

TO: Freedom of Information Commission  
FROM: Russell Blair  
RE: Minutes of the Commission's regular meeting of March 12, 2025

A regular meeting of the Freedom of Information Commission was held on March 12, 2025. The Commission meeting of March 12, 2025 was conducted in person. The meeting convened at 2:01 p.m. with the following Commissioners present:

Commissioner Owen P. Eagan, presiding  
Commissioner Jonathan J. Einhorn  
Commissioner Kate Farrish  
Commissioner Stephen Fuzesi Jr. (participated via speakerphone)  
Commissioner Judith Ganswindt (participated via speakerphone)  
Commissioner Aigné Goldsby-Wells  
Commissioner Christopher P. Hankins  
Commissioner Thomas A. Hennick (participated via speakerphone)  
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, J. Max McCann, Jennifer Mayo and Russell Blair.

The Commissioners voted 8-0 to approve the Commission's regular meeting minutes of February 26, 2025. Commissioner Goldsby-Wells abstained from the vote.

Those in attendance were informed that the March 12, 2025 regular meeting of the Commission was being recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0155](#) Julian Geter v. Chief, Police Department, City of Bridgeport; Police Department, City of Bridgeport; and City of Bridgeport

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

[Docket #FIC 2024-0156](#) Donald Daniels v. Chief, Police Department, Town of East Hartford; Police Department, Town of East Hartford; and Town of East Hartford

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

[Docket #FIC 2024-0362](#) Francis Anderson v. Angel Quiros, Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction; and State of Connecticut, Department of Correction

The Commissioners took no action. The matter was marked off prior to the meeting.

[Docket #FIC 2019-0756](#) Mike Savino v. Director of Public Records, State of Connecticut, University of Connecticut, Public Records Administration; and State of Connecticut, University of Connecticut, Public Records Administration

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

[Docket #FIC 2021-0177](#) Robert Cushman v. Jason Thody, Chief, Police Department, City of Hartford; Police Department, City of Hartford; and City of Hartford

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

[Docket #FIC 2023-0633](#) David Cummings v. Chief Court Administrator, State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch; and State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch

David Cummings appeared on his own behalf. Attorney Andre Tarutin appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Final Decision After Reconsideration. The Commissioners unanimously voted to amend the Final Decision After Reconsideration for a second time. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Final Decision After Reconsideration as amended.\*

[Docket #FIC 2024-0165](#) Jennifer Damon v. Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, Office of the Secretary of the State; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Secretary of the State

Jennifer Damon appeared on her own behalf. Assistant Attorney General Blake Sullivan 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 2024-0198](#) Cynthia Ross-Zweig v. Chair, Permanent Building Committee, Town of New Fairfield; Permanent Building Committee, Town of New Fairfield; and Town of New Fairfield

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

[Docket #FIC 2024-0234](#) Nathaniel Clark v. William Tong, Attorney General, State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General

Nathaniel Clark appeared on his own behalf. Assistant Attorney General Julian Quinones Reyes appeared on behalf of the respondents. The Commissioners unanimously voted to adopt the Hearing Officer's Report. The proceedings were digitally recorded.

[Docket #FIC 2024-0448](#) Daniel Kokoszka v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Windham; Police Department, Town of Windham; and Town of Windham

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

[Docket #FIC 2024-0544](#) Gemnisw LLC v. Town Manager, Town of North Branford; and Town of North Branford

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

The Commissioners unanimously voted to file a Joint Motion for Remand in *Department of Energy and Environmental Protection et al v. Jean Farricielli and Freedom of Information Commission*, HHB-CV-24-6087248-S.

Executive Director Colleen M. Murphy reported that the Connecticut Foundation for Open Government would be honoring Nobel Peace Prize Laureate Maria Ressa with the Walker Cronkite Award at an event scheduled for April 14, 2025.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

/s/ Russell Blair  
Russell Blair

## AMENDMENTS\*

[Docket #FIC 2023-0633](#)

David Cummings v. Chief Court Administrator, State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch; and State of Connecticut, Judicial Branch

Paragraphs 57 and 63 of the Final Decision upon Reconsideration are amended as follows:

57. With respect to IC-2023-0633-006 line 31, IC-2023-0633-007 line 16, IC-2023-0633-008 line 28, and IC-2023-0633-016 line 5, it is found, based on the testimony of the Director, along with a careful in camera inspection, that such records constitute A cellular phone number[s] of OPI personnel. It is found that the Director determined that the cellular phone number[s are] IS utilized to communicate regarding matters related to intelligence activities, including wit judges and Judicial Branch employees, and are not publicly disclosed, for reasons that include, but are not limited to, the misuse of such information to harass, threaten, or harm OPI personnel, Judicial Branch employees, and judges. The Director determined that disclosure of such information may result in a safety risk, including a risk of harm to people in the Judicial Branch or the facility itself.

63. **BASED ON THE UNIQUE FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THIS CASE, [i]t** is found that the determinations made by the Director, as described in paragraphs 56-60, above, were not frivolous or patently unfounded, or in bad faith. Therefore, this Commission must defer to the Director's determination, as the Chief Court Administrator's designee, that there are reasonable grounds to believe that disclosure of the records described in paragraphs 56-60, above, may result in a safety risk, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(19), G.S.

Docket #FIC 2024-0165

Jennifer Damon v. Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, Office of the Secretary of the State; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Secretary of the State

Paragraphs 32 and 33 of the Hearing Officer's Report are amended as follows:

32. [Moreover, because the respondents provided the complainant with the Schedule A (that is, IC-2024-0165-86 through IC-2024-0165-95), it is found that they cannot] **BASED ON THE LIMITED NATURE OF THE TESTIMONY PRESENTED AT THE CONTESTED CASE HEARING, IT IS FOUND THAT THE RESPONDENTS FAILED TO** prove that the information contained in the Schedule B (i) derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from their disclosure or use, and (ii) is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain secrecy, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(5)(A), G.S.

33. [It is concluded that IC-2024-0165-96 and 2024-0165-97 are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the provisions of §1-210(b)(5)(A), G.S.] **IT IS THEREFORE CONCLUDED THAT THE RESPONDENTS VIOLATED THE DISCLOSURE PROVISIONS OF §§1-210(A) AND 1-212(A), G.S, WHEN THEY DECLINED TO PROVIDE A COPY OF THE SCHEDULE B TO THE COMPLAINANT.**