

TO: Freedom of Information Commission
FROM: Russell Blair
RE: Minutes of the Commission's regular meeting of May 13, 2026

A regular meeting of the Freedom of Information Commission was held on May 13, 2026. The Commission's regular meeting of May 13, 2026 was conducted in person. The meeting convened at 2:05 p.m. with the following Commissioners present:

Commissioner Owen P. Eagan, presiding
Commissioner Kate Farrish
Commissioner Christopher P. Hankins
Commissioner Thomas A. Hennick (participated via speakerphone)
Commissioner Matthew Streeter

Also present were staff members Danielle L. McGee, Valicia D. Harmon, C. Zack Hyde, Nicholas A. Smarra, Marybeth G. Sullivan, Paul V. Arce, Jonathan McCann, Jennifer Mayo and Russell Blair.

The Commissioners unanimously voted to approve the Commission's regular meeting minutes of April 22, 2026.

Those in attendance were informed that the May 13, 2026 regular meeting of the Commission was being recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0360](#) Andres Sosa v. Chairperson, State of Connecticut, Connecticut Board of Pardons and Paroles; and State of Connecticut, Connecticut Board of Pardons and Paroles

Andres Sosa appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Colin Milne appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended.* The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0445](#) Rashid Johnson v. Karl Jacobson, Chief, Police Department, City of New Haven; Police Department, City of New Haven; and City of New Haven

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0555](#) Kenneth Roger v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Social Services; and State of Connecticut, Department of Social Services

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0559](#) Kenneth Roger v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Children & Families; and State of Connecticut, Department of Children & Families

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

[Docket #FIC 2022-0120](#) Paul Michalski v. Chairman, Board of Education, Town of Darien; Board of Education, Town of Darien; Superintendent of Schools, Darien Public Schools; and Darien Public Schools

Paul Michalski appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Thomas Mooney appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report Upon Remand. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0356](#) Alexander Grene v. Building Official, Office of Building Inspection & Enforcement, City of New Haven; Office of Building Inspection & Enforcement, City of New Haven; and City of New Haven

Alexander Grene appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Michael Pinto appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended.* The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0357](#) Jacqueline Rabe Thomas v. Blue Hills Civic Association

The Commissioners voted 4-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Farrish recused herself from the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0364](#) Robert Young v. Town Manager, Town of Wethersfield; and Town of Wethersfield

Robert Young appeared on his own behalf. Attorney John W. Bradley appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0366](#) John H. Spang, Jr. v. Administrator, State of Connecticut, Teachers' Retirement Board; and State of Connecticut Teachers' Retirement Board

John H. Spang, Jr. appeared on his own behalf. Assistant Attorney General Richard Sponzo appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 4-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Hankins was not present for the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0370](#) Jeff Rieck v. Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Danbury; and Housing Authority of the City of Danbury

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0372](#) Elijah El-hajj-bey v. Chief Executive Officer, The Metropolitan District; and The Metropolitan District

Attorney John Mirtle appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 4-0 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners voted 4-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended.* Commissioner Hankins was not present for the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0374](#) Deborah G. Stevenson v. Governor, State of Connecticut, Office of the Governor; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Governor

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0375](#) Deborah G. Stevenson v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, State Department of Education; and State of Connecticut, State Department of Education

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0384](#) Winston Davis v. Secretary of State, State of Connecticut, Office of the Secretary of the State; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Secretary of the State

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0408](#) Gina Tyler v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut, Connecticut Technical Education and Career System; and State of Connecticut, Connecticut Technical Education and Career System

Gina Tyler appeared on her own behalf. The Commissioners voted 4-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Hankins was not present for the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0412](#) Bryant Abbott v. Joseph P. Ganim, Mayor, City of Bridgeport; and City of Bridgeport

