

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Petition for Relief
From Vexatious Requester by

FINAL DECISION

Town of Greenwich, Greenwich Town
Attorney's Office, and Greenwich Police
Department,

Petitioners

against

PRVR #21

Caitlin Hayes,

Respondent

July 13, 2026

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on March 31, 2026, and May 7, 2026, at which times the Petitioners appeared and presented exhibits and argument on the Petition for Relief from Vexatious Requester (the "Petition"), but Respondent Hayes did not appear for either hearing. The Petitioners also presented testimony during both hearings.

The presiding hearing officer took administrative notice of all communications submitted to the Commission regarding the Petition and so notified the parties at the outset of the first hearing on March 31, 2026.

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

1. The Petitioners are public agencies within the meaning of §1-200(1), G.S.

I. THE PETITION AND THE PROCEDURE FOLLOWING ITS FILING

2. On July 16, 2025, the Petitioners filed with the Freedom of Information ("FOI") Commission a Petition for Relief from Vexatious Requester, dated July 16, 2025, pursuant to §1-206(b)(6), G.S.¹

3. Section 1-206(b)(6), G.S., provides, in relevant part:

Notwithstanding any provision of this subsection, a public agency may petition the commission for relief from a requester that the public agency alleges is a vexatious requester. Such petition shall be

¹ The Petitioners mistakenly cited to §1-206(b)(5), G.S., in their Petition. Section 1-206(b)(5), G.S., grants the Commission the authority to impose civil penalties on public agencies, and §1-206(b)(6), G.S., affords public agencies the ability to petition the Commissioner for relief from vexatious requesters. Based upon the text of the above-described statutory subdivisions, as well as the substance of the Petitioners' pleadings, described in paragraph 5, below, the Commission interprets the Petition as seeking relief pursuant to §1-206(b)(6), G.S. and adjudicates such Petition accordingly herein.

sworn under penalty of false statement, as provided in section 53a-157b, and shall detail the conduct which the agency alleges *demonstrates a vexatious history of requests*, including, but not limited to: (A) The number of requests filed and the total number of pending requests; (B) the scope of the requests; (C) the nature, content, language or subject matter of the requests; (D) the nature, content, language or subject matter of other oral and written communications to the agency from the requester; and (E) a pattern of conduct that amounts to an abuse of the right to access information under the Freedom of Information Act or an interference with the operation of the agency. Upon receipt of such petition, the executive director of the commission shall review the petition and determine whether it warrants a hearing. [...] If the executive director determines that a hearing is warranted, the commission shall serve upon all parties, by certified or registered mail, a copy of such petition together with any other notice or order of the commission. The commission shall, after due notice to the parties, hear and either grant or deny the petition within one year after its filing. Upon a grant of such petition, the commission may provide appropriate relief commensurate with the vexatious conduct, including, but not limited to, an order that the agency need not comply with future requests from the vexatious requester for a specified period of time, but not to exceed one year. [. . .]

(Emphasis added.)

4. The Petitioners have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a requester is vexatious under §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

5. In their Petition, the Petitioners alleged that Respondent Hayes is a vexatious requester and detailed examples of FOI requests and conduct that they believe demonstrate that the Respondent has a vexatious history. In addition, the Petitioners claimed that Respondent Hayes has “engaged in a pattern of conduct that amounted to abuse of the right to access information under the [FOI] Act and an interference with the operation of the agency.” The Petitioners further alleged that “the nature, content, language or subject matter of other oral and written communications to the agency” from the Respondent demonstrates her vexatious history.

6. On August 26, 2025, the Commission provided the parties with a “Notice of Receipt of Petition for Relief from Vexatious Requester,” wherein it attached a copy of the Petition and informed the parties that: (a) the attachments to the Petition (330 pages) would be transmitted to them via email and (b) the Executive Director would review the Petition and determine whether it warrants a hearing pursuant to §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

7. After conducting the required review pursuant to §1-206(b)(6), G.S., the Executive Director issued a Notice of Hearing and Order to Show Cause on the Petition (“Order to Show Cause”) on January 21, 2026, setting a hearing date on the Petition.

II. DEFINITION OF THE TERM “VEXATIOUS” IN §1-206(b)(6), G.S.; AND THE PHRASE “PATTERN OF CONDUCT” THAT AMOUNTS TO AN “ABUSE OF THE RIGHT TO ACCESS INFORMATION UNDER THE FOI ACT” OR AN “INTERFERENCE WITH THE OPERATION OF THE AGENCY” IN §1-206(b)(6)(E), G.S.

8. In Petition for Relief from Vexatious Requester #1; Town of East Lyme and East Lyme Board of Education v. David Godbout (Feb. 26, 2020) (“PRVR #1”), the Commission analyzed the meaning of, and ultimately defined, several terms set forth in §1-206(b)(6), G.S., as follows:

- a. “Vexatious” means “causing vexation: distressing; intended to harass.”
- b. “Pattern of Conduct” requires a showing of recurring incidents or repetitive behavior on the part of the requester.
- c. “Abuse of the right to access information under the FOI Act” requires the Commission to assess the cumulative nature of the requester’s requests and conduct, and their effect on the petitioning agency.
- d. “Interference with the operation of the agency” requires the Commission to assess whether the requests and conduct exhibited by the requester significantly obstructs or hinders the petitioning agency’s ability to carry out its responsibilities and functions.

9. The courts have concluded that the Commission appropriately defined the term “vexatious” and applied the words and phrases identified in paragraph 8, above, in determining that a respondent is a vexatious requester within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6), G.S. *See Matthew Olson v. Freedom of Info. Comm’n*, Superior Court, Judicial District of New Britain, Docket No. CV22-6076363-S (August 30, 2024), *aff’d*, 238 Conn. App. 625 (April 21, 2026) (petition for certification pending).

III. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

10. In paragraph 4 of the Commission’s January 21, 2026, Order to Show Cause, the Commission’s Executive Director ordered Respondent Hayes to appear on the noticed date and time at the noticed place, warning that “[f]ailure to appear may lead to the granting of the petition and the imposition of appropriate relief.” Paragraph 3 of such Order to Show Cause likewise ordered the Petitioners to appear, similarly warning that “[f]ailure to appear may lead to denial of the petition.”

11. On February 23, 2026, the Commission issued a “Notice of Postponement,” rescheduling the initial hearing scheduled for February 24, 2026, due to the unavailability of the then-designated hearing officer. In such notice, the Commission instructed the parties to notify

the Commission's Acting Clerk, within the next two business days, of any dates during the subsequent eight (8) weeks during which the parties would be unavailable.

