Legislative History for Connecticut Act

PA 16-105

HB5366

Senate	3065-3066, 3078-3079	4
Judiciary	1115-1125, 3900-3901	13
House Transcripts have not been received. They are available on CGA website, but are not the Official copy. Contact House Clerk for assistance (860) 240-0400		**17**

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2017

S - 699

CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2016

VOL. 59
PART 9
2751 – 3097

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 14, Calendar 478, Substitute for House Bill Number 5366, AN ACT CONCERNING COURT OPERATIONS. It's amended by House Amendment Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Coleman, good evening, sir.

SENATOR COLEMAN (2ND):

Good evening again, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage in concurrence. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR COLEMAN (2ND):

Madam President, this bill is one that we consider every session. It is a bill that addresses revisions to the statutes that have to do with the operation of our court system. It was unanimously passed by the members of the House of Representatives. I urge support for the bill here in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good bill, ought to pass, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. At this point, would you make a suggestion to put it on Consent, sir?

SENATOR COLEMAN (2ND):

May it go on Consent, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

Mr. Clerk. Agenda 3, sir, Calendar 595.

THE CLERK:

On Agenda Number 3, Calendar 595, House Bill numbers 5612. It's an act concerning elections.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano. Good evening, sir. Good evening, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Madam President. I move acceptance of the bill and --

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage in concurrence with the House. Will you remark, sir?

Mr. Clerk. Will you please call the numbers on the Consent Calendar Number 2.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5612; House Bill 5189; House Bill 5138; on page 5, Calendar 377, House bill 5467; page 6, Calendar 391, House Bill 5456; on page 8, Calendar 418, House Bill 5364; page 10, Calendar 442, House Bill 5468; on page 14, Calendar 478, House Bill 5366; on page 15, Calendar 47, House Bill 5317; page 19, Calendar 513, House Bill 5553; page 21, Calendar 528, House Bill 5420; page 26, Calendar 560, House Bill 5069; page 29, Calendar 581, House Bill 5547; page 30, Calendar 590, House Bill 5407.

THE CHAIR:

The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call on Consent Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano, would you like to vote on this Consent Calendar please? Thank you.

All members have voted? All members have voted? The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally on Consent Calendar 2.

THE CLERK:

Consent Calendar Number 2,

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. Senator Duff. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Can the Clerk please call Calendar page 13, Calendar 472, House Bill 5311.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 13, Calendar 472, Substitute for House Bill Number 5311, AN ACT CONCERNING TELECOMMUNICATIONS PROVIDER TARIFFS FOR SERVICES OFFERED TO BUSINESS RETAIL END USERS AND CERTAIN TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICE-RELATED EFFORTS. It's amended by House A.

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry, is that, Senate, not yours --

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

The Senate will stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

JUDICIARY
PART 3
902 – 1382

2016

State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL

REPRESENTATIVE CHRISTIE CARPINO
THIRTY-SECOND ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4200
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

CAPITOL: (860) 240-8700
Christie.Carpino@housegop.ct.gov

CHAIR
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEMBER
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

Testimony in support of

HB-5365: An Act Concerning Legal Protections for Persons Entering Cars to Render Emergency Assistance to Children

Judiciary Committee

February 29, 2016

Good Morning Co-Chairs Senator Coleman, Representative Tong, Vice Chairs Senator Doyle, Representative Fox; Ranking Members Senator Kissel, Representative Rebimbas; and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee. Thank you for raising my bill and allowing me to submit testimony in support of *HB-5365 An Act Concerning Legal Protections for Persons Entering Cars to Render Emergency Assistance to Children.*

On average we have lost 37 children annually since 1998 in the United States because they were left unattended in a hot vehicle. These unspeakable tragedies require us to take action and encourage bystanders to help these innocent children. As a result, I have crafted this proposal narrowly to encourage someone with a reasonable belief that a child is in imminent danger within a vehicle, to take reasonable steps to rescue the child and contact the appropriate authorities. This simple bill will prevent a family from losing a precious child to an avoidable circumstance.

