

Since 1975



FREEDOM OF INFORMATION



Connecticut Freedom of Information Commission · 18-20 Trinity Street, Suite 100 · Hartford, CT 06106
Toll free (CT only): (866)374-3617 Tel: (860)566-5682 Fax: (860)566-6474 · www.state.ct.us/foi/ · email: foi@po.state.ct.us

Don Stacom and the Hartford Courant,
Complainant(s)
against

Notice of Meeting

Docket #FIC 2011-711

Chief, Police Department, City of New Britain;
and Police Department, City of New Britain,
Respondent(s)

September 19, 2012

Transmittal of Proposed Final Decision Dated September 19, 2012

In accordance with Section 4-179 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Freedom of Information Commission hereby transmits to you the proposed finding and decision dated September 19, 2012, prepared by the hearing officer in the above-captioned matter.

This will notify you that the Commission will consider this matter for disposition at its meeting which will be held in the Freedom of Information Commission Hearing Room, 18-20 Trinity Street, 1st floor, Hartford, Connecticut, at **2 p.m. on Wednesday, October 10, 2012**. At that time and place you will be allowed to offer oral argument concerning this proposed finding and order. Oral argument shall be limited to ten (10) minutes. For good cause shown, however, the Commission may increase the period of time for argument. A request for additional time must be made in writing and should be filed with the Commission *on or before September 28, 2012*. Such request **MUST BE (1) copied to all parties, or if the parties are represented, to such representatives, and (2) include a notation indicating such notice to all parties or their representatives.**

Although a brief or memorandum of law is not required, if you decide to submit such a document, the Commission requests that an **original and fourteen (14) copies** be filed *on or before September 28, 2012*. **PLEASE NOTE: Any correspondence, brief or memorandum directed to the Commissioners by any party or representative of any party MUST BE (1) copied to all parties, or if the parties are represented, to such representatives, (2) include a notation indicating such notice to all parties or their representatives and (3) be limited to argument. NO NEW EVIDENCE MAY BE SUBMITTED.**

If you have already filed a brief or memorandum with the hearing officer and wish to have that document distributed to each member of the Commission, it is requested that **fourteen (14) copies** be filed *on or before September 28, 2012* and that **notice be given to all parties or if the parties are represented, to their representatives, that such previously filed document is being submitted to the Commissioners for review.**

By Order of the Freedom of
Information Commission

W. Paradis

Acting Clerk of the Commission

Notice to: Don Stacom
Joseph E. Skelly, Jr., Esq.
Joseph W. McQuade, Esq.

2012/09/19/FIC# 2011-711/Trans/wrbp/SDL/LFS/TAH

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

Third Report of Hearing Officer

Don Stacom and the Hartford Courant,

Complainants

against

Docket #FIC 2011-711

Chief, Police Department, City of New Britain;
and Police Department, City of New Britain,

Respondents

September 19, 2012

The above-captioned matter was heard as a contested case on May 2, 2012, at which time the complainants and the respondents appeared, stipulated to certain facts and presented testimony, exhibits and argument on the complaint. Anthony Paventi requested and received permission to join as an intervenor in this matter.

A report of Hearing Officer was issued on June 30, 2012. At its regular meeting of July 25, 2012, the Commission amended such report and postponed further consideration of the report. A second report of Hearing Officer was issued on August 15, 2012. At its regular meeting of September 12, 2012, the Commission considered and then tabled the second report.

A third report of Hearing Officer was issued on September 19, 2012.

After consideration of the entire record, the following facts are found and conclusions of law are reached:

1. The respondents are public agencies within the meaning of §1-200(1)(A), G.S.
2. It is found that on October 14, 2011, the complainants requested access to the internal investigation concerning Captain Anthony Paventi, along with all supporting records.
3. It is found that on December 29, 2011, the respondents refused to provide the investigation records to the complainants.
4. By letter dated December 29, 2011, the complainants appealed to this Commission, alleging that the respondents violated the Freedom of Information ("FOI") Act by denying their request for copies of records. At the hearing in this matter, the complainants requested the imposition of civil penalties.

5. Section 1-200(5), G.S., provides:

Public records or files means any recorded data or information relating to the conduct of the public's business prepared, owned, used, received or retained by a public agency, ... whether such data or information be handwritten, typed, tape-recorded, printed, photostated, photographed or recorded by any other method.

6. Section 1-210(a), G.S., provides, in relevant part:

Except as otherwise provided by any federal law or state statute, all records maintained or kept on file by any public agency, whether or not such records are required by any law or by any rule or regulation, shall be public records and every person shall have the right to (1) inspect such records promptly during regular office or business hours ... or (3) receive a copy of such records in accordance with the provisions of section 1-212.

7. Section 1-212(a), G.S., provides in relevant part: "Any person applying in writing shall receive, promptly upon request, a plain, facsimile, electronic or certified copy of any public record."

8. It is concluded that the records requested by the complainants are public records within the meaning of §§1-200(5), 1-210(a), and 1-212(a), G.S.

9. The respondents and the intervenor claim that the records are exempt pursuant to §§1-210(b)(2) and 1-214(b) G.S., and Rocque v. Freedom of Information Commission, 255 Conn. 651, 774 A.2d 957 (2001). Specifically, the respondent objects to the disclosure of those portions of the record that would reveal the identity of the complainants and would also reveal sexually explicit information.

10. Section 1-210(b)(2), G.S., provides in relevant part that nothing in the FOI Act shall require the disclosure of "personnel or medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of personal privacy. . . ."

11. In Perkins v. Freedom of Information Commission, 228 Conn. 158, 175 (1993) ("Perkins"), the Supreme Court set forth the test for an invasion of personal privacy, necessary to establish the exemption at §1-210(b)(2), G.S. The claimant must first establish that the records in question are personnel, medical or similar files. Second, the claimant must show that disclosure of the records would constitute an invasion of personal privacy. In determining whether disclosure would constitute an invasion of personal privacy, the claimant must establish both of two elements: first, that the information sought does not pertain to legitimate matters of public concern, and second, that such information is highly offensive to a reasonable person. The Commission takes administrative notice of the multitude of court rulings, Commission final

decisions¹, and instances of advice given by the Commission and staff members², which have relied upon the Perkins test, since its release in 1993.