12. Later in the day, on February 23, 2026, Respondent Hayes replied to the Notice of Postponement via email four (4) separate times, stating the following:

- a. At 3:17 p.m.: "Im [sic] not looking at it – You just cheat and steal and act like you win fair AND SQUARE I allege[.]"
- b. At 3:18 p.m.: "I'm waiting for Press now and going to interview all over the nation and talk about how lawyers for municipalities and cops should be held equally culpable for the crimes they cover up."
- c. At 3:22 p.m.: "You are all literally in conspiracy I allege for a little boy still being allegedly abused – and for destroying a mandatory report I made in good faith [sic] 5/25/23 – alleging molestation and wife beating allegations based on a mothers [sic] testimony to me and pictures..[sic] I got arrested 7/2023. That will only be your legacy."
- d. At 4:03 p.m.: "Are you pedophiles too? Just asking for the people?"

13. On February 24, 2026, the Petitioners' counsel emailed the Commission and Respondent Hayes and inquired whether March 17, 2026, would be a possible date for the rescheduled hearing. By email later that day, the Commission's Acting Clerk responded to the parties that the then-designated hearing officer was not available that day.

14. Later in the day, on February 24, 2026, Respondent Hayes replied two separate times to the emails described in paragraph 13, above, stating the following:

- a. At 1:13 p.m.: "I can't do that date. I am unavailable until May. Regards,"
- b. At 1:45 p.m.: "Harass someone else in the meantime."

15. Later in the day, on February 24, 2026, at 2:59 p.m., the Petitioners' counsel sent two (2) dates that were convenient for the Petitioners for the rescheduled hearing.

16. Later in the day, on February 24, 2026, Respondent Hayes replied three (3) separate times to the email described in paragraph 15, above, stating the following:

- a. At 3:42 p.m.: "Why am I included in this if my availability doesn't matter?"
- b. At 3:42 p.m.: "I cannot do until May- what wasn't clear? I'm bus [sic] w work done w BS [sic]"

- c. At 4:05 p.m.: “I demand this is dismissed I made foia [sic] under my law firm only that’s a corporation[.]”

17. On March 2, 2026, the Commission issued a “Notice of Scheduled In-Person Hearing,” informing the parties that the initial hearing had been rescheduled for March 31, 2026.

18. Later in the day on March 2, 2026, at 5:43 p.m., Respondent Hayes replied to the Commission’s Acting Clerk regarding the notice described in paragraph 17, above, stating, “I cannot make it that date. So cheat and get the finding w/o my appearance if you want. You illegally denied me an adjournment in my complaint.”²

19. The following day, on March 3, 2026, Respondent Hayes emailed the Commission’s Acting Clerk five (5) separate times, stating the following:

- a. At 5:00 a.m.: “I’m not a child, and I will sue you for all of the illegality of your office I allege. I am not going- I cannot go I advised already- You gave Greenwich courtesies which YOu [sic] did not give me – you are probably paid off to [sic]. You have not advised how to request and [sic] adjournment.

I DON’T TRUST YOU OR FOIA OR CT [...][.]”

- b. At 5:01 a.m.: “In fact= [sic] what you did in denying me adjournment after your boss stated I would be granted one – you will be added to my appeal in NYC against CT – so be mindful I believe you are in conspiracy against my rights [...].”
- c. At 5:03 a.m.: “I will be FOIA – [sic] your office and asking for the message I left for your boss highlighting how clear it was that someone from Greenwich called him to try to get me to drop my complaint against you all before you illegally denied my adjournment request after he advised I would be granted it.

YOU CHEATERS WILL NOT WIN[.]”

- d. At 5:10 a.m.: “[Acting Clerk] I allege you are a pedophile supporter and cover uper [sic] as well as I allege [Petitioners’ counsel] is. So Whatever [sic] you say about me at least I didn’t hear allegations of a boy being molested and did nothing like [Petitioners’ counsel] did.”
- e. At 5:12 a.m.: [Petitioners’ counsel] I HOPE THAT HAUNTS YOU – since we got a report from 2/2025 the kids is still allegedly being

² The Commission notes that the Respondent was likely referring to a separate complaint that she filed against the Petitioner First Selectmen of the Town. *See* paragraphs 54 through 56, below.

abused. good [sic] job ladies from 5/25/23 mandatory report that was deleted that you both personally covered up I allege.”

20. The first hearing ultimately convened, as scheduled, on March 31, 2026, at 11:05 a.m. The Petitioners appeared with two witnesses: John Sykes, a paralegal for the Greenwich Town Attorney’s Office; and Ana Oliveira, a paralegal for Karsten & Tallberg, LLC, whose firm represented the Petitioners in a federal action brought by Respondent Hayes.³ Respondent Hayes failed to appear. The March 31, 2026, hearing adjourned at 1:43 p.m. after the admission of documentary evidence, witness testimony, and opening statement by the Petitioners. Because the Petitioners had not concluded their case in chief, the hearing was adjourned to a future date to be determined.

21. On April 6, 2026, after receiving the Commission’s “Notice of Continued Hearing” for the May 7, 2026, continued hearing on this matter, Respondent Hayes emailed the Commission’s Acting Clerk two separate times:

- a. At 7:01 p.m.: “I can recount each email I received as retaliation for me calling out the crimes against my family you all conspired w [sic][.]”
- b. At 7:03 p.m.: “All he has is your [sic] guys left in his dirty pocket[.] I started my process in NY I’m not dealing w anyone from your freedom office in CT[.] They covered up destroyed bodycam felony during bogus criminal investigation[.]”

22. The second hearing convened on May 7, 2026, at 2:37 p.m. The Petitioners appeared with three witnesses: John Sykes; Ken Borsuk, executive assistant to the Greenwich First Selectman; and James Bonney, Deputy Chief of the Greenwich Police Department. Respondent Hayes again failed to appear. The May 7, 2026, hearing adjourned at 5:09 p.m. after the admission of additional documentary evidence, witness testimony, and closing argument by the Petitioners. The Petitioners chose to make oral argument in closing in lieu of filing a post-hearing brief. Respondent Hayes did not submit any post-hearing filings to the Commission.

IV. RESPONDENT HAYES’ FOI REQUESTS, RELATED CONDUCT, AND COMMUNICATIONS

23. In their Petition, documentary submissions, and witness testimony at the hearings on this matter, the Petitioners set forth evidence of Respondent Hayes’ various FOI requests and her conduct related thereto. Such requests, communications, and conduct are detailed in the findings set forth in paragraphs 24 through 37, below.⁴

³ See *Caitlin Hayes, et al. v. Alfred Camillo, et al.*, 3:25-cv-00552-VDO.

⁴ The Commission notes that, despite being afforded ample opportunity to do so, Respondent Hayes did not appear to proffer any documentary evidence or provide any testimony in this matter.

24. It is found that, on October 7, 2021, Respondent Hayes made her first FOI request to several members of the Petitioner Town's board of education, copied to the town clerk, first selectman, town attorney, and a state senator. It is found that this request sought nine categories of records relating to COVID-19 testing and vaccination, school curriculum, school district mask policies, and messages from board of education members or the superintendent to various elected officials regarding vaccination centers, salary increases, and private pharmaceutical companies. It is found that the Petitioners acknowledged such request and requested that Respondent Hayes narrow its scope, but she never responded. It is found that, given Respondent Hayes' lack of response, the Petitioners did not proceed with processing such request.

