

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

STATE ETHICS COMMISSION

CONNECTICUT STATE ETHICS COMMISSION 97 ELM STREET (REAR) HARTFORD, CONN. 06106

85-B

Declaratory Ruling

In re: Michael J. Zazzaro, D.M.D.

Dental Commission Member Serving as Consultant to Commissioner of Health Services

The Ethics Commission has been asked whether a member of the State Dental Commission may also be employed as consultant to the Commissioner of Health Services.

Members of the Dental Commission are appointed by the Governor; five of them, of which the member in question is one, must be practitioners in dentistry. Subsection 20-103a(a), General Statutes. They are not compensated for their services, but are reimbursed for expenses incurred in the performance of their duties. Subsection 20-103a(b), id. Their several duties in relation to dentists and dental hygienists licensed to practice in Connecticut include (1) hearing and deciding matters concerning suspension or revocation of licensure, (2) adjudicating complaints filed against practitioners, and (3) imposing sanctions when appropriate. Id. If the Dental Commission finds that a practitioner has violated one of a number of statutory standards, it may, among other things, suspend or revoke the practitioner's license. Sections 20-114, 19a-17, General Statutes. No dentist or dental hygienist may practice in Connecticut without a license. Sections 20-106, 20-111, id.

Considering the manner of their appointment and the State power they may exercise, members of the Dental Commission are public officials for purposes of the Code of Ethics for Public Officials (Chapter 10, Part I, General Statutes). Subsection 1-79(i), id.

The Dental Commission member in question has been employed by the Commissioner of Health Services to furnish a variety of personal services. Pursuant to his contract these include providing advice to the Commissioner and to the health system agencies concerning dental health and dental services in Connecticut; representing the Commissioner at meetings and

Phone: (203) 566-4472

conferences as required; assisting in the inves complaints of professionals who might be in vio General Statutes or regulations concerning dent practice of dentistry; inspecting dental office laboratories to insure compliance with the Gene regulations administered by the Dental Commissi assisting in the documentation and substantiati charges which the Department of Health Services against health professionals licensed by the Deconsultant, the member is paid an hourly fee, preimbursement for travel expenses.

ation of
ion of the
s or the
nd
Statutes and
and
of formal
y present
tment. As a

The license which permits a professional to livelihood by utilizing his education and exper valuable property right. There can be no doubt respondent is constitutionally entitled to due including an opportunity to be heard by a fair body, in a proceeding which could result in sus Altholz v. Connecti revocation of the license. Commission, 4 Conn. App. 307 (1985). A Commiss has investigated a possible violation by a dent hygienist might well have prejudged the facts i a consultant whose contract is renewed from tim could have a financial interest in supporting t of the investigation. Subsection 1-84(c), Gene Therefore, the member should not sit in judgmen and Department regulations forbid him to. Subs 19-2a-11(c), Regulations of Connecticut State A Disqualification of a member who has investigat avoids non-compliance with provisions of the Un Administrative Procedure Act, Chapter 54, Gener such as the limitation on ex parte communicatio 4-181, General Statutes) and the requirement th fact be based exclusively on the evidence and m officially noticed (subsection 4-177(g), Genera With regard to the latter, it would seem virtua for the member to ignore facts and opinions acq investigation, yet the respondent would have no explain or rebut them if they were not entered

n a ce is a at a cess, impartial sion or Dental member who or dental ne case. o time, he conclusions Statutes. n the case, ion cies. the case also ^m Statutes, (section Findings of tatutes). impossible ed during the portunity to o the record.

It appears that by becoming a paid consulta include inspecting dental facilities and invest professionals concerning matters which might re disciplinary proceedings before the Commission, accepted employment which impairs his independe in violation of subsection 1-84(b), General Stajudgment is so clearly impaired that he is forb by the standards of due process but by Departme

whose duties
ting dental
t in
e member has
of judgment
es. His
en not only
l regulations

to serve as a member in cases he has investigated. (There is also a question as to whether the Dental Commission can be considered fair and unbiased when it hears a case investigated by one of its members, who may also testify in the case, even though the member does not participate in adjudicating the matter.)

It should be noted that the process by which a member of the Dental Commission is retained as a consultant must be an open and public one, including prior public offer and subsequent public disclosure of all proposals considered and the contract awarded. Subsection 1-84(i), General Statutes.

In summary, the duties of a member of the Dental Commission who is hired as a consultant should not include investigating matters which may later be acted on by the Commission in disciplinary proceedings. Furthermore, the procedures under which the consulting contract is reached must satisfy the requirements of subsection 1-84(i), General Statutes.

By order of the Commission,

Dated 8/12/85

	W ²	
		(,
		(