12. In Rocque, supra, the Supreme Court held that “the identity of a sexual harassment complainant ... including related identifying information, and sexually explicit portions of the investigation documents are not of legitimate public concern, and their disclosure would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. Consequently, the identity of the complainant and the sexually explicit portions of the investigation documents are exempt from public disclosure under §1-210(b)(2)[, G.S].” Id. at 967.

13. It is found that the requested records consist of the internal investigation and supporting records and that they are part of the intervenor’s personnel file or similar file, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(2), G.S.

14. Following the hearing in this matter, the respondents submitted the requested records for in camera inspection.

15. Upon careful review of the in camera records, it is found that such records concern serious misconduct allegations against the intervenor, who was a senior commander and head of the professional standards division of the respondent police department.

16. Based on the in camera inspection, it is found that a few of the requested records contain sexually explicit or descriptive information. It is found that such sexually explicit information contained in the requested records is not a legitimate matter of public concern, and that disclosure of such information would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. Such records are referenced in paragraph 20, below.

17. It is also found that several of the requested records identify the complainants in the police investigation or contain information that could be used to identify the complainants. It is found that the complainants’ identities are not a legitimate matter of public concern, and that disclosure of such information would be highly offensive to a reasonable person. Such records are referenced in paragraph 20, below.

18. It is found that, with the exception of the records identified in paragraph 20, below, the requested records pertain to a legitimate matter of public concern and that disclosure would not be highly offensive to a reasonable person.

19. It is concluded, therefore, that with the exception of the records identified in paragraph 20, below, disclosure of the requested records would not constitute an invasion of privacy, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(2), G.S.

20. It is found that the following records do not pertain to a legitimate matter of public concern, and that disclosure of such information would be highly offensive to a reasonable person:

a. Throughout all the in camera records: names, dates of birth, home addresses, phone numbers, photographs, and home addresses of family members of the individuals identified as complainants 1, 2, and 3;

b. Record A, described on the Index to Records Submitted for In Camera Inspection ("Index") as "Administrative Internal Investigative Report:

- p. 6: line 16 (word 7);
- p. 7: line 13 (word 13), line 14 (word 10), line 18 (words 9 and 13), line 35 (word 13);
- p. 8: line 34 (w. 1-7); line 36 (w. 1-5)
- p. 9: line 6 (w. 13, 14);
- p. 11: line 5 (w. 6-9);
- p. 12: line 34;
- p. 13: line 3;
- p. 14: line 13 (w. 1-9), line 14 (w. 10-12), line 15 (w. 1), line 26, line 33 (w. 1-6);
- p. 15: line 3(w. 11, 12), line 9 (w. 14, 15), line 10 (w. 10-13), line 21 (w. 1, 2), line 23 (w. 8, 9);
- p. 16: line 1 (w. 9), line 23 (w. 8);
- p. 20: line 5 (w. 10);
- p. 21: line 9;
- p. 26: line 10 (w. 2,3), line 13 (w. 6, 7, 11, 12), line 15 (w. 1-3), line 16 (w. 1-3, 9, 10), line 17 (w. 4-6), line 18 (w. 5, 6, 8, 12), line 19 (w. 4, 5, 9), line 20 (w. 1), line 21 (w. 4, 5), line 22 (w. 10, 11), line 27 (w. 1, 2), line 29 (w. 1, 2, 3), line 30 (w. 2, 3), line 31(w. 10), line 33 (w. 10-12), line 34 (w. 1), line 35 (w. 4, 5, 6, 7), line 37 (w. 13, 14);
- p. 34: lines 1 through 5;
- p. 41: line 5 (w. 15), line 14 (w. 3-7);
- p. 42: line 19 (w. 9-12), line 26 (w. 5, 6);
- p. 51: line 18, line 19 (w. 1-3), line 20 (6-14), line 21;
- p. 54: line 13 (w. 1,2), line 14 (w. 12, 13, 14), line 16 (w. 13, 14, 15), line 17 (w. 1-7);
- p. 58: line 20 (w. 8, 9, 11, 12), line 22 (w. 2, 3), line 26 (w. 16, 17);
- p. 59: line 6 (w. 3, 4), line 9 (w. 6,7,12), line 11, line 13 (w. 1), line 14 (w. 15), line 16 (w. 4-7), line 17 (w. 4,12,14), line 18 (w. 1-4), line 19 (w. 8-12), line 20 (w. 2, 15), line 21 (w. 3), line 22 (w. 5, 10, 16), line 23 (w. 5), line 27 (w. 4), line 32 (w. 10), line 35 (w. 8), line 37 (w. 4,5);
- p. 63: line 1 (w. 14), line 4 (w. 15), line 5 (w. 3), line 6 (w. 3, 6), line 8 (w. 12), line 13 (w. 2, 4);
- p. 64: line 15 (w. 7, 8), line 19 (w. 15), line 20 (w. 16-18), line 21 (w. 1), line 22 (w. 11-15), line 23 (w. 1-10), line 25 (w. 6-8),

line 28 (8, 9), line 29, line 33, line 34, line 35 (w. 1-4), line 36, line 37;
 p. 68: line 19 (w. 12-14), line 20, line 22 (w. 7-12), line 23 (w. 1);
 p. 72: line 22 (w. 6);

c. Record C, described in the Index as “Complainant No. 2 Statement”:

p. 1: lines 6-15;
 p. 2: line 8 (w. 1-5), line 16 (w. 20), line 17 (w. 1), line 18 (w. 14-15), lines 27-34;
 p. 3: all;
 p. 4: lines 1-5, line 6 (w. 1-4), line 7 (w. 7-10), lines 8-33;
 p. 5: all;
 p. 6: all;
 p. 7: lines 1-4; lines 18-end of page;
 p. 8: all;
 p. 9: all;
 p. 10: all;
 p. 11: all;
 p. 12: lines 1-13; line 17 (w. 19, 20), line 18, lines 20 – end of page);
 p. 13: lines 1-7, line 8 (w. 16-23), line 9, lines 18-22, lines 27-31;
 p. 14: line 1, line 10 (w. 8, 9), line 12 (w. 11-13), line 13 (w. 1), line 15 (w. 9-12), line 24, line 27 (w. 19), lines 28-32;
 p. 15: line 6 (w. 1, 2), lines 9-14, line 15 (w. 1-10), line 19, lines 23-end of page;
 p. 16: lines 1, 2, 6, 7, line 10 (w. 12-14), line 15 (w. 14-17), line 29 (w. 16-22), line 30 (w. 1-3);
 p. 17: line 8 (w. 11);
 p. 18: line 2 (w. 10-13), line 20 (w. 8-18), line 21;

d. Record D, described in the Index as “Complainant No. 2 Statement):

p. 2: line 7 (w. 14-16), line 8 (w. 1, 2), line 9, line 10 (w. 1-3, 5, 8, 9), line 11 (w. 6, 15), line 12 (w. 16-19), line 13 (w. 18), line 19 (w. 1), line 20 (w. 1-3), line 21 (w. 10-14), line 22 (w. 1-6), line 23 (w. 18), line 25 (w. 15, 16), line 26, line 27 (w. 1-5), line 28, line 29;

e. Record F, described in the Index as “Photographs”: photos of women;

f. Record G, described in the Index as “Interdepartmental Correspondence”:

i) Memo dated August 24, 2011:

- p. 1: line 3 (w. 2-6), line 6 (w. 10, 11), line 12, (w. 10, 11), line 14 (w. 4), line 19 (w. 7), line 20 (w. 11), line 24 (w. 16), line 26 (w. 6, 7), line 27 (w. 8, 14), line 28, line 29;
- p. 2: line 1 (w. 1), line 4 (w. 6), lines 6-9, line 12 (w. 10, 15), line 13 (w. 5), line 18 (w. 5), line 20 (w. 13), line 24 (w. 4, 7), line 25 (w. 8), line 26 (w. 3), line 28 (w. 2, 11, 12), line 29 (w. 14), line 30 (w. 9), line 31 (w. 6), line 32 (5, 11-15), line 33, (w. 1, 12, 6, 10), line 34 (w. 4, 12);
- p. 3: line 1 (w. 4, 11), line 2 (w. 6), line 3 (w. 5, 7), line 4 (w. 1), line 5 (w. 5), line 6 (w. 11), line 8 (w. 4, 16, 17), line 12 (w. 3), line 14 (w. 13, 14), line 20 (w. 5-14), line 21, line 22 (w. 3, 10), line 28 (w. 1), line 29 (w. 1), line 30 (w. 4, 7), line 31 (w. 12), line 34 (w. 1, 10, 13);
- p. 4: line 2 (w. 2-5), 13), line 3 (w. 5), line 4 (w. 5), line 14 (12-18), line 15, (w. 1-12), line 16 (w. 9), line 17 (w. 2), line 33 (w. 4, 5, 11);
- p. 5: line 1 (w. 5), line 4 (w. 9), line 11 (w. 10-15), line 12, line 15 (w. 10), line 16 (w. 1-3), line 19 (w. 12, 14, 15), line 22 (w. 12), line 31 (w. 15);
- p. 6: line 9;

ii) Memo dated 8/23/2011: woman's name referenced in first paragraph, and all references to such name in all the records submitted for in camera inspection;

iii) Memo dated 8/29/2011 from Sgt. Burgos: woman's name and employer (first reference in second sentence of second body paragraph) and all recurring references to such woman's name in all the records submitted for in camera inspection;

iv) Memo dated 8/30/2011 from Officer Macci: line 11 (w. 11-14);

v) Memo dated 8/30/2011 from Sgt Chute: line 7 (w. 11-19), line 8 (2. 1-5, 9), line 12 (w. 13-15), line 13 (w. 13), line 14;

vi) Memo dated 8/30/2011 from Burgos: line 10 (words 9-13), line 14 (word 3), line 16, line 17 (w. 1-3);

vii) Memo dated 1/14/2012: lines 13, 27-29;

g. Record K, described in the Index as “Attorney Letter”: page 1.

21. It is concluded, therefore, that disclosure of the information referenced in paragraph 20, above, would constitute an invasion of privacy, within the meaning of §1-210(b)(2), G.S.

22. It is found that the respondents refused to provide the requested records to the complainant based on the intervenor’s objection to disclosure.

23. With respect to whether it was proper for the respondents to notify the intervenor of the complainants’ request and whether it was proper for the respondents to rely on the intervenor’s objection, §1-214(b) and (c) provide, in relevant part:

(b) Whenever a public agency receives a request to inspect or copy records contained in any of its employees’ personnel or medical files and similar files and the agency reasonably believes that the disclosure of such records would legally constitute an invasion of privacy, the agency shall immediately notify in writing (1) each employee concerned . . . and (2) the collective bargaining representative, if any, of each employee concerned. Nothing herein shall require an agency to withhold from disclosure the contents of personnel or medical files and similar files when it does not reasonably believe that such disclosure would legally constitute an invasion of personal privacy.

(c) A public agency which has provided notice under subsection (b) of this section shall disclose the records requested unless it receives a written objection from the employee concerned . . . within seven business days from the receipt by the employee . . . Each objection filed under this subsection shall be on a form prescribed by the public agency, which shall consist of a statement to be signed by the employee or the employee’s collective bargaining representative, under the penalties of false statement, that to the best of his knowledge, information and belief there is good ground to support it and that the objection is not interposed for delay. Upon the filing of an objection as provided in this subsection, the agency shall not disclose the requested records unless ordered to do so by the Freedom of Information Commission pursuant to section 1-206. (Emphasis added.)