The body heat of a child heats up and cools off significantly faster than that of an adult, in fact 4 times as fast. On a 60 degree day, which is nothing compared to the extreme heat of recent Connecticut summers, a mere 20 minutes is all it takes for the temperature in a vehicle to climb high enough to be deadly to a youth. Hence, it is time and exposure to extreme temperatures that are critical factors impacting a child left in these dangerous environments.

In addition, extreme cold can harm a child as well. A highly publicized case here in Connecticut last winter illustrates how important it is for this bill to pass.

Thank you for your consideration and support of this important proposal.

NATASHA M. PIERRE, ESQ.
State Victim Advocate

Testimony of Natasha M. Pierre, Esq., State Victim Advocate
Submitted to the Judiciary Committee
Monday, February 29, 2016

Good morning Senator Coleman, Representative Tong and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee. For the record, my name is Natasha Pierre and I am the Victim Advocate for the State of Connecticut. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony concerning:

House Bill No. 5366, *An Act Concerning Court Operations*

In 2011, the Connecticut General Assembly amended the definition of "family or household member" (pursuant to C.G.S. § 46b-38a(2)) by adding "regardless of the age of such person" to ensure that any person, including a person under the age of 18, could seek relief from abuse against another family or household member[1]. While the intent of the legislature in 2011, was to allow for persons under 18 to seek such relief, the Office of the Victim Advocate (OVA) understands the dilemma faced by judges when a person under the age of 18 makes an application for relief from abuse against a family or household member. The OVA applauds the work of the Task Force to Study the Statewide Response to Minors Exposed to Domestic Violence (Task Force) and their efforts to improve the process of obtaining a restraining order. The OVA also appreciates the Judicial Branch's willingness to work with the OVA to ensure that, despite the age of the applicant of a restraining order or civil protection order, applicants are not unduly burdened through the application process.

Sections 3 and 4 of House Bill No. 5366 proposes to require a parent, guardian or a responsible adult as next friend to make the application for relief from abuse on behalf of the minor applicant. The OVA respectfully requests that the Committee amend Sections 3 and 4 to add the following language which was worked out with the Judicial Branch:

> On line 78, after "age," insert "unless legally emancipated, pursuant to C.G.S. § 46b-150" **and** on line 153, after "age," insert "unless legally emancipated, pursuant to C.G.S. § 46b-150"

[1] Public Act No. 11-152

This amended language will ensure that a minor applicant that has been legally emancipated is not required to have a parent, guardian or responsible adult as next friend make the application on their behalf.

Additionally, the OVA is supportive of the expansion of information that may be available to the court when considering an application for relief from abuse as proposed in Section 3. The information will include any existing or prior orders of protection; information on pending or past criminal cases in which the respondent was arrested or convicted of a violent crime; any outstanding arrest warrant for the respondent; and the respondent's level of risk based on a risk assessment tool. The more information available to the court, the better informed the court will be when deciding whether to grant the relief and what conditions of relief are appropriate and necessary for the protection of the applicant.

Every now and then, unintended consequences are revealed that serve to contradict the intended purpose of a proposal. The OVA does recognize that Sections 3 and 4, if passed and implemented, may result in one or more unintended consequences. However, it is my understanding that this recognition was also realized by the Task Force, and in response, through a working group, will monitor the implementation of the proposal to expeditiously identify any potentially negative ramifications.

I urge the Committee's favorable report of House Bill No. 5366, with the recommended changes as proposed by the OVA and Judicial Branch. Thank you for consideration of my testimony.

