

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

SA 19-17

SB1008

House	9299-9302	4
Senate	1104-1106, 1142-1143	5
Judiciary	4495-4497, 4728, 4739-4745,	11
		<u>20</u>

Connecticut
Gen.Assembly
House

Proceedings
2019

Vol. 62
Part 11
8848-9664

call Calendar, okay. Calendar No. 569.

CLERK:

On Page 36, House Calendar 569 Senate Bill No. 1008 AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF THE DISPARITIES IN PRETRIAL AND SENTENCING OUTCOMES OF CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE (48TH):

Representative Luxenberg.

REP. LUXENBERG (12TH):

Good Evening, Madam Speaker. I move for Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE (48TH):

Question is Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in concurrence with the Senate. Representative Luxenberg.

REP. LUXENBERG (12TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill will

enable that the Connecticut Sentencing Commission study outcomes in criminal prosecutions both at the pretrial and sentencing stages to ascertain whether ethnic, racial, gender or socioeconomic disparities exist in the criminal justice system in the State. We had good bipartisan cooperation in crafting this Bill and moving it through the process. It went on Consent in the Senate and I move adoption. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE (48TH):

Thank you, Representative Will you care to remark further? Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker I rise in support of the proposal before us. Again this is a study that we are asking the Sentencing Commission, which is a very diverse commission, to actually look at this. I just want to make sure that loud and clear, the Sentencing Commission as you are looking at the information, that the information that is being requested certainly is

information that is required in order to study but we would like a big picture of everything. So again, just to make it clear, this is information we're requesting but not limited to the information and I know they will do their due diligence and research and provide us with all of the data necessary in order to properly analyze this. So thank you, Madam Speaker and I rise in support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE (48TH):.

Thank you, madam. Will you care to remark further on the Bill before us? If not, Staff and guests come to the Well of the House. Members take your seats; the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll,
Members to the Chamber. The House of
Representatives is voting by roll, Members to the
Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE (48TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members
voted? If all members have voted, please check the

sp
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

455
June 5, 2019

Board to determine if your vote has been properly
cast. If so, the machine will be locked and the
Clerk will take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 1008 in concurrence with the
Senate.

Total Number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	146
Those voting Nay	1
Absent not voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE (48TH):

The Bill passes in concurrence with the Senate
[Gavel]. Are there any announcements or
introductions? Announcements or introductions.
Representative McGee. Representative Gibson.
Sorry, Bobby.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

That's okay, Madam Chair. Representative McGee
is a great Representative. Madam Chair - Madam

S-719

Connecticut
Gen.Assembly
Senate

Proceedings
2019

Vol. 62
Part 2
792A-1611

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 229 as amended by Senate C. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 229. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 229 as amended by Senate A and Senate C.

Total number voting	34
Total number voting Yea	29
Total number voting Nay	5
Absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 34, Calendar Number 391, Senate Bill Number 1008, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF THE DISPARITIES IN PRETRIAL AND SENTENCING OUTCOMES OF CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS.

THE CHAIR:

dlg
Senate

107
May 9, 2019

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you again, Madam President. This bill comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. What it does is it requires that the Sentencing Commission study, the pretrial and sentencing outcomes, and looks at issues of disparity in race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status of the criminal defendant, and report back to the Judiciary Committee with an interim report on January 1, 2020, and a final report on January 1, January 1st, 2021. I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I stand in support and wish to be associated with the remarks of Chairman Winfield. Happy to support this bill. The Sentencing Commission does yeoman's work in tackling very difficult issues. Clearly, there are racial and ethnic disparities as far as the

