

TO: Freedom of Information Commission
FROM: Russell Blair
RE: Minutes of the Commission's regular meeting of June 24, 2026

A regular meeting of the Freedom of Information Commission was held on June 24, 2026. The Commission's regular meeting of June 24, 2026 was conducted in person. The meeting convened at 2:02 p.m. with the following Commissioners present:

Commissioner Owen P. Eagan, presiding
Commissioner Kate Farrish (participated via speakerphone)
Commissioner Judith Ganswindt (participated via speakerphone)
Commissioner Aigné Goldsby Wells (participated via speakerphone)
Commissioner Christopher P. Hankins
Commissioner Thomas A. Hennick
Commissioner Kerry J. Robair
Commissioner Matthew Streeter

Also present were staff members Danielle L. McGee, Paula S. Pearlman, C. Zack Hyde, Mary Kate Smith, Nicholas A. Smarra, Marybeth G. Sullivan, Paul V. Arce, Uswah A. Khan, Jennifer Mayo, Bijoux Amegavi and Russell Blair.

The Commissioners unanimously voted to appoint Bijoux Amegavi as Acting Clerk of the Commission.

The Commissioners unanimously voted to approve the Commission's regular meeting minutes of June 10, 2026.

Those in attendance were informed that the June 24, 2026 regular meeting of the Commission was being recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0552 Kenneth Roger v. Attorney General, State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0554 Kenneth Roger v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Revenue Services; and State of Connecticut, Department of Revenue Services

Kennith Roger appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Louis Bucari appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0564 Ahmaad Lane v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut,
Department of Correction; and State of Connecticut,
Department of Correction

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0616 Andres Sosa v. Joseph Greelish, Director, State of Connecticut,
Judicial Branch, Performance Management and Judicial Branch
Statistics; and State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch,
Performance Management and Judicial Branch Statistics

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0537 Jacqueline Rabe Thomas v. Commissioner, State of
Connecticut, Department of Correction; and State of
Connecticut, Department of Correction

Jacqueline Rabe Thomas appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Jennifer Lepore appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 7-0 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners voted 7-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended*. Commissioner Farrish recused herself from the matter. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0538 Ryan Salvas v. Zoning Enforcement Officer, Town of Sterling;
and Town of Sterling

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0539 Ryan Salvas v. Superintendent of Schools, Sterling School
District; and Sterling School District

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0541 Ryan Salvas v. Superintendent of Schools, Sterling School
District; and Sterling School District

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0570 Nancy Griswold v. Ralph Celone, Chairman, Planning & Zoning Commission, Town of Thomaston; Planning & Zoning Commission, Town of Thomaston; and Town of Thomaston

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0585 Nancy Griswold v. Chairman, Planning and Zoning Commission, Town of Norfolk; Planning and Zoning Commission, Town of Norfolk; and Town of Norfolk

Nancy Griswold appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Rich Roberts appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners voted 7-1 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report, with Commissioner Streeter opposed. The Commissioners voted 5-3 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended*, with Commissioners Hennick, Streeter and Robair opposed. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0654 John DiIorio v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Banking; and State of Connecticut, Department of Banking

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 2025-0734 James N. Demetriades v. Director, Human Resources Department, Town of Stratford; Human Resources Department, Town of Stratford; and Town of Stratford

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0740 Jean D. William v. Tax Assessor, Assessor's Office, City of Stamford; Assessor's Office, City of Stamford; and City of Stamford

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

Executive Director and General Counsel Danielle L. McGee reported that the Commission is holding its annual conference at The Riverhouse in Haddam on September 25, 2026.

Executive Director and General Counsel Danielle L. McGee introduced Uswah A. Khan, who joined the Commission as a Staff Attorney on June 12, 2026.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:48 p.m.

/s/ Russell Blair

Russell Blair

AMENDMENTS*

Docket #FIC 2025-0537 Jacqueline Rabe Thomas v. Commissioner, State of
Connecticut, Department of Correction; and State of
Connecticut, Department of Correction

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows, and all subsequent paragraphs and paragraph references are renumbered accordingly:

29. It is found, however, that **DESPITE THE HEARING OFFICER ORALLY ORDERING THE RESPONDENTS TO BE PREPARED TO ADDRESS CLAIMS OF EXEMPTION FOR THE INCOMPLETE SECURITY DIVISION INVESTIGATIONS AT THE MAY 19TH HEARING ON THIS MATTER**, the respondents did not provide evidence or argument **AT SUCH HEARING** to establish that the Department of Correction is a "law enforcement agency" within the meaning of §1-210(b)(3), G.S. **AT THE TIME OF DRAFTING THE REPORT OF HEARING OFFICER IN THIS MATTER, THE HEARING OFFICER WAS** [The Commission is] unaware of any decision of the Connecticut Courts or **THE COMMISSION'S** [its] own administrative proceedings wherein it **HAD** [has] been determined that the DOC is a "law enforcement agency" within the meaning of §1-210(b)(3), G.S. Moreover, [it is found that] **STATUS AS A LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY UNDER §1-210(b)(3), G.S.**, is not, in and of itself, an exemption to disclosure under the FOI Act, and the respondents did not **ESTABLISH THE OTHER CRITERIA SET FORTH IN §1-210(B)(3), G.S., OR** specifically argue which subsection(s) [of §1-210(b)(3), G.S.,] they were claiming as the basis for withholding unfinished Security Division Reports.