Attorneys Karen Miller and Tyisha Toms appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 4-0 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners voted 3-1 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended, with Commissioner Streeter in opposition. Commissioner Hankins was not present for the votes. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2025-0415](#) Bryant Abbott v. Director, Department of Health & Social Services, City of Bridgeport; Department of Health & Social Services, City of Bridgeport; and City of Bridgeport

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0442](#) Toni Simonetti v. Chair, Board of Finance, Town of Westport; Board of Finance, Town of Westport; and Town of Westport

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0454](#) Toni Simonetti v. Chair, Board of Finance, Town of Westport; Board of Finance, Town of Westport; and Town of Westport

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0574](#) Ryan Salvas v. Chief State's Attorney, State of Connecticut, Division of Criminal Justice; and State of Connecticut, Division of Criminal Justice

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0643](#) Edward Ploughton v. Director, Windham Region Transit District; and Windham Region Transit District

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0728](#)

Brendan Keatley v. Chief, Fire Department, City of Stamford; Fire Department, City of Stamford; and City of Stamford

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

[Docket #FIC 2025-0790](#)

Wendy Taylor v. Town Clerk, Town of Bloomfield; and Town of Bloomfield

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

The Commissioners voted 4-0 to deny the Petition for Reconsideration dated April 21, 2026 and received by the Commission on April 21, 2026, filed by the Complainant in *DeVaughn Ward v. Attorney General, State of Connecticut, The Office of the Attorney General; and State of Connecticut, The Office of the Attorney General*, Docket #FIC 2025-0261. Commissioner Hankins was not present for the vote

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

/s/ Russell Blair
Russell Blair

AMENDMENTS*

Docket #FIC 2025-0360 Andres Sosa v. Chairperson, State of Connecticut,
Connecticut Board of Pardons and Paroles; and State of
Connecticut, Connecticut Board of Pardons and Paroles

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on January 9, 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, SUPERIOR COURT, J.D. OF HARTFORD AT HARTFORD, CORRECTED ORDER DATED JANUARY 27, 2004 (SHELDON, J.).**

17. The respondents, however, averred that because such **RECORDS** originated from another state agency, they were not obligated to provide him with records responsive to Item #6 of his request described in paragraph 2, above.

² The language codified in §4-67dd, G.S., was proposed during the General Assembly's February 2024 Session as Senate Bill 256, and was signed into law by the Governor on May 30, 2024. *See* Public Act 24-81, §99. The Commission opposed Senate Bill 256, noting its concerns that the legislation: (i) was overly broad; (ii) would inhibit the public's ability to directly access public records from a "receiving" state agency that were transmitted from an "**ORIGINATING**" ["origination"] (i.e., sending) state agency; (iii) would cause delays in the processing of records requests; and (iv) would impact the public's ability to determine whether the sharing of records by state agencies is being conducted in compliance with federal and state laws.

Docket #FIC 2025-0356 Alexander Grene v. Building Official, Office of Building
Inspection & Enforcement, City of New Haven; Office of
Building Inspection & Enforcement, City of New Haven;
and City of New Haven

The order in the Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

1. Within thirty (30) days of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall conduct a search of all email accounts maintained by the respondent Office of Building Inspection & Enforcement for the period of January 1, 2024 through March 20, 2025 containing *any* of the following keywords: "750 Orange [Street]", "B-24-00566", "B-24-00846", "E-24-00488", "P-24-00426", or "M-24-00379".
2. Within thirty (30) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall search their Municipality database for records containing *any* of the following keywords: "750 Orange [Street]", "B-24-00566", "B-24-00846", "E-24-00488", "P-24-00426", or "M-24-00379".

4. Within thirty (30) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall provide the complainant with electronic copies of any records stored within their CitySquared database: (i) pertaining to the address “750 Orange [Street];” and (ii) that were not already provided to the complainant electronically. Such records shall be provided to the complainant unredacted and free of charge.

