



Dave Caron <dave.caron391@gmail.com>

Bonding Claim

Collin Provost <collin.provost391@gmail.com>
To: Dave Caron <dave.caron391@gmail.com>

Wed, May 21, 2014 at 2:07 PM

Collin Provost-President
CT State Prison Employees
Union AFSCME Local 391

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Charlie Jurgonis" <CJurgonis@afscme.org>

Date: May 21, 2014 1:59 PM

Subject: FW: Bonding Claim

To: "dave.caron@gmail.com" <dave.caron@gmail.com>

Cc: "Sal Luciano" <Sall@council4.org>, "Collin Provost (collin.provost391@gmail.com)" <collin.provost391@gmail.com>, "Richard Abelson" <RAbelson@afscme.org>, "James Howell" <JHowell@afscme.org>

Brother Caron,

Two things---

- 1) The newspaper article is wrong. There is no mention of the word "embezzlement" in the Judicial Panel decision.
- 2) There is no basis for a bonding claim. The Labor Organization Bond covers losses that occur through dishonest acts that can be proven to have been for the personal benefit of the individual, and with no union purpose. The lack of documentation or the lack of approvals do not mean that the funds weren't spent in the conduct of union activities or business. For a bonding claim to be made, the local has the responsibility to provide documented proof that the funds were not related to the conduct of union activities or business.

The lack of documentation and lack of approvals are a violation of the Financial Standards Code. But for the reasons stated above, a Financial Standards Code violation is not, on its own, a basis for a bonding claim.

Charles Jurgonis

Director, Financial Services