

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

FINAL DECISION

Ralph Neunteufel,

Complainant

against

Docket #FIC 2025-0461

Chair, Planning and Zoning Commission,
Town of Easton; Planning and Zoning
Commission, Town of Easton; and Town of
Easton,

Respondents

May 27, 2026

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on November 26, 2025, at which time the complainant and the respondents appeared, stipulated to certain facts and presented testimony, exhibits and argument on the complaint. The case caption has been amended, without objection, to accurately reflect the respondents in this matter.

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 May 27, 2025, the complainant requested copies of the following records: “[a]ny and all records governing the ‘unregistered parking structure’ supposedly located at 740 Stepney Road, as mentioned by Justin Giorlando to Momentum Solar. Please include the definition of ‘parking structure’ from EZR.”
3. It is found that the respondents did not respond to the complainant’s records request described in paragraph 2, above.
4. By complaint, dated June 3, 2025 and filed June 11, 2025, the complainant appealed to this Commission, alleging that the respondents violated the Freedom of Information (“FOI”) Act by failing to provide the records described in paragraph 2, above. By email, dated and filed October 6, 2025, the complainant also requested the imposition of a civil penalty against the respondents.
5. Section 1-200(5), G.S., provides:

“[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 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:

[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: “[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 hearing on this matter, the respondents conceded that they never responded to the records request described in paragraph 2, above. The respondents testified, and it is found, that they lost track of this particular records request due, at least in part, to the large volume of other records requests made by this complainant around the same time.¹ The respondents also testified, and it is therefore found, that no records were provided to the complainant in response to his request described in paragraph 2, above.

10. It is therefore concluded that the respondents violated §§1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S., by failing to provide records in response to the records request described in paragraph 2, above.

11. It is also found, however, that the complainant and the respondents in this matter stipulated that records responsive to the request described in paragraph 2, above, were provided to the complainant in response to a separate records request.

12. Based upon the foregoing, the Commission, in its discretion, declines to consider the imposition of a civil penalty against the respondents.

¹ The Commission takes administrative notice of Docket #FIC 2025-0338, Ralph Neunteufel v. Zoning Officer, Land Use Department, Town of Easton, et al. (April 22, 2026), wherein the Commission found, based upon the testimony of the Zoning Enforcement Officer for the Town of Easton, that the complainant in this matter submitted approximately 110 records requests around the same time as the request at issue in Docket #FIC 2025-0338, which was made on April 29, 2025.

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

1. Henceforth, the respondents shall strictly comply with the provisions of §§1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S.

Approved by Order of the Freedom of Information Commission at its regular meeting of May 27, 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:

RALPH NEUNTEUFEL, 15 Hayes Street, Easton, CT 06612

**CHAIR, PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION, TOWN OF EASTON;
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION, TOWN OF EASTON; AND TOWN OF
EASTON**, 225 Center Road, Easton, CT 06612



Jennifer M. Mayo
Acting Clerk of the Commission