6. WITHIN THIRTY (30) DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE NOTICE OF FINAL DECISION IN THIS MATTER, THE RESPONDENTS SHALL SUBMIT TO THE COMMISSION, VIA EMAIL AT FOI@CT.GOV, WITH COPY TO THE COMPLAINANT, AN AFFIDAVIT SWORN TO OR ATTESTED BY A PERSON WITH THE REQUISITE KNOWLEDGE DETAILING THEIR COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPHS 1 THROUGH 5 OF THE COMMISSION’S ORDER, ABOVE.

Docket #FIC 2025-0372 Elijah El-hajj-bey v. Chief Executive Officer, The Metropolitan District; and The Metropolitan District

The Hearing Officer’s Report is amended as follows:

14. It is found that, by email dated September 11, 2025, the respondents provided the complainant with copies of the requested police report, described in paragraph 2, above, as well as email correspondence, responsive to the request described in paragraph 5, above, to the correct email address, which the complainant received. [Such records included emails between the respondents and the Office of the Attorney General (“OAG”) that the respondents contended were not responsive to the request described in paragraph 5, above.]

17. The respondents’ witness, the police chief, testified, and it is found, that the respondents investigated the complainant, following a message the complainant had sent on LinkedIn. It is found that such message was routed to the respondents’ LinkedIn inbox, and subsequently forwarded to the respondents’ legal counsel and other members of the Metropolitan District, [the OAG] and to the respondent police chief.

Docket #FIC 2025-0408 Gina Tyler v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut, Connecticut Technical Education and Career System; and State of Connecticut, Connecticut Technical Education and Career System

The order in the Hearing Officer’s Report is amended as follows:

23. On April 21, 2026, pursuant to the order of the hearing officer, the respondents submitted copies of unredacted records to the Commission for in camera

inspection.^[1] On the Index to Records Submitted for In Camera Inspection (“Index”), accompanying such records, the respondents contended that portions of the in camera records are exempt from disclosure pursuant to §§1-210(b)(2), 1-210(b)(11) and/or 1-210(b)(17), G.S. The records submitted to the Commission for in camera inspection shall be referred to as IC-2025-0408-2^[2], lines 31-32; IC-2025-0408-4, lines 11 and 43; IC-2025-0408-6, lines 3, 6, 7, 19, 22, 38 and 40; IC-2025-0408-8, lines 26, 31, 33 and 37; IC-2025-0408-10, line 34; IC-2025-0408-13, lines 16 and 22; IC-2025-0408-15, lines 2 and 7; IC-2025-0408-16, lines 18, 28, 30 and 31; IC-2025-0408-19, line 24; IC-2025-0408-21, lines 7 and 12; IC-2025-0408-23, lines 4 and 12; IC-2025-0408-24, lines 3, 8, 29 and 33; IC-2025-0408-25, lines 15, 23 and 35; IC-2025-0408-27, lines 15 and 42; IC-2025-0408-29, line 35; IC-2025-0408-32, line 16; IC-2025-0408-35^[25], line 25; IC-2025-0408-37, line 20; IC-2025-0408-40, lines 33 and 34; IC-2025-0408-41, lines 8-10 and 17. Such records consist of emails and logged phone messages.

Docket #FIC 2025-0412 Bryant Abbott v. Joseph P. Ganim, Mayor, City of
Bridgeport; and City of Bridgeport

The Hearing Officer’s Report is amended as follows:

7. It is found that, via the online Gov QA portal² on April 25, 2025, the complainant requested from the respondents copies of “any and all records, communication, documentation, and/or reports relating to, or stemming from, the explosion which occurred at the Tradebe Treatment Facility on December 29, 2023, 50 Cross Street, Bridgeport, Ct. [sic] [. This request includes any and all records of communication with Tradebe spokesperson Richard Bamberger”] (hereinafter, “April 25, 2025, request”).

8. It is found that, via the GovQA portal on April 25, 2025, the respondents partially acknowledged the complainant’s request, quoting the request sent by the complainant as described in paragraph 7, above. [, yet omitting the second sentence regarding his request for the respondents’ “communications with Tradebe spokesperson Richard Bamberger.” It is further found that the respondents assigned the reference number W036349-042525 to such request.]

