

Judiciary Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5308 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING POST-CONVICTION DNA TESTING.

Vote Date: 3/23/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/18/2026

File No.:

***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:

Judiciary Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

Many people who have been wrongfully convicted that serve their sentences are released on parole, or some kind of compassionate release, without being exonerated. If DNA testing can demonstrate their innocence, this population should not be excluded from eligibility; therefore, this bill would remove the incarceration requirement. It also permits a petitioner to appeal the denial of a motion for postconviction DNA testing in order to better reveal and correct wrongful convictions.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Deborah Del Prete Sullivan, Legal Counsel, Director, Office of Chief Public Defender:

She testified in support because the bill permits individuals to petition for post-conviction DNA testing while incarcerated, on supervision, or after release. She notes that DNA evidence may be held by prosecution, law enforcement, labs, or the courts, and that denial of a petition is appealable. She supports the bill's expansion but requests that individuals be allowed to petition at any time post-conviction, without limitation, to clear their names as they re-enter the community.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Amanda Wallwin, State Policy Advocate, Innocence Project: She testified in support because HB 5308 expands eligibility for post-conviction DNA testing to people released from incarceration and ensures an explicit right to appeal the denial of such testing. She notes that post-conviction DNA testing can prove innocence and identify the actual perpetrator, delivering justice to both wrongfully convicted individuals and crime victims. Wallwin

emphasizes that fears of overwhelming litigation have not materialized in other states, and judges will continue to gatekeep to prevent frivolous requests. She urges the committee to report the bill favorably. She also provides background on post-conviction DNA statutes.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Karen Jackson: She testified in opposition, stating that it violates Article 1, Section 7 of the Connecticut Constitution, which protects against unreasonable searches and seizures. She notes that DNA of individuals who were not convicted or sentenced can still be held by the state even after a pardon, raising constitutional and personal concerns.

Reported by: Trevor Ellis

Date: March 26, 2026