H. Morera March 11, 2016 Judiciary Committee Public Hearing Testimony – Bill HB-5366

TESTIMONY FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

Joint Committee on Judiciary
Room 2500, Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106
Monday February 8, 2016

Dear Judiciary Committee Members:

Good morning and thank you for affording me the opportunity to speak before you today. I am here to speak in opposition to the portions of proposed Bill HB-5366 which would allow the Judicial Branch to use certain information as part of a CGS 46b-15 order of protection. Specifically I oppose the introduction as written of the following language to CGS 46b-15 (b):

> *" In addition, at the time of the hearing, the court, in its discretion, may also consider a report prepared by the Family Services Unit of the Court Support Services Division that may include, as available: Any existing or prior orders of protection obtained from the protection order registry; information on any pending or past criminal case in which the respondent was charged with or convicted of a violent crime; any outstanding arrest warrant for the respondent and the respondent's level of risk based on a risk assessment tool utilized by the Court Support Services Division. The report may also include information pertaining to any pending or disposed family matters case involving the applicant and respondent. Any report provided by the Court Support Services Division to the court shall also be provided to the applicant and respondent."*

Before I express my specific concerns with this language, I would like to point out the following:

1. The description summary to this bill describes the changes to CGS 46b-15 as follows:

   (2) amend sections 46b-15 and 46b-16a of the general statutes to permit minors to apply for certain orders of protection;

   I am not sure what the proposed language above has to do with allowing adults to file for restraining orders (RO's) for minors. I hope this isn't an attempt to mislead the public and/or your colleagues about the full intent of this Bill.

2. This also appears to be an attempt to protect the judicial branch after the error was made in the Aaden Moreno case. I understand that incident was horrific and steps MUST be taken to mitigate another incident like that from occurring but this language (somewhat of a knee jerk reaction) alone may not have stopped that incident from occurring. A formal Task force should be convened to allow all aspects surrounding this incident to be studied and allow the public opportunity to weigh in on what is and isn't working with regards to RO hearings. Time again, public testimony has confirmed that relying solely on the Judicial Branch's input alone is not adequate to properly serve the public.

This language appears similar (with some modifications) to the Judicial Branch's recommendations included in the final report prepared by the Task Force to Study the Statewide Response to Minors Exposed to Domestic Violence in January of this year. I provided testimony against these recommendations and my testimony was included as Appendix L of the Final Report presented to the Legislature. A copy of that report and my testimony can be found at the following link:

https://www.cga.ct.gov/hs/tfs/20150730_Task%20Force%20to%20Study%20the%20Statewide%20Response%20to%20Minors%20Exposed%20to%20Domestic%20Violence/FinalReport.pdf

Essentially these are the issues I see with this language in its current form:

1. No reference to CGS 54-142 (Chapter 961a Criminal Records) is included in the language. Although the Bill language allows less than what the Judicial Branch originally requested in their recommendations, it's a very slippery slope with the potential for the misuse of past records, especially with self represented litigants who may or may not be aware of their rights, or for that matter, the Family Relations employee who is NOT familiar with CGS 54-142. As such, the language **should be modified to state that the data included in the FR Report should comply with all provisions of CGS 54-142**.

2. Similar to Item 1 above, there is a very real risk that the FR report will contain information that violates the Code of Evidence, especially with regards to Hearsay and Relevancy. Excluding any biases which I feel certain FR employees have towards certain parties, most FR employees are not lawyers and they are being asked to prepare a report that may include hearsay or legally irrelevant data and the party (most likely a self represented party) will have to defend themselves against these statements. During a hearing on February 8, 2016, Senator Coleman was trying to assist a speaker who was complaining about a judge. Sen. Coleman appeared to be attempting to address the speaker's concerns by pointing out the possibility that the judge deemed a report entirely inadmissible because it contained hearsay from a police report. However, in that case it was lawyer who pursued having the report deemed inadmissible and it was a self represented party who was attempting to have the report admitted. In most RO cases, it will be a self represented party who will have to defend themselves against the report, not the other way around as was in the case discussed on February 8 hearing. As such, the language should be **modified to state that the data included in the FR Report should comply with all provisions of the Code of Evidence**.

3. Unintended consequences are possible. After speaking with Karen Jarmoc of CCADV, there is a concern that women (or men) may be hesitant to pursue RO's if mistakes from their past (which were subsequently corrected) may be used against them detrimentally. I outline an example in my testimony to the Task Force where an outdated statement was misused against a party. Please refer to my testimony attached to that report.