24. It is well-settled that personnel records pertaining to the job performance of public officials are not ordinarily subject to any exemption from mandatory disclosure. Personnel records “are presumptively legitimate matters of public concern.” Perkins, supra, 228 Conn. 168.

25. It is found that the requested records at issue in this matter relate in their entirety to the investigation of serious misconduct by the intervenor. As the complainants noted at the hearing in this matter and in their brief, the investigation in this case was prompted by public allegations of on-duty sexual misconduct by the intervenor when he held a high rank in the respondent police department.

26. Furthermore, it is found that the intervenor was still employed by the respondents when the report was delivered to the town on October 11, 2011, and when the complainants made their request for a copy of the report on October 14, 2011. It is found that the intervenor and the city signed a settlement on December 29, 2011, whereby the intervenor would retire with his pension and the city would forego a pending disciplinary hearing.

27. It is found that it was not reasonable for the respondents to believe that disclosure of the report and supporting records would legally constitute an invasion of privacy, except for the few instances where "complainant 1, 2 and 3" are identified, as described in paragraph 20, above.

28. It is concluded, therefore, that the respondents had no duty under §1-214(b), G.S., to notify the intervenor of the complainants' request and should have promptly disclosed the records to the complainants.

29. Furthermore, it is found that the intervenor's objection did not conform to the requirements of §1-214(c), G.S., in that it was not on a form prescribed by the respondents, nor was it signed by Paventi or his collective bargaining representative "under the penalties of false statement that to the best of his knowledge, information and belief there is good ground to support it and that the objection is not interposed for delay."

30. It is found that the intervenor failed to file an objection to disclosure in accordance with the requirements of §1-214(c), G.S.

31. Consequently, it is also concluded that the respondents were not entitled to rely on the intervenor's objection in withholding the requested records.


32. Accordingly, it is concluded that the respondents violated §§1-214(b) and (c), G.S., as well as the promptness requirements of §§1-210(a) and 1-212(a), G.S., by refusing to disclose the records requested by the complainants, except for the information referenced in paragraph 19, above.

33. After consideration of the entire record in this case, the Commission declines to consider the imposition of civil penalties against the respondents.

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 provide the complainants with a copy of the records described in paragraph 2 of the findings, above, free of charge, except for the information that may be redacted, described in paragraph 20 of the findings.

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



Commissioner Sherman D. London
as Hearing Officer

ENDNOTES

A. Court cases

Payne v. City of Danbury, 267 Conn. 669 (2004); Director, Retirement & Benefits Services Div. v. FOIC, 256 Conn. 764 (2001); Rocque v. FOIC, 255 Conn. 651 (2001); Dept. of Public Safety v FOIC, 242 Conn. 79 (1997); Conn. Alcohol & Drug Abuse Commission v. FOIC, 233 Conn.28 (1995); Kurecza v. FOIC, 228 Conn. 271 (1994); First Selectman v. FOIC, 60 Conn. App. 64 (2000); Dept. of Children & Families v. FOIC, 48 Conn. App. 467 (1998); Almeida v. FOIC, 39 Conn. App. 154 (1995); Dept. of Transportation v. FOIC, Super Ct JD NB CV 01-0508810 (Schuman, J. 2001); City Treasurer, City of Hartford v. FOIC, Super Ct JD NB CV 99 0496222 (Cohn, J. 2000); Rocque, Commissioner of Environmental Protection v. FOIC, Super Ct JD NB CV 98 0492734 (Hartmere, J. 1999); Director, Retirement & Benefits Services Div. v. FOIC, Super Ct JD NB CV 98 0492692 (Hartmere, J. 1999); First Selectman, Town of Ridgefield v. FOIC, Super Ct JD NB CV 99-0493041 (McWeeny, J. 1999); Chairman, Bd. of Education Town of Darien v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd NB CV 97 0575674 (McWeeny, J. 1998); Waters, Commissioner of State of Conn. Dept. of Administrative Services v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB CV 96 0565853 (McWeeny, J. 1997); Armstrong, Commissioner of State of Conn. Dept. Of Correction v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB CV 96 0563608 (McWeeny, J. 1997); Dept. of Children & Families v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd NB CV 96 0562546 (McWeeny, J. 1997); State of Conn. Office of Protection and Advocacy for Persons with Disabilities v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB CV 95 0554467 (McWeeny, J. 1997); Youngquist v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB, CV 95 0554601 (McWeeny, J. 1996 and 1997); Cracco v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB, CV 94 0705371 (Dunnell, J. 1995); Cracco v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd NB, CV 93 0705370, (Dunnell, J. 1995); Cracco v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd NB, CV 94 0705369, (Dunnell, J. 1995); Simonds v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB, CV 93 070 41 39 (Maloney, J. 1994); Gallagher v. FOIC, Super Ct JD Htfd/NB, CV 93 0531514 (Maloney, J. 1994).

B. FOIC Decisions

Docket #FIC 2003-285; Frank C. Violissi, Jr. v. First Selectman, Town of Chester (May 26, 2004); Docket #FIC 2003-074; Heather M. Henderson v. State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Legal Affairs Department (Dec. 10, 2003); Docket #FIC 2003-020; Hugh Curran v. Mayor, City of Waterbury (Sept. 10, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-580; Ken Byron and The Hartford Courant v. First Selectman, Town of Westbrook (Sept. 10, 2003); Docket #FIC 2003-038 Chris Dehnel and The Journal Inquirer v. First Selectman, Town of Ellington (Aug. 27, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-531 Chris Dehnel and Journal Inquirer First Selectman, Town of Ellington (Aug. 27, 2003); Docket #FIC 2003-055; Robert Mack v. Director, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction, Labor Relations (July 23, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-345; Josh Kovner, Chris Keating, and The Hartford Courant v. Chief, Police Department, City of Middletown (July 23, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-338; Amy L. Zitka and The Middletown Press v. Chief, Police Department, City of Middletown; and Professional Standards Unit Supervisor, Police Department, City of Middletown (July 23, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-465; Fred Radford v.