population in our Department of Corrections, and to study every step of the way I think will help us to make informed policies going forward. Happy to support the bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you again, Madam President. If there are not objections and no further comment, I'd ask that this be moved to Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 41, Calendar Number 430, substitute for Senate Bill Number 58, AN ACT CONCERNING GAY AND TRANSGENDER PANIC DEFENSE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like the Clerk to please call the items on our Consent Calendar followed by a vote on the Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, kindly call the items.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar Number 1. Page 6, Calendar 100, Senate Bill 777. Page 6, Calendar 105, Senate Bill 953. Page 18, Calendar 238, Senate Bill 1048. Page 28, Calendar 346, Senate Bill 521. Page 34, Calendar 388, Senate Bill 843. Page 34, Calendar 391, Senate Bill 1008. Page 41, Calendar 430, Senate Bill 58. Page 44, Calendar 452, Senate Bill 504. And Page 48, Calendar 290, Senate Bill 140. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar Number 1. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar Number 1. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar Number 1.

THE CHAIR:

dlg
Senate

145
May 9, 2019

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? Seeing that they have, the machine will be close and, Mr. Clerk, if you could kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

On Consent Calendar Number 1.

Total number voting	34
Total number voting Yea	34
Total voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The Consent Calendar is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I thank you, Madam President. Madam President, before we adjourn for the day, just a brief announcement. We're -- The Senate Democratic Caucus will have a brief caucus immediately following adjournment. Immediately following adjournment, brief caucus immediately following adjournment. And I will now yield to any points of personal privilege or announcements.

THE CHAIR:

Any points of personal privilege? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

JUDICIARY

**Part 6
4227-5106**

2019

PUBLIC HEARING

what hits me the most is when I see her little brother, he's always like desperate because he doesn't know what to do. He always comes to me and whenever I'm around, he just wants me to play with him because he has nobody else to play with. They all hurt in silence. We all hurt in silence.

And they're still out there living their lives, not -- with like no care in the world. When -- it's sad. And we just want the investigation to be over with. We want the trial to start. We're tired of going to court, having everything pushed back and pushed back and pushed back. Nothing ends.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH): Thank you. You girls -- you girls are remarkable for coming up here, for sitting here, and -- and for being so strong in your testimony. Questions, comments? Thank you both. Anybody else who hasn't had a chance to testify that wants to? If not, we -- we wish -- we wish you absolutely all the best. And I -- I assure you we are going to take this very seriously. And -- and I anticipate that this Bill will move out of this Committee in the next couple weeks. So, thank -- thank you all very much.

Okay. I know we have a couple of other folks who are still here who want to testify. I'm going to call them. And then, we'll see if there's anybody I missed. Noemi Soto. Just make sure you hit your microphone button there and turn that on.

NOEMI SOTO: Hello. Okay.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH): Got it.

NOEMI SOTO: So, I came here -- my allergies are all wacky right now. But I came here in support of SB -- oh, I'm sorry, thank you, SB 880, 996, 1008,

SB 1098

PUBLIC HEARING

and 1098. I'm just going to kind of piece my testimony, because I did submit the full thing along with evidence of what I'm going to be stating. So, as evidence, basically -- I'm sorry, unjust -- all these Bills are regarding unjust legal remedies and the bias application of judicial power.

As evidence to support this, I submit everyone review the pre-trial versus current case details on the ten state employees being criminally prosecuted regarding the Whiting Forensic Hospital Abuse Case. The abuse in this case is literally a crime against humanity when "more than 40 out of 200 staff at Whiting," these are state employees, "are implicated in an abuse scandal with such an absence of accountability that staff felt free to abuse an elderly disabled patient knowing there is a camera in the room."

What rationale does prosecution have to extend plea bargains reducing charges from 12 counts to 2? Ten counts to 6? Another got a plea bargain 10 counts to 1? What rationale is behind such generous leniency? It is -- is it due to them being state employees? Is this part of Connecticut Labor Union benefits? Who's paying for their lawyers? Is it because these criminals have asked us to private counsel? If so, then are plea bargains biased towards defendants who are indigent and dependent on the resources of a public defender, the bias application of judicial power?