4. No information is provided regarding how the Risk Based assessment is conducted and whether it is grounded in any scientific research that supports the formula for computing the Risk Hazard? As an engineer, I have done Risk Assessments for structures and know well how much statistical data is required for an accurate risk assessment to be performed. There must be complete transparency in the preparation of this Risk Assessment. As such, the language should be **modified to state that the parties must be provided with copies of all relevant data that was used along with the methodology employed to perform the Risk Assessment**.

5. Providing the parties a copy of the report may not suffice. As I stated above, many times those reports contain secondary sources of information that may otherwise be considered hearsay unless the source of the information is subpoenaed/verified. All parties must be allowed to obtain subpoenas for all the sources of the information used to prepare the report.

As such the language should be **modified to state that the parties be allowed to subpoena all sources of data used to prepare the report**. Anything less is an open invitation to the misuse of information and inappropriate use of otherwise inadmissible evidence in fashioning ruling by the court. Appealing the misuse of this evidence is not a viable option for typical litigant.

I am very concerned about FR preparing reports that may contain inappropriate information that otherwise would not be admissible as evidence under the rules of the court. Although the Bill language appears to address some concerns which were raised during the last DV Task Force public hearing about the Judicial Branch's original recommendations, the language as written still leaves open the possibility of misuse of data and I feel does not provide sufficient safeguards against the misuse of that data..

Thank you for your time.

Hector Morera
119B House St.
Glastonbury, CT

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
JUDICIAL BRANCH

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

231 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Connecticut 06106
(860) 757-2270 Fax (860) 757-2215

Testimony of the Honorable Patrick L. Carroll III
Judiciary Committee Public Hearing
February 29, 2016

H.B. 5366, *An Act Concerning Court Operations*

Thank you for the opportunity to provide written testimony on behalf of the Judicial Branch in support of **H.B. 5366, *An Act Concerning Court Operations***. This is the Judicial Branch's annual "omnibus" bill that contains changes intended to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Branch's operations. Since it covers a variety of areas, please allow me to walk you through a section by section summary of the bill.

Sections 1 and 2 would conform Connecticut statutes with federal law, by providing that judges make a finding that reasonable efforts to reunite the family have occurred pursuant to the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997. Current statute requires such a finding under the federal Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act (AACWA) of 1980. AACWA has long been superseded by ASFA.

Section 3 would permit judges to consider additional information when ruling on a temporary restraining order after a hearing. The current statute limits the information that a judge may consider to "relevant court records if the records are available to the public." It would be a significant benefit if the court had access to a report prepared by family relations counselors that contained existing or prior orders of protection obtained from the protection order registry, outstanding arrest warrants and the respondent's level of risk based on a risk assessment tool utilized by family relations counselors.

Additionally, this section clarifies that minors may apply for a temporary restraining order through a parent, guardian or other responsible adult as a next friend. It also specifies that the parent, guardian or responsible adult may not speak on the minor's behalf

at the hearing, unless there is good cause shown as to why the minor is unable to speak on his or her own behalf. Based upon conversations with the Office of the Victim Advocate, we would also suggest that the following language be added to line 78: "If the applicant is under eighteen years of age, **unless legally emancipated pursuant to section 46b-150,** the application shall be made...".

Section 4 clarifies that minors may apply for a civil order of protection through a parent, guardian or other responsible adult as a next friend. It also specifies that the parent, guardian or responsible adult may not speak on the minor's behalf at the hearing, unless there is good cause shown as to why the minor is unable to speak on his or her own behalf. We would suggest that the following language be added to line 153: "If the applicant is under eighteen years of age, **unless legally emancipated pursuant to section 46b-150,** the application shall be made...".

In addition, Section 4 specifies that, if a postponement of a hearing on the application is requested by either party, no ex parte order shall be continued except upon agreement of the parties or by order of the court for good cause shown. This change would be consistent with the existing language in 46b-15.

Section 5 excludes "cap" plea agreements from review by the Sentence Review Division. "Cap" plea agreements are negotiated, similar to other plea agreements that are not reviewable.

