

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

FINAL DECISION

Alex Coriaty and Kathryn Coriaty,

Complainants

against

Docket #FIC 2025-0073

Chief, Police Department, Town of East Lyme;  
Police Department, Town of East Lyme; and  
Town of East Lyme,

Respondents

September 25, 2025

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on July 29, 2025, at which time the complainants and respondents appeared and presented testimony, exhibits and argument on the complaint.<sup>1</sup>

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. It is found that, by form dated February 5, 2025, complainant Kathryn Coriaty requested that the respondents provide her with copies of all statements, reports, supplements, videos and other information pertaining to case number 24-00014720.
3. It is found that, by letter dated February 5, 2025, the respondents informed the complainants that their investigation did not result in a finding of probable cause and therefore no warrant was signed. The letter further provided that the State's Attorney's Office would decline to prosecute, and, in addition, the respondents claimed that the records constitute uncorroborated allegations and were withheld pursuant to §1-210(b)(3)(H), G.S.
4. By letter dated February 5, 2025, the complainants appealed to the Commission, alleging that the respondents violated the Freedom of Information ("FOI") Act by failing to provide them with copies of the records described above in paragraph 2, above.
5. Section 1-200(5), G.S. provides:

---

<sup>1</sup> On August 5, 2025, by order of the undersigned hearing officer, the caption of the case was amended, without objection, to add Kathryn Coriaty.

“[p]ublic records or files” means any recorded data or information relating to the conduct of the public’s business prepared, owned, used, received or retained by a public agency, or to which a public agency is entitled to receive a copy by law or contract under section 1-218, whether such data or information be handwritten, typed, tape-recorded, videotaped, printed, photostated, photographed or recorded by any other method.

6. Section 1-210(a), G.S. provides in relevant part that:

[e]xcept as otherwise provided by any federal law or state statute, all records maintained or kept on file by any public agency, whether or not such records are required by any law or by any rule or regulation, shall be public records and every person shall have the right to . . . (3) receive a copy of such records in accordance with section 1-212.

7. Section 1-212(a), G.S., provides in relevant part that “[a]ny person applying in writing shall receive, promptly upon request, a plain, facsimile, electronic or certified copy of any public record.”

8. It is concluded that the requested records are public records within the meaning of §§1-200(5) and 1-210(a), G.S.

9. At the contested case hearing, complainant Alex Coriaty testified that he observed the incident related to the requested records referenced in paragraph 2, above. Complainant Alex Coriaty also questioned the adequacy of the investigation and stated that he believed there was sufficient probable cause to make an arrest.

10. The respondents contended that the requested records were exempt from disclosure because they constitute “uncorroborated allegations,” within the meaning of §1-210(b)(3)(H), G.S.

11. On July 29, 2025, the respondents submitted the records at issue to the Commission for in camera inspection. Such records consist of police reports and video pertaining to case number 24-00014720.

12. With respect to the respondents’ claim that the records described in paragraph 2, above, constitute “uncorroborated allegations,” §1-210(b)(3)(H), G.S., provides, in relevant part, that, disclosure is not required of:

[r]ecords of law enforcement agencies not otherwise available to the public which records were compiled in connection with the detection or investigation of a crime, if the disclosure of said records would not be in the public interest because it would result in the disclosure of . . . (H) uncorroborated

allegations subject to destruction pursuant to section 1-216.

13. Section 1-216, G.S., provides as follows:

[e]xcept for records the retention of which is otherwise controlled by law or regulation, records of law enforcement agencies consisting of uncorroborated allegations that an individual has engaged in criminal activity shall be reviewed by the law enforcement agency one year after the creation of such records. If the existence of the alleged criminal activity cannot be corroborated within ninety days of the commencement of such review, the law enforcement agency shall destroy such records.

14. The Commission has interpreted the term “corroborate” to mean “to strengthen, to add weight or credibility to a thing by additional and confirming facts or evidence”, “to state facts tending to produce confidence in the truth of a statement made by another”, and “to give increased support to; make more sure or evident.” See e.g. Rachel Gottlieb and the Hartford Courant v. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Docket #FIC 94-291 (May 24, 1995).

15. With respect to the complainants’ claim regarding the adequacy of the investigation, it is not for this Commission to “review the actions of the law enforcement agency to see if the agency, in the opinion of the Commission, has conducted a sufficient investigation in order to obtain such corroboration.” Bona v. Freedom of Information Commission, 44 Conn. App. 622, 635 (1997).

16. After a careful review of the in camera records, it is found that the in camera records are records of a law enforcement agency, not otherwise available to the public, which were compiled in connection with the detection or investigation of crime within the meaning of §1-210(b)(3)(H), G.S.

17. It is also found that the in camera records constitute uncorroborated allegations, subject to destruction, and are permissibly exempt from disclosure, pursuant to §§1-210(b)(3)(H) and 1-216, G.S.

18. It is therefore concluded that the respondents did not violate the disclosure provisions of the FOI Act by withholding the requested records.

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

1. The complaint is hereby dismissed.

Approved by Order of the Freedom of Information Commission at its regular meeting of September 25, 2025.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Linda Fasciano", is written over a horizontal line.

Linda Fasciano


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:

**ALEX CORIATY AND KATHRYN CORIATY**, 14207 Maple Tree Lane, East Lyme, CT 06333

**CHIEF, POLICE DEPARTMENT, TOWN OF EAST LYME; POLICE DEPARTMENT, TOWN OF EAST LYME; AND TOWN OF EAST LYME**, c/o Attorney Tracy M. Collins, Waller Smith & Palmer, PC, 52 Eugene O'Neill Drive, New London, CT 06320



Linda Fasciano

Acting Clerk of the Commission