25. It is found that, during the two years subsequent to Respondent Hayes' first request, described in paragraph 24, above, she made no further requests until after a series of precipitating incidents that led to her arrest by the Petitioner Greenwich Police Department ("GPD") and felony charges in state court. It is found that, following such incidents, Respondent Hayes dramatically increased her volume of FOI requests made to the Petitioners Town and GPD.

A. The genesis of Respondent Hayes' numerous, voluminous, and continuous FOI requests and related conduct stemmed from several incidents in summer 2023 that resulted in her arrest by Petitioner GPD and multiple felony charges.

26. It is found that Respondent Hayes' FOI requests and related conduct, referenced in paragraphs 27 through 37, below, began as a reaction to her arrest by Petitioner GPD and felony charges in Superior Court in summer 2023.

27. It is found that, in July 2023, Respondent Hayes was arrested and charged with the following felonies:

- a. first-degree larceny for issuing a bad check for over \$2,000 to her landlords for her tenancy at a Greenwich address and
- b. first-degree criminal property damage for causing approximately \$90,000 in repairs and lost property prior to her eviction from her tenancy at such Greenwich address (e.g., furniture damage, drain damage due to dried cement poured down a sink, and broken floor tiles, among other damages).

28. Following such charges, described in paragraph 27, above, it is found that Respondent Hayes began bombarding Town departments, including the Petitioner GPD and Petitioner Town's Office of the First Selectman, with numerous and voluminous FOI requests, and corresponding emails, telephone calls, and voicemail messages.

B. The volume, scope, and nature of Respondent Hayes' FOI requests to the Petitioners demonstrate a history of vexatious requests within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

29. It is found that for the period relevant to the Petition (i.e., October 7, 2021, through July 16, 2025), Respondent Hayes made approximately thirty-six⁵ (36) FOI requests across all Petitioners in this matter, submitting thirty-four (34) of such requests during the period from her July 2023 felony charges and the filing date of the Petition.^{6, 7}

30. It is found that many of the requests made by Respondent Hayes during the period covered by the Petition were extensive in scope, containing multiple parts or seeking a broad range of records (or both). The volume and scope of the Respondent's requests are illustrated by the following examples:

- a. On August 18, 2023, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a request seeking records relating to sixty-six (66) different GPD case numbers.
- b. On November 27, 2023, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioners Town of Greenwich, GPD, and the Greenwich Public Library a request for thirteen (13) categories of records pertaining to the following:
 - i. correspondence regarding or between the GPD, her former landlords, and herself, along with any related bodycam imagery;
 - ii. disciplinary records relating to certain GPD detectives;

⁵ The Petitioners, in Exhibit Y, indicate that the Respondent had also submitted seven (7) FOI requests to the Petitioner GPD *after* the Petition was filed on July 16, 2025. While requests which post-date the Petition may be relevant to other portions of the Commission's analysis in determining whether the Respondent meets the standard for a vexatious requester (e.g., to show an ongoing pattern of conduct), such requests are excluded for the purposes of determining the volume of requests made by the Respondent *at the time of the Petition*.

⁶ The Petition alleges conduct by Respondent Hayes beginning on October 7, 2021, through the date the Petition was filed, July 16, 2025. During the course of this proceeding, the Petitioners submitted additional evidence of Respondent Hayes' conduct through May 7, 2025.

⁷ The Commission acknowledges that, although the number of requests filed by Respondent Hayes in this matter is far less than the number of requests filed by the respondent in PRVR #1, *Town of East Lyme, et al. v. David Godbout* (February 26, 2020), it exceeds the number of requests filed by the respondent in PRVR #4, *City of Stamford v. Matthew Olson* (November 23, 2022). In the instant Petition, thirty-four requests by Respondent Hayes over a two-year period to the same public agency is significant and tends to support a history of vexatious requests and an abuse of the right to access information under the FOI Act. See *Lowther v. Freedom of Info. Comm'n*, 2021 WL 4394404, *6, (September 1, 2021) *aff'd*, 220 Conn. App. 48 (2023) (citing *Smith v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 2016 WL 4498174 *4 (July 19, 2026) ("the fact that the plaintiff filed thirty-two complaints with the commission in the past two years *in and of itself* represents an abuse of the system.")). (Emphasis added.)

- iii. records of all library books and DVDs related to an August 2, 2023, letter from the library to the Respondent; and
 - iv. correspondence between the GPD chief, certain GPD detectives, the Petitioner Town's officials, Greenwich Library staff, and Governor Lamont, among others, from September 2021 through November 26, 2023.
- c. On February 6, 2024, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a records request seeking records relating to thirty-five (35) different GPD case numbers.
- d. On September 6, 2024, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioners Town of Greenwich, GPD, and Greenwich Public Library a request for thirteen (13) categories of records pertaining to topics similar to the request described in paragraph 30(b), above.
- e. On September 16, 2024, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner Town of Greenwich a request seeking records relating to several categories of records pertaining to the following:
 - i. body worn camera footage depicting incidents at the Greenwich rental address on April 18, 2025, and May 7, 8, and 25, 2025;
 - ii. the police report from April 17, 2023, at the Greenwich rental address, along with body worn camera footage; and
 - iii. body worn camera footage from December 24, 2023, depicting an officer's conversation with her former landlord at the Greenwich rental address.
- f. On December 2, 2024, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a records request seeking records relating to fifteen (15) different GPD case numbers.
- g. On December 16, 2024, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioners Town of Greenwich and the GPD a records request for (i) GPD Chief James Heavey's employment contract and (ii) correspondences regarding any pay raises for the Chief from January 1, 2020, through December 16, 2024.
- h. Later in the day, on December 16, 2024, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioners Town of Greenwich and the GPD a records request for written and electronic correspondences, phone calls, and body

worn camera footage between State Senator Ryan Fazio, First Selectman Fred Camillo, her former landlords, GPD Chief Heavy, GPD Officer Tramotano, and herself.

- i. On March 3, 2025, Respondent Hayes submitted a handwritten records request to the Petitioner Town of Greenwich for records relating to (i) a “bad check packet” completed at GPD and (ii) an “April 17 bad check investigation.”
- j. On April 1, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a request seeking records relating to thirty-nine (39) different GPD case numbers.
- k. On May 6, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a request seeking records relating to forty-four (44) different GPD case numbers.
- l. On May 13, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a request seeking records relating to twenty-two (22) different GPD case numbers.
- m. On May 14, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioners Town of Greenwich and the GPD a request relating to six (6) categories of records pertaining to the following:
 - i. the relationship between the GPD police union, Silver Shield, Petitioner Town employees, the library, and elected officials;
 - ii. correspondence, phone calls, and body worn camera footage between her former landlords for the Greenwich rental address, Sergeant O’Neill, First Selectman Camillo, and GPD Chief Heavy for dates between March 25, 2023, and May 14, 2025; and
 - iii. the disciplinary history for Sergeant O’Neill.
- n. Also on May 14, 2025, Respondent Hayes emailed the Petitioner GPD a separate request for “all disciplinary reports on this alleged dirty cop [Sergeant O’Neill] and all records with his name on it all reports he ever took and the body cams [sic][.]”
- o. On June 3, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent the Petitioner GPD a request seeking records relating to sixteen (16) different GPD case numbers.

