

Judiciary Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-6667

Title: AN ACT ADDRESSING GUN VIOLENCE.

Vote Date: 3/28/2023

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/6/2023

File No.: 641

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

Request of the Governor Pursuant to Joint Rule 9

REASONS FOR BILL:

Gun violence is plaguing our nation and it is imperative that something is done to curb it. This bill makes various changes to gun laws to ensure the public safety of our communities.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language makes various changes. It adds technical and conforming changes and adds language stating that you need to be eighteen years or older to purchase ammunition but includes various exemptions. Any person who violates the ammunition section will be guilty of a class D felony. Makes clarifying changes to someone not being allowed to have a gun permit or criminal possession of a firearm/ammunition if they committed a family violence crime. Removes the age increase to 21 for ammunition certificates. Adds a section about the sale of body armor. Removes the section related to criminal possession of body armor. Adds the bill language in its entirety from HB 6834.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Patrick Griffin, Chief States Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice: The Chief States Attorney supports the bill for many of its provisions; the testimony specifically notes its support for the amendment to high-capacity magazine prohibition and the increase in age restrictions. With respect to the high-capacity magazines, the Chief States Attorney explains that in the absence of the date a magazine was obtained, it is difficult to prosecute possession cases on a felony level; this bill would eliminate the pre-2013 classification to allow for uniform prosecution.

With respect to the age restrictions on long guns, the Chief States Attorney provides data supporting the idea that gun violence is often concentrated on a small slice of young society, both as the aggressors and victims, and increased education and increasing the age at which they obtain guns will help to combat crime. The Chief States Attorney concludes by providing information on crime rates in Connecticut, how they have changed in recent years, and the breakdown of who commits the crimes.

Manisha Juthani, Commissioner, Department of Public Health: The commissioner supports the bill for its efforts to combat gun violence, as well as the \$2.5 million allocated to the DPH's Community Gun Violence Prevention Program, expressing the belief that gun violence is a public health issue, the commissioner thanks the governor for the provision of extra funding to reduce gun violence.

James Rovella, Commissioner, DESPP: The commissioner categorizes the bill into four areas which improve gun protections in Connecticut: reducing community gun violence, stopping mass shootings, reducing suicide and domestic violence, and strengthening user safety protections.

With respect to reducing community gun violence, the commissioner supports the further investment into the Department of Public Health's Office of Injury and Violence Prevention which was created by 2021 legislation. The commissioner also expresses their support for severely reducing the ability for citizens to open carry, which often results in law enforcement officers making quick decisions as to whether an individual is a risk to society or merely practicing legal open carry. Similarly, the presence of guns in arguments or around alcohol increases the risk of escalation; this bill seeks to prevent these situations from occurring. The commissioner notes the reduction of the "time to crime" period for guns used in crimes, with nearly half of guns used in crimes having been owned less than three years; the 30-day limit on handguns reduces the risk of straw purchasing. Concerning "ghost guns", the commissioner supports the elimination of grandfathered guns, as it is near impossible to distinguish what is a true pre-2019 gun and what was manufactured afterwards. The commissioner also expresses their support for gun stores being licensed.

With respect to stopping mass shootings, the commissioner focuses their support on strengthening the assault weapons ban by removing grandfathered guns which have banned features, such as forward pistol grips, flash suppressors, or other features. Similarly, "other" weapons have started to appear, which have been manufactured to evade classification as a pistol, rifle, or shotgun, but continue to operate as one. Rimfire rifles are a popular example, which are legal provided they have fewer than two banned features. Noting the lack of serialization of large-capacity magazines, the commissioner supports the elimination of pre-2013 treatment of just a \$90 fine for possession of them, as opposed to the class D felony which would otherwise be imposed. Finally, the commissioner notes the science suggesting that youth brains are impulsive and not fully developed as the reasoning behind supporting the increase of age required to purchase all firearms to 21 from the current level at 18 for long guns. The commissioner notes that under 21s are still able to go hunting with others' guns, they just may not own their own long guns.

Concerning the reduction of suicide and domestic violence, the commissioner supports the ten-day restriction for the cooling down period it grants, reducing the likelihood of impulsive violence on the self or others. The commissioner supports the expansion of safe storage of

guns to all households, as it reduces the likelihood of stolen firearms being taken in burglaries. Finally, the commissioner supports the automatic disqualification for family violence committers for a pistol permit, as differences exist between state law and federal law, requiring a hearing to be held for each current case.

