STIPULATION AND CONSENT ORDER

Pursuant to the Code of Ethics, General Statutes sections 1-79, et seq., Thomas K. Jones, Ethics Enforcement Officer for the Office of State Ethics ("OSE"), issued a Complaint against the Respondent Jill D’Antona ("D’Antona" or "Respondent") for violations of the Code of Ethics, Connecticut General Statutes section 1-84(c) and (g).

Based on the investigation by the Enforcement Division of the OSE, the Ethics Enforcement Officer finds there is probable cause to believe that the Respondent, while employed by the Connecticut Judicial Branch as a Judicial Marshal, accepted gifts in the form of cash from bail bondsmen Robert Jacobs and/or Philip Jacobs and/or their company Jacobs Bail Bonds in exchange for, or in consideration of, or as a reward for, assisting them in their business. Consequently, the Ethics Enforcement Officer finds there is probable cause to believe that the Respondent used her state position to obtain financial gain for herself in violation of General Statutes section 1-84(c), and that the Respondent accepted gifts based on the understanding that her official actions would be or had been influenced thereby, in violation of General Statutes section 1-84(g).
The Parties have entered into this Stipulation and Consent Order following the issuance of the Complaint, but without any adjudication of any issue of fact or law herein.

I. STIPULATION

The Ethics Enforcement Officer and the Respondent stipulate to the following facts:

1. From on or about 2000 to on or about December 2007, and at all times relevant hereto, Jill D’Antona (hereinafter “D’Antona” or “Respondent”) was employed by the Judicial Marshal Service, a part of the Connecticut Judicial Branch, as a Judicial Marshal.

2. From on or about 2000 to on or about December 2007, and at all times relevant hereto, the Respondent was a “State Employee” as that term is defined in General Statutes §1-79(m).

3. From on or about 2000 to on or about December 2007, and at all times relevant hereto, the Respondent worked in the Connecticut Superior Court located at 121 Elm Street, New Haven, Connecticut and provided for courthouse security and transportation of prisoners.

4. At all times relevant hereto, Robert Jacobs and Philip Jacobs were bail bondsmen associated with Jacobs Bail Bonds in New Haven, Connecticut. As bail bondsmen, Robert Jacobs and Philip Jacobs were responsible for paying the State of Connecticut at least 50% of the bond posted by them if an arrestee failed to appear in Connecticut state court as required by the bond.
5. During the course of her employment, the Respondent accepted cash, in an amount no less than one thousand five hundred dollars ($1,500), from Robert Jacobs and/or Philip Jacobs and/or Jacobs Bail Bonds in exchange for, or in consideration of, or as a reward for, assisting them in their business.

6. The Respondent assisted Robert Jacobs and Philip Jacobs in several manners during the course of her state employment, including but not limited to making referrals by providing early notification to Robert Jacobs and/or Philip Jacobs about an arrestee in state custody who required the services of a bondsman; providing financial and personal information about an arrestee obtained at work through state resources in order to facilitate the writing of a bond by Robert Jacobs and Philip Jacobs; and holding prisoners in the lock-up to expedite the bond process.

7. The Respondent admits that she engaged in the conduct as set forth herein, and admits that her conduct violated General Statutes sections 1-84(c) and 1-84(g).


9. As part of her sentence, the Respondent paid $600 in restitution.

10. As part of her sentence, the Respondent was ordered to perform 100 hours of community service.

11. As part of her service, the Respondent was sentenced to 12 months of probation, and placed in home confinement for the first four months of probation subject to electronic monitoring.
12. The Respondent understands that she has the right to counsel and has expressly waived such right.

II. JURISDICTION

1. The Ethics Enforcement Officer is authorized to investigate the Respondent’s employment practices, to issue a Complaint against the Respondent, and to enter into this Stipulation and Consent Order.

2. The provisions of this Stipulation and Consent Order apply to and are binding upon the undersigned Parties.

3. The Respondent hereby waives all objections and defenses to the jurisdiction of the Ethics Enforcement Officer over matters addressed in this Stipulation and Consent Order, including that attached Exhibit A.