31. It is further found that, in making the requests described in paragraph 30, above, Respondent Hayes utilized several tactics to overwhelm the Petitioners and frustrate their efforts

to not only reply to and comply with her requests, but also perform their other functions. Such tactics included overwhelming the Petitioners' staff with follow-up emails, phone calls, and voicemails demanding updates and taunting them with accusations and personal attacks.

32. It is found that, for the period of August 4, 2023, through March 18, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent at least two hundred seventy-six (276) emails to the Petitioner GPD concerning her FOI requests described in paragraph 29, above. It is further found that the Respondent sent many of such emails in rapid succession in the course of a single day or several days, described as follows:

- a. Over the course of three (3) consecutive days, the Respondent sent at least twenty-four (24) emails regarding her FOI requests at the following times:
 - i. November 20, 2023, at 4:16 a.m., 4:28 a.m., 9:59 a.m., 10:01 a.m., 3:29 p.m., 3:31 p.m., 4:43 p.m., and 4:49 p.m.;
 - ii. November 21, 2023, at 8:49 a.m., 8:51 a.m., 8:54 a.m., 9:03 a.m., 9:04 a.m., 9:06 a.m., 9:17 a.m., 9:19 a.m., 9:28 a.m., 9:40 a.m., and 12:36 p.m.; and
 - iii. November 22, 2023, at 6:33 a.m., 6:53 a.m., 9:18 a.m., 9:20 a.m., and 9:23 a.m.
- b. Over the course of four (4) consecutive days, Respondent Hayes sent at least forty (40) emails regarding her FOI requests at the following times:
 - i. On April 2, 2024, at 2:25 p.m., 2:44 p.m., 2:47 p.m., 2:49 p.m., 2:58 p.m., and 3:18 p.m.;
 - ii. On April 3, 2024, at 7:29 a.m., 8:14 a.m., 9:25 a.m., 9:27 a.m., 9:38 a.m., 11:11 a.m., 1:49 p.m., and 1:54 p.m.;
 - iii. On April 4, 2024, at 3:19 p.m., 3:22 p.m., 3:46 p.m., 3:47 p.m., 3:49 p.m., 3:50 p.m., 3:51 p.m., 3:55 p.m., 3:57 p.m., 4:07 p.m., 4:09 p.m., 4:11 p.m., 4:17 p.m., 4:35 p.m.; and
 - iv. On April 5, 2024, at 3:57 a.m., 2:05 p.m., 3:43 p.m., 3:52 p.m., 4:01 p.m., 4:05 p.m., 4:15 p.m., 4:35 p.m., 5:35 p.m., 5:37 p.m., 5:38 p.m., and 5:46 p.m.

33. It is further found that the sampling of Respondent Hayes' email frequency to the Petitioner GPD, identified in paragraph 32, above, did not consist of separate or distinct requests for records or inquiries on the status of pending records requests. Rather, it is found that such emails were sent by the Respondent in rapid succession, as demonstrated on April 5, 2024, described in paragraph 32(b)(iv), above, to taunt and verbally abuse the Petitioner GPD. It is found that Respondent Hayes sent the following emails to Petitioner GPD on such date, in which she wrote, in relevant part:

- a. At 3:52 p.m.: "You said it was destroyed in time of bodycam laws I'm Not scrolling again right now or Makes me want to vomit. stop Being alleged liars just stop enough is enough – [...] I never lied once To you backstabbers [...]."
- b. At 4:01 p.m.: "Of who destroyed them and who commanded them Destroyed. Thx. After a FOIA you destroy the body-cams I requested – Wanton Reckless w mal intent it's outrageous – just cause you have badges !? Let's take those away then, right Commissioner?"
- c. At 4:15 p.m.: "And a list of who watched it[.]"
- d. At 4:35 p.m.: "What chief Heavey you wanted to erased evidence of the bad acts of your alleged agents or bosses [my former landlords]?"
- e. At 5:35 p.m.: "Last point Chief[.] I want to Know the actual Dollar amount that was allegedly spent to You directly or silver shield or [detective] quezada – to abuse me and my kids please[.]"
- f. At 5:37 p.m.: "That way – after I get my expected verdicts and damages award I can tell You how much more I got and how then you'll Have to return any monies allegedly illegally gotten to harm Innocent children."
- g. At 5:38 p.m.: "Good luck looking in the mirror. Ps[.] Don't members of the force have athletic standards??"
- h. At 5:46 p.m.: "Your Resignation Chief Heavey! I allege that you Don't destroy too many records before then because guess what backups always exist you just need the tech professionals[.] #BambisWorld [rainbow emoji][.]"

34. Likewise, it is found that, for the period October 7, 2021, through March 20, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent at least one hundred twenty-seven (127) emails to the Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Fred Camillo⁸ concerning her FOI requests described in

⁸ The Commission notes that Mr. Camillo served as both First Selectman and Police Commissioner for the Petitioner Town of Greenwich at the times relevant to the instant Petition.

paragraph 29, above. It is found that one hundred twenty-four (124) of such emails were sent following Respondent Hayes' July 2023 felony charges, described in paragraph 27, above. It is further found that the Respondent sent many of such emails in rapid succession in the course of a single day or several days, described as follows:

- a. Over the course of three (3) consecutive days, the Respondent sent at least seventeen (17) emails regarding her FOI requests at the following times:
 - i. November 20, 2023, at 4:43 p.m., 4:49 p.m., 6:17 p.m., and 6:39 p.m.;
 - ii. November 21, 2023, at 3:51 a.m., 8:49 a.m., 8:54 a.m., 9:06 a.m., 9:17 a.m., 9:19 a.m., 9:28 a.m., 9:40 a.m., and 12:36 p.m.; and
 - iii. November 22, 2023, at 6:33 a.m., 9:14 a.m., 9:18 a.m., and 9:18 a.m.
- b. Over the course of four (4) consecutive days, the Respondent sent at least forty (40) emails regarding her FOI requests at the following times:
 - i. April 3, 2024, at 7:29 a.m., 9:25 a.m., 9:27 a.m., and 1:49 p.m.;
 - ii. April 4, 2024, at 3:47 p.m., 3:50 p.m., 3:51 p.m., 3:55 p.m., 3:56 p.m., 4:07 p.m., 4:09 p.m., 4:11 p.m., 4:17 p.m., and 4:35 p.m.;
 - iii. April 5, 2024, at 3:22 a.m., 3:29 a.m., 3:31 a.m., 3:33 a.m., 3:35 a.m., 3:41 a.m., 3:41 a.m., 3:44 a.m., 3:57 a.m., 7:06 a.m., 7:06 a.m., 7:08 a.m., 7:12 a.m., 7:31 a.m., 7:34 a.m., 7:44 a.m., 7:50 a.m., 8:35 a.m., 8:42 a.m., 8:44 a.m., 9:13 a.m., 10:06 a.m.; and
 - iv. April 6, 2024, at 7:27 a.m., 7:28 a.m., 7:32 a.m., and 2:12 p.m.

