



CITY OF NEW BRITAIN

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
THE HONORABLE BOBBY SANCHEZ

EST. 1871

WWW.NEWBRITAINCT.GOV

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

April 15, 2026

Statement from Mayor Bobby Sanchez on Report Exposing a Culture of Misconduct Within City Hall

New Britain, CT —“What this report reveals is unacceptable, and it will not be tolerated in this administration. The findings point to a longstanding breakdown in accountability and oversight that allowed misconduct to persist for years. That is why we have taken immediate action, terminating the Revenue Collector, making this report public, and referring this matter to the State’s Attorney. Anyone who violated the public trust will be held accountable to the fullest extent of the law.

But this is not an isolated incident. The pattern outlined here demands a broader response. I am directing that this investigation be expanded to ensure every individual involved is identified and held responsible. For too long, there were different rules for different people in City Hall. That ends now. There cannot be one set of rules for the well-connected and another for everyone else. Everyone pays what they owe. Everyone follows the law.

We are also implementing immediate changes to strengthen internal controls, oversight, and financial safeguards so this never happens again. The people of this city deserve honesty, fairness, and accountability, and that is exactly what they are going to get.”

###

Media Contact:

Alisha Rayner
Director of Operations and Communications
(860) 826-3302
alisha.rayner@newbritainct.gov

To: William C. Rivera, Corporation Counsel, City of New Britain

From: Crumbie Law Group

Date: April 14, 2026

Subject: Office of The Revenue Collector Investigation Update

Page | 1

MEMORANDUM

This memorandum shall serve as an update regarding our ongoing investigation into concerning behavior in the Revenue Collector's Office.

On January 14, 2026, this firm was engaged by The City of New Britain, CT (the "City") to conduct a comprehensive review of certain town operations with the goal of identifying opportunities to improve efficiency and fiscal sustainability. An initial review of internal City records revealed documented reports going back nearly ten years that raised concerns about the Revenue Collector's Office, led by Revenue Collector, Cheryl S. Blogoslawski, including cash mismanagement, ineffective people management, favoritism, bullying, and a failure to train new employees. Among the most egregious reports we received related to improper backdating of delinquent tax payments to avoid statutory interest, which is not permitted under state law. These allegations were raised with the previous administration; however, given that the claims were never investigated, the allegations became the initial focus of our review.

1. Improper Backdating of Tax Payments

Our investigation identified a long-standing practice by Ms. Blogoslawski of falsifying internal computer records relating to delinquent tax payments for real estate, motor vehicle and water taxes to avoid interest being assessed to the taxpayer that otherwise would have been due. This conduct is a violation of Conn. Gen. Stat. (C.G.S.) §12-146, which mandates that 18% per annum interest be collected on tax payments made after their due dates.

The City uses an online portal known as Quality Data Service ("QDS") to record all real and personal property tax payments. QDS has several fields including Payment Date, Effective Date, the Amount of Tax Paid, and for late payments the Amount of Interest Paid. When a payment is processed after its due date, the QDS system automatically adds the statutorily mandated interest charge. Payments made in person at the Revenue Collector's Office are processed immediately by a revenue-aide, who records the transaction in QDS at their assigned terminal; in this situation, the Payment Date and Effective Date will be the same. Payments made using an online portal are downloaded by a revenue-aide who processes the transaction in QDS;

in this scenario, the transaction could be processed the next day, but the Effective Date always reflects the actual date of the online payment.

Payments made by mail are processed differently. As January and July are busy times, with a steady flow of taxpayers making payments in person at the Revenue Collector's Office, the practice is to prioritize in-person payments and to process the mailed check payments when time permits. Payments sent by U.S. Mail that are postmarked before the due date but entered into the QDS system by a revenue-aide after the due date are considered timely under state statute.

The evidence indicates that Ms. Blogoslawski improperly backdated tax payments for her own personal benefit and for other taxpayers, including at times at the direction of the previous Mayor's Office.

As for her own tax payments, the evidence indicates that none of the tax payments made by Ms. Blogoslawski over the last four years were processed by the due date and nearly all of them were backdated to the due date to eliminate the statutory interest charge. It is not possible to discern in each instance whether Ms. Blogoslawski directed a revenue-aide to backdate her late tax payments or whether Ms. Blogoslawski backdated her late payment herself by using a revenue-aide's assigned terminal to process the transaction. There is clear evidence that Ms. Blogoslawski altered the date on at least two of her checks for the purpose of backdating the payment.

