officer, municipal animal control officer or regional animal control officer made pursuant to this subsection may request a hearing before the commissioner not later than fourteen days after the issuance of such order. After such hearing, the commissioner may affirm, modify or revoke such order as the commissioner deems proper. A dog owned by a police agency of the state or any of its political subdivisions is exempt from the provisions of this section when such dog is under the direct supervision, care and control of an assigned police officer, has been vaccinated annually and is subject to routine veterinary care."

IV

DISCUSSION

Although Terry Bowden, the dogs' owner, did not make an appearance nor was he represented by counsel at this hearing, said hearing was conducted in his absence. The Department made proper notice of hearing to Mr. Bowden as provided in RCSA §22-7-25 beyond which further attempts of notification were made. Tr. at pages 19-22 inclusive.

Acting under the provisions of C.G.S. §22-358(h), the Town of Hamden issued disposal orders on the dogs "Mir-Mir" and "Nina" and presented evidence of three separate attacks on other dogs to support the issuance of the disposal orders. The evidence presented by the Town shows that the circumstances of only two of the documented bite incidents, those of June 4, 2014 and August 3, 2014, meet the standard of law as provided in C.G.S. §22-358(h) for the issuance of a restraint or disposal order.

The circumstances of the June 4, 2014 incident, in which "Mir-Mir", "Nina" and "Noni" were the attacking dogs, met the standard of law since the attack occurred on the property of Michael Kelly, the owner⁶ of the attacked dog, "Midnight". The circumstances of the July 9, 2014 incident, again in which "Mir-Mir", "Nina" and "Noni" were the attacking dogs, did not meet the standard of law. The attack did not occur on the property of the attacking dogs' owner, Mr. Bowden, but the attacked dog "Cody" was neither under the control of its owner, Leo Mitchell, nor did the attack occur on Mr. Mitchell's property. The circumstances of the August 3, 2014 incident, in which "Mir-Mir" was the sole attacking dog, meet the standard of law because the attacked dog was under the control of its owner, William Smith, and the attack did

⁶ The term "complainant" as used in C.G.S. §22-358(h) is assumed to mean "owner" relative to the 3 documented dog bite attack incidents cited in the evidence.

not occur on the property of Mr. Bowden, the attacking dog's owner.

Based on the above analysis and the evidence, the dog "Nina" was an offending dog in only one dog bite attack incident, that of June 4, 2014, in which the circumstances of the attack met the standard of law, as set forth in C.G.S. §22-358(h), to provide for the issuance of a disposal order by the Town of Hamden. However, the dog "Mir-Mir" was an offending dog in two dog bite attack incidents, those of June 4, 2014 and August 3, 2014 in which the circumstances of the attack met the standard of law for the issuance of a disposal order.

ACO Smith testified that he had issued only two other disposal orders while serving as the Hamden Animal Control Officer and that, only under the worst conditions, would he proceed with this type of enforcement action. Considering ACO Smith's testimony, which this Hearing Officer found to be credible and sincere, and evidence contained in police reports entered into the record, it is reasonable to believe that he issued the disposal orders on "Mir-Mir" and "Nina" based on his overriding concern for the safety of the neighborhood in which the dogs resided.

Such concern was based on his assessment that "Mir-Mir" and "Nina" are dog aggressive, with "Mir-Mir" being highly dog aggressive and "Nina" being dog aggressive to a lesser extent, and that Mr. Bowden, throughout, proved to be an irresponsible dog owner.

The town provided ample evidence that Mr. Bowden took no actions after the first dog bite attack incident to control his dogs and prevent them from causing further harm. Moreover, he ignored repeated recommendations by Hamden officials to implement specific restraint and control measures and to assure that his dogs were currently vaccinated for rabies and currently licensed. He blatantly misled and deceived Hamden officials when he left the state with his dog "Noni" after being informed on July 9, 2014 that all three of the dogs, "Mir-Mir", "Nina" and "Noni", would be removed from his residence the next day for impoundment at the North Haven

pound to serve a 14-day off property quarantine

ACO Smith issued the disposal order on the dog “Mir-Mir” on August 5, 2014 after the August 3, 2014 incident in which “Mir-Mir” attacked William Smith’s dog “April” while she was not on Mr. Bowden’s property and was under the control of her owner. It is reasonable to conclude that ACO Smith was justified, acting under the provisions of C.G.S. §22-358(h), in issuing the disposal order on “Mir-Mir” considering his history of attacks on other dogs, his highly dog aggressive behavior, his aggressive behavior toward persons while in the North Haven pound and Mr. Bowden’s continual refusal to take the recommended and necessary measures to prevent further attacks.