[33. It is found that the search terms used by the respondents’ IT department, described in paragraph 32, above, to search for responsive records was inadequate, as it did not contain some of the key words identified in the complainant’s April 25 or May 13, 2025, requests, such as “explosion” and “Richard Bamberger.”]

^[1] The Commission notes that the respondents failed to comply with the requirements of hearing officer’s first order to submit records for in camera inspection, issued on February 20, 2026. Following a second in camera order issued on April 8, 2026, the respondents complied with such order and delivered the in camera records to the Commission as ordered on April 21, 2026.

^[2] The first in camera record is labeled #2 and there is no in camera labeled as #1. Therefore, the in camera records start with record #2.

[34.] **33.** It is found that the respondents offered no evidence or explanation as to whether their IT department conducted similar searches of any other computer systems in the respondent office, including the respondent mayor's computer systems.

[35.] **34.** Regarding the complainant's May 13, 2025, request, it is found that the respondents failed to prove that any of the respondents' above-described efforts included a search for records responsive to that request.

Respondents' Compliance with March 23, 2026, Orders

[36.] **35.** After the November 7, 2025, and March 20, 2026, hearings in this matter, the undersigned hearing officer, on March 23, 2026, issued two orders to the respondents.

First Order

[37.] **36.** One of such March 23, 2026, orders, described in paragraph [36] **35**, above, instructed the respondents to do the following:

(a) conduct a new search for records responsive to the complainant's April 25, 2025 request at issue, specifically including, but not limited to, any notice received by the respondents of any enforcement action or any action to recover any civil penalty imposed under Title 22a of the Connecticut General Statutes by the Connecticut Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection against Tradebe Treatment Facility relating to the explosion which occurred on December 29, 2023, at 50 Cross Street, Bridgeport, CT; and

(b) appear at a reopened hearing, scheduled for April 1, 2026, with any competent witness or witnesses to testify as to the nature of the above-ordered search; any responsive records located from such search, any exemptions to disclosure the respondents may wish to claim for such records; and evidence concerning the imposition of a civil penalty.

[38.] **37.** It is found that, in lieu of appearing at the April 1, 2026, reopened hearing in this matter as ordered by the undersigned hearing officer, the respondents attempted to comply with the order described in paragraph [37] **36(a)** and (b), above, through the submission of an affidavit from their counsel of record¹⁰ in this matter on March 31, 2026 ("March 31, 2026, affidavit).

[39.] **38.** It is found that, in the March 31, 2026, affidavit, the respondents' counsel of record averred that she conducted her own search in response to the hearing officer's order for a new search for records responsive to the complainant's April 25, 2025 request. It is found that such search did not include a search of any responsive records maintained by the respondents;

rather, respondent counsel's search consisted of the following: making her own FOI request to DEEP, searching DEEP's "Document Search Portal" and the agency's website, and searching the respondent city's land records.

[40.] **39.** Therefore, it is concluded that the respondents failed to comply with the orders described in paragraphs [37] **36(a)** and [37] **36(b)**, above.

[41.] **40.** It is further found that, attached to the March 31, 2026, affidavit from respondents' counsel was an item marked "Exhibit 5." Such attachment contained DEEP's response to counsel's FOI request, described in paragraph [39] **38**, above. It is found that such attachment contained an electronic message sent on December 29, 2023, at 1:14 p.m., from DEEP to the address Mayor@bridgeportct.gov. It is found that DEEP provided respondents' counsel a copy of such message, which respondents' counsel attached to her affidavit.¹¹

[42.] **41.** It is found that the message from DEEP to the respondent mayor, described in paragraph [41] **40**, above, consisted of an incident notification described as "[p]ossible AST fire on Cross street, possibly from Santa Fuel tank farm or Tradebe property" at the location "Cross Street at Willow Street, Bridgeport, CT."