Chairman, Police Commission, Town of Trumbull; and Chief, Police Department, Town of Trumbull (July 9, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-118; Kimberly W. Moy and the Hartford Courant v. Superintendent of Schools, Southington Public Schools (Feb. 26, 2003); Docket #FIC 2002-020; Maurice Timothy Reidy and The Hartford Courant v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Newington and Brendan Fitzgerald (Oct. 23, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-489 Jonathan Kellogg, Trip Jennings and Waterbury Republican-American Chief, Police Department, Borough of Naugatuck and Rick Smolicz (Sept. 25, 2002); Docket #FIC 2002-173; Carrie J. Campion v. Director, Department of Human Resources, Town of Fairfield (Aug. 28, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-425 Joseph Mincewicz, Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police; and State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police (Aug. 28, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-421 Jean M. Morningstar and University Health Professionals Local 3837, AFT-CFEPE, AFL-CIO v. Executive Vice President for Health Affairs, State of Connecticut, University of Connecticut Health Center; and State of Connecticut, University of Connecticut Health Center; and Justin Radolf, M.D., Director, Center for Microbial Pathogenesis, School of Medicine, University of Connecticut Health Center (Aug. 28, 2002); Docket #FIC 2002-093 Sean P. Turpin v. Director, Department of Human Resources, Town of Greenwich and Steve Demetri (July 24, 2002); Docket #FIC 2002-034; MariAn Gail Brown, Michael P. Mayko and Connecticut Post Michael Lupkas, Comptroller, City of Bridgeport; Christopher Duby, Chief of Staff, City of Bridgeport; Mark Anastasi, City Attorney, City of Bridgeport; and Gregory Conte, Deputy Chief of Staff, City of Bridgeport (June 26, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-364; Karen Guzman and The Hartford Courant v. City of New Britain Docket (June 26, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-180 James H. Smith and The Record Journal Publishing Company v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police; and State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police (Feb. 13, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-129; Kimberly W. Moy and The Hartford Courant v. Police Commission, Town of Southington (Feb. 13, 2002); Docket #FIC 2001-251 Fred Radford v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Trumbull (Jan. 23, 2002); Docket #FIC 2000-624; Eric Gustavson v. Board of Education, Brookfield Public Schools (June 13, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-557; Wendy John v. Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General, State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General; Wil Gundling, William McCullough, Phillip Schulz, Margaret Chapple, Assistant Attorneys General, State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General; and State of Connecticut, Office of the Attorney General (June 13, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-268; Michael Costanza and The Day v. Director of Utilities, Utilities Department, City of Groton; and Mayor, City of Groton (April 25, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-198; William J. Stone v. Personnel Administrator, State of Connecticut, Department of Transportation, Bureau of Finance and Administration; and State of Connecticut, Department of Transportation (April 20, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-537; James Leonard, Jr. v. Chief, Police Department, City of New Britain (March 28, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-348; Bradshaw Smith v. Office of the Vice Chancellor for Information Services, State of Connecticut, University of Connecticut; and State of Connecticut, University of Connecticut (February 28, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-474; Robert H. Boone and Journal Inquirer v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Windsor Locks (Jan. 24, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-265; Lisa Goldberg and The Hartford Courant v. Superintendent of Schools, Vernon Public Schools (Jan. 24, 2001); Docket #FIC 2000-569; Mary Hyde v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Seymour (Dec. 13, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-049; Nicholas B. Wynn v. Board of Directors, Ansonia Public Library, Town of Ansonia (Dec. 13, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-136; Thomas E. Lee v. Board of Education, Trumbull Public Schools; and Superintendent of Schools,

Trumbull Public Schools (Nov. 29, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-135; Thomas E. Lee v. Board of Education, Trumbull Public Schools; and Superintendent of Schools, Trumbull Public Schools (Nov. 29, 2000); Docket #FIC2000-086; Mitchell D. Poudrier v. Superintendent of Schools, Killingly Public Schools (Sept. 13, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-173; Robert H. Boone and the Journal Inquirer v. Anthony Milano, District Manager, Metropolitan District Commission; and Metropolitan District Commission (Aug. 23, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-094; James D. Goodwin v. Communications Specialist, State of Connecticut, Department of Social Services, Public and Government Relations Unit (Aug. 9, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-022; Thedress Campbell v. City Treasurer, City of Hartford (Aug. 9, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-137; Robert H. Boone and Journal Inquirer v. Metropolitan District Commission (July 12, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-560; Leo F. Smith v. Robert H. Skinner, First Selectman, Town of Suffield; and Selectmen's Office, Town of Suffield (July 12, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-556; Delores Annicelli v. Director, New Haven Housing Authority, City of New Haven; and New Haven Housing Authority, City of New Haven (July 12, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-548; Leo F. Smith v. John P. Lange, Human Resources Director, Town of Suffield; and Department of Human Resources, Town of Suffield (July 12, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-547; Leo F. Smith v. John P. Lange, Human Resources Director, Town of Suffield; and Department of Human Resources, Town of Suffield (July 12, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-525; Leo F. Smith v. John P. Lange, Human Resources Director, Town of Suffield; and Department of Human Resources, Town of Suffield (July 12, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-118; Elizabeth Ganga and Connecticut Post v. Police Department, Town of Stratford (June 28, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-095; Ron Robillard and the Chronicle v. Chairman, Board of Education, Eastford Public Schools; and Board of Education, Eastford Public Schools (June 28, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-093; Megan J. Bard and The Norwich Bulletin v. Chairman, Board of Education, Eastford Public Schools; and Board of Education, Eastford Public Schools (June 28, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-575; Bruce Kaz v. Robert Skinner, First Selectman, Town of Suffield; and Ted Flanders, Building Inspector, Town of Suffield (June 28, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-519; Robert J. Fortier v. Personnel Director, Town of East Hartford; and Mayor, Town of East Hartford (June 14, 2000); Docket #FIC1999-550; James and Susanne Milewski v. Deputy Chief, Police Department, Town of Clinton; and Police Department, Town of Clinton (May 24, 2000); Docket #FIC 2000-005; Fred B. Feins v. President and Chief Executive Officer, Granby Ambulance Association, Inc., Town of Granby (May 10, 2000); Docket #FIC1999-606; Robert L. Corrado and IBEW Local 90 v. Town Attorney, Town of Hamden; and Electrical Contractors, Inc. (May 10, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-533; Donald J. Lanouette, Jr. v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Madison; and Police Department, Town of Madison (April 26, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-502; Christopher Hoffman and New Haven Register v. Director of Personnel, State of Connecticut, Southern Connecticut State University; and Personnel Office, State of Connecticut, Southern Connecticut State University (April 26, 2000); Docket #FIC1999-440; Anne Hamilton and The Hartford Courant James Martino, Chief, Police Department, Town of Avon; Peter A. Agnesi, Lieutenant, Police Department, Town of Avon; and Police Department, Town of Avon (March 8, 2000); Docket #FIC1999-333; Lynn Fredricksen and New Haven Register v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Madison; and Police Department, Town of Madison (March 8, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-289; Thomas Moran v. Director, Human Resources, Town of Simsbury; and Department of Human Resources, Town of Simsbury (Feb. 9, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-328; Victor Zigmund v. Director, State of Connecticut, Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Human Resources Operations, Connecticut Valley Hospital, Whiting Forensic Division (Jan. 26, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-100; Janice D'Arcy and

