

TO: Freedom of Information Commission

FROM: Russell Blair

RE: Minutes of the Commission's regular meeting of September 9, 2026

A regular meeting of the Freedom of Information Commission was held on September 9, 2026. The Commission's regular meeting of September 9, 2026 was conducted in person. The meeting convened at 2:01 p.m. with the following Commissioners present:

Commissioner Owen P. Eagan, presiding
Commissioner Kate Farrish
Commissioner Judith Ganswindt
Commissioner Aigné Goldsby Wells
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, Valicia D. Harmon, C. Zack Hyde, Mary-Kate Smith, Nicholas A. Smarra, Marybeth G. Sullivan, Paul V. Arce, Uswah A. Khan, Molly Steffes and Russell Blair.

The Commissioners unanimously voted 7-0 to approve the Commission's regular meeting minutes of August 26, 2026. Commissioner Goldsby Wells was not present for the vote.

Those in attendance were informed that the September 9, 2026 regular meeting of the Commission was being recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-1029 Darrell Blatche v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Bloomfield; Police Department, Town of Bloomfield; and Town of Bloomfield

The Commissioners unanimously voted 7-0 to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. Commissioner Goldsby Wells was not present for the vote. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0816 Connecticut Light & Power Co. v. Marissa Paslick Gillett, Chairman, State of Connecticut, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; and Public Utilities Regulatory Authority

Attorney Thomas Murphy and Attorney James Healy appeared on behalf of the complainant. Assistant Attorney General James Zimmer 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 for a second

time. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Hearing Officer's Report for a third time. The Commissioners voted 7-1 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report for a fourth time, with Commissioner Streeter opposed. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended*. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0828 Justin DiMarco v. Rafael Medina III, Chief, Police Department, Town of Wethersfield; Police Department, Town of Wethersfield; and Town of Wethersfield

Justin DiMarco appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Trent Kaisen appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0846 Justin DiMarco v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Wethersfield; Police Department, Town of Wethersfield; and Town of Wethersfield

Justin DiMarco appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Trent Kaisen appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0836 Peter Murrugarra v. Research Attorney, State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch, Court Operations Division; and State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch, Court Operations Division

Peter Murrugarra appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Jillian Greenbacker appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0837 Lee McCready v. Chairman, Board of Ethics, City of New London; Board of Ethics, City of New London; and City of New London

Lee McCready appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Brian Estep appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0840 Lee McCready v. City Attorney, City of New London; and City of New London

Lee McCready appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Brian Estep appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0843 Neil Johnson v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut,
Department of Social Services; and State of Connecticut,
Department of Social Services

Neil Johnson appeared on his own behalf. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0845 Jim Haddadin v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut,
General Assembly, Office of Legislative Management; and
State of Connecticut, General Assembly, Office of Legislative
Management

Jim Haddadin appeared on his own behalf. Assistant Attorney General Ben Abrams appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Hearing Officer's Report. The Commissioners voted 6-2 to amend the Hearing Officer's Report for a second time, with Commissioners Goldsby Wells and Streeter opposed. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report as amended*. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0849 Margaret Moffitt 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. Upon the arrival of the complainant, the Commissioners unanimously voted to reopen the matter. Margaret Moffitt appeared on her own behalf. Attorney Brittney Ignace appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

Docket #FIC 2025-0852 Timothy Haggerty v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut,
Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division; and State of
Connecticut, Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division

Attorney Andre Tarutin 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 2025-0906 Nick Sambides Jr. and Gregory Stroud v. Edward Reynolds,
Chief, Police Department, Town of Hamden; Police
Department, Town of Hamden; and Town of Hamden

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

Docket #FIC 2025-0949 Frank Fedeli v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut,
Department of Energy & Environmental Protection; and State of
Connecticut, Department of Energy & Environmental Protection

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

Docket #FIC 2025-1049 Michael Johnson v. Chief, Police Department, City of Stamford;
Police Department, City of Stamford; and City of Stamford

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

Docket #FIC 2025-1229 Ronald Gardner v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut,
Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection; and
State of Connecticut, Department of Emergency Services and
Public Protection

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

The Commissioners unanimously voted to deny the Petition for Reconsideration and Modification dated August 18, 2026 and received by the Commission on August 18, 2026, filed by respondents in *Evan Delman v. Superintendent of Schools, Greenwich Public Schools; and Greenwich Public Schools*, Docket #FIC 2025-0759.

Executive Director and General Counsel Danielle L. McGee reported that Attorney Paul V. Arce would be departing the Commission on September 11, 2026.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.

/s/ Russell Blair
Russell Blair

AMENDMENTS*

Docket #FIC 2025-0816 Connecticut Light & Power Co.; Yankee Gas Services Company; Aquarion Water Company of Connecticut; and UIL Holdings Corporation v. Marissa Paslick Gillett, Chairman, State of Connecticut, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority; and State of Connecticut, Public Utilities Regulatory Authority,