I would ask that I -- it's missing the fact that the Bills do not call for a written record of plea deals. I believe -- I would ask that emphasis on generating disaggregated data also include a record of initial charges presented before an accused, the

PUBLIC HEARING

initial. Because I've been following this case, this case has ten criminal abusers and I printed out the original charges but -- and throughout the process, self-monitoring the updates from the hearings and things like that, you know, they say substituted charges, but then if there's another, you know, four months later down the road, you know, their sentence or whatever, they just got two charges, you know. What's the record? There is no record. They are probably -- the record that they're all saying they have is probably that final record of what was the result. And so, I'm sorry but I believe a written record of prosecutory rational needs to be a procedural mandate in our to deter the bias application of judicial power.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH): Thank you.

NOEMI SOTO: And such data needs to be made available to the public.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH): Thank you very much for testifying. Questions from the Committee? Seeing none, appreciate you being with us today.

NOEMI SOTO: Uh-huh.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH): Next up I have Kathy Flaherty.

KATHY FLAHERTY: Good afternoon, Senator Winfield, Representative Stafstrom, and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Kathy Flaherty. I'm the Executive Director of Connecticut Legal Rights Project, and also sharing this testimony on behalf of the Keep the Promise Coalition and the Cross-Disability Life Span Alliance.

SB 1099

March 25, 2019

Judiciary Committee
Public Hearing Testimony
Submitted By Noemi Soto
New Britain, CT

Members of the Judiciary and to the Public at Large,

Four of the Bills being discussed today are due to the fact that the people's voice has been silenced, and the integrity of our government has been marred, because of **unjust legal remedies and the bias application of Judicial Power.**

As evidence to support this claim, I submit pre-trial vs current case details on the 10 state employees being criminally prosecuted regarding the Whiting Forensic Hospital Abuse Case. The abuse in this case is **literally a crime against humanity** when "more than 40 out of 200 staff at Whiting are implicated in an abuse scandal; [with] such an absence of accountability that staff felt free to abuse a [elderly-disabled] patient knowing there is a camera in the room"

What rationale does prosecution have to extend plea bargains reducing charges from 12 counts to 2? 10 counts to 6? Another 10 counts to 1? What rationale is behind such generous leniency? Is it due to them being state employees? Is this part of CT Labor Union benefits? Is it because these criminals have access to private counsel? If so, then are plea bargains bias towards defendants who are indigent and depend on the resource of a Public Defender? – ***The Bias Application of Judicial Power.***

For all these reasons I am in support of **SB 880, SB 996, SB 1008, and SB 1098.** But I would ask that emphasis on generating disaggregated data also include a record of initial charges presented before an accused. I also believe that a written record of prosecutory rational needs to be a procedural mandate in order to deter the bias application of Judicial Power – And such data needs to be made available to the public.

SB 1099 – on pg22 of Bill- starting on line item 694 a "[or] status as a veteran or **criminal matters of public record**" - needs to be added. All else is praise for this Bill:

This Bill was beautiful to see; it made me cry. Truly it has been a grievous injustice that those justice-involved have had to endure perpetual punishment regardless of time served for so long. It gave me hope that meaningful change is possible with government and hope for healing to bear fruit, now that perpetual punishment is beginning to lift on such an oppressed people group. Thank you for this bill being raised. Thank you. It is an act of immense relief to a severe injustice. Thank you from the bottom of my heart. Every vote on this Bill will speak volumes about the value of human dignity in this state. Thank you again to all who have worked on this! Bravo! Thank you! Amen! And Bless all the Yay votes in Jesus name! Hallelujah!

