

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

FINAL DECISION

Curt Rivard, Jr.,

Complainant

against

Docket # FIC 2025-0687

Angel Quiros, Commissioner, State of
Connecticut, Department of Correction; and
State of Connecticut, Department of
Correction,

Respondents

July 22, 2026

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on March 20, 2026, at which time the complainant and the respondents appeared, stipulated to certain facts, and presented testimony, exhibits and argument on the complaint. The complainant, who is incarcerated, appeared via teleconference, pursuant to the January 2004 memorandum of understanding between the Commission and the Department of Correction. See Docket No. CV 03-0826293, Anthony Sinchak v. FOIC et al., Superior Court, J.D. of Hartford at Hartford, Corrected Order dated January 27, 2004 (Sheldon, J.).

Pursuant to an order of the undersigned hearing officer, the respondents filed an affidavit, which has been marked and admitted as Respondents' Exhibit 5 (after-filed): Affidavit of Stephanie Secore, dated June 5, 2026 (5 pages).

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 written request dated June 27, 2025, the complainant requested contracts between the Department of Correction ("DOC") and different vendors, as well as budget documentation covering multiple years.
3. It is found that the complainant did not receive any acknowledgement from the respondents regarding his June 27 request, described in paragraph 2, above.
4. By complaint, dated July 24, 2025, and received August 1, 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.

5. It is found that, by letter dated October 9, 2025, the Commission informed the respondents of the complaint in this matter, and provided the respondents with a copy of the June 27, 2025 request.

6. 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.

7. 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....”

8. It is found that the complainant mailed the June 27 request, described in paragraph 2, above, to 24 Wolcott Hill Road, Wethersfield, CT 06109 (“Central Office”).

9. At the hearing in this matter, the respondents contended that they did not receive the June 27 request until October 9, 2025, when they received notice from the Commission that the complaint was filed in this matter.

10. The respondents testified, and it is found, that mail from their facilities is sent through the U.S. Postal Service, is then processed by the mail handlers at Central Office, and ultimately is provided to the recipient at the DOC.


11. The respondents testified, and it is found, that upon receipt of the complaint, described in paragraph 5, above, the respondents checked their own internal records request tracking database for the June 27 request, and found no record of receipt of such request. The respondents also testified, and it is found, that they checked with other staff at Central Office and confirmed that they had not received the June 27 request. The respondents further testified, and it is found, that they checked with the FOI Liaison at the complainant’s facility and asked if she had received his June 27 request, but she had no record of receipt of such request.

12. 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.

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 July 22, 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:

CURT RIVARD, JR., #337249, Cheshire Correctional Institution, 900 Highland Avenue, Cheshire, CT 06410

ANGEL QUIROS, COMMISSIONER, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION; AND STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION, c/o Attorney Jennifer Lepore, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction, 24 Wolcott Hill Road, Wethersfield, CT 06109


Jennifer M. Mayo
Acting Clerk of the Commission