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

1. Within seven (7) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall provide the complainants with copies of the in camera records identified in Appendix A and Appendix B to this decision, unredacted and free of charge.
2. Within one week of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall commence an additional search for records responsive to the May 27, 2025 request. With respect to such search, the respondents are not required to [conduct an additional] **REPEAT THE SAME IT** search through BITS **THAT THE RESPONDENTS ALREADY CONDUCTED**. In complying with this order, the respondents shall designate a person, other than the **FORMER** Legal Director, **SCOTT MUSKA**, to supervise and manage the search and disclosure of responsive records that have not already been provided to the complainants. Such search must also include searches of any relevant personal devices, personal email accounts, personal social media accounts and Google Docs accounts for responsive records. To the extent that any relevant persons are no longer employed by PURA, the respondents should nevertheless make all reasonable efforts to inquire with such individuals and to request that such individuals search their personal devices, their personal email accounts, their personal social media accounts and Google Docs accounts for responsive records.
3. Within thirty (30) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall provide the complainants with: (a) an affidavit, from someone with direct knowledge, detailing the search that was conducted; and (b) copies of all responsive records located by such search, unredacted and free of charge, that have not already been provided.
4. **IN COMPLYING WITH PARAGRAPHS 2 AND 3 OF THE ORDERS ABOVE, THE RESPONDENTS MAY WITHHOLD OR REDACT SUCH RECORDS, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, THAT ARE SUBJECT TO THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE OR WORK-PRODUCT PRIVILEGE PURSUANT TO §1-210(B)(10), G.S.**
5. **IF ANY RECORDS, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, ARE WITHHELD PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ORDER ABOVE, THE RESPONDENTS SHALL SUBMIT AN AFFIDAVIT SWORN TO BY A PERSON WITH REQUISITE KNOWLEDGE, WHICH IDENTIFIES AND BRIEFLY DESCRIBES THE WITHHELD RECORDS, OR PORTIONS THEREOF, AND THE STATUTORY BASIS FOR WITHHOLDING SUCH RECORDS. SUCH AFFIDAVIT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE COMMISSION AND THE COMPLAINANTS WITHIN FIFTEEN (15) DAYS OF THE DISCLOSURE ORDERS SET**

FORTH IN PARAGRAPHS 2 AND 3, ABOVE.

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

7. ATTORNEY SCOTT MUSKA IS ADMONISHED AND MUST STRICTLY COMPLY WITH THE DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS OF THE FOI ACT.

Docket #FIC 2025-0845 Jim Haddadin v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut,
General Assembly, Office of Legislative Management; and
State of Connecticut, General Assembly, Office of Legislative
Management

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

1. "Forthwith, the respondents shall conduct a diligent and thorough search for all responsive records described in paragraph 61 of the findings, above. **WITH REGARD TO THE PERSONAL EMAIL ACCOUNTS AND TEXT MESSAGES OF STAFF MEMBERS OF OLM, THE RESPONDENTS SHALL REQUEST THAT EACH SUCH STAFF MEMBER SEARCH THEIR RESPECTIVE PERSONAL EMAIL ACCOUNT(S) AND DEVICE(S) FOR RESPONSIVE RECORDS.**

2. Within [thirty (30)] **FORTY-FIVE (45)** days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall provide the complainant with: (a) an affidavit from someone with direct knowledge detailing the search that was conducted for the records described in paragraph [60] **61** of the findings, above; and (b) copies of all responsive records located by such search, unredacted and free of charge.

3. Within [fourteen (14)] **FORTY-FIVE (45)** days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall provide the complainant with copies of the in camera records described in paragraphs 29, 33, and 41 of the findings, above, unredacted and free of charge.

4. Henceforth, the respondents shall strictly comply with the disclosure provisions of §§1-210(a), 1-211(a), and 1-212(a), G.S.

Docket #FIC 2025-0852 Timothy Haggerty v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut, Judicial
Branch, Court Support Services Division; and State of Connecticut,
Judicial Branch, Court Support Services Division

The Hearing Officer's Report is amended as follows:

31. It is therefore found that disclosure of the following portions of the in camera records would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(2), G.S.:

- a. IC-2025-0852-1, lines 1, 3, 6 and 7;
- b. IC-2025-0852-1, line 35 through IC-2025-0852-2, line 1;
- c. IC-2025-0852-3, lines 30-33;
- d. IC-2025-0852-4, lines 22-23;
- e. IC-2025-0852-5, lines 3-6 [and] 24-29[;], **AND 30-31**
- f. IC-2025-0852-7, line 9; and
- g. IC-2025-0852-8, lines 15, [only as to the portion appearing between “also” and “notes”]33 and 36.

32. It is therefore found that the in camera records, described in paragraph 31, above, are exempt from disclosure pursuant to §1-210(b)(2), G.S. It is further concluded that the respondents did not violate §§1-210(a) or 1-212(a), G.S., by withholding such portions of the in camera records.

33. However, based upon the same inspection of the in camera records, it is found that the respondents failed to prove that disclosure of the following portions of the in camera records would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(2), G.S.:

- a. IC-2025-0852-4, line 18;
- b. [IC-2025-0852-5, lines 30-31;]
- c. IC-2025-0852-6, lines 4-5;
- d. [IC-2025-0852-8, line 15, except as otherwise provided in paragraph 31(g), above;]
and
- e. IC-2025-0852-8, line[s 33 and 36-]37.

34. It is therefore concluded that the respondents violated the disclosure provisions of §§ 1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S., when they withheld from the complainant the in camera records described in paragraph 33, above.

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

1. Within fourteen (14) days of the date of the Notice of Final Decision in this matter, the respondents shall provide the complainant, free of charge, with the following portions of the in camera records:

- a. IC-2025-0852-4, line 18;
- b. [IC-2025-0852-5, lines 30-31;]
- c. IC-2025-0852-6, lines 4-5;
- d. [IC-2025-0852-8, line 15, except as otherwise provided in paragraph 31(g), above;]
and
- e. IC-2025-0852-8, line[s 33 and 36-]37.

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