Noemi
Soto

Digitally signed by
Noemi Soto
Date: 2019.03.25
09:29:06 -04'00'

Court of Common Council

CITY OF HARTFORD
550 MAIN STREET
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06103



HB 1008

Glendowlyn L. H. Thames, Council President
Julio A. Concepción, Majority Leader
John Q. Gale, Assistant Majority Leader
Wildalíz Bermúdez, Minority Leader

John V. Bazzano, Town and City Clerk

Thomas J. Clarke II Councilman
Cynthia R. Jennings, Councilwoman
James Sánchez, Councilman
Larry Deutsch, Councilman
rJo Winch, Councilwoman

Testimony for Public Hearing, Judiciary Committee, 25 March 2019 by

Larry Deutsch, MD, MPH; Member, Court of Common Council, City of Hartford

These days there is much talk of justice and SECOND CHANCE, particularly regarding our State's young people. Today and next few weeks may be the LAST CHANCE for us officials this term to rectify a persistent known wrong, and as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has said, JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED.

US Supreme Court has declared as unjust and now illegal the very lengthy sentences that now confine many who got caught up in illegal acts and made bad mistakes while young, under ages 16, 17, 18.

Many of us are now familiar with its opinion on cases like Miller v. Alabama and Jackson v. Arkansas. The Court recognized real differences among those whose less capable of knowing and doing right from wrong, of thinking ahead about their own acts and the welfare of their fellow human beings - and make dreadful mistakes. The Supreme Court, and sometimes our own courts in Connecticut have begun to take some conditions and factors into consideration -- by reason of age, mental capacity, desperate life circumstances Please review the following Connecticut General Assembly history and documents preceding us today....

General
Assembly

File No. 705

January
Session,
2009

Substitute Senate Bill
No. 543

The Committee on Judiciary reported through SEN. MCDONALD of the 27th Dist., Chairperson of the Committee on part of the Senate, that substitute bill ought to pass.

[see especially two sentencse of OLR report highlighted below]

AN ACT CONCERNING SENTENCE MODIFICATION.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. Section 53a-39 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2009*):

(a) At any time during the period of a definite sentence, [of three years or less,] the defendant may seek modification of the sentence pursuant to this section, except that a defendant may not seek such modification for a second or subsequent time without the agreement of the state's attorney.

(b) The sentencing court or judge may, after hearing and for good cause shown, reduce the sentence, order the defendant discharged [.] or order the defendant discharged on probation or conditional discharge for a period not to exceed that to which the defendant could have been originally sentenced.

[(b) At any time during the period of a definite sentence of more than three years, upon agreement of the defendant and the state's attorney to seek review of the sentence, the sentencing court or judge may, after hearing and for good cause shown, reduce the sentence, order the defendant discharged, or order the defendant discharged on probation or conditional discharge for a period not to exceed that to which the defendant could have been originally sentenced.]

(c) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any portion of a sentence imposed that is a mandatory minimum sentence for an offense which may not be suspended or reduced by the court.

(d) At a hearing held by the sentencing court or judge under this section, such court or judge shall permit any victim of the crime to appear before the court or judge for the purpose of making a statement for the record concerning whether or not the sentence of the defendant should be reduced, the defendant should be discharged or the defendant should be discharged on probation or conditional discharge pursuant to

[subsection (a) or (b) of] this section. In lieu of such appearance, the victim may submit a written statement to the court or judge and the court or judge shall make such statement a part of the record at the hearing. For the purposes of this subsection, "victim" means the victim, the legal representative of the victim or a member of the deceased victim's immediate family.

OFA Fiscal Note (2009)

State Impact:

Agency Affected	Fund-Effect	FY 10 \$	FY 11 \$
Pub. Defender Serv. Com.; Criminal Justice, Div.; Comptroller Misc. Accounts (Fringe Benefits)	GF - Potential Cost	Significant	Significant
Correction, Dept.	GF - Potential Savings	Significant	Significant

Municipal Impact: None

Explanation

The bill entitles inmates sentenced to prison for 3 years or more to have one hearing to consider sentence modifications; such hearings are routinely denied under current law.¹

There are currently more than 5,000 sentenced offenders who would qualify for such hearings under the bill. Approximately 2% of offenders for whom sentence review hearings are held have their sentences altered (in all cases reduced). Provided this rate of change holds for sentence modification hearings held under the bill, approximately 100 inmates could have their sentences reduced.