30. **IN THEIR BRIEF TO THE FULL COMMISSION, THE RESPONDENTS, FOR THE FIRST TIME, RELY UPON ROBERT IRIZARRY V. WARDEN, WILLARD CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, STATE OF CONNECTICUT, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION, DOCKET #FIC 1995-419 (OCTOBER 23, 1996) ("IRIZARRY"), A SINGLE COMMISSION DECISION FROM APPROXIMATELY THIRTY YEARS AGO, TO SUPPORT THEIR ARGUMENT THAT THEY ARE A "LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY" WITHIN THE MEANING OF §1-210(B)(3), G.S. IT IS UNCLEAR FROM THE FINAL DECISION IN IRIZARRY, HOWEVER, THE FACTUAL AND LEGAL BASIS UPON WHICH THE COMMISSION RELIED IN CONCLUDING THAT THE DOC WAS A "LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY" IN THAT CASE.⁵ NONETHELESS, IT IS FOUND THAT THE SPECIFIC FACTS AND EVIDENCE IN IRIZARRY ARE DISTINGUISHABLE FROM THE PRESENT MATTER.**

⁵ **THE COMMISSION ALSO NOTES THAT IRIZARRY WAS DECIDED APPROXIMATELY THREE YEARS PRIOR TO THE ENACTMENT OF §1-210(B)(18), G.S., WHICH PERMITS THE RESPONDENTS TO WITHHOLD RECORDS, THE DISCLOSURE OF WHICH THE COMMISSIONER OF DOC HAS REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE MAY RESULT IN A SAFETY RISK.**

31. THE SECURITY DIVISION FILE AT ISSUE IN IRIZARRY WAS GENERATED AS PART OF A “SIMULTANEOUS INVESTIGATION” CONDUCTED BY THE DOC’S SECURITY DIVISION AND THE CONNECTICUT STATE POLICE (“CSP”) INTO ALLEGATIONS OF INAPPROPRIATE AND/OR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY BY DOC STAFF. THE SECURITY DIVISION FILE, WHICH CONTAINED A FINALIZED SECURITY DIVISION REPORT, WAS “GENERATED AS A RESULT OF” SUCH SIMULTANEOUS INVESTIGATION. CONVERSELY, IN THE PRESENT MATTER, IT IS FOUND THAT ONLY ONE OF APPROXIMATELY THIRTY RESPONSIVE SECURITY DIVISION REPORTS IS ASSOCIATED WITH A CSP INVESTIGATION AND THAT ALL SUCH RESPONSIVE SECURITY DIVISION REPORTS ARE UNFINISHED REPORTS. IT IS ALSO FOUND THAT THE RESPONDENTS DID NOT TESTIFY THAT THE SECURITY DIVISION’S INVESTIGATION INTO THAT ONE MATTER WAS BEING CONDUCTED “SIMULTANEOUSLY” ALONGSIDE, OR IN CONJUNCTION WITH, THE CSP’S INVESTIGATION, BUT RATHER, THAT THE SECURITY DIVISION INVESTIGATION WAS PUT ON HOLD UNTIL THE CSP’S INVESTIGATION IS COMPLETE. THE FINDINGS IN IRIZARRY ESTABLISH THAT THE RESPONDENTS PRESENTED EVIDENCE REGARDING THE SPECIFIC SECURITY DIVISION INVESTIGATION AT ISSUE IN THAT MATTER. IN THE PRESENT MATTER, HOWEVER, THE RESPONDENTS PROVIDED GENERALIZED TESTIMONY ABOUT ALL SECURITY DIVISION INVESTIGATIONS, BUT FOR THE ONE UNIDENTIFIED SECURITY DIVISION INVESTIGATION ASSOCIATED WITH A CSP INVESTIGATION. THE RESPONDENTS TESTIFIED THAT, WITH RESPECT TO SUCH UNIDENTIFIED SECURITY DIVISION INVESTIGATION, IT HAD BEEN HALTED DUE TO AN INVESTIGATION BY THE CSP. HOWEVER, OTHER UNIDENTIFIED INVESTIGATIONS WERE DELAYED DUE TO UNAVAILABLE WITNESSES AND/OR INCOMPLETE MEDICAL EXAMINATIONS.

