Representative Paul A. LaRosa stipulates and the State Ethics Commission determines that:

1. On or about September 21, 1979 Representative LaRosa, a public official as defined in subsection 1-79(j), Connecticut General Statutes, mailed to lobbyists and to public officials in the legislative and executive branches of the State letters advertising the opening of the Casa Loma Restaurant in which Representative LaRosa and his son, Mr. Anthony LaRosa, have substantial proprietary interests.

2. For these letters Representative LaRosa used official envelopes and copies of official stationary bearing the indicia of his office as a State Representative of the State of Connecticut. The envelopes bore the Connecticut State Seal and a printed return address to the State of Connecticut's House of Representatives. They identified Representative LaRosa as the House of Representative's member from the Third District. The envelopes' enclosures bore Representative LaRosa's official letterhead as a State Representative and the Connecticut State Seal. The letterhead identified Representative LaRosa as a Chairman of the Public Health and Safety Committee and as a member of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee of the General Assembly. The signatures of Representative LaRosa and Mr. Anthony LaRosa appeared at the bottom of the enclosures.

3. Representative LaRosa's use of the official indicia of his office as a State Representative for the personal financial interest of himself, his son, and the Casa Loma Restaurant, a business with which Representative LaRosa is associated within the meaning of subsection 1-79(a), Connecticut General Statutes, was in violation of subsection 1-84(c), Connecticut General Statutes, which prohibits such use of public office by public officials.

4. In restitution, Representative LaRosa has fully reimbursed the State of Connecticut for the cost to the State of the official envelopes and sheet of official letterhead stationary used to advertise the opening of the Casa Loma Restaurant.

5. Representative LaRosa's violation of subsection 1-84(c), Connecticut General Statutes, was not wilful or intentional. The Commission, therefore, will take no action on this matter under any provision of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials other than subsection 1-88(a), Connecticut General Statutes.
6. Representative LaRosa waives any right he may have to a hearing to determine whether on or about September 21, 1979 he violated subsection 1-84(c), Connecticut General Statutes, and agrees with the State Ethics Commission to an informal disposition of this matter as permitted by subsection 4-177(d), Connecticut General Statutes.

WHEREFORE, the State Ethics Commission enters, and Representative LaRosa agrees to, these orders: In lieu of any other action it is authorized by law to take with respect to Representative LaRosa's use of the indicia of his public office on or about September 21, 1979 in promoting the Casa Loma Restaurant, the Commission orders Representative LaRosa henceforth to comply with the provisions of subsection 1-84(c), Connecticut General Statutes, and orders Representative LaRosa to pay a civil penalty of two hundred and fifty dollars.

Dated __________________________

By Order of the Commission

Dated __________________________
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COMPLAINT

I wish to register with the State Ethics Commission a complaint of violation of:

- The Code of Ethics for Public Officials and State Employees, Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes
- The Code of Ethics for Lobbyists, Chapter 10, Part II, General Statutes

Time and date matters complained of occurred:

10:30 a.m. September 21, 1979

Place violation occurred:

Hartford, Connecticut

Persons involved: Representative Paul A. LaRosa
12 Cowles Street
Hartford, CT 06114

Witnesses: Letter received by number of state legislators and others including Senator Marcella Fahey, Secretary of State and complainant.

Circumstances which indicate that the Code of Ethics designated above was violated are as follows (a short, plain statement of allegations that constitute a violation of Chapter 10, General Statutes): On or about September 21, 1979 State Representative Paul A. LaRosa mailed to complainant and others an announcement of the opening of his restaurant in Hartford. The letter clearly promoted the restaurant and urged readers of the letter to dine at his place of business. The letter was signed by Mr. LaRosa and by Anthony LaRosa. I understand that the latter individual is Mr. LaRosa's son.

The announcement and invitation was typed on an official letterhead of the Connecticut House of Representatives. The announcement was mailed in a State House of Representatives envelope.

Chapter 10 of the C.G.S. §1-84(c) Prohibited Activities states in part:

"...no public official or state employee shall use his public office...to obtain financial gain for himself, his spouse, child, child's spouse, parent, brother or sister, or a business with which he is associated." (underlining added) (over)
The use of an official state letterhead and state envelopes to announce the opening of a private business and to urge members of the public to use that private business would appear to be a violation of §1-84(c).

RECEIVED
CT 1 1979
STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

I hereby certify under penalty of false statement that I believe that the foregoing statement describing a possible violation of the Code of Ethics designated is true.

[Signature]  September 27, 1979

Complainant's name and address (printed or typewritten):
William Olds, Executive Director
Connecticut Civil Liberties Union, 57 Pratt Street, Hartford 06103

Complainant's telephone number: 247-9823

Mail or hand deliver this complaint to the: State Ethics Commission
30 Trinity Street
Hartford, Ct 06115

Note: In addition to the criminal penalties that may be imposed upon a complainant who, under penalty of false statement, knowingly files a false complaint, sections 1-82(d) and 1-93(d) provide that if any complaint, brought under the provisions of Chapter 10, General Statutes, is made with the knowledge that it is made without foundation in fact, the person against whom the complaint is made has a cause of action against the complainant for double the amount of damage caused thereby. If the respondent prevails in such action, the cost of the action together with reasonable attorney's fees may be awarded by the court.