

Judiciary Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5311 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING THE NONISSUANCE OF A STANDING CRIMINAL PROTECTIVE ORDER IN THE CASE OF A FAMILY VIOLENCE CRIME.

Vote Date: 3/24/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/2/2026

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:

In an effort to create accountability for judicial decision-making regarding the non-issuance of a protective order, this requires a judge to issue either a criminal protective order in favor of a victim of domestic violence and against the perpetrator of such violence as part of the sentence for a domestic violation conviction, or a finding that such an order is not necessary and include such finding in the record.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Natasha Pierre Esq., State Victim Advocate: She supports the legislation because it would require courts to state on the record their reasons for denying a standing criminal protective order following a family violence conviction. She emphasizes that providing this explanation would help victims understand the court's decision, evaluate other legal options, and update safety plans to better protect themselves.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence (CCADV): The Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence (CCADV) supports the legislation because it would require judges to state on the record their reasons for not issuing a standing criminal protective order after a family violence conviction. They note this requirement would promote transparency and accountability in judicial decision-making while helping ensure long-term protection for victims in cases where such orders are appropriate.

Connecticut House Republican Caucus: The Connecticut House Republican Caucus supports the legislation because it would require courts to either issue a standing criminal protective order following a family violence conviction or state on the record why such an order is not issued. They contend this requirement would close a gap in current law by ensuring that the safety of domestic violence victims is explicitly considered and documented, while still preserving judicial discretion in sentencing decisions.

Michele May: Michele May supports the legislation because it would require courts to provide explicit, recorded reasons when declining to issue standing criminal protective orders in family violence cases. She argues this would increase transparency and accountability in judicial decision-making. Drawing on her experience as a licensed family therapist, she contends that clearer reasoning and stronger protections would help safeguard victims, deter repeat abuse, and promote family stability and safety.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Two anonymous individuals: testified in opposition to the bill stating that it was more important to address affordability issues.

Reported by: Justin Lamoureux

Date: March 27, 2026