[43.] **42.** It is concluded that the respondents failed to prove that they searched for the email from DEEP to the respondent mayor, described in paragraphs **40 AND 41** [and **42**], above, among the records maintained by the respondents.

Second Order

[44.] **43.** The second of such March 23, 2026, orders, described in paragraph [36] **35**, above, was conditional, instructing the respondents to submit to the Commission for in camera inspection responsive records, if any, located as a result of the new search ordered, described in paragraph **35** [37](a), above, for which the respondents were claiming partial or complete exemption from disclosure. Such order instructed the respondents to hand-deliver such records to the Commission on April 1, 2026, at 10:00 a.m., prior to the commencement of the April 1, 2026, reopened hearing in this matter.

[45.] **44.** It is found that the respondents did not submit to the Commission any in camera records responsive to the second March 23, 2026, order described in paragraph [44] **43**, above.

[46.] **45.** Accordingly, it is concluded that the respondents technically did not violate the conditional portion of the March 23, 2026, order described in paragraph [44] **43**, above, assuming that they did not find any responsive records for which they claimed an exemption to disclosure. However, as described in paragraph [40] **39**, above, the respondents did not complete the search for responsive records per the first portion of the undersigned hearing officer's order; therefore, the respondents failed to prove full compliance with such order described in paragraph [44] **43**, above.

Conclusions

[47.] **46.** Based upon the findings described in paragraphs 27 [-35]-**34** and [38-43] **37-42**, above, it is found that the respondents failed to prove that they conducted a thorough and diligent search for records responsive to the complainant's April 25 and May 13, 2025, requests. Accordingly, it is found that the respondents failed to prove that they provided the complainant with a copy of all records responsive to such requests.

[48.] **47.** Therefore, it is concluded that the respondents violated the disclosure provisions of §§1-210(a), and 1-212(a), G.S.

[Consideration of the Imposition of Civil Penalties

49. Section 1-206(b)(2), G.S., provides the following in relevant part:

[U]pon a finding that a denial of any right created by the Freedom of Information Act was without reasonable grounds and after the custodian or other official directly responsible for the denial has been given an opportunity to be heard at the hearing conducted in accordance with sections 4-176e to 4-184, inclusive, the commission may, in its discretion, impose against the custodian or other official a civil penalty of not less than twenty dollars nor more than five thousand dollars.

50. The standard for when a violation is "without reasonable grounds" is analogous to the legal standard "without any substantial justification." Connecticut Dept. of Pub. Safety v. FOIC, et al., 1997 WL 537117 (Conn. Super.), affirmed, 247 Conn. 341 (1998). Similarly, the phrase "without reasonable justification" has been construed to mean "entirely unreasonable or without any basis in law or fact." Id., quoting Bursinkas v. Dept. of Social Services, 240 Conn. 141, 155 (1997).

51. It is found that respondent Joseph P. Ganim, as the mayor of the City of Bridgeport and a public agency in his own right, is the public official directly responsible for the violation set forth in paragraph 48, above, and the respondents' failure to comply with the hearing officer's order as described in paragraph 40, above.

52. It is found that the respondent mayor's failure to acknowledge the complainant's April 25, 2025, request in its entirety, as described in paragraph 8, above, was not reasonable.

53. It is found that the respondent mayor's provision of nonresponsive records to the complainant, as described in paragraphs 10 and 19, above, was not reasonable.

54. It is found that respondent mayor's failure to ensure that the respondent city's IT department searched all computers in the mayor's office, rather than only the communication director's computer, was both suspect and not reasonable.

55. It is found that evidence submitted by the respondent mayor concerning searches of other departments that are not respondents to the instant matter, particularly affidavits from the city's health director regarding her search of her department¹² and from the respondents' counsel regarding her search of land records,¹³ was irrelevant, obfuscatory, and not reasonable.

56. It is found that the respondent mayor's failure to prove that the respondents' search for records was thorough and diligent, as described in paragraphs 35, 43, and 47, above, was not reasonable.