The Hartford Courant v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Cheshire; Police Department, Town of Cheshire; Town Manager, Town of Cheshire; and Town of Cheshire (Jan. 26, 2000); Docket #FIC 1999-355; Wayne Mercier v. Patricia C. Washington, Director of Personnel, City of Hartford; and Department of Personnel, City of Hartford (Nov. 10, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-391; Jonathan F. Kellogg and The Republican American v. Department of Education, City of Waterbury (Oct. 13, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-161; Michael W. Cahill v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Hamden; and Police Department, Town of Hamden (Sept. 22, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-294; Robert J. Bourne v. Department of Public Utilities, City of Norwich, and City of Norwich (Sept. 22, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-293; Joseph J. Cassidy v. Department of Public Utilities, City of Norwich, and City of Norwich (Sept. 22, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-040; Judith F. Machuga and State of Connecticut, Division of Public Defender Services, Superior Court, G.A. 13 v. Chief, Police Department, Town of East Windsor; and Police Department, Town of East Windsor (Aug. 25, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-144; Robert H. Boone and Journal Inquirer v. William Gifford, Chief, Police Department, Town of Windsor Locks; Police Department, Town of Windsor Locks; and Windsor Locks Police Commission (July 28, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-096; Paul Marks and The Hartford Courant v. Chief, Police Department, Town of Windsor Locks; and Police Department, Town of Windsor Locks (July 28, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-064; Joan Coe v. First Selectman, Town of Simsbury; Director, Human Resources Department, Town of Simsbury; and Town of Simsbury (July 28, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-150; Andrew Nargi v. Office of Corporation Counsel, City of Torrington; and City of Torrington (July 14, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-135; Warren Woodberry, Jr. and The Hartford Courant v. Acting Town Manager, Town of Rocky Hill and Town of Rocky Hill (July 14, 1999); Docket #FIC 1999-015; Richard Manuel Rivera v. Superintendent of Schools, Torrington Public Schools; and Board of Education, Torrington Public Schools (June 9, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-372; William C. Kaempffer and New Haven Register v. Police Department, City of New Haven; City of New Haven; and James Sorrentino (June 9, 1999); Docket #FIC 1997-361; Dominick L. Santarsiero v. Director, Human Resources, City of Stamford (June 10, 1998); Docket #FIC 1999-019; David K. Jaffe v. State of Connecticut, Connecticut Lottery Corporation, Human Resources; State of Connecticut, Connecticut Lottery Corporation, Security Division; and State of Connecticut, Connecticut Lottery Corporation (April 28, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-325; Virginia Groark and The Day v. Freedom of Information Officer, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health, Office of Special Services, Communications Division; and Agency Personnel Administrator, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Health, Human Resources Division (April 28, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-208; Thedress Campbell v. City Treasurer, City of Hartford; and City of Hartford (April 14, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-265; Benjamin M. Wenograd and Service Employees International Union Local 760 v. John Roughan, Executive Director, East Hartford Housing Authority; and East Hartford Housing Authority, Town of East Hartford (March 24, 1999); Docket #FIC 1997-363; Diana R. Raczkowski v. Mayor, Town of Naugatuck (March 11, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-307; Krystin Bratina v. Chief, Hartford Fire Department, City of Hartford (March 11, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-288; Christian Miller and the New Haven Register v. Superintendent, Branford Public Schools; and Board of Education, Branford Public Schools (Feb. 24, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-255; Joan O'Rourke v. Chief, Police Department, City of Torrington; and Police Department, City of Torrington (Jan. 27, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-251; John Ward v. Beverly L. Durante, Personnel Administrator, Housatonic Area Regional Transit; and Housatonic Area Regional Transit (Jan. 27, 1999); Docket #FIC 1998-163; Lawrence A. Butts v. Director, State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection,

