



### **OFFICE OF STATE ETHICS**

DOCKET NUMBER 2021-13

OFFICE OF STATE ETHICS

IN THE MATTER OF A

18-20 TRINITY STREET

COMPLAINT AGAINST

HARTFORD, CT 06106

CARLA OCAMPO

JULY 20, 2021

# STIPULATION AND CONSENT ORDER

Pursuant to the Code of Ethics, General Statutes §§ 1-79, et seq., Mark Wasielewski, Ethics Enforcement Officer, filed a Complaint against the Respondent Carla Ocampo ("Ocampo" or "Respondent"), alleging a violation of the Code of Ethics, Connecticut General Statutes § 1-84b (b). Based on the investigation by the Enforcement Division of the Office of State Ethics ("OSE"), the OSE finds there is probable cause to believe that the Respondent violated the Code of Ethics as further set forth in herein.

The Parties have entered into this Stipulation and Consent Order following the issuance of the Complaint, but without any adjudication of any issue of fact or law herein.

#### I. STIPULATION

The Ethics Enforcement Officer and the Respondent stipulate to the following facts:

- 1. From on or about March 2019 through on or about June 2020, the Respondent was a Regional Chief Operating Officer at the Department of Correction ("DOC").
- 2. Until on or about June 2020, the Respondent was a "State Employee" as that term is defined in General Statutes § 1-79 (m).
- On or about June 2020, the Respondent departed from state service and was thereafter a "former state employee."
- 4. At all times relevant hereto, the Respondent operated and was employed by a private business with offices located in Oakdale, Connecticut (the "Oakdale business").
- 5. Within one year of June 2020, and within one year of her leaving state service, the Respondent had contact with employees at the DOC regarding the sale of thermal temperature monitoring cameras ("thermal cameras") to the DOC in which the Oakdale business was involved.
- At all times relevant hereto, the DOC monitored the body temperatures of individuals at DOC facilities in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- 7. The Respondent, as owner/operator of the Oakdale business, would receive a financial gain from the sale of the thermal cameras and accessories to the DOC.
- 8. The state has a substantial interest in the monitoring of individuals' body temperatures at DOC facilities.
  - 9. General Statutes § 1-84b (b) states in pertinent part:

No former... state employee shall, for one year after leaving state service, represent anyone, other than the state, for compensation before the department, agency, board, commission, council or office in which he

served at the time of his termination of service, concerning any matter in which the state has a substantial interest.

- 10. The Respondent, by engaging in the acts set forth above, represented someone other than the state for compensation before the DOC within one year of her departure from state service, in a matter in which the state had a substantial interest, in violation of General Statutes § 1-84b (b).
- 11. The Respondent admits to the foregoing facts, and she admits that these facts constitute a violation of the Code of Ethics, General Statutes §1-84b (b).

# II. RESPONDENT'S POSITION

- The Respondent states that she did not knowingly or intentionally violate the Code of Ethics.
- The Respondent states that she did not have any disciplinary issues during her state service at DOC.

## III. JURISDICTION

- The Ethics Enforcement Officer is authorized to investigate the Respondent's acts as set forth herein, and to enter into this Stipulation and Consent Order.
- The provisions of this Stipulation and Consent Order apply to and are binding upon the Respondent.
- The Respondent hereby waives all objections and defenses to the jurisdiction of the Ethics Enforcement Officer over matters addressed in this Stipulation and Consent Order.
- 4. The Respondent waives any rights she may have under General Statutes §§ 1-80, 1-82, 1-82a, 1-87 and 1-88, including the right to a hearing or appeal in this case, and agrees with the Ethics Enforcement Officer to an informal disposition of this matter as authorized by General Statutes § 4-177 (c).

- 5. The Respondent consents to jurisdiction and venue in the Connecticut Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford, in the event that the State of Connecticut seeks to enforce this Stipulation and Consent Order. The Respondent recognizes that the Connecticut Superior Court has the authority to specifically enforce the provisions of this Stipulation and Consent Order, including the authority to award equitable relief.
- 6. The terms set forth herein are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other existing or future statutory, regulatory, or other legal obligation that may be applicable to the Respondent.
- 7. The Respondent understands that she has a right to counsel and has expressly and knowingly waived such right during the OSE's investigation and in connection with this Stipulation and Consent Order.

# IV. ORDER

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to General Statutes § 4-177 (c), the Office of State Ethics hereby ORDERS, and Respondent agrees, that:

- 1. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-88 (a) (1), Respondent will cease and desist from any future violations of General Statutes § 1-84b (b).
- 2. Pursuant to General Statutes § 1-88 (a) (3), Respondent will pay a civil penalty to the State in the amount of Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for her violation of General Statutes § 1-84b (b) as set forth in the Complaint and herein.
- 3. The Respondent agrees that, should she return to state employment, that she will file statements of financial interests ("SFIs") with the OSE for the duration of her state employment.

WHEREFORE, the Ethics Enforcement Officer and the Respondent hereby execute this Stipulation and Consent Order dated July 20, 2021.

Dated: 7-22-202

Carla Ocampo

Dated: 7-26-2021

Mark E. Wasielewski
Ethics Enforcement Officer
Connecticut Office of State Eth

Connecticut Office of State Ethics 165 Capitol Avenue

Suite 1200

Hartford, CT 06106 PH: (860) 263-2398