

TO: Freedom of Information Commission

FROM: Russell Blair

RE: Minutes of the Commission's regular meeting of October 22, 2025

A regular meeting of the Freedom of Information Commission was held on October 22, 2025. The Commission meeting of October 22, 2025 was conducted in person. The meeting convened at 2:02 p.m. with the following Commissioners present:

Commissioner Owen P. Eagan, presiding
Commissioner Jonathan J. Einhorn
Commissioner Kate Farrish
Commissioner Stephen Fuzesi Jr.
Commissioner Aigné Goldsby Wells
Commissioner Thomas A. Hennick
Commissioner Christopher P. Hankins
Commissioner Matthew Streeter

Also present were staff members Colleen M. Murphy, Paula S. Pearlman, Valicia D. Harmon, Danielle L. McGee, C. Zack Hyde, Nicholas A. Smarra, Marybeth G. Sullivan, Paul V. Arce, Molly Steffes and Russell Blair.

The Commissioners voted 7-0 to approve the Commission's regular meeting minutes of October 8, 2025. Commissioner Fuzesi abstained from the vote.

Those in attendance were informed that the October 22, 2025 regular meeting of the Commission was being recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0664](#) Raymond Grullon v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Naugatuck; Police Department, Borough of Naugatuck; and Borough of Naugatuck

Raymond Grullon appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Kyle McClain appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Hearing Officer's Report a second time. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended.* The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2020-0503](#) Maria Naughton v. Superintendent of Schools, New Canaan Public Schools; Chair, Board of Education, New Canaan Public Schools; and New Canaan Public Schools

Maria Naughton appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Chelsea McCallum appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 7-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's

Report. Commissioner Hennick abstained from the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0652](#)

Nancy Griswold v. Chairman, Planning and Zoning Commission, Town of Thomaston; Planning and Zoning Commission, Town of Thomaston; and Town of Thomaston

Nancy Griswold appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Nicole Byrne appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0653](#)

Fred Camillo v. Chairman, Board of Education, Greenwich Public Schools; and Board of Education, Greenwich Public Schools

Attorney Tom Cassone appeared on behalf of the complainant. Attorney Fred Dorsey appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 7-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Fuzesi recused himself from the matter. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0656](#)

Michael Donnelly v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services; and State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services

Attorney Michael Donnelly appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Ernestine Weaver appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 7-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Hennick was not present for the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0658](#)

Michael Mourning v. Chief, Police Department, City of Danbury; Police Department, City of Danbury; and City of Danbury

The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0659](#)

John C. DiIorio v. Executive Director, Office of Legislative Management, State of Connecticut, Connecticut General Assembly; and Office of Legislative Management, State of Connecticut, Connecticut General Assembly

Attorney Alexa Millinger appeared on behalf of the complainant. Assistant Attorney General Timothy Holzman appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 6-0 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Hennick was not present for the vote and Commissioner Farrish recused herself from the vote. The Commissioners voted 5-0

to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners voted 5-0 to deny the respondent's Motion to Stay. Commissioners Hennick and Streeter were not present for the votes and Commissioner Farrish recused herself from the votes. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0672](#) Octavia Belardo v. Chief Administrative Officer, Marrakech Inc.; and Marrakech Inc.

The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2024-0680 Robert Kornberg v. Superintendent of Schools, Milford Public Schools; and Milford Public Schools

The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0240](#) Richard Leighton v. Chairperson, Planning & Zoning Commission, Town of Deep River; Planning & Zoning Commission, Town of Deep River; and Town of Deep River

The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

The Commissioners voted 5-0 to deny Complainant 1-21j-29 Motion-Hearing Before the Full Commission at Next Regular Meeting, dated October 9, 2025, and received by the Commission on October 9, 2025, filed by the Complainant in *David Godbout v. Town Clerk, Town of East Lyme; and Town of East Lyme*, Docket #FIC 2025-0890. Commissioners Hennick, Streeter and Goldsby Wells were not present for the vote.

The Commissioners voted 5-0 to deny Complainant 1-21j-29 Motion-Hearing Before the Full Commission at Next Regular Meeting, dated October 20, 2025, and received by the Commission on October 20, 2025, filed by the Complainant in *David Godbout v. Chief, Police Department, Town of East Lyme; Police Department, Town of East Lyme; and Town of East Lyme*, Docket #FIC 2025-0915. Commissioners Hennick, Streeter and Goldsby Wells were not present for the vote.