Human Resources Division; and State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection, Human Resources Division (Dec. 9, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-162; Lawrence A. Butts Chairperson, State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection, Human Resources Division; and State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection, Human Resources Division (Dec. 9, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-232; Scott Clark, Amy Kertesz, Michael Gates and the Ridgefield Police Union v. First Selectman, Town of Ridgefield; and Town of Ridgefield (Nov. 18, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-193; Daniel P. Jones and The Hartford Courant v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection; and State of Connecticut, Department of Environmental Protection (Nov. 18, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-121; Ernie Cantwell and International Association of Firefighters, Local No. 1073 v. Director, Personnel Department, City of Middletown and Personnel Department, City of Middletown (Oct. 14, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-120; Ernie Cantwell and International Association of Firefighters, Local No. 1073 v. Director, Personnel Department, City of Middletown (Oct. 14, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-094; Janice D'Arcy and The Hartford Courant v. Chief, Meriden Police Department, City of Meriden and Meriden Police Department (Oct. 14, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-422; Joseph A. Johnson, Jr. and Greenwich Time v. Chief, Greenwich Police Department, Town of Greenwich; and Greenwich Police Department, Town of Greenwich (Sept. 9, 1998); Docket #FIC 1998-023; Deborah Maynard v. Superintendent, Voluntown School District; and Principal, Voluntown Elementary School, Voluntown School District (Aug. 12, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-298; Allan Drury and The New Haven Register v. Chief, East Haven Police Department, Town of East Haven; and Town of East Haven (June 10, 1998); Jonathan Lucas and Greenwich Times v. Director, Department of Human Resources, Town of Greenwich; and Town of Greenwich (May 27, 1998); John C. Rettman v. Meriden Police Department, Internal Affairs Division; and Paul Rowen (May 13, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-318; Dennis Carnot v. Chief, Meriden Police Department, City of Meriden; Internal Affairs Division, Meriden Police Department, City of Meriden; Meriden Police Department, City of Meriden; and Paul Rowen (May 13, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-175; Matthew Brown, Ken Byron and The Hartford Courant v. Superintendent of Schools, Plymouth Public Schools; and Board of Education, Town of Plymouth (February 18, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-123; John Christoffersen and The Advocate v. Superintendent of Schools, Stamford Public Schools and Director of Personnel, Stamford Public Schools (Feb. 11, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-088; John B. Harkins v. Acting Town Manager, Town of Tolland (Jan. 28, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-085; Joe Johnson and Greenwich Time v. Chief of Police, Greenwich Police Department (Jan. 28, 1998); Docket #FIC 1997-142; Laura Amon v. Program Manager, Affirmative Action Division, State of Connecticut, Department of Transportation (Dec. 3, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-572; Ken Byron and The Hartford Courant v. Chief of Police, Town of Wethersfield (Nov. 12, 1997); Docket #FIC 1997-238; Kimberley A. Thomsen and the Republican-American v. Acting Superintendent, Waterbury Police Department (Oct. 29, 1997); Docket #FIC 1997-089; Steven Edelman v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Mental Retardation; and State of Connecticut, Department of Mental Retardation (Oct. 22, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-551; Judith A. Amato v. Executive Director, New Britain Housing Authority; and New Britain Housing Authority (Aug. 27, 1997); Docket # FIC 1996-539; Ann Marie Derwin v. Legal Advisor, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety; and State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety (Aug. 27, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-592; Francine Karp v. Mayor, City of Bristol; Director of Personnel, City of Bristol; and Dennis Daigneault (July 23, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-243; Joanne C. Tashjian v. Personnel Officer, State of Connecticut, Workers' Compensation Commission; and State of Connecticut, Workers'

Compensation Commission (June 4, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-322; Carolyn Moreau and The Hartford Courant v. Chief of Police, Southington Police Department; and Susan Williams (May 28, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-465; John Gauger, Jr., Joseph Cadrain and Richard Westervelt v. Kenneth H. Kirschner, Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety; Dawn Carnese, Legal Advisor, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety; and Lt. David Werner, Commanding Officer, Troop "B", State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police (April 9, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-315; David W. Cummings v. Christopher Burnham, Treasurer, State of Connecticut (April 9, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-521; Carol Butterworth v. Town Council, Town of Tolland (March 26, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-421; John B. Harkins v. Chairman, Tolland Town Council (March 26, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-314; David W. Cummings v. Christopher Burnham, Treasurer, State of Connecticut (April 9, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-119; David W. Cummings v. Jesse M. Frankl, Chairman, State of Connecticut, Workers' Compensation Commission (March 26, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-215; Alice M. Gray v. Chief of Police, Manchester Police Department, and Assistant Town Attorney, Town of Manchester (Feb. 26, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-159; Carolyn Moreau and The Hartford Courant v. Police Chief, Southington Police Department (Jan. 22, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-124; Donald H. Schiller, Michael Kelley and The Record-Journal Publishing Company v. Police Chief, Town of Southington Police Department, and Town of Southington Police Department (Jan. 22, 1997); Docket #FIC 1996-134; Betty Halibozek v. Superintendent of Schools, Middletown Public Schools; and Supervisor of Maintenance and Transportation, Board of Education, City of Middletown (Dec. 11, 1996); Docket #FIC 1996-006; Joseph Cadrain and Richard Westervelt v. Gerald Gore, Legal Affairs Unit, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety; and State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police (Dec. 11, 1996); Docket #FIC 1996-153; Tracey Thomas and The Hartford Courant v. Legal Affairs Unit, State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety (Nov. 20, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-419; Robie Irizarry v. Warden, Willard Correctional Institution, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction (Oct. 23, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-368; Thomas Lally v. Executive Director, State of Connecticut Board of Education and Services for the Blind, and Special Projects Coordinator, State of Connecticut, Board of Education and Services for the Blind (Oct. 9, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-403; Jesse C. Leavenworth and The Hartford Courant v. Superintendent of Schools, Regional School District #7 (Sept. 25, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-361; Christopher Hoffman and the New Haven Register v. James J. McGrath, Chief of Police, Ansonia Police Department and Eugene K. Baron, Brian Phipps, and Howard Tinney as members of the Ansonia Board of Police Commissioners (Sept. 25, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-358; Lyn Bixby and The Hartford Courant v. State of Connecticut, Department of Administrative Services (Sept. 25, 1996); Docket #FIC 1996-056; Francine Cimino v. Chief of Police, Glastonbury Police Department; Town Manager, Town of Glastonbury; and Town of Glastonbury (Sept. 25, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-343; John J. Woodcock, III v. Town Manager, Town of South Windsor (July 24, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-324; John J. Woodcock, III and Kathryn A. Hale v. Dana Whitman, Jr., Acting Town Manager, Town of South Windsor (July 24, 1996); Docket #FIC 95-251; Lyn Bixby & The Hartford Courant v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction (July 10, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-252; Valerie Finholm and The Hartford Courant v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Children and Families (May 22, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-193; Terence P. Sexton v. Chief of Police, Hartford Police Department (May 8, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-125; Chris Powell and Journal Inquirer v. Commissioner, State of Connecticut, Department of Social Services (March 13, 1996); Docket

