

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION  
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

FINAL DECISION

David C. Wold,

Complainant

against

Docket # FIC 2025-0285

First Selectman, Town of Greenwich; and  
Town of Greenwich,

Respondents

April 8, 2026

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on November 14, 2025, at which time the complainant and the respondents appeared, stipulated to certain facts, and presented testimony, exhibits and argument on the complaint.

Subsequent to the hearing in this matter, the complainant submitted a motion in support of receiving the flash-drive as a full exhibit. Absent objection from the respondents, the flash-drive is received into evidence as a full exhibit as Complainant's Exhibit J.

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 email dated April 11, 2025, the complainant made a request for all emails, communications, announcements, meeting minutes and/or other correspondence related to the flag raising for Vietnam Veterans Day and Norwegian National Flag raising (the "April 11" request).
3. By letter of complaint, dated and received April 24, 2025, the complainant appealed to this Commission, alleging that the respondents violated the Freedom of Information ("FOI") Act by failing to provide him with the records, described in paragraph 2, above.
4. It is found that, by letter dated June 6, 2025, the Commission informed the respondents of the complaint in this matter, and provided the respondents with a copy of the April 11 request.
5. Section 1-206(a), G.S., provides, in relevant part, that:

[a]ny denial of the right to inspect or copy records provided for under section 1-210 shall be made to the person requesting such right by the public agency official who has custody or control of

the public record, in writing within four business days of such request. . . Failure to comply with a request to so inspect or copy such public record within the applicable number of business days shall be deemed to be a denial.

6. Section 1-206(b)(1), G.S., provides in relevant part: “[a]ny person denied the right to inspect or copy records under 1-210... or denied any other right conferred by the Freedom of Information Act may appeal therefrom to the FOI Commission, by filing a notice of appeal with said commission....”

7. At the hearing in this matter, the respondents contended that they did not receive the April 11 request until they received notice from the Commission that the complaint was filed in this matter on or about June 6, 2025.

8. It is found that the complainant sent the April 11 request, referenced in paragraph 2, above, to the following email addresses: [fred.camillo@greenwichct.org](mailto:fred.camillo@greenwichct.org) and [kenneth.borsuk@greenwichct.org](mailto:kenneth.borsuk@greenwichct.org).

9. The Commission takes administrative notice that Fred Camillo’s email address is [fred.camillo@greenwichct.gov](mailto:fred.camillo@greenwichct.gov) and Kenneth Borsuk’s email address is [ken.borsuk@greenwichct.org](mailto:ken.borsuk@greenwichct.org).

10. At the hearing in this matter, the respondents testified that they checked both of the accounts for Mr. Camillo and Mr. Borsuk, as well as their mail inboxes, but did not locate the April 11 request.

11. Consequently, it is found that, at the time of the complaint, the respondents had not received the request, described in paragraph 2, above, and therefore had not denied the complainant’s request for records, or denied any other right under the FOI Act, within the meaning of §1-206(b)(1), G.S. Because there was no denial at the time of the complaint, it is concluded that the respondents did not violate the FOI Act under the facts of this case.

12. The Commission notes, however, that upon receiving notice of the complaint from the Commission, the respondents searched for responsive records, and provided responsive records to the complainant, on a thumb drive, on or about July 25, 2025, and again after realizing the first thumb drive’s data was corrupted.

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 April 8, 2026.


  
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:

**DAVID C. WOLD**, 45 Gerry Street, Greenwich, CT 06830

**FIRST SELECTMAN, TOWN OF GREENWICH; AND TOWN OF GREENWICH**, c/o Attorney Abby R. Wadler, Greenwich Town Attorney, 101 Field Point Road, Greenwich, CT 06830



Jennifer M. Mayo  
Acting Clerk of the Commission