Regarding the delinquent tax payments for other taxpayers, the witness testimony indicates that Ms. Blogoslawski frequently waived statutory interest for taxpayers at the payment collection window if they complained loudly enough about the assessed interest, even though there was no legally permissible basis to waive the interest. A common theme of the witnesses' statements was that Ms. Blogoslawski relented to taxpayer demands to avoid confrontation and/or to do favors for people she was familiar with. The evidence indicates that this practice has gone on for a decade or longer. Two witnesses stated that they reported this practice to a member of the former Mayor's Office, who indicated that they would look into it.

Ms. Blogoslawski conceded that she improperly backdated payments for at least one taxpayer (Taxpayer 1) who owned several properties in the City and was significantly in arrears, but she explained that she did so at the direction of the former Mayor's Office. The QDS records indicate that numerous tax payments for Taxpayer 1 were backdated during the last decade; some payments were backed to the due date to eliminate interest completely while other payments were backdated to an intermediate date to decrease the amount of interest due.

Ms. Blogoslawski stated that the former Mayor's Office facilitated meetings between Taxpayer 1 and herself to sort out Taxpayer 1's tax liabilities. Ms. Blogoslawski also indicated that a member of the former Mayor's Office (Witness 8) often hand-delivered checks from Taxpayer 1 to her for processing; this allegation was corroborated through email evidence and the QDS records. Ms. Blogoslawski added that some of the checks she received from Witness 8 were not dated and some checks were late. Ms. Blogoslawski recalled at least one instance when Witness 8 delivered checks to her after the due date but Witness 8 directed her to honor the payments as being timely because Witness 8 claimed they had been holding the checks in their office for some time. Some of the more egregious examples of payment backdating include a motor vehicle tax that was due on July 31, 2015, but not paid until June 2017, and because the payment date was backdated, no interest was assessed or collected. The note in the QDS record indicates that the July 2015, date was honored as a "1 time courtesy per mayor." See Exhibit 1. However, the evidence indicates that backdating Taxpayer 1's late payments to avoid interest was not merely a one-time courtesy.

Witness 8 acknowledged that they delivered checks from Taxpayer 1 to Ms. Blogoslawski for several years, explaining that they were trying to help Taxpayer 1 get current with his tax liabilities. Witness 8 denied specifically directing Ms. Blogoslawski to backdate payments for the express purpose of avoiding interest; however, they acknowledged that they were trying to facilitate a resolution to Taxpayer 1's outstanding tax liabilities, and given their role in the Mayor's Office, Ms. Blogoslawski could have reasonably felt that she was being directed to accommodate Taxpayer 1 through the "courtesy" notations denoted in the QDS system and described above. Witness 8 added that as Chief of Staff to the former Mayor they did not have any "real" authority, so they could not act without direction of the former Mayor, and therefore, anything that they did regarding Taxpayer 1 was either at the mayor's direction or with her knowledge.

2. Mishandling of Cash Receipts

Review of internal records indicates that for several years there have been numerous instances in the Revenue Collector's Office of large amounts of cash left haphazardly around the office and not secured. Internal policies provide that cash receipts should be locked in the safe within the Revenue Collector's Office and that cash receipts should be deposited into the bank daily. However, there have been repeated documented instances where cash was left unsecured in drawers or on top of filing cabinets around the Revenue Collector's Office and cash left unsecured in Ms. Blogoslawski's internal office drawers. In one instance in January 2024, over \$246,000 was left unsecured on top of the safe. See Exhibit 6. Additionally, after discovery of the large amounts of cash left unsecured overnight, the custodial staff refused to clean the

Revenue Collector's Office to avoid any suspicion if money was discovered to be missing. See Exhibit 7.

In sum, although we have not conducted an exhaustive review of all the City's tax collection records, it is clear from our investigation to date that the Revenue Collector's Office has engaged in a long-standing practice of backdating tax payments thereby allowing certain taxpayers to avoid statutory interest, and Ms. Blogoslawski benefited personally from this illegal practice. Ms. Blogoslawski knowingly violated her fiduciary duty to her office and to the City. It is not possible at this juncture to calculate the total revenue that would have been collected by the city but for Ms. Blogoslawski's actions but given the pervasiveness of the practice over many years, the total lost revenue is likely significant.

Given the extent of these compliance failures in the Revenue Collector's Office, including the history of mishandling cash receipts, we strongly recommend a forensic examination be conducted to identify whether theft or misappropriation of City funds have occurred. As it relates to Ms. Blogoslawski's own self-dealing in the late tax payment backdating scheme, a referral to the proper state law enforcement authority should be made to determine if action by that office is warranted.

The investigation is ongoing.

#END#

