

Housing Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5367 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE REMOVAL OF UNAUTHORIZED PERSONS
Title: FROM RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY.

Vote Date: 3/10/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/3/2026

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:

Housing Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill attempts to allow for the immediate removal of certain unauthorized persons from residential property. Through this bill, the committee hopes to better enable residential property owners to protect both themselves and their dwellings while opening available housing to approved renters.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None Expressed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Connecticut General Assembly, Rob Sampson, State Senator 16th District supports this bill because it prevents property owners from going through full summary process evictions in cases of clear trespassing. He stresses that unauthorized occupants can damage property, avoid paying utilities, and disrupt neighborhoods during this process. Moreover, he argues that the bill applies only when strict conditions are met, which include protections for current and former tenants and requiring an affidavit and proof of ownership from the property owner. These provisions thereby prevent abuse of this law.

Connecticut Realtors, Jim Heckman, General Counsel supports this bill, as it would speed up removing “squatters” from properties. He believes this bill provides a faster legal remedy than the existing eviction process while also reducing financial burdens on the owner. He highlights the importance of the penalties included in the bill to prevent misuse of this law.

CT Apartment Association, Lauren Tagliatela supports this bill, as she believes it gives property owners an appropriate solution to removing unauthorized persons from a property. She emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between unauthorized occupants and lawful tenants and their family members to maintain tenant protections. Additionally, she states that the safeguards included in the bill, such as a signed affidavit, ensures that the process is used properly.

Trio Properties, Jeff Feron, President submitted testimony in support of this bill, stating that it establishes a clear and efficient process for addressing unlawful occupants. He argues that unlawful occupancy has a negative impact not just on the property owners, but on lawful residents, neighbors, and those searching for housing. Lengthy legal procedures can render a unit unavailable for a qualified renter who may need it.

CT Coalition of Property Owners, John Souza, President supports this bill and contends that unauthorized individuals should be subject to immediate removal, thereby preventing them from occupying a property for months during summary process legal proceedings.

Several landlords and anonymous testifiers lend their support for this bill, emphasizing that breaking and entering an apartment illegally is criminal activity. This bill allows property owners to reclaim their property and forego court proceedings that could interfere with their ability to rent the space to others:

Sullivan Real Estate Michael Flaherty, Real Estate Broker and Landlord

Charles Baugh

Adam Bonoff

Janet Dahlberg

CT Apartment Association, Krystal Garcia, Assistant Property Manager

Peterson Homes

Greater Enfield Landlord Association, Paul Januszewski, President

Ryan Kapur

Kali Sukumar

Tara Ramlal

Dan Saunders

Morgan Miller

Eric Polinsky

Phil Marasco

Harold Ryan

Brian Withington

C. Marcella Kurowski

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

CT Legal Services, Inc., Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate expresses concerns that this bill would encourage landlords to skip the judicial process for occupants who they claim are unauthorized. Additionally, he argues that police are already trained to distinguish between residents and trespassers, and the way that the bill uses “unauthorized” and “unlawful” interchangeably could exacerbate the widespread misuse of those terms by

landlords. Violation of a lease is a ground for eviction through the court system, and not a crime, which indicates the need to carry out the judicial eviction process.

The Partnership for Strong Communities, Amy Peltier, Coalition and Advocacy Director and The Partnership oppose this bill. They cite low vacancy rates and rising rents as evidence of the disadvantage that tenants have in the landlord-tenant relationship. She states that, “This bill threatens to undermine existing tenant protections that include due process and other legal rights that minimize displacement and act as the backbone for resolutions to landlord-tenant disputes...Our current eviction system provides an orderly mechanism for removing tenants who no longer have a right to occupy - including those who the tenant admitted but the landlord did not admit. It is a dangerous precedent to allow select removal of individuals from spaces without formalized legal guidance that assigns all parties delineated rights and retributions.”

CT Fair Housing Center, Sarah White, Attorney and the CT Fair Housing Center, a civil rights organization to protect CT residents from housing discrimination, voice strong opposition to the bill. She argues that the state has prohibited self-help methods of eviction since colonial times because it prevents violence, keeps landlords from taking the law into their own hands, and ensures that both sides have due process. Moreover, she testifies that, “As drafted, the bill would very likely be unconstitutional because tenants could be violently evicted without advanced notice, an opportunity to be heard, a court order, or any judicial oversight...H.B. 5367 is so broadly worded that nearly all tenants and occupants would be vulnerable to extrajudicial ‘self-help’ eviction.” White has practiced law in states that have implemented these types of provisions and says that they were abused by landlords. In her experience at different legal aid clinics across the country, she witnessed landlords use the police to bypass the eviction process or shut off utilities to evict tenants. She notes that tenants are more likely to speak about concerns about health and safety code violations if they do not fear arbitrary arrest or eviction.

CT Fair Housing Center, Chelsea Connery, Staff Attorney maintains that this bill is unnecessary because the state already criminalizes trespassing, and the summary process procedures allow landlords to quickly evict unlawful occupants. Since the bill only requires an affidavit from the landlord, and the police department is not required to investigate the affidavit besides confirming that the landlord owns the property, she argues that tenants can be violently evicted without due process. She cites the violence that occurred during self-help evictions that prompted our current laws, and lists potential dangers of this bill that include, “... the improper removal of rightful occupants from their homes, the potential for arrest or violent interaction between tenants and police, and a heightened ability of landlords to intimidate tenants by threats of non-judicial police eviction.”

Connecticut Legal Rights Project (CLRP), Kathy Flaherty, Executive Director and the CLRP, which provides legal services to low-income adults with serious mental health conditions, opposes this bill because it would eliminate tenant and due process protections. She argues that the police can arrest people for trespassing, and that the best process for determining who has legal possession of a unit is a court process and a judge.

**Reported by: Mia Giglietti
Michael Flynn**

Date: 3/24/2026