Concerning strengthening user safety protections, the commissioner supports expanding the prohibition of loaded long guns being transported in vehicles, with note of the aforementioned "other" guns being currently exempt from the law. The commissioner also supports the increased education prior to obtaining a firearm permit, with expanded information on state laws and live fire training. Finally, the commissioner also supports the requirement of loaded chamber indicators on all semiautomatic handguns and trigger locks on all firearms.

Judicial Branch, External Affairs: The Judicial Branch expresses their concern at the implementation of section 30 (b), concerning the prohibition of issuance of certificates for long guns to those convicted of family violence crimes. The Branch states that they do not keep this information, suggesting instead that the individual crimes which make up family violence be designated as such and then referred to in the bill.

The following testimony was submitted for HB 6834:

Ned Lamont, Governor, Office of the Governor: The Governor supports the bill for its targeted approach at reducing crime rates in Connecticut's major cities. The Governor believes that this bill is not a return to the widespread damages caused by criminal laws in the 1990s, but instead a response to the data which shows that a significant amount of crime is caused by repeat offenders.

Jennifer Bourn, Chief of Legal Services, Office of Chief Public Defender: The Office strongly opposes the bill due to the apparent arbitrary nature of the offenses categorized as "serious firearm offenses", their opposition to the unconstitutional requirement for detention without bail, and the burden it places upon minority groups. It is the Office of Chief Public Defenders opinion that the required violations of probation hearing are unrealistically quick in projected timing, and that the focus on four predominantly black and brown communities to be the centers of gun dockets is a misplaced policy which will only exacerbate racial injustice in the state.

External Affairs Division, Judicial Branch: The Judicial Branch suggests that statutory references be provided for the "serious firearm offenses" charges. The branch also suggests that Fairfield be changed to Bridgeport in line 630, as Bridgeport is the home to the geographical area court. Finally, the court raises the apparent contradiction between section 2 (d) of the bill and section 8 of the Connecticut Constitution, which requires bail to be offered upon sufficient scrutiny.

Patrick Griffin, Chief States Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice: The Chief States Attorney supports the bill for its ability to combat repeat crime in Connecticut's cities, noting the number of gun offenders and victims who have prior felonies. The testimony also supports the extra day to review all relevant information pertinent to a parole or probation hearing.

Sharmese Walcott, Hartford States Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice: The Hartford States Attorney supports the bill because of its efforts to combat repeat offenders who constitute a substantial proportion of crime in Connecticut. The testifier believes that the detention laid out in section 2 of the bill is constitutional as it follows a practice similar to parole for supervised individuals, whilst ensuring that individuals are not held for substantial periods of time by setting out a time limit on their detainment. The testifier expresses the belief that current bond setting allows for individuals to terrorize communities by constantly being released for minimal cost; section 3 of this bill allows for further discretion to be shown. The testifier states that the bill will provide the probation and parole departments a set procedure on how to handle all relevant information, which will ensure community safety and measure data effectively.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Liza Andrews, Director of Public Policy, Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence: The group specifically supports two provisions in the bill. Concerning the disparity between state and federal law with respect to family violence, the group supports the elimination of lengthy hearings for convicted individuals who are already disqualified under federal law from owning a gun yet are still able to apply for state gun permits; this provision would clarify their ineligibility to own any gun. The group also supports the 10-day waiting period because it is their belief that access to firearms by either party in an impulsive domestic situation increases the risk of the abused being injured or killed, contrary to the belief that the firearm would make the abused safer. Noting the 1 in 83 chance that a woman uses a firearm in a domestic situation compared to men, and the low rate of justifiable homicide by women in domestic violence, the group holds the belief that no gun is better than a defensive gun.

Ken Barone, Associate Director, IMRP at UCONN: The IMRP are generally supportive of section 1 (c) of the bill for the collection of data concerning law enforcement stops due to suspicion of unlawful open carry of a firearm, as well as 1 (d) for the requirement to produce a report on the data from 1 (c).