The Commissioners voted 5-0 to deny Complainant 1-21j-29 Motion-Hearing Before the Full Commission at Next Regular Meeting, dated October 20, 2025, and received by the Commission on October 20, 2025, filed by the Complainant in *David Godbout v. Colleen M. Murphy, Executive Director, State of Connecticut, Freedom of Information Commission; and State of Connecticut, Freedom of Information Commission*, Docket #FIC 2025-0924. Commissioners Hennick, Streeter and Goldsby Wells were not present for the vote.

Attorney Valicia D. Harmon reported on the following six appeals:

- Ira Alston v. Freedom of Information Commission, HHD-CV25-5090465-S, filed September 10, 2025.
- Director of Public Records, State of Connecticut, et al. v. Freedom of Information Commission, HHB-CV25-6099547-S, filed September 19, 2025.
- Charles J. Mozzochi v. Freedom of Information Commission, HHD-CV25-5090676-S, filed September 23, 2025.
- Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Banking, et al. v. Freedom of Information Commission et al., HHB-CV25-6099820-S, filed September 26, 2025.
- Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction, et al. v. Freedom of Information Commission et al., HHB-CV25-6099821-S, filed September 26, 2025.
- Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Economic and Community Development, et al. v. Freedom of Information Commission et al., HHB-CV25-6099819-S, filed September 26, 2025.

Attorney Valicia D. Harmon also reported that oral argument was held Tuesday, October 7, 2025, before the Appellate Court in David Godbout v. Freedom of Information Commission, AC 47401. The Appellate Court sustained the appeal by Per Curium Opinion released October 21, 2025.

Executive Director Colleen M. Murphy announced her intention to retire from state service effective March 1, 2026, after serving with the Commission for more than 35 years, including 20 as executive director.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:27 p.m.

/s/ Russell Blair
Russell Blair

AMENDMENTS*

Docket #FIC 2024-0664 Raymond Grullon v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Naugatuck; Police Department, Town of Naugatuck; and Town of Naugatuck

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

Paragraph 30:

30. Based upon a careful review of the administrative record and inspection of the in camera records, it is found that the following records are "sworn statements of witnesses" and are therefore exempt from disclosure pursuant to §1-210(b)(3)(C), G.S.: IC-2024-0664-1 (lines 20-44); IC-2024-0664-2 (lines 3-6); IC-2024-0664- 11 (lines 3-6); IC-2024-0664-12 (lines 10-18, **22-25**); IC-2024-0664-13 (lines **2-5**, 21-26); IC-2024-0664-14 (lines 2-13); [and] IC-2024-0664-18 (lines 8-16, **20-23**) ; **IC-2024-0664-19 (LINES 2-6, 23-24); AND IC-2024-0664-20 (LINES 1-17).** It is concluded that the respondents did not violate §§1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S., by withholding such records from the complainant.

Paragraph 31:

31. Based upon a careful review of the administrative record and inspection of the in camera records, however, it is found that the respondents failed to prove that the following records are "signed or sworn statements of witnesses" within the meaning of §1-210(b)(3)(C), G.S.: IC-2024-0664-2 (lines 10-24); [IC-2024-0664-12 (lines 22-25);] IC-2024-0664-13 (lines [2-5,] 10-18); [IC-2024-0664-18 (lines 20-23);] **AND** IC-2024-0664-19 (lines [2-6,] 11-20 [, 23-24]; and IC-2024-0664-20 (lines 1-17)]. It is concluded that the respondents violated §§1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S., by withholding such records from the complainant.

Footnote 9:

The Commission notes that a nearly identical signed statement of a witness was admitted as part of Complainant's Exhibit B (after-filed), which substantiates the respondents' claim with respect to IC-2024-0664 -1 (lines 20-44); IC-2024-0664-2 (lines 3-6); **IC-2024-0664-12 (LINES 22-25);** IC-2024-0664-13 (lines **2-5**, 21-26); [and] IC-2024-0664-14 (lines 2-13);**IC-2024-0664-18 (LINES 20-23); IC-2024-0664-19 (LINES 2-6, 23-24); AND IC-2024-0664-20 (LINES 1-17).** It is unclear from the administrative record whether additional signed statements of witnesses existed at the time of the complainant's September 26th request and whether the complainant had possession of such statements, if any.

