

**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION**

In the Matter of a Complaint by John P. Vasellina,  
West Hartford

File No. 2020-078

**FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS**

Complainant John P. Vasellina, of the Town West Hartford, State of Connecticut, brought this complaint per General Statutes § 9-7b, alleging that election officials at the Bristow Middle School polling place, violated election laws by failing to request identification from him when he presented himself to vote at the November 3, 2020 election in the Town of West Hartford. After investigating the allegations raised in the complaint the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. Complainant alleged that he was not asked to provide ID at the checkers' table when he announced his name and address to vote in West Hartford at the November 3, 2020 election in the Town of West Hartford.
2. Respondent stressed that he was filing this complaint so that "*...this information can be used in future planning and training of poll volunteers.*"
3. Respondent indicated that he did not believe that "poll worker had malicious intentions," or that the incident has "impacted" the outcome of the election results. Nevertheless, he believed that the "...state's Voter ID rule was not followed" for him.
4. General Statutes § 9-261, provides in pertinent part:
  - (a) In each primary, election or referendum, when an elector has entered the polling place, the elector shall announce the elector's street address, if any, and the elector's name to the official checker or checkers in a tone sufficiently loud and clear as to enable all the election officials present to hear the same. Each elector who registered to vote by mail for the first time on or after January 1, 2003, and has a "mark" next to the elector's name on the official registry list, as required by section 9-23r, shall present to the official checker or checkers, before the elector votes, either a current and valid photo identification that shows the elector's name and address or a copy of a current utility bill, bank statement, government check, paycheck or other government document that shows the name and address of the elector. Each other elector shall (1) present to the official checker or checkers the elector's Social Security card or any other preprinted form of identification which

shows the elector's name and either the elector's address, signature or photograph, or (2) on a form prescribed by the Secretary of the State, write the elector's residential address and date of birth, print the elector's name and sign a statement under penalty of false statement that the elector is the elector whose name appears on the official checklist. Such form shall clearly state the penalty of false statement. A separate form shall be used for each elector. If the elector presents a preprinted form of identification under subdivision (1) of this subsection, the official checker or checkers shall check the name of such elector on the official checklist, manually on paper or electronically. If the elector completes the form under subdivision (2) of this subsection, the registrar of voters or the assistant registrar of voters, as the case may be, shall examine the information on such form and either instruct the official checker or checkers to check the name of such elector on the official checklist, manually on paper or electronically, or notify the elector that the form is incomplete or inaccurate.

5. By way of background, Complainant provided the following details about his experience as alleged by his complaint:

*I voted in the most recent election on November 03, 2020 at Bristow Middle School at about 6:55 AM. When I approached the station organized by street name to check-in and receive my ballot, I had my CT Drivers license in hand to serve as my for of ID. I provided my name and address to the poll worker. She found me on her sheet. I asked if she needed to see my ID...*

*She replied "No, you're all set to vote.". I was perplexed since I believed ID was needed to receive a ballot in Connecticut. When I arrived home, I looked up the voter ID rules for our state. Indeed, I found that a form of ID (drivers license or mail) is indeed needed to receive a ballot (or a signed affidavit) in order to receive a ballot and vote.*

6. The Commission finds that the Moderator's Diary for the Bristow Middle School polling place at the November 3, 2020 election in West Hartford, does not include an entry for the incident as detailed by Complainant; or otherwise include entries pertaining to the failure by election officials, and more specifically checkers, in administering identification requirements for individuals entering the polls and presenting themselves at the checkers' table to receive a ballot.

7. Additionally, upon investigation, the checker based on Complainant's address and the time he presented himself at the polls, was identified. While not remembering the exact name or face of the Complainant, the checker did provide an affidavit regarding an incident with an elector who insisted that his identification be taken by hand for verification. The checker based on her training and specific Covid 19 protocols declined to do so and explained by affidavit:

*"[I]n accordance with my training, and the safety precautions put in place, that the process of voter check-in was contactless, and it was sufficient that I [was] able to verify his identity through the plexi-glass."*

8. The Commission finds that the checker viewed Complainant's license through the plexi-glass, which was consistent the protocol at the Bristow Middle School Polling place at the November 3, 2020 election in the Town of West Hartford.
9. After investigation, the Commission finds that Complainant's allegations were not proved by the facts after investigation. Further, the Commission finds a lack of evidence to support the conclusion that the requirements pertaining to the process of voting and General Statutes § 9-261 were not followed by the checkers assigned to the Bristow Middles School polling place at the November 3, 2020 election in West Hartford. Complainant's allegation is therefore dismissed.
10. The Commission concludes that under these specific and narrow circumstances that Complainant's allegations were not supported by the facts after investigation and therefore this complaint should be dismissed.

### ORDER

The following Order is recommended on the basis of the aforementioned findings:

That this matter is dismissed.

Adopted this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of NOVEMBER, 2021 at Hartford, Connecticut.



Stephen T. Penny, Chairman  
By Order of the Commission