32[30]. Based upon the foregoing, **AND THE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE**, it is found that the respondents failed to prove that, **WITH RESPECT TO THE RECORDS AT ISSUE IN THIS CASE**, the DOC [Department of Correction] is a “law enforcement agency” within the meaning of §1-210(b)(3), G.S. It is further concluded that the respondents, therefore, failed to prove that the unfinished Security Division Reports are exempt from disclosure pursuant to §1-210(b)(3)**(D)**, G.S.⁶

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

1. Forthwith, the respondents shall undertake a diligent and thorough search for the records described in paragraphs **33[31]** and **34[32]** of the findings, above, and **PROMPTLY** provide copies of such records to the complainant, free of charge, and on a rolling basis, with

⁶ **THE COMMISSION DECLINES TO OVERTURN OR REVISIT THE DECISION IN IRIZARRY, IN FAVOR OF AWAITING AN APPROPRIATE CASE, IF ONE SHOULD ARISE.**

the first provision of records occurring no later than within thirty (30) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter.

Docket #FIC 2025-0585 Nancy Griswold v. Chairman, Planning and Zoning
Commission, Town of Norfolk; Planning and Zoning
Commission, Town of Norfolk; and Town of Norfolk

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

15. IT IS FOUND THAT THE FIRST SELECTMAN IS AN EX OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE RESPONDENT COMMISSION, AND THEREFORE, IT IS CONCLUDED THAT HIS ATTENDANCE AT THE FIRST EXECUTIVE SESSION DID NOT VIOLATE §1-231(a), G.S. [It is found that the respondents did not limit the first invitees' attendance to the period of time for which their presence was necessary to present testimony or opinion within the meaning of §1-231(a), G.S.]

16. IT IS FOUND THAT WITH RESPECT TO THE REMAINING INVITEES TO THE FIRST EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR ATTENDANCE WAS NOT LIMITED TO THE PERIOD OF TIME FOR WHICH THEIR PRESENCE WAS NECESSARY TO PRESENT TESTIMONY OR OPINION WITHIN THE MEANING OF §1-231(A), G.S. IT IS THEREFORE CONCLUDED THAT THE RESPONDENTS VIOLATED THE PROVISIONS OF §1-231(A), G.S., WITH RESPECT TO THE REMAINING INVITEES TO SUCH EXECUTIVE SESSION. [It is therefore concluded that the respondents violated the provisions of §1-231(a), G.S., regarding the first executive session held on June 10, 2025.]

21. AS ALREADY FOUND IN PARAGRAPH 15, ABOVE, THE FIRST SELECTMAN IS AN EX OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE RESPONDENT COMMISSION. IT IS CONCLUDED, THEREFORE, THAT HIS ATTENDANCE AT THE SECOND EXECUTIVE SESSION DID NOT VIOLATE §1-231(A), G.S. [It is found that the respondents did not limit the second invitees' attendance to the period of time for which their presence was necessary to present testimony or opinion within the meaning of §1-231(a), G.S.]

22. IT IS FOUND THAT WITH RESPECT TO THE REMAINING INVITEES TO THE SECOND EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR ATTENDANCE WAS NOT LIMITED TO THE PERIOD OF TIME FOR WHICH THEIR PRESENCE WAS NECESSARY TO PRESENT TESTIMONY OR OPINION WITHIN THE MEANING OF §1-231(A), G.S. IT IS THEREFORE CONCLUDED THAT THE RESPONDENTS VIOLATED THE PROVISIONS OF §1-231(A), G.S., WITH RESPECT TO THE REMAINING INVITEES TO SUCH EXECUTIVE SESSION. [It is therefore concluded that the respondents violated the provisions of §1-231(a), G.S., regarding the second executive session held on June 10, 2025.]

Docket #FIC 2025-0654 John DiIorio v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut,
Department of Banking; and State of Connecticut, Department
of Banking

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

8. It is found that in the same July 10, 2025 email, described in paragraph 7[8] above, the complainant requested that the respondents provide him with a copy of "all records identified at [paragraph] 81 of the [#FIC 2024-0467 Report of Hearing Officer] ("July 10, 2025 request").

17. It is found that, on August 4, 2025, the respondents responded to the complainant's August 4, 2025 email, described in paragraph 16[15] above, as follows:

This letter is an acknowledgement of your email request (copy enclosed), dated August 4, 2025, requesting copies of certain Department of Baking Records.

Your request is denied. The records requested are confidential under state banking law, §36a-21, CGS, and thus exempt from the FOI Act's public inspection and copy provisions, §1-210(a) [, G.S].