Section 6 provides that any party or the deponent may obtain a copy of the deposition transcript and permanent electronic record at his or her own expense. The current statute provides that the cost of copies of a deposition transcript is borne by the party on whose behalf the deposition is taken. This change would conform to the Connecticut Practice Book, as well as federal practice and most other states.

Section 7 would delete the requirement that a two dollar fee be paid to the clerk for receiving and filing an assessment of damages by appraisers of land taken for public use. This fee creates a technical issue for the e-filing system, preventing the Attorney General's office from e-filing a condemnation action. Furthermore, the fee does not generate a significant amount of revenue. It is anticipated that the fee generates less than $500 annually.

Section 8 would amend Public Act 13-239 to allow the Judicial Branch to purchase the Waterford Juvenile Facility.

To conclude, I urge the Committee to act favorably on these provisions. Thank you again for the opportunity to submit written testimony in support of this bill.

CCDLA
Connecticut Criminal Defense Lawyers
"Ready in the Defense of Liberty"
Founded in 1988

Association
P.O. Box 1766
Waterbury, CT 07621-1766
(860) 283-5070 Phone & Fax
www.ccdla.com

February 28, 2016

Judiciary Committee
Legislative Office Building
Hartford, Connecticut 06106

Re: Raised Bill 5366

Raised Bill No. 5366 proposes a significant change to section 51-195 of Connecticut General Statutes which provides for the review of certain sentences in criminal actions. The proposed change will exempt from the consideration of the review division any sentence where the plea agreement "provides that the term of imprisonment will not exceed an agreed upon maximum term, but provide that the person sentenced may request a term of imprisonment lower than the agreed upon maximum term." This is commonly referred to as the "right to argue".

The purpose of sentence review is to ensure Superior Court judges, who have discretion in the sentence they impose, are exercising this discretion appropriately. Plea agreements containing a right to argue often afford judges a great deal of latitude in sentencing. This latitude often includes a number of years. It is not uncommon for a judge to have the option to impose a completely suspended sentence or multiple years of incarceration. The right to argue is a tool used very often in many serious felony cases. The right to have such sentences reviewed is important to our criminal system; it is also the judicial discretion the legislator originally intended to monitor. As noted by our Supreme Court recently "Any reservation of the right to argue for a lesser sentence affords the court the very discretion that the statute intended to monitor."

Additionally, the proposed legislation will serve to limit the number of people who can have their cases reviewed significantly. This is contrary to our system of checks and balances. Our system works better when the people of this state can have faith that our criminal justice system will be fair, and that the exercise of judicial discretion will be monitored. Allowing for review of a sentence is essential to our notions of fundamental fairness. It provides those sentenced by a judge exercising discretion in the imposition of a sentence of a period of incarceration of three years or more, with an opportunity to have their sentence reviewed if they act within thirty days. There is no harm in allowing those sentenced to such lengthy terms of imprisonment, the opportunity to know that their

sentence has been reviewed by other judges. This will only increase confidence and faith in our system. By contrast, removing this opportunity for review will have the opposite effect.

Finally, it is unclear how this proposed change will improve our current system. It certainly does not do anything to improve the protections provided to those accused of crimes. It is also difficult to see how this will improve our system at all or what perceived problem this change in the law seeks to fix.

The proposed legislation is unnecessary and potentially harmful to our criminal justice system. For these reasons, the Connecticut Criminal Defense Lawyers Association is opposed to this proposed legislation.

STANDING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

JUDICIARY
PART 9
3731 - 4039

2016

TESTIMONY FOR JUDICIARY COMMITTEE PUBLIC HEARING

Joint Committee on Judiciary
Room 2500, Legislative Office Building
Hartford, CT 06106
Wednesday, March 23, 2016

Dear Judiciary Committee Members:

Good day and thank you for affording me the opportunity to speak before you today. I am here to offer some comments on Bill SB 471 as it is currently written in the hopes that you will make some minor modifications. I feel these modifications are required to provide some safeguards against misuse of a bill, which although at face appears to be intended to help self-represented litigants, may be open to misuse by less than scrupulous persons, especially within the Family Court system.

