

## Insurance and Real Estate Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No.:** HB-6967

AN ACT CONCERNING THE ASSIGNMENT OF POST-LOSS HOMEOWNERS AND COMMERCIAL PROPERTY INSURANCE BENEFITS AND REVISING DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS FOR HOME IMPROVEMENT CONTRACTORS

**Title:** AND SALESPERSONS.

**Vote Date:** 2/25/2025

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable

**PH Date:** 2/18/2025

**File No.:** 92

***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:

Insurance and Real Estate Committee

### REASONS FOR BILL:

Homeowners face rising fraud and deceptive practices in home improvement and insurance claims. Many people struggle with unclear contracts and unethical contractors. Fraudulent assignment of insurance benefits and misleading sales tactics have increased, leaving consumers vulnerable. Strengthening regulations, transparency, and enforcement will protect homeowners, ensure fair practices, and reduce scams. By requiring stricter contractor qualifications, better insurance coverage, and stronger disciplinary measures, this bill hopes to enhance consumer protection and prevents financial harm.

### RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None Expressed.

### NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Eric George, Esq., President, The Insurance Association of Connecticut](#)

[Kristina Baldwin, Esq., Vice President, The American Property and Casualty Insurance Association](#)

[Christopher Nicolopoulos, Esq., Senior Regional Vice President, The National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies](#)

[Brooke Foley, General Council, Insurance Associates of CT](#)

Joint testimony was submitted in support of the bill. The testimony detailed how they believe this bill would protect consumers and help prevent exploitive assignment of benefit contracts, which drive up the cost of property insurance. It suggested that by helping reduce frivolous litigation from contractors the bill would help control the cost of homeowners insurance.

**[Howard Handler, Senior Director of Government Affairs, National Insurance Crime Bureau](#)**

Mr. Handler submitted written testimony in support of the bill. He suggested that contractor fraud is a significant problem in Connecticut, and that assignment of benefit contracts are a tool that unscrupulous contractors use to take advantage of consumers. Accordingly, he urged support of the bill as it would help protect consumers.

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

**[Ian Wright, Owner, Wright's Remodeling LLC](#)**

Mr. Wright submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He suggested that the bill would have a negative impact on consumers and contractors, and that the regulations would create higher costs.

**[Jim Perras, CEO, Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Connecticut](#)**

Mr. Perras submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He suggested that it would drive up costs for homeowners, make doing business more difficult for law abiding contractors, and increase the number of underground contractors. He wrote that the bill would make payment for contractors more uncertain, making them less likely to take on emergency work. He stressed the importance of contractors being able to negotiate insurance claims and opposed the changes to the statutes governing home improvement projects. He suggested that a better approach to protecting consumers would be to increase consumer education and the enforcement of existing laws.

**[Christopher Soverns, President, Rising Star Roofing](#)**

Mr. Soverns submitted extensive written testimony in opposition to the bill, detailing his numerous objections to specific sections and clauses within the bill (see linked testimony). He suggested that the bill's regulation of assignment of benefit contracts would result in consumers having fewer options for handling claims, and that the bill would put an undue administrative burden on contractors.

**[Connecticut Association of Public Insurance Adjusters Executive Board](#)**

CAPIA submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. They noted that although the bill was modeled after the Florida anti-assignment statute, there were modifications made to the bill that make the language confusing and overly restrictive. They wrote that the language of the bill is broad enough that the restrictions it imposes could apply not just to contractors, but to public insurance adjusters as well. They suggested that the language of the bill be clarified, and that it specifically clarifies that the restrictions are not intended to apply to public insurance adjusters.

**[John Biller and Brianna Robert, Biller, Sacks & Robert](#)**

Two attorneys from Biller, Sacks & Robert submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. They objected to the vague language of the bill, as well as the fact that it does not specifically exclude public adjusters from the provisions of the bill. They noted that there are recent cases in which the Connecticut Supreme Court has declined to interpret statute and has instead based their judgment on the literal language of the statute, making it especially important for the language of the bill to be clear. They also objected to the bills requirement that in an assignee must give notice to the assignor and the insurance company before initiating a lawsuit in connection with an insurance claim. Fulfilling these requirements could take a significant amount of time, and could result in missing the deadline for filling a suit.

**Reported by: Lauren Kaiser Krause**

**Date: 3/11/2025**