

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION  
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

FINAL DECISION

Deborah Weiss and Deborah Boles,

Complainants

against

Docket # FIC 2024-0268

Aidee Nieves, President, City Council, City  
of Bridgeport; City Council, City of  
Bridgeport; and City of Bridgeport,

Respondents

April 23, 2025

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on November 22, 2024, at which time the complainants and the respondents appeared and presented testimony, exhibits, and argument on the complaint.

After consideration of the entire record, the following facts are found and conclusions of law are reached:

1. The respondents are public agencies within the meaning of §1-200(1), G.S.
2. By email dated May 15, 2024, and received and filed by the Commission on May 16, 2024, the complainants appealed to this Commission alleging that the respondents violated the Freedom of Information (“FOI”) Act by doing the following at their January 2, 2024 regular meeting:
  - (a) amending Resolution 20-23 based upon revisions made at two secret meetings, which were held on the afternoon and evening of January 2, 2024 and were facilitated by the City of Bridgeport’s mayor<sup>1</sup> and

---

<sup>1</sup> The complainants further alleged in their appeal that the January 2, 2024 afternoon gathering allegedly facilitated by the City of Bridgeport’s mayor constituted an unnoticed secret meeting of the mayor in violation of §1-225, G.S. Specifically, they alleged that on April 16, 2024, they received constructive notice of such gathering within the meaning of §1-206(b)(1), G.S., and, therefore, the Commission had subject matter jurisdiction to hear such claim. However, the Commission declined to docket a complaint against the mayor, given that (a) the complainants’ appeal named the Bridgeport City Council as the violating public agency and (b) the allegations pled in the appeal regarding such gathering failed to allege that any public agency, other than the mayor himself as a single-member public agency, attended. Additionally, regarding the second gathering allegedly facilitated by the mayor on the evening of January 2, 2024, the complainants waived any claim that such gathering violated the FOI Act by acknowledging in their appeal that said gathering was made public within several days after it took place and, therefore, a claim alleging that such gathering was an unnoticed secret meeting within the meaning of §1-225, G.S., would be untimely.

- (b) attempting to conceal such revisions to Resolution 20-23 by making it appear that a subcommittee of the respondent city council had approved the revisions prior to the full council's adoption at such regular meeting.

3. Because the complainants in this matter filed a notice of appeal more than thirty days after the respondents' regular meeting convened on January 2, 2024, the Commission must determine whether it has subject matter jurisdiction over any alleged violation occurring at those meetings.

4. Section 1-206(b)(1), G.S., provides the following in relevant part:

Any person denied the right to inspect or copy records under section 1-210 or wrongfully denied the right to attend any meeting of a public agency or denied any other right conferred by the Freedom of Information Act may appeal therefrom to the Freedom of Information Commission, by filing a notice of appeal with said commission. A notice of appeal shall be filed not later than thirty days after such denial, except in the case of an unnoticed or secret meeting, in which case the appeal shall be filed not later than thirty days after the person filing the appeal receives actual or constructive notice that such meeting was held.

5. It is found that the complainants filed their notice of appeal in this matter on May 15, 2024, which was 134 days after the respondents' meeting at issue.

6. Consequently, it is found that with respect to the respondents' January 2, 2024 meeting, the complainants failed to file their complaint in a timely manner and in accordance with the provisions of §1-206(b)(1), G.S.

7. It is therefore concluded that the Commission has no jurisdiction to address alleged violations occurring at the respondents' regular meeting held on January 2, 2024. Accordingly, the Commission has no authority over the allegations described in paragraphs 2(a) and 2(b), above.

The following order is hereby recommended on the basis of the record concerning the above-captioned complaint:

1. The complaint is dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

Approved by Order of the Freedom of Information Commission at its regular meeting of April 23, 2025.

/s/ Jennifer M. Mayo  
Jennifer M. Mayo  
Acting Clerk of the Commission

PURSUANT TO SECTION 4-180(c), G.S., THE FOLLOWING ARE THE NAMES OF EACH PARTY AND THE MOST RECENT MAILING ADDRESS, PROVIDED TO THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION, OF THE PARTIES OR THEIR AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE.

THE PARTIES TO THIS CONTESTED CASE ARE:

**DEBORAH WEISS AND DEBORAH BOLES**, c/o Attorney Jonathan J. Klein, Parlatore Law Group, LLP, 1057 Broad Street, Suite 403, Bridgeport, CT 06604

**AIDEE NIEVES, PRESIDENT, CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF BRIDGEPORT; CITY COUNCIL, CITY OF BRIDGEPORT; AND CITY OF BRIDGEPORT**, c/o Attorney Michael Jankovsky and Attorney Tyisha S. Toms, Office of the City Attorney, 999 Broad Street, Bridgeport, CT 06604

/s/ Jennifer M. Mayo  
Jennifer M. Mayo  
Acting Clerk of the Commission