



DOCKET NUMBER 2025-07 : **OFFICE OF STATE ETHICS**
: **165 CAPITOL AVENUE, SUITE 1200**
IN THE MATTER OF A : **HARTFORD, CT 06106**
: **JULY 28, 2025**
COMPLAINT AGAINST
RICHARD COLANGELO

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Pursuant to the Code of Ethics, Connecticut General Statutes §§ 1-79, *et seq.*, Mark E. Wasielewski, Ethics Enforcement Officer for the Office of State Ethics (the “OSE”), issued a Complaint against the Respondent, Richard Colangelo (“Colangelo” or “Respondent”) (together with OSE, the “Parties”) for violations of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, Connecticut General Statutes §§ 1-79, *et seq.* Based on the investigation by the Enforcement Division of the OSE, the OSE finds there is probable cause to believe that Respondent violated the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, as set forth below.

The Parties have entered into this Settlement Agreement following the issuance of the Complaint, but without any adjudication of any issue of fact or law herein.

I. STATE’S POSITION

Based upon a preliminary investigation of this matter, the Ethics Enforcement Officer was prepared to establish the following at a probable cause hearing:

1. Beginning on or around February 1, 2020, and at all times relevant hereto, Respondent was employed as Chief State's Attorney of the Division of Criminal Justice (the "Division") of the State of Connecticut.

2. At all times relevant hereto, Respondent was a "state employee" as that term is defined in General Statutes § 1-79 (13).

3. At all times relevant hereto, Respondent's official duties included, but were not limited to, the selection of Division personnel.

4. At all times relevant hereto, the Department of Administrative Services ("DAS") was a Connecticut state agency whose duties and responsibilities included, but were not limited to, establishing compensation schedules or plans pertaining to state employees, and/or amending compensation schedules, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management ("OPM").

5. At all times relevant hereto, OPM was a Connecticut state agency whose responsibilities included, but were not limited to, approving compensation schedules established by DAS.

6. Beginning in or around March 2020, Respondent commenced efforts to obtain pay increases for himself as Chief State's Attorney, two Deputy Chief State's Attorneys, and thirteen State's Attorneys (the "pay increases").

7. At all times relevant hereto, the pay increases required approval by both the Secretary of OPM and the Commissioner of DAS, the heads of those respective agencies.

8. Following commencement of his efforts to obtain the pay increases, Respondent communicated with several OPM personnel, including the second highest ranking OPM official, the Deputy Secretary of OPM (the "Deputy Secretary").

9. In or around April and/or May 2020, Respondent requested that the Secretary of OPM and the Commissioner of DAS authorize the pay increases.

10. In or around May 2020, the Secretary of OPM denied Respondent's request.

11. Subsequent to the denial, on or around May 27, 2020, Respondent asked the Deputy Secretary if the two could discuss the pay increases, to which the Deputy Secretary agreed.

12. Subsequent to the denial of the pay increases by the Secretary of OPM, Respondent sought the Deputy Secretary's assistance in securing OPM's approval of the pay increases.

13. At or around the time that Respondent sought the Deputy Secretary's assistance, the Deputy Secretary sought to secure from Respondent a position for the Deputy Secretary's daughter ("Individual One") at the Division.

14. Respondent agreed to hire Individual One based on the understanding that by doing so, the Deputy Secretary, in his official capacity, would provide support and/or additional support for the pay increases.

15. On or around June 3, 2020, Respondent sent an email to the Deputy Secretary with the subject line "info" (the "June 3 email").

16. The June 3 email contained no message in the body but did include an attached scanned document containing two Division job descriptions.

17. On that same day, the Deputy Secretary forwarded the June 3 email, with its attachment, to Individual One with the message, "thoughts?"

18. On June 9, 2020, Individual One emailed Respondent a copy of her resume, to which Respondent replied, "thank you I will be in touch soon."

19. On June 10, 2020, Respondent called Individual One to ask that she come to the Chief State's Attorney's Office for an interview.

20. On June 11, 2020, Respondent and two other Division personnel interviewed Individual One for a position at the Division.

21. Respondent offered Individual One the position of Executive Assistant during the interview.

22. Respondent did not interview any other candidate for the position.

23. Individual One accepted Respondent's offer and commenced paid employment with the Division on or around July 3, 2020.