ACO Smith also issued the disposal order on the dog “Nina” on August 5, 2014 after the August 3, 2014 incident in which “Mir-Mir” was the sole offending dog. As stated previously, “Nina” was an offending dog in only one attack incident, June 4, 2014, in which the circumstances surrounding the incident meet the standard of law for issuance of a restraint or disposal order as provided in C.G.S. §22-358(h). Therefore, the June 4, 2014 attack incident provides the only legal basis, pursuant to C.G.S. §22-358(h), for the issuance of a disposal order on “Nina”. However, there is substantial evidence in the record that leads to belief that the Town did not base its decision to issue the disposal order on “Nina” solely on her involvement in the June 4, 2014 incident but also on her involvement in the July 9, 2014⁷. Moreover, the disposal order was issued on “Nina” subsequent to the August 3, 2014 attack incident in which she had no involvement but appears to have served as the deciding factor and impetus for the Town’s issuance of the disposal order on her. Even if the Town issued the disposal order on “Nina”

⁷ In the Hamden Case/Incident Report dated 8/11/14, ACO Smith cites both the June 4, 2014 and the July 9, 2014 bite attack incidents as justification for issuance of the disposal order on “Nina” but it is not clear from the narrative of the report if he considered only the June 4th incident to provide the legal basis for issuance of the disposal order. Ex. T-9. ACO Smith gave the following testimony: “the culmination of these three attacks caused me to believe that the only outcome should be a disposal of these two dogs.” Tr. at pages 45 and 46.

based on the June 4, 2014, the only attack incident which met the statutory provisions to do so, the disposal order was issued on August 5, 2014, a full two months after the fact. If “Nina” alone, irrespective of the other two dogs, “Mir-Mir” and “Noni”, presented sufficient danger to warrant issuance of a disposal order based on based on her actions in the June 4, 2014 incident, the disposal order should have been issued immediately after that incident and not retrospectively two months later.

It is this Hearing Officer’s belief that the Town had other more appropriate enforcement options available as legal remedies, short of the issuance of a disposal order, to address “Nina’s” actions. As a result of the June 4, 2014 attack incident, the evidence shows that the Town issued citations for nuisance to Mr. Bowden on all three of his dogs, including “Nina” as provided in C.G.S. §22-363 which states “No person shall own or harbor a dog or dogs which is or are a nuisance by reason of vicious disposition or excessive barking or other disturbance, or, by such barking or other disturbance, is or are a source of annoyance to any sick person residing in the immediate vicinity. Violation of any provision of this section shall be an infraction for the first offense and a class D misdemeanor for each subsequent offense and the court or judge may make such order concerning the restraint or disposal of such dog or dogs as may be deemed necessary.” However, the Town presented no evidence or testimony documenting the court’s disposition of the infractions for nuisance.

The Town had the option of issuing second counts for violation of C.G.S. §22-363 to Mr. Bowden on his dogs, including “Nina”, after the second attack incident, July 9, 2014, which would have constituted a Class D misdemeanor and resulted in the court or judge deciding the disposition of the dogs. The record is not clear as to whether the Town did so (see #20. in above Finding of Facts) and, if it did, no evidence or testimony was presented to document the court’s

ruling on the class D misdemeanors.

The circumstances of the June 4, 2014 attack incident met the standard of law, as provided in C.G.S. §22-358(h), that gave the Town the statutory authority to issue restraint orders on Mr. Bowden's three dogs including "Nina". When asked, ACO Smith testified that he did not issue restraint orders because he knew that Mr. Bowden would not comply with them.

V

PROPOSED FINAL DECISION

After careful consideration of testimony and exhibits presented by the Town of Hamden, I recommend that the final decision maker in this matter *affirm* the Disposal Order issued by the Town of Hamden on the dog named "Mir-Mir" owned by Terry Bowden. I further recommend that the final decision maker in this matter *revoke* the Disposal Order issued by the Town of Hamden on the dog named "Nina" owned by Terry Bowden.

Dated:
November 3, 2015



Bruce A. Sherman, DVM, MPH
Hearing Officer