As I stated in previous testimony on Bill HB 5366, similar to Bill HB 5366, this bill appears to be a knee jerk reaction to the Aaden Moreno incident. I believe that it is important that the Judicial Branch and legislature explore ways to mitigate that horrific incident from reoccurring. However, I am concerned that in their quest to prevent another tragedy like that one from reoccurring, that without studying the matter carefully, laws may be enacted that cause more harm than good.

As an example to support my concerns, I know a father whose ex-wife has tried several times to get a TRO on him. She has made claims that he committed some act of aggression at exchanges or that he has stalked her at her home to support her requests. I know the father well. His only desire is to maintain a presence in his child's life. He has absolutely no ill intentions towards his ex-wife. In her last attempt, she moved to a new venue. I pointed out to the father that her actions appeared to violate Practice Book Chapter 12. He brought this to the attention of the court clerk and the matter was subsequently dropped 2 weeks after the TRO was granted. But sadly, he lost 2 weeks of access with his child as there were no provisions in the TRO to address exchanges. In addition, he was not properly served with the TRO. Fortunately, he had a friend in the police department who informed him that his name appeared in the TRO registry. Had he not been informed, he would've violated the TRO when he went to pick up his child and most likely been arrested and charged with violating a TRO which is a Class D felony. I have heard of other instances of this occurring.

As such I am concerned that an attorney with questionable motives may take the opportunity to volunteer for a 46b-15 application and subsequently use it as a tactical advantage in Family Court. To further support my point, I know of a recent case in which a parent is currently on supervised visitation, for over a year after accidently violating a baseless TRO. Both parents are parishioners of the same church and share many common friends so a TRO in that case would be very easy to violate. This parent is still on supervised visitation, DESPITE paying $7500 for a psychological/custody evaluation, performed by an industry insider psychologist who has determined that the parent is no threat to their child or other parent. In addition, it is my understanding that my ex-wife's attorney, Ceil Gersten has openly bragged in court how she must be a good attorney to have stolen my children from me. That is not the intent of Family Court; that is to allow an overzealous attorney with questionable motives to destroy families for whatever reason. However, the sad reality is that Family Law is treated by some Family Attorneys as somewhat of a sport, a vicious sport where taking children from a

good parent is seen as a prize, rather than just protecting their client's rights. This is NOT something new. It has occurred for a long time.

As such, I implore the Judiciary Committee and/or the legislature to please add the following or similar language to the bill:

> ***"Pursuant to this Section, all litigants must be advised of their right to obtain legal representation under this program. Should one party be afforded legal representation under this Section, the other litigant must be afforded the same opportunity."***

In addition, I would suggest you include some language in the bill to provide a positive incentive for lawyers to volunteer their services. As such, I recommend that the following or similar language be included in the bill.

> ***"Pursuant to this section, attorneys who volunteer their time to assist litigants, may use the time they volunteer, on a one hour to one hour basis to fulfill up to a maximum of one half of their total yearly Continuing Legal Education requirements."***

Please do not misunderstand me. I am fully aware that there are many men who enjoy battering women and children. And I am fully aware that battered women typically need legal help as many times their batterer controls them financially and emotionally. For the past two years, I have been working with Patrice Lenowitz, an advocate who runs a number of non-profits that help women who are victims of Domestic Violence, to address failures of the court system. However, I am also very familiar with the reality of Family Law as exemplified in the Simms v Seaman ruling; the sad reality that certain Family Court attorneys feel it is their job to "win" at all costs regardless of whether or not it is in the best interests of the children involved.

In summary, although I commend the legislature in taking steps to address the Aaden Moreno incident, I am very concerned that any legislation that is enacted without properly studying the ramifications of that legislation may cause just as much harm as it is intended to prevent. I have spoken to dozens of litigants over the past few years so I have a very good perspective on "what if" scenarios. Therefore, I ask that you please do not dismiss my concerns merely because you do not share them and I implore the legislature to include safeguards in the bill.

Thank you for your time.

Hector Morera
119B House St.
Glastonbury, CT