35. It is further found that the sampling of Respondent Hayes' email frequency to the Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Camillo, identified in paragraph 34, above, did not contain separate or distinct requests for records or inquiries on the status of pending records requests. Rather, it is found that such emails were likewise sent by the Respondent in

rapid succession on April 5, 2024, as described in paragraph 34(b)(iii), above, to taunt and verbally abuse the Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner, as in the following example, in relevant part:

- a. At 3:22 a.m.: “My first request for Mr. Camillo’s resignation.”
- b. At 3:29 a.m.: “[Chief] Heavy [sic] should also resign. NON actions further compound the outrageous crimes I allege I was victim to, include this alleged crime of the police tampering with the evidence, destroying criminal records pending adjudication [...] FRED NEVER TALK TO ME AGAIN [...] FRED SHAME ON YOU SAME ON YOU SHAME ON YOU
!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!”
- c. At 3:31 a.m.: “ALL ALLEGEDLY COVERING UP CRIMES AGAINST ME AND MY KIDS[.] FRED YOU ARE NOT WORTHY OF THE POSITION YOU HOLD IN MY OPINION YOU ARE A FAKE AND A COWARD [...] SHAME ON GREENWICH[.]”
- d. At 3:33 a.m.: “ALLEGEDLY TOWNIES GONE CORRUPT RIGHT? CAMILLO AND HEAVEY [...]”
- e. At 3:35 a.m.: “NOW LET’S FOLLOW THE MONEY TRAIL. FRED I ALLEGE YOU ARE NOT A FRIEND YOU ARE JUST A REGULAR DIRTY OLD POLITICIAN UNDER INFO AND BELIEF[.]”
- f. At 3:41 a.m.: “LAUREN REMEMBER THE INFO I ASKED OF YOU MONTHS AGO =[sic]-about mandatory reporting- well GUESS WHAT THEY DESTROYED IT AFTER ALSO YOU ASKED ABOUT IT. may 25 destroyed bodycam (destroyed after I requested it I allege) SO NOT ONLY DID GPD NOT INVESTIGATE ALLEGATIONS OF SEXUAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN, THEY DESTROYED THE EVIDENCE OF THE REPORT BODYCAM AND OMMITED FROM THE WRITTEN REPORT/[sic][.]”
- g. At 3:41 a.m.: “Fred is there something else you want to tell us all?”
- h. At 3:44 a.m.: “AND FRED KNOWS THIS ALL PROBABLY (MAYBE HE INSTRUCTED THEM TO DESTROY IT) BASED ON A POLITICAL CONTRIBUTION>[sic]???) AND HE STILL

SAYS BETWEEN ME AND COPS – KEN HOW ARE YOU
STILL WORKING FOR HIM????? YOU WILL BE
SUBPOENAED HOW MUCH ELSE DO YOU KNOW?????”

- i. At 7:08 a.m.: “[...] IT IS GAME ON BASTARDS.]”
- j. At 7:12 a.m.: “[...] MAY KARMA BE SWIFT[.]”

36. It is found that, for the period October 7, 2021, through March 20, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent at least one hundred fifty-three (153) emails to the Petitioner Town of Greenwich Law Department concerning her FOI requests described in paragraph 29, above. It is found that one hundred thirty-nine (139) of such emails were sent following Respondent Hayes’ July 2023 felony charges, described in paragraph 27, above. It is further found that Respondent Hayes sent many of her emails in rapid succession in the course of a single day or several days, described as follows:

- a. Over the course of three (3) consecutive days, Respondent Hayes sent at least seventeen (17) emails regarding her FOI requests at the following times:
 - i. On November 20, 2023, at 4:43 p.m., 4:49 p.m., 6:17 p.m., and 6:39 p.m.;
 - ii. On November 21, 2023, at 3:51 a.m., 8:49 a.m., 8:54 a.m., 9:06 a.m., 9:17 a.m., 9:19 a.m., 9:28 a.m., 9:40 a.m., and 12:36 p.m.; and
 - iii. On November 22, 2023, at 6:33 a.m., 9:14 a.m., 9:18 a.m., and 9:18 a.m.
- b. Over the course of three (3) consecutive days, Respondent Hayes sent at least seventeen (17) emails regarding her FOI requests at the following times:
 - i. On April 3, 2024, at 7:29 a.m., 9:25 a.m., 9:27 a.m., and 1:49 p.m.;
 - ii. On April 4, 2024, at 3:47 p.m., 3:50 p.m., 3:51 p.m., 3:55 p.m., 3:56 p.m., 4:07 p.m., 4:09 p.m., 4:11 p.m., 4:17 p.m., and 4:35 p.m.; and
 - iii. On April 5, 2024, at 3:29 a.m., 3:31 a.m., 3:33 a.m., 3:35 a.m., 3:41 a.m., 3:41 a.m., 3:44 a.m., 3:57 a.m.,

7:06 a.m., 7:06 a.m., 7:08 a.m., 7:12 a.m., 7:31 a.m.,
7:34 a.m., 7:44 a.m., 7:50 a.m., 8:35 a.m., 8:42 a.m.,
8:44 a.m., 9:13 a.m., and 10:06 a.m.

37. It is further found that the sampling of Respondent Hayes' email frequency to the Petitioner Greenwich Law Department, identified in paragraph 36, above, did not contain separate or distinct requests for records or inquiries on the status of pending records requests. Rather, it is found that such emails were likewise sent by the Respondent in rapid succession on April 4, 2024, as described in paragraph 36(b)(ii), above, to taunt and verbally abuse the Petitioner, as in the following example, in relevant part:

- a. At 3:55 p.m.: "[...] I am at my lawyer's office so I won't say what I wanted to...but disgust is an understatement."
- b. At 3:56 p.m.: "Not sure how you deal w this behavior [...] xo[.]"
- c. At 4:09 p.m.: "I am sure I advised not to destroy evidence and for a pending criminal case? You can't disclose it but you can destroy it? Wowo where are the lawyers??? (accused Chief of destroying evidence) [.]"
- d. At 4:11 p.m.: "Just collecting me and voicing my opinion w the people because the authorities set me up I allege to try to set me up again huh I allege? Ok I'm done I'll wait for [...] Those records[.]"
- e. At 4:17 p.m.: [sparkling heart emoji]

38. Based on the foregoing, it is found that a significant number of Respondent Hayes' requests relevant to the Petition were not made to access public records. Rather, it is found that the Respondent, operating under the guise of seeking public records, used many of her requests as a platform by which she could air her grievances against the Petitioners as well as castigate and, in some instances, threaten retaliation against public officials and employees for perceived wrongdoing.