Assuming that it takes 2 hours to prepare for and participate in any such hearing, the bill could generate approximately 10,000 hours of additional work for state prosecutors and 7,500 hours for public defenders (who handle roughly 75% of cases processed in Judicial District courts). The extent to which inmates will take the opportunity to participate in a hearing to consider sentence modification is uncertain. However, given the relatively large pool of potential applicants, the Divisions of

Criminal Justice and Public Defender Services Commission could each require at least one more position to handle additional hearings under the bill.

The Out Years

The potential significant savings to the Department of Correction and potential significant cost to the state agencies involved in conducting hearings would decrease in the out years as the one-time influx of hearings (related to current inmates) is depleted.

Sources: Public Hearing Testimony

OLR Bill Analysis sSB 543 (2009)

AN ACT CONCERNING SENTENCE MODIFICATION.

SUMMARY: Under current law, there are different procedures for seeking sentence modification. Defendants serving a sentence of less than three years can ask the sentencing court or judge to modify the sentence; however, those serving a sentence of more than three years must get the state's attorney to agree to have the court or judge consider the request.

This bill eliminates the different procedures. Instead it allows all defendants, regardless of their sentence length, to make an initial request for modification without first getting the state's attorney's approval. Defendants seeking a second or subsequent modification must get the state's attorney's approval. Under current law, defendants sentenced to less than three years may make unlimited requests for modification.

By law, unchanged by the bill, a sentencing court or judge may reduce a defendant's sentence, order him or her discharged, or order him or her discharged on probation or conditional discharge. The decision to modify a sentence can only be made after a hearing and for good cause. A mandatory minimum sentence may not be suspended or reduced by the court.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 2009

COMMITTEE ACTION: Judiciary Committee: Joint Favorable Substitute

Yea 43 Nay 0 (03/31/2009)

¹ Under current law, any person serving up to 3 years can seek sentence modification and any person serving more than 3 years must first get the state's attorney's approval. The bill permits any inmate (regardless of sentence length) to make an initial request without getting the state's attorney's approval; any subsequent requests require the state's attorney's approval under the bill.



Legislative Testimony
765 Asylum Avenue, First Floor
Hartford, CT 06105
860-523-9146
www.acluct.org

**Written Testimony Supporting Senate Bill 1008,
An Act Concerning A Study of the Disparities in Pretrial
and Sentencing Outcomes of Criminal Defendants**

Senator Winfield, Representative Stafstrom, and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee:

My name is David McGuire, and I am executive director of the American Civil Liberties Union of Connecticut (ACLU-CT). I am submitting this testimony in support of Senate Bill 1008, An Act Concerning A Study of the Disparities in Pretrial and Sentencing Outcomes of Criminal Defendants.

As an organization that fights to reduce inequity in the criminal justice system and ensure the system is fair and equal for everyone, the ACLU-CT supports efforts to increase transparency about disparities in all aspects of the criminal justice system. We therefore support Senate Bill 1008, which would require the Connecticut Sentencing Commission to study potential racial, ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic status disparities in pretrial and sentencing outcomes related to criminal defendants and to report its findings and recommendations to the Judiciary Committee.

Government transparency and accountability are imperative to a democracy, and this study would be one step to increase transparency about our criminal justice system and create accountability for inequities occurring within and because of it. Connecticut prosecutors, known as "state's attorneys" in our state, help make decisions in the pretrial and sentencing phases of criminal cases. As some of the most powerful people in the criminal justice system, prosecutors hold people's lives in their hands. Prosecutors decide whether to keep, change, or drop a charge against someone; whether to offer a plea deal; whether to recommend bail; how a case is investigated; and whether to offer someone who is accused of a crime the chance to participate in a diversionary program, like drug treatment, instead of trying to send them to prison. Nationwide, 95 percent of criminal cases end in plea bargains, meaning that most of the time it is the prosecutors, not judges and juries, who decide how a case is resolved.