Docket #FIC 2024-0659 John C. DiIorio v. Executive Director, Office of Legislative Management, State of Connecticut, Connecticut General Assembly; and Office of Legislative Management, State of Connecticut, Connecticut General Assembly

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

Paragraph 35:

35. The respondents assert that the following portions of the in camera records are exempt pursuant to the attorney-client privilege (i.e., §1-210(b)(10), G.S.):

IC-2024-0659-0004 (lines 8-12)

IC-2024-0659-0050 (lines 9-24, and 37-42)

IC-2024-0659-0051 (lines 3-5 and 15-20)

IC-2024-0659-0056 (lines 11-20)

IC-2024-0659-0061 (lines 8 and 15)

IC-2024-0659-3542 (lines 14-21)

IC-2024-0659-3619 (lines 18-20)

IC-2024-0659-3635 (lines 10-11)

IC-2024-0659-3687 (lines 8-19)⁵

IC-2024-0659-3692 (lines 20-22)⁶

IC-2024-0659-3762 (lines 10-22 and 37-38)⁷

IC-2024-0659-3763 (lines 1-28)

⁵ The respondents claim that the attachment to the email at IC-2024-0659-3687 is also protected by the attorney-client privilege; however, such records (i.e., IC-2024-0659-3688 through IC-2024-0659-3691) were already found to be permissively exempt as preliminary drafts or notes. See paragraph 22, above.

⁶ The respondents claim that the attachment to the email at IC-2024-0659-3692 is also protected by the attorney-client privilege; however, such records (i.e., IC-2024-0659-3693 through IC-2024-0659-3761) were already found to be permissively exempt as preliminary drafts or notes. See paragraph 22, above.

⁷ The respondents claim that the attachment to the email at IC-2024-0659-3762 is also protected by the attorney-client privilege; however, such records (i.e., IC-2024-0659-3764 through IC-2024-0659-3772) were already found to be permissively exempt as preliminary drafts or notes. See paragraph 32, above.

IC-2024-0659-3836 (lines 11-15) through IC-2024-0659-3838⁸

Paragraph 46:

46. Upon careful in camera inspection, it is found that the following in camera records are communications “between a public official or employee of a public agency acting in the performance of his or her duties or within the scope of his or her employment and a government attorney,” which “relate to legal advice” sought by the public agency client from the attorney, which were “transmitted in confidence,” or were “records prepared by the government attorney in furtherance of the rendition of such legal advice,” within the meaning of §52-146r, G.S:

IC-2024-0659-0050 (lines 9 after the “,” - 24, and 37-42)

IC-2024-0659-0051 (lines 3-5 and 15-20)

IC-2024-0659-0056 (lines 11 after the first sentence – 20)

IC-2024-0659-3542 (lines 14 after the first sentence - 21)

IC-2024-0659-3687 (lines 10 after the first sentence – 19)

IC-2024-0659-369[96]2 (lines 20 after the first sentence – 22)

IC-2024-0659-3762 (lines 10-22 and 37-38)

IC-2024-0659-3763 (lines 1-28)

IC-2024-0659-3836 (lines 11-15) through IC-2024-0659-3838

Paragraph 48:

1. 48. It is further concluded that the following in camera records are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to §§1-210(b)(10), G.S., or 52-146r, G.S., as: (i) the respondents failed to prove one or more criteria for the attorney-client privilege; (ii) the in camera record, on its face, is not protected by the attorney-client privilege; or (iii) the privilege did apply, but the substance of the record, or portion thereof, had been actually disclosed by the respondents, thereby waiving the privilege⁹:

⁸ The respondents claim that the attachment to the email at IC-2024-0659-3836 is also protected by the attorney-client privilege; however, such records (i.e., IC-2024-0659-3839 through IC-2024-0659-3846) were already found to be permissively exempt as preliminary drafts or notes. See paragraph 32, above.

⁹As found in paragraph 4, above, the Complainant’s Exhibit C is the log of withheld records for the respondents’ search. It is found that the log provides general descriptions which actually disclose the topic of the emails identified in paragraph 48, above.

IC-2024-0659-0004 (lines 8-12)

IC-2024-0659-0050 (line 9 up to the “,”)

IC-2024-0659-0056 (the first sentence of line 11)

IC-2024-0659-0061 (lines 8 and 15)

IC-2024-0659-3542 (the first sentence of line 14)

IC-2024-0659-3619 (lines 18-20)

IC-2024-0659-3635 (lines 10-11)

IC-2024-0659-3687 (the first sentence of line 10)

IC-2024-0659-3692 (the first sentence of line 20)