39. Accordingly, it is found that the volume, scope, and nature of Respondent Hayes' requests, along with her corresponding communications pertinent to the Petition, supports a finding that she is a vexatious requester within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

C. The nature, content, language, or subject matter of other oral or written communications to the agency demonstrates that Respondent Hayes is a vexatious requester within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6)(D), G.S.

40. It is found that, in addition to communications regarding her records requests, described in paragraphs 32 through 37, above, Respondent Hayes engaged in a pattern of

offensive and abusive communication, both oral and written, with the Petitioners during the time relevant to the Petition.

41. It is found that the instances of oral communications to the Petitioners by Respondent Hayes shared many characteristics with her records communications described in paragraphs 32 through 37, above, such as incessant, nonsensical attacks; prolific profanity; disturbing allegations; and demeaning, ominous, and intimidating language.

42. It is found that one instance representative of such oral communication includes a voicemail from Respondent Hayes to the Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Camillo, a cancer survivor, sent on November 7, 2025, at 7:52 a.m. It is found that the Respondent left such voicemail on the same day that she filed an amended complaint in federal court against the Petitioners, alleging, among other things, a conspiracy among the Petitioners to destroy records relevant to the criminal matters described in paragraph 27, above.⁹ In such voicemail, Respondent Hayes states the following:

Fred, you piece of shit. Attorney Hayes, here. So, remember on July 2nd when you illegally falsely arrested me, and then on August 13th where you had me illegally evicted? [...] Do you know what a *piece of shit* you are? Fred Camillo, I hope you rot in *hell*. I hope your cancer comes back. I hope you have a *painful, painful* cancer treatment. And I hope your hair falls out. And your f[----]n' eyebrows fall out. I *hate* you, Fred Camillo. I *hate* you, what you did to me and my family. I *haaaaaate* you. Burn in hell, bitch.

Go suck [my landlord's] d[---]. Maybe he needs you today. Your buddy needs you. You – your daddy needs you. Go suck [my landlord's] d[---] today, Fred. I hate you.

43. It is found that written correspondence sent by Respondent Hayes to the Petitioners is similarly abusive. In addition to those emails described in paragraphs 32 through 37, above, Respondent Hayes has sent the following emails to the Petitioners as part of communications tangential to her FOI requests:

- a. On October 12, 2024, to Petitioners First Selectman Camillo, GPD Chief Heavey, and Town Attorney Barbara Schellenberg: “Are you people all devil worshippers? Do you together praise satan?”
- b. On December 16, 2024, to Petitioner GPD: “I prefer it presented as A freedom of info so that when, I allege, my case is nollod and all

⁹ See *Caitlin Hayes, et al. v. Alfred Camillo, et al.*, 3:25-cv-00552-VDO.

records are expunged I still have it for my civil litigation.....
JUSTICE FOR BAMBI!!!!!!”¹⁰

- c. On March 20, 2025, to an assistant attorney for the Petitioner Law Department: “Tell [Petitioners’ counsel] she is being sued too. Criminal proceeding that was brought w malice and where evidence was destroyed and where I never got the bad check letter fu! Leave me alone liars I’ll see you in court.” And later that same day: “[Petitioners’ counsel,] stop pissing me off.”

44. It is found that Respondent Hayes utilizes the pretense of a records request and follow-up correspondence to ensnare the Petitioners and make them a captive audience to her grievances, insults, and attacks.

45. Accordingly, based upon the foregoing, it is found that Respondent Hayes’ other communications with the Petitioners (both written and oral) support a finding that she is a vexatious requester within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

D. Other factors are also relevant as to whether Respondent Hayes is a vexatious requester within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

46. As noted in paragraph 3, above, the Commission’s determination as to whether a requester is vexatious is not limited to those factors expressly enumerated in §1-206(b)(6), G.S.

Citizen Complaints to the Petitioner Police Department

47. It is found that, from the period of July 23, 2023, through March 16, 2024, Respondent Hayes filed five “Civilian Complaint Reports” (hereinafter “complaint reports”) with the Petitioner GPD related to her FOI requests.

48. It is found that such complaint reports occasionally contained requests for body camera footage, alleged destruction of records requested by Respondent Hayes in prior FOI requests, and leveled accusations of conspiratorial criminality against GPD leadership and employees. The following describes the relevant content in such complaint reports, received by the Petitioner GPD on the dates indicated:

- a. On July 23, 2023, a complaint report against Detective Sabrina Diaz, alleging, “I believe that on 7/24/23 [sic] Diaz entered into a conspiracy at [Greenwich rental address] to destroy the bodycam evidence from May 25, 2023 showing criminal lockout and mandatory report of allegations of molestation of [illegible].”
- b. On April 8, 2024, a complaint report against GPD Chief James Heavey, alleging, “Greenwich Records Department [illegible]...

¹⁰ The Commission notes that Respondent Hayes frequently refers to herself using the moniker “Bambi the Billionaire.”

that they destroyed bodycam evidence related to open criminal case [....].

- c. On December 9, 2024, a complaint report against Carino, containing a request for bodycam footage relating to an incident at “Western Civic,” alleging, “Attempted entrapment[.] Illegal threat of arrest. I requested his bodycam from event[.] I demand it!!” (Emphasis in original.)
- d. On December 27, 2024, a complaint report relating to a phone call with GPD dispatch, “directed to desk sergeant Perregroot,” alleging: “When I had just reviewed bodycam released by GPD same coverup I called to ask re protocol for police lying – as they blatantly did in that video to me about significant, consequential truth – he asked my, improperly in violation of my HIPAA rights – if I was on antipsychotic medicine – to insult my testimony and criminal allegations against me – I sent an online complaint – heard nothing – Followed up w/Camillo – organized misogynyn [sic] to discredit women.”
- e. On March 17, 2025, a complaint report against Lieutenant Isidoro, alleging, in part, “I told him Diaz deleted body [sic] includes deletion of allegation of child molestation. Did he tell her to delete the bodycam[?]”

