

# Government Administration and Elections Committee

## JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** SB-466 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

**Title:** AN ACT CONCERNING VEXATIOUS REQUESTERS UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.

**Vote Date:** 3/23/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable

**PH Date:** 3/13/2026

**File No.:**

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

### SPONSORS OF BILL:

The Government Administration and Elections Committee

### REASONS FOR BILL:

SB 466 expands the category of what can be considered a vexatious request and increases the relief period an individual can receive from a vexatious requester. There has been concern that bad actors are taking advantage of the FOIA request system and this harms smaller communities substantially as they may not have the staff available to deal with these requests.

### RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

[Freedom of Information Commission, Managing Director, Paula Pearlman](#) strongly supports SB 466 as she believes it will give public agencies more time to comply with requests from vexatious requestors and give needed support to said public agencies. She states that, “amending Section 1-206(b)(6) of the FOI Act as proposed may lead to an increase in the number of petitions for relief from a vexatious requester filed with the FOI Commission, which may require additional resources for the timely adjudication of such matters”.

### NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[The Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, Executive Director, Jim Rivers](#) expresses his support for SB 466 as he believes vexatious requestors makes a negative impact on public agencies throughout the state of CT. He states how he has noticed recent utilization shift of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and how a few individuals tend to use this act as a way to overwhelm public agencies and municipalities throughout CT. Rivers

believe that SB 466 is the balance needed to provide relief from vexatious requestors while upholding the FOIA.

[Western Connecticut Council of Governments, Executive Director, Francis R. Pickering](#) supports SB 466 as he believes it will create the needed precautions protecting public agencies from vexatious requestors. He suggests distinguishing natural people and automated systems in the bill as it would likely decrease the number of requests that public agencies receive on a daily basis.

[Town of Canterbury, First Selectman, Christopher Lippke](#) supports HB 466 as he believes this bill will rectify the repeated abusive behavior municipalities face from vexatious requestors. He describes how SB 466 will help maintain transparency, have a positive impact on small municipalities, and provide relief from repeated abuse.

[Connecticut Council of Small Towns, Executive Director, Betsy Gara](#) supports SB 466 as she believes it will help ensure that the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is used as it is intended and prevent vexatious requestors from abusing it. She expresses that CT municipalities should be able to work in a transparent manner without the overwhelming pressure from vexatious requestors.

[Town of Union, First Selectmen, David D. Eaton](#) supports SB 466 as he believes town do not have the funds or manpower to respond to unwarranted/unreasonable FOI requests.

[Connecticut Council on Freedom of Information, Secretary, Mary Connolly](#) supports SB 466 and requests clarification throughout the bill. She states how, “harassing or threatening conduct” should be defined and concise in the bill.

[Town of Brooklyn, First Selectman, Joe Bellavance](#) supports SB 466 as he expresses how his small community have dealt with an individual requesting countless amounts of information and how it takes an extensive time to process it. He continues by saying how this individual does not use this information afterward and pushes for change.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

[Anonymous 109](#) opposes HB 466 as they believe it will restrict future access of public records to requestors. They continue by stating how “public records should not become a revocable privilege dependent on whether a citizen is persistent, inconvenient, critical or unpopular.

[John Dilorio](#) opposes SB 466 as its drafted and provide case studies and key rulings regarding his experiences with the Freedom of Information Commission (FOIC). He describes three cases titled FIC 2023-0142, FIC 2020-0231 and FIC 2024-0659 that he filed with the FOIC in the last three six years. These cases resulted with the FOIC stating that, “Legislative Accountability: The FOIC repeatedly affirms that the General Assembly, its committees, and OLM are public agencies under FOIA with no special immunity”

[Christina D](#) strongly opposes SB 466 as she believes it is already illegal to block information that people own. She states that there is no authority or authorization for government officials to research or investigate individuals who oppose them.

[Anonymous 95](#) expresses their concern with SB 466 having “too many items” and politely requests that the number of items is decreased to seven.

[Anonymous 89](#) & [Anonymous 88](#) opposes SB 466 as they believe it is not necessary and believe it would make it easier for agencies to avoid releasing records to the public.

**Reported by: Rachel Casasnovas**

**Date: 3/31/26**