Luke Bronin, Mayor, City of Hartford: The mayor supports the bill's provision to limit the existence of "ghost guns" by requiring that all guns be required to register with the state. The mayor supports this because the original 2019 legislation gave exception to guns produced prior to 2019, which has proven difficult to distinguish from new ghost guns, and therefore hinders law enforcement's ability to enforce the laws; Hartford Police Department doubled their ghost gun recovery rate from 29 in 2021 to 58 in 2022. The mayor also supports the provision strengthening the ban on large capacity magazines; the removal of violations specifically targeting pre-2013 magazines allows for possession of magazines to be universally treated as a class D felony. Finally, the mayor supports the strengthening of the state's assault weapons ban, closing loopholes exploited by manufacturers to evade the ban.

Joseph Ganim, Mayor, City of Bridgeport: The mayor supports the bill for its ability to combat repeat offenders, the crackdown on ghost guns and high-capacity magazines, the investments in community violence centers, all whilst avoiding the trap of mass incarceration which often targets minority groups the hardest. The mayor notes that Bridgeport Police Department recovered 24 ghost guns and 118 high-capacity magazines in 2022, forming a substantial number of the guns recovered. The mayor also lends their support to expansion

of DOC programs to help train incarcerated individuals for jobs, increased re-entry programs, and expanded youth support.

Jeremy Stein, Executive Director, CT Against Gun Violence: The testifier notes the increased levels of gun crime in recent years, with guns being the leading cause of death in children. They note the correlation between strong gun laws and lower gun deaths. With respect to safe storage, the testifier supports the provision being expanded to all homes, regardless of how many residents live there. They note the high theft rate, issues which result from temporary visitors to the residence, and threats to self or others. They express the belief that less than half of gun owners store their guns securely.

With respect to ghost guns, the testifier supports the removal of grandfathered guns, as ghost guns have become an increasing threat to society, with the numbers recovered in Hartford doubling over the past year. The testifier notes that it is difficult to enforce the current exceptions for pre-2019 guns; removing the separate treatment of these guns will unify prosecution and allow for better enforcement.

With respect to assault weapons, the testifier supports the closure of loopholes allowing for "other" weapons to slip through the prohibition. The testifier also expresses support for a "true" ban by eliminating grandfathered guns from pre-1993.

Michele Voigt, Cofounder & CEO, Violent Crimes Survivors: The group supports the bill in its entirety, with specific support for specific provisions in the bill.

With respect to the prohibition of open carry, the group pays particular attention to the emotional suffering continued exposure to firearms can have. They note the presence of open carry at vigils, with the believed intention being to intimidate and cause greater suffering for those who have PTSD from the violence. They also express the view that the presence of open firearms may alter behavior and increase aggression.

With respect to the serialization of ghost guns, the group views the current law as unenforceable due to the exception for pre-2019 guns and notes the fast expansion of ghost guns seized in Connecticut cities. Although the group accepts that criminals are unlikely to register illegal firearms, they express the belief that a reduction in untraced guns is still important.

With respect to safe storage of guns, the group supports the provision requiring the safe storage of firearms. The testimony recounts several stories of individuals who were injured through suicide and random violence as a result of unsecured guns, with many guns stolen from vehicles every year.

The group strongly supports the provision aligning state laws with federal laws concerning family violence crimes and the ability of offenders to own a firearm. They note studies which have shown a decrease in homicides within relationships and families, with reportedly over a million women currently alive who have reported being shot at by an intimate partner.

The group also expresses support for the further funding of the Department of Public Health's Gun Violence Prevention program.

Other testimony: Due to the quantity of testimony received for this bill, it is not possible to give a summary of each individual submission. Of the remaining testimonies in support of the bill, the following ideas were expressed:

58 solely expressed their support for the bill.

124 supported the bill for the belief that it would help to reduce gun violence in Connecticut, with some noting their support for extra funding for gun violence prevention. **7** noted the impact this bill could have to reduce domestic violence.

171 supported the provision concerning safe storage of firearms in the home, with many noting the impact that such a move would have on suicide rates.

162 supported the ghost gun provision, with many noting the increasing level of guns without serial numbers being recovered by police.

13 expressed support for the assault rifle categorization update.