Communications with Petitioners During Pendency of the Instant Petition

49. It is found that, at the commencement of the administrative proceedings in the instant Petition, Respondent Hayes left a voicemail for Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Camillo, on June 27, 2025, at 8:54 a.m., after the Petitioners filed the instant Petition, stating the following:

You *have* to stop harassing me. So, Jackie, from the Law Department, emailing me the Freedom of Information that bullshit vexation, which she couldn’t even *serve* them because it was too *long* and you guys don’t read the f[-----] *rules*. You know, it’s only indication of further harassment that I’m bring to the federal court. [...] Now you have the Freedom of Information board as witness to me of your further harassment. And let me tell you something about Jackie. She’s gotta be some kind of sick narcissist, and you’re all part of some sick narcissistic cult – maybe that’s what the police are anyway. And you think you’re now gonna try to intimidate me at this juncture? [...]

50. It is further found that Respondent Hayes left a voicemail for Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Camillo, on July 31, 2025, at 7:38 a.m., after the Petitioners filed the instant Petition, stating the following:

Yeah, I just got the Freedom of Information – the lawsuit that you guys started against me. Fred, you don't understand somethin' about me. Let me tell you somethin': you guys didn't check the dates about my time in the Middle East. You didn't check the dates. What happened after I left Dubai? Maybe like ten countries went into an Arab Spring, *son*. Keep goin', Fred. I'll see you later, man. Have a good day.

51. It is further found that Respondent Hayes left voicemails for Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Camillo after the federal district court's February 18, 2026, dismissal of her lawsuit against the Petitioners, stating the following:

- a. On February 18, 2026, at 12:54 p.m.: "[...] I'm gonna assure you, I've beckoned every demon on this planet to haunt you. You've been beckoned to be haunted by all the underworld demons that are on this planet for what you just did today. [...] All of the demons have been called. All of them have been called that are circling on this planet. Have a great life."
- b. On February 20, 2026, at 6:50 a.m.: "[inaudible]...Russell covers up all the crimes for Andrew Gold. His wife is having a baby soon. I just was so disgusted. And I'm so grateful I didn't say, "Be careful, cuz they eat babies." I didn't tell him that; that they eat babies. Like Cleo and Paul eat babies, probably. So, I didn't tell him that [inaudible]. I didn't look at the guy and curse the baby. That is the best I didn't do. [...] So, I don't care what happens to his kids, because what did he do to my kids? But I did not curse his unborn baby. I could have, but I didn't. But I – and I did not say that people eat babies, so be careful when you have your babies, because three hours after the baby's born is when the most valuable meat is on the baby. That these cannibals that are paid – that paid Fred Camillo and Heebee [phonetic], I allege, to eat human beings in Greenwich and in Connecticut. But I didn't tell him that.

But he would also be responsible for the bribery as well, because him and Phillip Russell participated in all of the crimes, [inaudible] [my former landlords]. So, uh, I do know

that karma has a way of working in people, and, um, I did not curse his child, and I did not curse his unborn child. Although the thought entered my mind, I did not do that.”

52. It is further found that Respondent Hayes left two voicemails for Petitioner First Selectman and Police Commissioner Camillo, on April 2, 2026, stating the following, in relation to her pending federal claim against the Petitioners:

- a. At 7:11 a.m.: “You f----- bastard . You have to make my life hard with my kids. And you tried to separate my family. And you tried to traffic my family. [...] You have no idea that karma that waits [sic] you. [...] You have no idea of the karmic repercussions of what you’ve done to my family. And I hope you find out. I really hope you find out in God’s way and God’s will. Amen.”
- b. At 8:08 a.m.: “[...] And then you harm my kids again, cuz you wanted to kill me. What does that check look like? Three years of compounded trauma by a little, short, ugly police commissioner that can’t get any ass and has to try to f[---] teenagers, I heard. How – what does that check look like that you owe me?”

53. It is found that the foregoing communications sent by Respondent Hayes to the Petitioners demonstrates a pattern of communication that is abusive, derogatory, and intimidating.

Complaints filed by Respondent Hayes with the Commission

54. It is found that, in addition to the numerous requests and communications described above, on June 27, 2025, eleven (11) days after the instant Petition was filed, Respondent Hayes filed with the Commission a complaint against the Petitioner First Selectman. The Commission takes administrative notice of the Final Decision in following case: Docket #FIC 2025-0525, *Caitlin Hayes v. First Selectman, Town of Greenwich, et al.* (March 11, 2026).

55. The Commission takes administrative notice of the Final Decision for FIC 2025-0525, wherein the Commission noted that Respondent Hayes failed to appear to prosecute her complaint at the February 11, 2026, contested case hearing scheduled for such matter. The Commission further noted in such Final Decision that the Petitioners did appear with witnesses, and their counsel dedicated approximately eight (8) hours to preparing for such hearing. The Commission admonished Respondent Hayes in such Final Decision for her failure to appear at the hearing in this matter, which failure resulted in a waste of scarce state and local resources.

56. It is found that such nonappearance indicates that Respondent Hayes did not make such complaint as part of a good faith effort to vindicate her rights under the FOI Act, but rather as a tactic to inconvenience and harass the Petitioners.

Respondent Hayes' Communication with the Commission

57. The Commission takes administrative notice of Respondent Hayes' frequent and taunting communications with the Commission. It is found that for the period relevant to the Commission's docketing of the Petition, beginning on July 16, 2025, Respondent Hayes sent at least forty-two (42) email messages and one voicemail message to the Commission and its staff.

58. It is found that many of the emails and voicemails sent by Respondent Hayes to the Commission during the period described in paragraph 57, above, were offensive, abusive, or both, as illustrated by the following examples:

- a. Respondent Hayes contacted the Commission's Acting Clerk by email on January 21, 2026, at 2:56 p.m., after receiving the Order to Show Cause for the instant Petition, stating the following:

Your motion for vexatious BS will get dismissed because I only ever asked as my law firm not my person. Bwahahahahahahah.

[trophy emoji]

Good luck denying a law firm the right to info we will just learn federal discovery rules[.]

- b. After receiving the Commission's March 2, 2026, notice rescheduling the initial hearing in this matter, Respondent Hayes left a voice message for the Commission's Director of Education and Communications, on March 4, 2026, at 9:48 a.m., stating the following:

Yeah, Russell, I don't know if you're aware of how I see the law. That you're in conspiracy of all the crimes that they committed against me, including taking my daughter's stuff, deleting the minutes of reports, the false arrest [...]. So I hope you realize that I'm gonna be suing you guys [...] So I don't know what all these emails I'm getting from this Mayo lady, and all your *lying*, and your *lies*, you *corrupt* organization. [...] I'm not participating in

anything else that you're doing. So take me off your fl[-----] email, Russell.

- c. Respondent Hayes also contacted the Commission's Acting Clerk by email on March 24, 2026, at 9:58 a.m., stating the following:

Until you address why you denied me an adjournment and hearing [in FIC 2025-0525] and then by extension I allege you, FOI of CT are covering up crimes against my kids and a mandatory report alleging molestation of a boy and wife beating by a man, in furtherance of a criminal conspiracy against my rights!"

59. Based on the findings in paragraphs 57 and 58, above, it is found that, rather than comply with the Commission's orders and requests in relation to the Commission's timely adjudication of the matter, Respondent Hayes used the communication from the Commission as a mechanism to harangue and verbally accost the Commission's staff.