#FIC 1995-081; Bruce Bellm, Kendres Lally, Philip Cater, Peter Hughes, Carol Northrop, Brad Pellissier, Todd Higgins and Bruce Garrison v. State of Connecticut, Office of Protection and Advocacy for Persons with Disabilities, Sharon Story and Marlene Fein (March 13, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-074; Jeffrey C. Cole and WFSB/TV 3 v. James Strillacci, Chief of Police, West Hartford Police Department (Jan. 24, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-026; Curtis R. Wood v. Director of Affirmative Action, State of Connecticut, Department of Correction (Jan. 24, 1996); Docket #FIC 1995-132; Michael A. Ingrassia v. Warden, Walker Special Management Unit, State of Connecticut Department of Correction (Dec. 27, 1995); Docket #FIC 1995-048; Jane Holfelder v. Canton Police Department (June 14, 1995); Docket #FIC 1994-351; Edward A. Peruta v. O. Paul Shew, Rocky Hill Town Manager and Director of Public Safety; Donald Unwin, Mayor of Rocky Hill, William Pacelia, Deputy Mayor of Rocky Hill; and Curt Roggi, Rocky Hill Town Attorney (May 28, 1995); Docket #FIC 1994-160; John Springer and The Bristol Press v. Chief of Police, Bristol Police Department (April 5, 1995); Docket #FIC 1994-077; Kathryn Kranhold and The Hartford Courant v. Director, New Haven Health Department (Feb. 8, 1995); Docket #FIC 1994-099; Frank Faraci, Jr. v. Middletown Police Department, Mayor of Middletown, and Middletown City Attorney (Feb. 2, 1995); Docket #FIC 1994-011; Robert Grabar, Edward Frede and The News-Times v. Superintendent of Schools, Brookfield Public Schools and Brookfield Board of Education (Aug. 24, 1994); Docket #FIC 1993-279; Jay Lewin v. New Milford Director of Finance (March 23, 1994).

2. Affidavit of Eric Turner, January 9, 2002.


AFFIDAVIT OF ERIC V. TURNER

Eric V. Turner, having been duly sworn, does hereby depose as follows:

1. I am over the age of eighteen (18) years and understand the obligation of an affirmation.
2. I am a member of the Connecticut Bar and am currently employed as Director of Public Education for the Connecticut Freedom of Information Commission, having first been employed by said commission in 1996.
3. I am providing this affidavit in light of the Supreme Court decision in *Director, Retirement & Benefits Services Division v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 256 Conn. 764 (2001), in which the court apparently invites a reconsideration of *Perkins v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 228 Conn. 158 (1993). See, *Director*, supra at 782, fn 13, 785 (Zarella, J. concurring).
4. As part of my responsibilities as Director of Public Education for said commission, I have developed, organized and scheduled speaking engagements, seminars and programs explaining the duties and rights established under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act.
5. Since I assumed my current position in 1996, there have been approximately 290 such speaking engagements, seminars and programs in Connecticut and I have personally lectured in approximately 80 such speaking engagements, seminars and programs.
6. As part of the presentation I have prepared for such speaking engagements, seminars and programs, the subject of the Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-210(b)(2) exemption for personnel, medical and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute an invasion of personal privacy is stressed because of the great interest in that exemption and the confusion generated by a series of inconsistent and contradictory court decisions prior to *Perkins*, supra. See, e.g., *Chairman v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 217 Conn. 193 (1991) (establishing "reasonable expectation of privacy" test; query whether subjectively or objectively applied) and *Board of Education v. Freedom of Information Commission*, 210 Conn. 590 (1989) (confirming a "balancing" test), which was overruled by the *Chairman* case.
7. Since the Supreme Court ruling in *Perkins*, supra, all Freedom of Information Commission staff members who conduct such speaking engagements, seminars and programs discuss in detail the rulings in that case and its progeny.
8. As part of my responsibilities as Director of Public Education, I also answer telephone and other inquiries from public officials and the public. Since my employment with said commission, I have answered thousands of such inquiries, including hundreds of inquiries

concerning the Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-210(b)(2) exemption. In responding to such inquiries I discuss in detail the *Perkins* case and its progeny.

9. Based on the foregoing experiences, it is my opinion that the *Perkins* decision, and its progeny, have had a beneficial effect on public officials and the public itself because they can rely on a now long-standing and clear test with respect to the Connecticut General Statutes Section 1-210(b)(2) exemption, which helps them determine whether that exemption is applicable to the practical problems they encounter with respect to personnel, medical and similar information. Indeed, the many court and Freedom of Information Commission decisions applying the *Perkins* test have given public officials and the public a now consistent body of law concerning that statutory exemption.




Eric V. Turner

COUNTY OF HARTFORD

ss: Hartford

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Subscribed and attested to before me this 9th day of January, 2002.



Mitchell W. Pearlman
Commissioner of the Superior Court