

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

CONFIDENTIAL

DOCKET NUMBER 84-1)	STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF A)	30 TRINITY STREET
COMPLAINT BY)	HARTFORD, CONN. 06106
ALAN S. PLOFSKY)	MARCH 8, 1984
VS.)	
REP. ABRAHAM GILES)	

STIPULATION AND ORDER

- 1. The Respondent, Representative Abraham Giles, admits the violation of Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes for which the State Ethics Commission found probable cause at its meeting of March 7, 1984, as per the attached Complaint.
- 2. The Commission finds the violation not to have been intentional. Rather, the Commission finds, and the Respondent admits, that the violation was the result of poor judgement on the part of Representative Giles.
- 3. The Respondent waives any rights he may have under section 1-82, General Statutes, to a further hearing in this case, and agrees with the State Ethics Commission to an informal disposition of this matter as permitted by subsection 4-177(d), General Statutes.

WHEREFORE, the State Ethics Commission enters, and Representative Abraham Giles agrees to, these orders: In lieu of any other action it is authorized by law to take with respect to this matter, the Commission orders Representative Giles to (1) henceforth comply with subsection 1-84(c) of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, Chapter 10, Part 1, General Statutes, and (2) pay a civil penalty of fifty dollars within 30 days of signing this Stipulation and Order.

By Order of the Commission

Jucille E. Brown

Dated 6 april 1984

Phone: (203) 566-4472

30 Trinity Street • Hartford, Connecticut 06115

An Equal Opportunity Employer

000051

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

CONFIDENTIAL

DOCKET NUMBER 84-1)	STATE ETHICS COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF A)	30 TRINITY STREET
COMPLAINT BY)	HARTFORD, CONN. 06106
ALAN S. PLOFSKY)	MARCH 8, 1984
vs.)	
REP. ABRAHAM GILES)	·

NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION AND RESULTS THEREOF

Pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1-82, General Statutes, the State Ethics Commission declares that on March 7, 1984 it terminated the preliminary investigation conducted in regard to Docket Number 84-1.

As a result of this investigation, the Commission found that there exists probable cause to believe that the Respondent in the above-captioned matter has violated Chapter 10, Part I. General Statutes, as alleged in the Complaint.

By order of the Commission,

Cindy Cerreta

Clerk of the Commission

CONNECTICUT STATE ETHICS COMMISSION 30 TRINITY STREET HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106 Telephone Number 566-4472

COMPLAINT

I wish to r complaint alleg	egister with the State Ethics Commission a ing a violation of:
X	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 da	te matters complained of occurred:*
	February, 1984
Place alleg	ed violation occurred:

Persons involved:

State Representative Abraham Giles

Hartford, Connecticut

Witnesses:

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):

I hereby allege that:

- 1. By virtue of his position as a member of the General Assembly, Representative Abraham Giles is a public official, as defined in subsection 1-79(j), General Statutes, subject to the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes.
- 2. The political advertising service referred to as "THE ABE GILES FAMILY" in the letter attached to this Complaint (over)

*No complaint may be made to the Ethics Commission except within three years next after the alleged violation described in the complaint has been committed.

(attachment "A") is owned by Representative Giles, and is therefore a business with which he is associated, as defined in subsection 1-79(a), General Statutes.

3. On or about February 17, 1984, Representative Giles caused approximately 50 copies of the letter (attachment "A") to be produced and mailed to candidates for the Republican and Democratic Town Committees in Hartford. Said activity being an effort by Representative Giles to solicit business for the political advertising service known as "THE ABE GILES FAMILY".

(continued)

I hereby certify under penalty of false statement that I believe that the foregoing statement describing a possible violation of the designated Code of Ethics is true.

Signature 3/1/84-

Complainant's name and address (printed or typewritten):
Alan S. Plofsky, Esq., State Ethics Commission, 30 Trinity Street,
Hartford, Conn. 06106

Complainant's telephone number: 566-4472

Mail or hand deliver this complaint to the:

State Ethics Commission 30 Trinity Street Hartford, CT 06106

NOTE: (1) This Complaint may not be withdrawn by you, the Complainant, except with leave of the Ethics Commission. (2) In addition to the criminal penalties that may be imposed upon a complainant who, under penalty of false statement, knowingly files a false complaint, subsections 1-82(d) and 1-93(d) provide that if any complaint, brought under the provisions of Chapter 10, General Statutes, is made with the knowledge that it is without foundation in fact, the person against whom the complaint is made (the respondent) has a cause of action against the complainant for double the amount of damage caused. If the respondent prevails in the action, the cost of the action together with reasonable attorney's fees may be awarded the respondent by the court.

- 4. The letters referred to in paragraph 3, above, were produced on Representative Giles' official stationery bearing the indicia of his public office, including the State seal, his official title, his position as an assistant majority leader, and his legislative committee memberships. In addition, the letters were mailed in official envelopes bearing the State seal and identifying Abraham Giles as a State representative and assistant majority leader.
- 5. Representative Abraham Giles use of the official indicia of his public office, as described in paragraph 4, above, for the financial gain of a business with which he is associated, as described in paragraph 3, above, was in violation of subsection 1-84(c), General Statutes. Subsection 1-84(c) states, in pertinent part, that "No public official ... shall use his public office or position ... to obtain financial gain for ... a business with which he is associated."