The following testimony was submitted in support of HB 69834:

Luke Bronin, Mayor, City of Hartford: The mayor supports the bill as it is in line with the findings of the special task force focused on tackling violent gun crime, which would include representatives from four major cities in Connecticut. The mayor notes that those four cities are home to new dockets that make up 80% of gun violence, with the bill seeking to narrowly focus on repeat offenders of serious firearm offenses. With respect to the issue of emergency petitions for high-risk individuals, it is the mayor's belief that the extra 48 hours will allow for all relevant information to be reviewed by the parole and probate offices. Considering the two new dockets, it is the mayor's opinion that they will help to clear the backlog currently held by the gun dockets in Hartford and New Haven.

Joseph Ganim, Mayor, City of Bridgeport: The mayor supports the legislation for its ability to address repeat violent offenders. The mayor opposes bills which target minority groups but believes this bill will help to make Bridgeport and other cities safer, noting that a significant proportion of victims are repeat felony offenders.

Michael Muszynski, CT Conference of Municipalities: CCM supports the bill for its efforts to combat gun violence by targeting retaliation and cyclical violence which persistent offenders experience and commit. CCM notes this bill is part of a broader effort to combat gun violence and follows the recommendations of the CCM task force.

Fernando Spagnolo, Chief of Police, City of Waterbury: The chief supports the bill because it targets repeat offenders who constitute a substantial percentage of those arrested in Waterbury last year; 70% of those arrested for shootings were on pretrial release or probation, with 63% having prior felonies. A similar issue is the victims; 8% of shooting victims were on pretrial release, 21% were on probation, 45% had violent felony convictions, and 18% had prior firearm convictions. The introduction of a serious firearm offence can help to reduce these numbers by increasing the parole required, as well as streamlining the current gun dockets to help for faster justice.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Edward Banasiak: The testifier states their opposition to eliminating open carry, noting that certain establishments encourage open carry within their facilities as a method of discouraging crime. They further raise this issue in terms of the gun-free zone issue, with the idea that individuals, especially the most vulnerable in society, would be harmed by their inability to maintain their firearms when travelling to such locations; this is especially troubling in their opinion with the expansion to alcohol as a gun-free zone.

Discussing the ten-day waiting period, the testifier opposes by noting that individuals already must have a permit, having passed a background check, and individuals who may be thinking of committing suicide would have other methods to which they could turn if needed.

The testifier opposes the one gun a month limit by noting that individuals who buy multiple handguns at a time are already required to be the subject of notification by the seller to the ATF, and if a buyer proceeds to sell a firearm onwards to someone who cannot legally own one, they are already breaking the law, making the new law redundant. The testifier takes similar issue with the ten handguns a year limit, suggesting that there is no rational reason to oppose someone's right to do so.

The testifier opposes the one-year expiration date on the long and handgun safety certificate, noting that an individual can maintain a permit for decades before they handle a gun, and that individuals may be unable to afford the full permit once they have completed the training and therefore would require more time to finish the process.

Finally, the testifier strongly opposes the requirement for magazine disconnection mechanisms to be incorporated on all new firearms. In their opinion, the presence of these mechanisms ferments a complacency amongst firearm owners; they testify that during their time as an officer many colleagues expressed support for the mechanisms due to the ease at which one could remove the magazine; conversely this makes it easier for children to potentially load the gun. The testifier also testifies to their personal experience with accidental discharging whilst using disconnection devices.

William Cassidy: The testifier takes issue with the bill's provisions concerning open carry, expressing the belief that the "fleeting glimpse" is open to interpretation, and that some individuals may wish to openly display their firearm as a deterrent for criminals. The testifier later expresses the belief that there may be a multitude of reasons why a firearm owner would seek to openly carry, and this bill does not enforce under fair assumptions.

With respect to alcohol limitations, the testifier opposes the provision with the belief that third parties' intoxication has no merit on the responsibility of a firearm owner, and that the bill left questions as to how delivery drivers who enter a restaurant to pick up orders would be impacted, especially as they may be unable to carry in self-defense.

Regarding serialization of firearms, the testifier believes that antique firearms would suffer heavy financial damage from the requirement of their serialization, and questions the ability for serial numbers to reduce criminal activity.

Regarding the thirty-day limit on purchasing firearms, the testifier notes that non-Federal Firearms License (FFL) holders seeking to review on a business level would be prevented by the provision, and that individuals working on time-based situations, such as deals on multiple guns, would be unable to benefit from them. The testifier takes issue with the 11-day waiting time on a firearm, questioning the apparent arbitrary nature of choosing specifically 11 above all other lengths of time, as well as questioning how the 11 days are counted in the thirty-day restriction. The testifier also questions which party in a transaction is responsible for following the regulation. The testifier also questions how the FFL would interact with the retail license, as they would be able to sell to other dealers; given how the process to obtain an FFL is already a lengthy, the testifier questions the necessity of a secondary license.