Despite the enormous power that prosecutors wield, Connecticut residents have very little information about what they do. The state does not collect or publish statistics about prosecutors' actions, and Connecticut's Division of Criminal Justice, which oversees

prosecutors, is generally exempt from the State Freedom of Information Act. This makes it almost impossible for people to get information about the decisions of state's attorneys. The current lack of information about prosecutors' work hinders both the public and policymakers. Without data, it is difficult, if not impossible, to evaluate the effectiveness of the criminal justice system and understand why there are substantial disparities in the Connecticut criminal justice system. It is clear that there are racial disparities in pretrial and sentencing because people of color are overrepresented in Connecticut state prisons and jails. Other types of disparities, such as those based on socioeconomic status, however, can be more difficult to identify and analyze. Without data about the prosecutorial process, however, it is impossible to understand if these disparities are in part rooted in the prosecutorial decision-making process in the pretrial and sentencing phases.

Importantly, this bill would give the Sentencing Commission the access to data it would need to fully analyze disparities in pretrial and sentencing outcomes. It would allow access to the state's criminal justice information system databases, the Connecticut Information Sharing System, and any state or local criminal or judicial databases that have not yet been integrated into the Connecticut Information Sharing System. The results of this study would allow lawmakers and the public to better evaluate the criminal justice system and, should it be necessary, propose evidence-based reforms to reduce racial, ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic status disparities.

In addition to supporting Senate Bill 1008, the ACLU-CT strongly encourages the committee to support another bill in the Judiciary Committee, Senate Bill 880, which would establish the long-term collection, reporting, and publication of data in our criminal justice system. While Senate Bill 1008 would require a one-time study, Senate Bill 880 would require annual reporting on data such as demographic information about who prosecutors decide, or decline to, prosecute, as well as data on charging, pretrial decisions, diversionary programs, and sentencing. The committee should explore amending Senate Bill 1008 to require the Sentencing Commission to use the data collected in result of the implementation of Senate Bill 880 to annually complete and report on a disparity study, should the legislature pass Senate Bill 880. Annual disparity studies would allow the public and policymakers to continually evaluate the disparities in the criminal justice system and reform the system to reduce those disparities.

We strongly encourage the committee to support Senate Bill 1008 and consider requiring an annual disparity study.

1008



State of Connecticut
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICES

Office of Chief Public Defender
30 Trinity Street, 4th Floor
Hartford, Connecticut
(860) 509-6405 Telephone
(860) 509-6495 Fax

Christine Perra Rapillo
Chief Public Defender
Christine.Rapillo@jud.ct.gov

Deborah Del Prete Sullivan
Legal Counsel, Director
deborah.d.sullivan@jud.ct.gov

Testimony of Christine Perra Rapillo, Chief Public Defender

Raised Bill 1008, AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY OF THE DISPARITIES IN PRETRIAL
AND SENTENCING OUTCOMES OF CRIMINAL DEFENDANTS

Committee on the Judiciary - March 25, 2019

The Office of Chief Public Defender supports Raised Bill 1008, *An Act Concerning a Study of the Disparities in Pretrial and Sentencing Outcomes of Criminal Defendants*. The bill requires that the Connecticut Sentencing Commission study outcomes in criminal prosecutions, both at the pretrial and sentencing stages, to ascertain whether ethnic, racial, gender and/or socioeconomic disparities exist in the criminal justice system in this state. As the Chief Public Defender, I am a member of the Sentencing Commission. Due to its diverse membership, which is comprised of stakeholders in the criminal justice system, including prosecutors and the courts, academia and non-profit organizations, the Office of Chief Public Defender believes that the Sentencing Commission can fairly and thoroughly study this issue and identify where disparities might exist.