Since 1975
It's Your Right to Know

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

Umar Shahid,
Complainant(s)
against

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

Notice of Meeting

Docket #FIC 2014-880

August 11, 2015

Transmittal of Proposed Final Decision

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 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, lst floor, Hartford, Connecticut, at **2 p.m. on Wednesday, September 9, 2015.** 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 August 28, 2015.*** 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, an **original and fourteen (14) copies** must be filed ***ON OR BEFORE August 28, 2015.*** **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 **fifteen (15) copies** be filed ***ON OR BEFORE August 28, 2015,*** 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

W. Paradis
Acting Clerk of the Commission

Notice to: Umar Shahid
Kimberly Carlson McGee, Esq.

2015-08-112015-08-11/FIC# 2014-880/Trans/wrbp/LFS//VDH

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

In the Matter of a Complaint by

Umar Shahid,

Complainant

against

Chief, Police Department, City of Norwich; Police Department, City of Norwich; and City of Norwich,

Respondents

Report of Hearing Officer

Docket #FIC 2014-880

June 10, 2015

The above-captioned matter was scheduled to be heard as a contested case on June 5, 2015. 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 et al, Superior Court, J.D. of Hartford at Hartford, Corrected Order dated January 27, 2004 (Sheldon, J.).

The respondents appeared, represented by counsel. Two witnesses for the respondents were present and ready to proceed.

At the outset of the hearing, the complainant informed the hearing officer that he was ready to proceed. After the hearing was opened, but before any evidence was entered into the record, the complainant then refused to go forward with his complaint. The complainant demanded that the hearing officer recuse herself, claiming bias because she granted a continuance in an unrelated matter brought by the complainant. When the hearing officer declined to recuse herself, the complainant then demanded a continuance in this matter, which the hearing officer denied. The hearing officer warned the complainant more than once that his refusal to proceed with the evidentiary hearing would result in dismissal of the complaint. Nevertheless, the complainant continued to demand a continuance and refused to proceed with the hearing.

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

1. The complaint is dismissed.

Lisa Fein Siegel
as Hearing Officer

FIC2014-880/HOR/LFS/06102015