4. The Respondent waives any rights she may have under General Statutes sections 1-80, 1-82, 1-82a, 1-87 and 1-88, including the right to a hearing or appeal in this case, and agrees with the Ethics Enforcement Officer to an informal disposition of this matter as authorized by General Statutes section 4-177(c).

5. The Respondent consents to jurisdiction and venue in the Connecticut Superior Court, Judicial District of Hartford, in the event that the State of Connecticut seeks to enforce this Stipulation and Consent Order. The Respondent recognizes that the Connecticut Superior Court has the authority to specifically enforce the provisions of this Stipulation and Consent Order, including the attached Exhibit A, including the authority to award equitable relief.
6. The terms set forth herein are in addition to, and not in lieu of, any other existing or future statutory, regulatory, or other legal obligation that may be applicable to the Respondent.

III. ORDER

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to General Statutes section 4-177(c), the Office of State Ethics hereby ORDERS, and the Respondent agrees, that:

1. Pursuant to General Statutes section 1-88(a)(1), the Respondent will heretofore cease and desist from any future violation of General Statutes § 1-84(c).

2. Pursuant to General Statutes section 1-88(a)(1), the Respondent will heretofore cease and desist from any future violation of General Statutes § 1-84(g).

3. Pursuant to General Statutes section 1-88(a)(3), the Respondent will pay civil penalties to the State in the amount of six hundred dollars ($600), according to the terms set forth in Exhibit A attached hereto, for her violation of General Statutes sections 1-84(c) and 1-84(g).

4. The Respondent shall not seek or enter into employment with the state of Connecticut for two (2) years following the execution of this Stipulation and Consent Order.

5. The Respondent shall not seek or enter into any contract for services with the state of Connecticut for two (2) years following the execution of this Stipulation and Consent Order.

6. If the Respondent should, in the future, become employed as a state employee, the Respondent shall be subject to the filing requirements of General Statutes
section 1-83 (statement of financial interests) for each year in which she serves as a state employee.

WHEREFORE, the Ethics Enforcement Officer and the Respondent hereby execute this Stipulation and Consent Order dated August 2, 2010.

Dated: 9/28/10

Jill D’Anton
Respondent
22 Church Street
Apt. 3
Seymour, CT 06483-2612

Dated: 10/21/10

Thomas K. Jones
Ethics Enforcement Officer
Connecticut Office of State Ethics
18-20 Trinity Street
Hartford, CT 06106
(860) 263-2390
EXHIBIT A - DOCKET NUMBER 2007-60

1. The Respondent, Jill D’Antona, shall make the following payments to the Office of State Ethics according to the following schedule:

   a. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than October 1, 2010.
   b. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than November 1, 2010.
   c. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than December 1, 2010.
   d. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than January 1, 2011.
   e. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than February 1, 2011.
   f. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than March 1, 2011.
   g. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than April 1, 2011.
   h. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than May 1, 2011.
   i. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than June 1, 2011.
   j. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than July 1, 2011.
   k. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than August 1, 2011.
   l. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than September 1, 2011.
   m. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than October 1, 2011.
   n. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than November 1, 2011.
   o. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than December 1, 2011.
   p. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than January 1, 2012.
   q. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than February 1, 2012.
   r. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than March 1, 2012.
   s. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than April 1, 2012.
   t. $20.00 shall be received by the Office of State Ethics no later than May 1, 2012.
2. Failure to provide payments according to the schedule herein shall constitute a violation of an Order of the Office of State Ethics.

3. Any failure or delay by the Office of State Ethics to enforce the terms of this Consent Order, including this Exhibit A, shall not be deemed a waiver of such right to enforce the terms at any time of its choosing.

4. In consideration for the Office of State Ethics’ acceptance of the extended payment schedule set forth herein, and in addition to any other remedy available to the Office of State Ethics, the Respondent agrees that, if the Respondent fails to make any payment pursuant to the terms of this Exhibit A, the Office of State Ethics, at its sole discretion and without further adjudication of any issue, may unilaterally rescind the Consent Order in this matter and proceed in its prosecution of the original Complaint. In such an event, Respondent agrees that she waives any defense she may have based on laches, statute of limitations, or any other time-based defense.