

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of a Referral by Lisbon Town Clerk Laurie Tirocchi, File No. 2021-172
Lisbon

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Lisbon Town Clerk made this referral alleging that Eugene Robert Jablonski (hereinafter "Respondent") voted twice at the November 3, 2020 election. Specifically, it was alleged that Respondent voted by absentee ballot in Lisbon, Connecticut and voted by mail Bradenton, Manatee County, Florida. After investigation of this matter, the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. The Lisbon Town Clerk made this referral pursuant to General Statutes § 9-7b (a) (1) alleging that Respondent voted twice at the November 3, 2020 election.
2. Specifically, records indicate that Respondent voted by absentee ballot in Lisbon, Connecticut and also voted by mail in Bradenton, Manatee County, Florida at the November 3, 2020 election. This referral was triggered by “hits” generated by an ERIC¹ system canvas report.
2. The Lisbon Town Clerk, by referral, indicated that:
*The Lisbon Town Clerk, by referral, indicated that:
It has been brought to my office's attention that the following
elector from the Town of Lisbon also voted in the Presidential
Election on November 3, 2020 in Manatee County, Florida.*

*Eugene Robert Jablonski
DOB 10/11/1942 SO Town House Road- Lisbon CVRS Voter
id# = 004592609*

*On August 31, 2021, Christine Palmer, Manatee County Voter
Service Coordinator, informed me that the ERIC system had
highlighted this elector as having voted in both CT and Florida.*

¹ The ERIC System is a database of individual registration and voting records by jurisdiction for elections shared by states participating in the program. “Hits” are information from election officials that an individual voted in more than one jurisdiction at the same election. Connecticut and Florida are participating states.

She has provided the election backup on the attached email showing that he voted by mail from his SO Town House Road Lisbon address and his ballot was received by them on 10/6/2020.

Applicable Law

3. General Statutes § 9-360, provides:

Any person not legally qualified who fraudulently votes in any town meeting, primary, election or referendum in which the person is not qualified to vote, and any legally qualified person who, at such meeting, primary, election or referendum, fraudulently votes more than once at the same meeting, primary, election or referendum, shall be fined not less than three hundred dollars or more than five hundred dollars and shall be imprisoned not less than one year or more than two years and shall be disfranchised. Any person who votes or attempts to vote at any election, primary, referendum or town meeting by assuming the name of another legally qualified person shall be guilty of a class D felony and shall be disfranchised.

State and County Records

4. Connecticut: Records indicate that Respondent completed an absentee ballot application and voted by absentee ballot in Lisbon at the November 3, 2020 election.
5. Florida: Records indicate that Respondent “voted by mail” at the November 3, 2020 election in Manatee County, Florida. Records indicate that he had been registered to vote in Florida as of August 10, 2012 and completed the requisite paperwork to vote by mail prior to the November 3, 2020 election including a Voter’s Certificate to verify that he was making an application to vote by mail.

Facts After Investigation

6. By way of background, the investigation determined that Respondent, at all times relevant to this complaint, was registered to vote in Lisbon, Connecticut and Manatee County, Florida. Records from each state confirm that Respondent voted in Connecticut and Florida at the November 3, 2020 election.
7. Respondent and his wife Maureen Jablonski were cooperative with Commission staff throughout the investigation. Mrs. Jablonski responded on behalf of her husband and indicated that:

My husband just turned 79 and seems to be having cognitive issues. This has been going on for at least a year that I am aware of. He told me he was going to vote in Lisbon and I asked him if he had already voted by absentee ballot in FL and he said he did not remember. I am thinking he really did not remember voting because there are things that he has done and has questioned it. This does not happen all the time but it is happening.

8. Respondent in the course of this investigation voluntarily provided medical records that confirmed his cognitive issues regarding short and long term memory loss. These records were consistent with his wife's representations regarding his cognitive condition.
9. Respondent and his wife were interviewed by a Commission investigator regarding these allegations. Respondent represented that he did not remember voting in Florida and stated that he did not remember voting in the "local" election. Further, Respondent stated that he "...knows he's in the early stages of Alzheimer's."
10. In the interview with the Commission investigator, Respondent admitted that he was "not quite sure" whether he voted in Florida at the November 3, 2020 election but did remember voting in Connecticut at that time.
11. The Commission investigator reported that Respondent during the interview sounded frail, confused and would readily drift from the subject at hand to past recollections of his professional career. The Commission investigator determined that Respondent and Mrs. Jablonski were credible witnesses.

Analysis and Conclusion

12. The Commission finds that Respondent voted in Connecticut and Florida at the November 3, 2020 election. However, the Commission finds that Respondent in this instance exhibited credible cognitive decline and provided record evidence of the same regarding the incidents that gave rise to this referral.
13. The Commission determines that based on the Respondent's current cognitive condition, as well as the potential that it may have may have existed at the time of his actions of voting twice at the November 3, 2020 election that under these narrow and specific circumstances that further action regarding this referral is unwarranted.

14. The Commission therefore dismisses this matter with no further action based on credible evidence regarding the state of Respondent's exhibited and documented cognitive decline and capacity to fully comprehend the underlying facts pertaining to his potential violation of General Statutes § 9-360.
15. Furthermore, under these narrow and specific facts, the Commission declines to pursue and exercise its civil penalty authority against Respondent pursuant to General Statutes § 9-7b (a) (2).
16. Therefore, the Commission will dismiss this matter for the reasons detailed herein with no further action.

ORDER

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

This matter is dismissed with no further action.

Adopted this 5th day of April, 2023 at Hartford, Connecticut.



Stephen T. Penny, Chairman
By Order of the Commission