The testifier questions why certain augmentations to firearms are banned when others are not, with their belief that magazine feeding is more dangerous than those banned by the bill. They also take issue with the costs associated with training, with their belief that a lawyer would be needed to interpret the requirements.

Darryl Conner: The testifier noted their opposition to the alcohol requirements, with the belief that many otherwise law-abiding gun owners would ignore this provision. They also testified to the financial damage engraving a serial number on an antique weapon would have; they also noted the issue with antique guns which are sold in pairs or groups, and how this bill would remove the ability for a collector to obtain both in a set. The testifier notes their opposition to the age changes for long barreled guns, with the belief that some bad individuals do not paint the whole picture. They state their opposition to the mandated magazine lockouts, with the belief that it doesn't improve safety.

Dr John Lott, President, Crime Prevention Research Center: The Crime Prevention Research Center provides opposition to six areas of the bill.

The testifier opposes the presence of gun-free zones, noting that the Buffalo shooter wrote their interest in targeting areas which are less likely to have guns in their manifesto. They also note that individuals who are being targeted are also at greater risk, as someone who is stalking an individual will know they are unarmed as they approach a gun-free area.

The testifier opposes the expansion of serial numbers for guns manufactured by individuals prior to 2019, commonly known as "ghost guns". They state that serial numbers serve very little purpose, as guns recovered in the commission of a crime are only found if the shooter has been injured or killed in the act. They note many examples of law enforcement being unable to give examples of when serial numbers were useful, New York abandoning its database of gun fingerprints. They also note that in a Canadian study, just 4.7% of homicides were committed by an individual who used a gun registered to themselves.

The testifier opposes the 30-day waiting period between purchases of handguns, noting that Connecticut has a low rate of exporting guns which are used in crimes, and that in situations where an individual would want more than one gun, this restriction would harm them. The example of a woman being stalked and therefore wanting multiple guns to have at multiple locations would be prevented by this bill. The testifier also raises questions of the constitutionality of this provision. The testifier also expresses the belief that the permit requirement for those selling more than 10 guns a year is just an effort to reduce gun sales. The testifier raises the scenario of a woman being stalked again with respect to the 10-day

waiting period, as someone who is threatened may be unable to defend themselves until a week and a half later. They note that studies have shown that even a small delay increases the rate of rape.

The testifier concludes with their opposition to the increase in age to 21 for ownership of long guns, principally on the grounds it is in violation of the Constitution, with the historical emphasis being that militia law required ownership of guns for much of Connecticut's history.

Jake McGuigan, Managing Director, National Shooting Sports Foundation: The foundation takes the belief that the bill does nothing for public safety, and will cost the state substantially for only the perception of safety.

The testifier expresses the belief that "one gun a month" restrictions have zero impact on crime rates, citing numerous examples of that being the case. They note that current law requires notification to the ATF for individuals buying more than one handgun within five days of each other, and that this provision will do nothing to reduce straw-purchases.

Regarding the issue of state licensing, the testifier expresses the belief that the introduction of the new license is a redundant act, which is difficult to obtain and easy to lose due to unrelated reasons. They also take issue with the pace and reliability of the current background check system.

The testifier expresses the belief that the ten-day waiting period is unnecessary, as once somebody has passed other checks they should be entitled to purchase and own a firearm. Similarly, they disagree with the age restrictions on long guns, as it is their belief that this provision violates the Second Amendment.

The testifier disapproves of the expansion of regulated firearms, questioning why these guns were not regulated with the original bill. They also express the belief that many of these guns are used for legal and recreational purposes, and that the prohibition would have no impact on crime. Finally, the testimony discusses the issue of storage of guns. They note that accidental deaths have significantly reduced over the past 20 years, and that children are significantly safer now than they were before. The testifier believes this provision will do nothing to reduce crime, and only penalize lawful firearm owners.

Other testimony: Due to the quantity of testimony received for this bill, it is not possible to give a summary of each individual submission. Of the remaining testimonies in opposition to the bill, the following ideas were expressed:

1991 solely expressed their opposition to the bill.