57. It is found that the respondent mayor's failure to ensure compliance with the hearing officer's March 23, 2026, order, as described in paragraph 40, above, was not reasonable.

58. It is found that the respondent mayor's failure to send counsel or any other representative or witness to appear at the April 1, 2025, civil penalty hearing on his behalf, as described in paragraph 38, above, was not reasonable.

59. It is therefore concluded that the complainant's right to access public records responsive to his April 25, 2025, request was denied by the respondent mayor "without reasonable grounds," within the meaning of §1-206(b)(2), G.S., and a civil penalty is warranted against the respondent mayor.]

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

[1. The respondent Mayor Joseph P. Ganim, as the official directly responsible for the denial herein, shall remit to the Commission, within forty-five (45) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, a civil penalty in the amount of one thousand, five hundred dollars (\$1,500.00).]

[2.] **1.** The respondents shall, within forty-five (45) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, perform a diligent and thorough search for records responsive to the complainant's request, as described in paragraphs 7 and 11 of the findings, above.

[3.] **2.** The respondent mayor, not his counsel, within forty-five (45) days of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, shall provide an affidavit to the complainant and the Commission informing them of the results of the respondents' search for the records described in paragraph [2] **1** of this order, above. The respondents shall provide to the complainant copies of any additional responsive records that were located, free of charge.

[4.] **3.** In the event that the complainant is not satisfied with the respondents' compliance with paragraphs of 1[,] **OR** 2[, or 3] of the instant order, he may file a noncompliance complaint with the Commission, which may be afforded expedited treatment upon request.

[5.] **4.** Henceforth, the respondents shall strictly comply with the disclosure provisions of §§1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S.

Docket #FIC 2025-0643 Edward Ploughton v. Director, Windham Region Transit District; and Windham Region Transit District

The order in the Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

1. The complaint is dismissed [for failure to prosecute].

Docket #FIC 2025-0728 Brendan Keatley v. Chief, Fire Department, City of Stamford; Fire Department, City of Stamford; and City of Stamford

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on March 11, 2026, at which time the respondents appeared, but the complainant failed to appear.¹

[The undersigned hearing officer notes that Attorney Michael Toma, counsel for the respondents, appeared with a witness. Attorney Toma represented that he spent approximately eight hours preparing for the hearing. In addition, it is noted that the respondents traveled over an hour and thirty minutes to attend the hearing. The hearing officer informed Attorney Toma that he would recommend that the matter be dismissed for failure to prosecute.]

ON MAY 7, 2026, THE COMPLAINANT, VIA EMAIL, INFORMED THE COMMISSION THAT HE WISHED TO WITHDRAW HIS COMPLAINT. THE COMMISSION TAKES ADMINISTRATIVE NOTICE OF SUCH WITHDRAWAL.

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

1. BASED UPON THE WITHDRAWAL, THE COMPLAINT IS HEREBY DISMISSED. [The complaint is hereby dismissed for failure to prosecute.]

[2. The complainant is admonished for his failure to appear at the hearing in this matter, which failure resulted in a waste of scarce state and local resources.]

¹ THE UNDERSIGNED HEARING OFFICER NOTES THAT ATTORNEY MICHAEL TOMA, COUNSEL FOR THE RESPONDENTS, APPEARED WITH A WITNESS. ATTORNEY TOMA REPRESENTED THAT HE SPENT APPROXIMATELY EIGHT HOURS PREPARING FOR THE HEARING AND REQUESTED THAT THE COMPLAINANT BE ADMONISHED FOR HIS FAILURE TO APPEAR AT THE HEARING ON THIS MATTER. IN ADDITION, IT IS NOTED THAT THE RESPONDENTS TRAVELED OVER AN HOUR AND THIRTY MINUTES TO ATTEND THE HEARING. THE HEARING OFFICER INFORMED ATTORNEY TOMA THAT HE WOULD RECOMMEND THAT THE MATTER BE DISMISSED FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE.

