

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of a Complaint by Matthew Hallock, Fairfield File No. 2025-004

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This complaint was brought pursuant to General Statutes § 9-7b. The complainant is a resident of Fairfield and was a write-in candidate for the 21st Senatorial Special Election. After an investigation of the complaint, the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions:

Complaint

1. On or about February 28, 2025, the Commission received the above-captioned complaint.
2. On or about March 19, 2025, the Commission voted it necessary to investigate the complaint.
3. The complainant alleges potential violations regarding the party endorsement and nomination forms submitted by both the Democratic and Republican parties for the 21st Senatorial Special Election held February 25, 2025.

Applicable Law

4. General Statutes § 9-388 provides in pertinent part:

Whenever a convention of a political party is held for the endorsement of candidates for nomination to state or district office, **each candidate endorsed at such convention shall file with the Secretary of the State a certificate, signed by him, stating that he was endorsed by such convention, his name as he authorizes it to appear on the ballot, his full residence address and the title and district, if applicable, of the office for which he was endorsed. Such certificate shall be attested by either (1) the chairman or presiding officer, or (2) the secretary of such convention and shall be received by the Secretary of the State not later than four o'clock p.m. on the fourteenth day after the close of such convention.** Such certificate shall either be mailed to the Secretary of the State by certified mail, return receipt requested, or delivered in person, in which case a receipt indicating

the date and time of delivery shall be provided by the Secretary of the State to the person making delivery. **[Emphasis added.]**

Investigation & Analysis

5. Upon investigation the Commission determines that on or about January 16, 2025, the Democratic and Republican parties, at separate locations, nominated candidates to run in the 21st Senatorial Special Election to be held February 25, 2025.
6. The Democratic party nominated Anthony Afriyie at a Democratic Town Convention held via Zoom. Following this endorsement and nomination, Mr. Afriyie filed with SOTS a Certificate of Party Endorsement. The certificate included the following information: a statement that the candidate was endorsed; the type of meeting and the date it was held; the office for which they were endorsed; the date of the Special Election; the endorsed candidate's name as it is to appear on the ballot; and the candidate's full residential address. The certificate was signed by the candidate and attested to by a presiding officer.
7. The Republican party nominated Jason Perillo at a Republican Party Convention held in Monroe. Following this endorsement and nomination, Mr. Afriyie filed with SOTS a Certificate of Party Endorsement. The certificate included the following information: a statement that the candidate was endorsed; the type of meeting and the date it was held; the office for which they were endorsed; the date of the Special Election; the endorsed candidate's name as it is to appear on the ballot; and the candidate's full residential address. The certificate was signed by the candidate and attested to by the party chair.
8. Both certificates, despite being different forms, included all necessary information and fully complied with the requirements of General Statutes §9-388. The certificates were validated by SOTS as both candidates appeared on the ballot for the February 25, 2025 Special Election.
9. The complainant alleges that neither certificate included the *printing* of the name of the respective attesting chairman/presiding officer and that only their *signatures* were included.
10. The complainant is correct; however, there is no requirement that the attestors need include their printed name.¹ The only mandate for a printed name is with regard to the candidate so that his/her name can appear correctly on the ballot. Furthermore, it is the candidate who is responsible for the filing of this certificate, not the attestor.
11. Based upon the foregoing, the Commission concludes that the certificates complied with their requirements and thus there are no violations of General Statutes §9-388.

¹ It can be noted that during this investigation, the names of the attestors to the certificates were identified.

12. The complaint includes additional enquires, including, but not limited to, the manner in which these party candidates were endorsed; however, the complainant does not allege any specific election law violations or any evidence thereof.
13. Absent evidence of any alleged Title 9 violations, the Commission makes no further determinations.
14. The Commission, under the narrow and specific circumstances detailed herein, dismisses this matter as the allegations were not supported by the facts or the law after investigation.

ORDER

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

That the Commission dismisses this matter.

Adopted this 2nd day of April, 2025 at Hartford, Connecticut.



Stephen T. Penny, Chairman
By Order of the Commission