1111 expressed the belief that the bill is unconstitutional in nature, with the majority noting the Second Amendment right to bear arms as the principal right which was being violated. **95** mentioned the recent Supreme Court case of **New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen**, with a number noting their perceived lack of historical backing for this bill. Some noted the right afforded by the **District of Columbia v. Heller** case, with a number mentioning the rights afforded by the Fourth Amendment with respect to storing guns at home.

1070 expressed the belief that the bill served little purpose other than to make individuals feel good, but that the bill would not hinder criminals because they do not follow the law. Many expressed frustration that the definition of "Military Style" was not clear, and the restrictions on attachments only impacted cosmetic features which incite fear in those unfamiliar with their purpose. 86 expressed the belief that gun crime is a mental health issue, and that efforts to tackle gun crime should be targeted there.

195 expressed the opinion that existing laws were sufficient, and that the issue lies with a lack of prosecution of cases. 171 expressed the belief that sentencing requires reformation, with mandatory sentencing for gun crimes being introduced, the elimination of plea agreements, and some supporting the reintroduction of the death penalty.

87 expressed opposition to the restrictions on possession around alcohol, with many expressing the belief that it would impact their lives substantially when going out for a meal with their families. Some noted their belief that the provision was redundant, with possession whilst intoxicated already forbidden. 29 expressed the belief that gun free zones were a mass shooter hotspot, with the knowledge that there would be no "good guys" with guns there to prevent them.

47 expressed the belief that the bill would cause significant financial hardship to gun owners, manufacturers, and that many gun manufacturers would move out of state. 45 opposed the one a month restriction on purchasing, with some expressing the desire to buy bulk with regards to deals and discounts. 33 opposed the educational requirements, with the primary objection coming at the two-hour live firing requirement, which would be potentially dangerous for individuals that soon after shooting for the first time.

44 opposed the ten-day waiting time to purchase a firearm, with many believing it to be redundant given the large prior waiting time they had to undergo to obtain their permit.

43 opposed the changes to age requirements for long barreled guns, with many stating that 18-year-olds are old enough to serve in the army and therefore are old enough to shoot. Some noted the historical requirements for men to own guns in Connecticut.

14 expressed the belief that the ban on open carry would result in racial profiling, in a stop and frisk style situation, with officers targeting minority groups.

7 expressed opposition to the limits on open carry on the grounds of their disabilities limiting their ability to conceal carry.

The following testimony was submitted in opposition to HB 6834:

Jess Zaccagnino, Policy Counsel, ACLU: The ACLU opposes the bill because it is their belief that it will increase mass incarceration in Connecticut, specifically impacting Black and Latino men. The ACLU opposes the increased use of bail for the same reasoning, suggesting that other methods should be used to combat gun crime without the use of the criminal legal system.

Kiel Marquez, Director; Anna VanCleave, Associate Professor; Mumina Egal, Student Fellow; UCONN School of Law: The School of Law opposes this bill under the belief that it will cause damage to communities of color because of the use of cash bail and preventative detention. The testifiers believe that the bill will remove the discretion prosecutors were able to grant for individual cases, resulting in an increase in preventative detention. It is also their belief that the burden of proof required to prove an individual does not endanger the public is near impossible to supply. The testimony includes examples of good preventative detention processes, emphasizing the speed and nuance shown to each case. Finally, the testimony expresses the belief that this bill will unfairly impact racial and class disparities in the criminal justice system through its increased use of cash bail and hardened preventative detention.

Audrey Felson, President, CT Criminal Defense Lawyers Association: The association opposes the bill for the same reasoning as the Office of the Chief Public Defender's Office concerning the impact this bill will have on people of color. The association also lists their opposition to the arbitrary nature of the serious offenses, the vague instructions of how to handle cases with prior felonies from out of state or after expungement, the unconstitutional nature of broadly banning brandishing a firearm at another individual, the changing nature of violation of probation (VOP) protocols, the pace at which VOP hearings are held hindering the ability for defense cases, the lack of clarity on how multiple previous offenses should be counted, and the increased bonds hurting poorer socio-economic individuals without concern for specific risks. The association also notes the apparent unconstitutional nature of holding an individual without bond.

Reported by: James McNealey

Date: April 14, 2023