24. At or around the time that Respondent offered the position to Individual One, and despite the Secretary of OPM's recent denial of Respondent's request, the Deputy Secretary commenced a sustained advocacy campaign at OPM and elsewhere in support of the pay increases.

25. The Deputy Secretary's actions included, but were not limited to:

- a. Using his access to the Secretary of OPM and other OPM personnel to attempt to influence OPM actions in support of the pay increases;
- b. Using his access to DAS personnel to attempt to influence DAS actions in support of the pay increases;
- c. Providing Respondent with increased access to OPM personnel;
- d. Providing Respondent with access to communications between OPM and DAS personnel concerning the pay increases; and
- e. Serving as Respondent's point of contact within OPM.

26. General Statutes §1-84 (f) states in pertinent part:

No person shall offer or give to a public official or state employee . . . or [his] child . . . anything of value, including, but not limited to, a gift, loan, political contribution, reward or

promise of future employment based on any understanding that the . . . official action or judgment of the public official[] [or] state employee . . . would be or had been influenced thereby.

27. General Statutes § 1-84 (g) states in pertinent part:

No public official or state employee . . . shall solicit or accept anything of value, including but not limited to, a gift, loan, political contribution, reward or promise of future employment based on any understanding that the . . . official action or judgment of the public official or state employee . . . would be or had been influenced thereby.

28. Respondent's hiring of Individual One based on the understanding that, by so doing, the Deputy Secretary would support the pay increases for Division personnel, including Respondent, as described above, constitutes a violation of General Statutes §§ 1-84 (f) or (g).

II. RESPONDENT'S POSITION

1. Insofar as the State's Position in this Settlement Agreement and the accompanying Complaint characterize the events portrayed in those documents to suggest violations of the Code of Ethics, the Respondent Richard Colangelo rejects those characterizations. To the contrary, Respondent denies any wrongdoing in connection with the matters discussed in those documents.

2. Respondent is entering this Settlement Agreement without admitting any wrongdoing, and in fact denies that he has violated any law or otherwise committed any improper act related to these matters. Respondent is entering into this Settlement Agreement solely to avoid the expense of continued litigation.

III. JURISDICTION

1. The Ethics Enforcement Officer is authorized to investigate Respondent's acts as set forth herein, and to issue the Complaint against Respondent.

2. The Office of State Ethics, through the Citizen's Ethics Advisory

Board, is authorized to enter into this Settlement Agreement.

3. The provisions of this Settlement Agreement apply to and are binding upon Respondent.

4. Respondent hereby waives all objections and defenses to the jurisdiction of the Citizen's Ethics Advisory Board and the Ethics Enforcement Officer over matters addressed in this Settlement Agreement.

5. Except as otherwise expressly set forth herein, 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 Settlement Agreement. Respondent recognizes that the Connecticut Superior Court has the authority to specifically enforce the provisions of this Settlement Agreement, 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 Respondent.

7. Respondent understands that this Settlement Agreement is subject to the approval of the Citizen's Ethics Advisory Board and is not final until signed. If the Citizen's Ethics Advisory Board does not approve this Settlement Agreement, and this matter proceeds to a hearing before the Board, Respondent expressly waives any objection he may have to the Board's presiding over a hearing in this matter based on the Board's previous consideration of this Settlement Agreement.

8. Respondent understands that he has the right to be represented by legal counsel and has been represented by counsel throughout the investigation of the Complaint and the negotiation of this Settlement Agreement.

IV. AGREEMENT AND DISPOSITION


NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes § 4-177 (c), the

Parties agree that:

1. Respondent will comply with the Codes of Ethics should he in the future become a state employee or public official.
2. Respondent will pay to the State the amount of seven thousand dollars (\$7,000.00) to resolve allegations of violations of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials, as set forth in the Complaint and herein.


WHEREFORE, the OSE and Respondent hereby execute this Settlement Agreement dated July 28, 2025.

Dated: 7/30/25



Richard Colangelo
Respondent

Dated: 7-31-25



Mark E. Wasielewski, Esq.
Ethics Enforcement Officer
Connecticut Office of State Ethics
165 Capitol Avenue
Suite 1200
Hartford, CT 06106
Ph.: (860) 263-2398