60. It is further found that Respondent Hayes used the Commission's adjudication of the Petition to express her dissatisfaction with the Commission, rather than to defend against the Petition. The Commission notes that Respondent Hayes' abuse of the Commission for its adjudication of the Petition is similar to her abusive behavior toward the Petitioners, their public officials, departments, and employees, when she became dissatisfied with their efforts to comply with her many FOI requests. It is further found that Respondent Hayes demonstrated contempt for the Commission, as indicated by her statements that she would not appear.

61. Thus, it is found that the record in this matter demonstrates a pattern of conduct by Respondent Hayes, which was intended to avoid, disrupt, and/or delay the Commission's timely adjudication of the Petition, as well as to use the process as an arena to disparage and harangue the Petitioners, their attorney, the Commission, and its staff, particularly through the use of unfounded and intimidating accusations.

62. Therefore, it is found that the other factors considered by the Commission, as outlined in paragraphs 47 through 61, above, and permitted under §1-206(b)(6), G.S., provide considerable insight and context to the tactics and methodologies by which Respondent Hayes abuses the FOI Act, and supports a finding that the Respondent is a vexatious requester.

V. **A PATTERN OF CONDUCT THAT AMOUNTS TO AN ABUSE OF THE RIGHT TO ACCESS INFORMATION UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT OR AN INTERFERENCE WITH THE OPERATION OF THE AGENCY**

63. The Commission notes that Respondent Hayes is familiar with the FOI Act, the rights afforded therein, and how to make a records request. It is found that throughout the time relevant to the Petition and these administrative proceedings, the Respondent has misused the FOI Act by

attempting to interfere with the operations of the Petitioners and the Commission through her repeated oral and written communications.

64. It is further found that the cumulative nature of Respondent Hayes' requests, communications, and conduct during the period covered by the Petition have had a decidedly detrimental effect on the Petitioners and significantly impeded their operations.

65. For instance, it is found that Respondent Hayes' communications and conduct have had a traumatizing effect on the Petitioner Greenwich Law Department. Based upon the testimony of a paralegal from such department, it is found that it has been "traumatic" for staff to receive written and oral communications from Respondent Hayes "because you're put in a defensive posture." It is found that Respondent Hayes' phone calls, emails, and in-person visits have had a detrimental effect upon the Petitioner Law Department and its staff, creating daily interruptions to their regular course of business. It is further found that, in April 2024, as a result of Respondent Hayes' distressing and antagonistic in-person visits to the Petitioner Law Department, the Petitioner Town has installed a key-card entry security system to help staff feel more secure. It is further found that the emotional toll that Respondent Hayes' conduct has taken on the Petitioner Law Department spilled over into the hearings on the instant Petition, where the Petitioners' counsel made a passionate and, at times, tearful plea in closing argument for the Commission to provide the Town relief by granting their Petition.

66. It is further found that Respondent Hayes' communications and conduct have had a traumatizing effect on the staff of Petitioner GPD. Based upon the testimony of the GPD's Deputy Chief, it is found that a staff member in the GPD records department is fearful of Respondent Hayes. It is found that such fear was demonstrated in the staff member's reluctance to testify in-person at the contested case hearing initiated by Respondent Hayes' complaint to the Commission in Docket #FIC 2025-0525. Based on the Deputy Chief's testimony, it is further found that such staff member requested that the Petitioner GPD drive her to the Commission's hearing room in Hartford in a squad car, out of fear that her personal vehicle would become a future target for Respondent Hayes.

67. It is further found that Respondent Hayes' communications and conduct have had a traumatizing effect on the staff of the Petitioner Office of the First Selectman. Based upon the testimony of the First Selectman's executive assistant, it is found that the frequency of Respondent Hayes' emails and phone calls alleging a conspiracy to destroy records and cover up crimes against her and others have significantly disrupted the daily operations of the Petitioner Office. It is further found that such communications have become "increasingly unstable in tone and volume," and "many involve personal attacks," "expletives are used," and "are defamatory." Based on the executive assistant's testimony, it is further found that, in July 2025, Respondent Hayes' in-person appearance at town hall triggered a lockdown procedure, initiated by an alarming phone call placed by Respondent Hayes from the lobby to the Petitioner Town's human resources department, and the Petitioner GPD was summoned.

68. Given the foregoing, it is found that Respondent Hayes has made it her mission to antagonize and intimidate the Petitioners, using the guise of the FOI Act to attempt to legitimize her abusive calls, emails, and visits to the Petitioners in pursuit of records. It is further found that such communications and behavior constitute "a pattern of conduct that amounts to an abuse of

the right to access information under the Freedom of Information Act” as well as “an interference with the operation” of the petitioning public agencies within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6)(E), G.S.

VI. CONCLUSION

69. It is concluded, based upon numerous findings throughout this decision, that Respondent Hayes has a “vexatious history of requests” with the Petitioners, and that Respondent Hayes has engaged in “a pattern of conduct” toward the Petitioners “that constitutes and abuse of the right to access information under the FOI Act” and an interference with the operation of the Petitioners, within the meaning of §1-206(b)(6)(E), G.S.

70. In light of the foregoing findings of fact set forth herein, it is concluded that the Petitioners have met their burden in this matter to establish the Respondent Hayes is a vexatious requester.

71. Accordingly, the Petitioners’ Petition for Relief from Vexatious Requester is granted.

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

1. The Petitioners, inclusive of all departments, public officials and employees of the Town of Greenwich, need not comply with FOI requests from the Respondent for a period of one year from the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, inclusive of any pending on the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter.

2. In the event the Respondent files an FOI request with the Petitioners that demonstrates similar vexatious conduct, as determined to be such herein, the Petitioners may immediately file another Petition for Relief from Vexatious Requester with the Commission; in that event, the Commission may take administrative notice of the entire record, including the vexatious history and conduct outlined in this matter, as the basis for consideration of whether such request(s) constitute a continuation of such conduct and history, as well as a basis for additional relief commensurate with the vexatious conduct.

3. Henceforth, and including after the expiration of the order set forth in paragraph 1 of the order, above, the Respondent shall cease from engaging in similar vexatious conduct toward the Petitioners as that which is found throughout the findings and conclusions, above.

Approved by Order of the Freedom of Information Commission at its special meeting of July 13, 2026.

/s/ Molly Steffes
Molly Steffes
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:

TOWN OF GREENWICH, GREENWICH TOWN ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, AND GREENWICH POLICE DEPARTMENT, c/o Attorney Lisa Waller, Law Department, Town of Greenwich, 101 Field Point Road, Greenwich, CT 06830

CAITLIN HAYES, c/o Hayes Law Office, 112 S. Main Street, Port Chester, NY 10573

/s/ Molly Steffes
Molly Steffes
Acting Clerk of the Commission