Board of Ethics
City of Stamford
888 Washington Boulevard
P.O. Box 10152
Stamford, CT 06904-2152

April 16, 1997

John F. Leydon, Esq.
Ryan, Ryan, Johnson, McCaghey & Deluca
80 Fourth Street
P.O. Box 3057
Stamford, CT 06905

Re: Request for Opinion

Dear Mr. Leydon:

The Board of Ethics of the City of Stamford has considered your written request of March 22, 1997 in which you have asked for an advisory opinion. You have represented that you are presently a member of the City of Stamford Board of Representatives and that you are also a practicing attorney employed as a member of a law firm. You have requested an opinion in regard to whether you and/or others associated with the firm may interact with the City of Stamford staff and employees and/or appear before the City's boards. You have noted that your firm is presently representing an individual appearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

It is the Board of Ethic's understanding that the Board of Representatives has appellate authority only over the Zoning Board. It is further understood that when the Board of Representatives is voting on the budgets of the various boards of the City of Stamford it is voting on the budget as a whole and not voting with regard to particular persons on those other boards or on the boards' line items in the budget.

Based on the above understandings, the Board of Ethics concludes that you may represent your firm's clients before the City's boards with the exception of the Zoning Board due to a possible conflict of interest. Other members of your firm may represent these clients provided, however, that you abstain from voting in your capacity as a member of the Board of Representatives holding appellate authority over the Zoning Board. On all other matters, it is understood that you are voting on budgets as a whole and that you will exercise your own discretion when voting on line items of the budget.

In light of the fact pattern described and so long as you abide by the opinions as stated herein, the Board is of the opinion that your actions do not result in a violation of Ordinance 706 Supplemental.

In accordance with § 19-14(C)(1) of Ordinance 706 Supplemental, this opinion is binding upon the Board and yourself unless amended or revoked and reliance on this opinion in good faith is an absolute defense in any action or proceeding brought under the provisions of the Code of ethics.

The Board thanks you for taking the time and effort to request an advisory opinion in advance of undertaking the transaction.

Very truly yours,

Louis M. Pasquino
Chairman

cc: Lois Pont-Briant, Town Clerk

Advisory #1997-1
Duplicate with stamp

Board of Ethics
City of Stamford
888 Washington Boulevard
P.O. Box 10152
Stamford, CT 06904-2152

April 16, 1997

John F. Leydon, Esq.
Ryan, Ryan, Johnson, McCaghey & Deluca
80 Fourth Street
P.O. Box 3057
Stamford, CT 06905

Re: Request for Opinion

Dear Mr. Leydon:

The Board of Ethics of the City of Stamford has considered your written request of March 22, 1997 in which you have asked for an advisory opinion. You have represented that you are presently a member of the City of Stamford Board of Representatives and that you are also a practicing attorney employed as a member of a law firm. You have requested an opinion in regard to whether you and/or others associated with the firm may interact with the City of Stamford staff and employees and/or appear before the City's boards. You have noted that your firm is presently representing an individual appearing before the Zoning Board of Appeals.

It is the Board of Ethic's understanding that the Board of Representatives has appellate authority only over the Zoning Board. It is further understood that when the Board of Representatives is voting on the budgets of the various boards of the City of Stamford it is voting on the budget as a whole and not voting with regard to particular persons on those other boards or on the boards' line items in the budget.

Based on the above understandings, the Board of Ethics concludes that you may represent your firm's clients before the City's boards with the exception of the Zoning Board due to a possible conflict of interest. Other members of your firm may represent these clients provided, however, that you abstain from voting in your capacity as a member of the Board of Representatives holding appellate authority over the Zoning Board. On all other matters, it is understood that you are voting on budgets as a whole and that you will exercise your own discretion when voting on line items of the budget.

In light of the fact pattern described and so long as you abide by the opinions as stated herein, the Board is of the opinion that your actions do not result in a violation of Ordinance 706 Supplemental.

In accordance with § 19-14(C)(1) of Ordinance 706 Supplemental, this opinion is binding upon the Board and yourself unless amended or revoked and reliance on this opinion in good faith is an absolute defense in any action or proceeding brought under the provisions of the Code of ethics.

The Board thanks you for taking the time and effort to request an advisory opinion in advance of undertaking the transaction.

Very truly yours,

Louis M. Pasquino
Chairman

cc: Lois Pont-Briant, Town Clerk