



September 16, 2011

Mr. A. David Ceneviva, President
Assn of Court Security Off
141 Church Street
New Haven, CT 06510

Case Number: |||||
LM Number: 541423

Dear Mr. Ceneviva:

This office has recently completed an audit of Association of Court Security Officers – Connecticut, under the Compliance Audit Program (CAP) to determine your organization’s compliance with the provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (LMRDA). As discussed during the exit interview with you and Treasurer Edward Allen on August 25, 2011, the following problems were disclosed during the CAP. The matters listed below are not an exhaustive list of all possible problem areas since the audit conducted was limited in scope.

Recordkeeping Violations

Title II of the LMRDA establishes certain reporting and recordkeeping requirements. Section 206 requires, among other things, that labor organizations maintain adequate records for at least five years by which each receipt and disbursement of funds, as well as all account balances, can be verified, explained, and clarified. As a general rule, labor organizations must maintain all records used or received in the course of union business.

For disbursements, this includes not only original bills, invoices, receipts, vouchers, and applicable resolutions, but also documentation showing the nature of the union business requiring the disbursement, the goods or services received, and the identity of the recipient(s) of the goods or services. In most instances, this documentation requirement can be satisfied with a sufficiently descriptive expense receipt or invoice. If an expense receipt is not sufficiently descriptive, a union officer or employee should write a note on it providing the additional information. For money it receives, the labor organization must keep at least one record showing the date, amount, purpose, and source of that money. The labor organization must also retain bank records for all accounts.

The audit of the Association of Court Security Officers – Connecticut’s 2009 records revealed the following recordkeeping violations:

1) Failure to keep records – Union

The union did not initially provide bank statements for January, February, and December 2009, although these reports were eventually secured and provided to DOL. The March 2009 bank statement was not found, and could not be secured from the bank. The union did not have all records and supporting documentation for disbursements made to pay Capitol One credit card bills of the former officer. The local did not have supporting documentation for all Elks club hall rentals, beverage payments. Records for the Marshal's dinner were spotty, including records of receipts collections and disbursements.

You were advised of proper record keeping requirements, and promised to keep records adequately in the future. Therefore, no further action will be taken regarding this violation at this time.

Reporting Violations

1) Deficient filing – Union

The union reported \$24,350 in receipts on 2009 Form LM-3. The audit showed bank deposits (less \$900 error in October) of \$25,252, a difference of \$902. Once funds are deposited to a union account, they become union funds and must be reported as such, including funds from social events such as the Marshal's dinner.

All officers must be included in Item 24, including past officers, and all payments to all officers must be included in Item 24. The former officers who were in office January to March 2009 were not listed on the 2009 form. The local reported a payment of \$564 to President David Ceneviva as the only payment to an officer in 2009. In fact, President Ceneviva received \$244 in reimbursed salary expenses and \$1,450 in reimbursed expense payments (cell phone and other expenses). Vice President Martin White received \$244 in salary reimbursements and \$72 in expense reimbursements. Secretary Tania Stenberg received \$718 in salary reimbursements and \$46 in expense reimbursements. Former President ||| received \$474 in salary reimbursements. Accordingly, \$1,680 in gross salary and \$1,568 in Allowances and other Disbursements should have been reported in 2009, with a total amount of \$3,248 carried over to Item 45 (To Officers).

No amended LM-3 form will be required; future forms are to be filled out correctly.

Other Violations

1) Bonding – Union

The union did not have a bond when the audit opened. When apprised of the bonding requirement at the opening interview, officers immediately took steps to get the union bonded. The union is now bonded for \$10,000, more than the required amount, by an approved surety company. Therefore, no action is required to correct this violation.

I want to extend my personal appreciation to Association of Court Security Officers - Connecticut for the cooperation and courtesy extended during this compliance audit. I strongly recommend that you make sure this letter and the compliance assistance materials provided to you are passed on to future officers. If we can provide any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

|||||

Investigator

cc: Mr. Edward Allen, Treasurer