

# Housing Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** SB-257 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

**Title:** AN ACT CONCERNING EVICTIONS FOR CAUSE.

**Vote Date:** 3/10/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 2/24/2026

**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 seeks to expand Connecticut law to protect renters from no-fault evictions. Current law protects tenants who are disabled or above the age of 62. The bill would extend those protections to all tenants in buildings with five or more units and mobile home parks. The committee hopes that this bill's protections would prevent no-fault evictions by ensuring there is justification for evicting a tenant.

## **SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:**

The substitute language clarifies that a landlord can choose not to renew a lease without cause within the first 12 months of a tenancy. Additionally, if that landlord files a notice to quit in that first 12 months, then the tenant is not protected by the bill, even if they have now lived in that unit for over 12 months. The language intends to add clarity and close potential loopholes.

## **RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:**

None Expressed.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

[CWCSEO, Werner Oyanadel, Policy Director](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that housing stability supports workforce participation, educational continuity for children, and effective functioning of communities. He noted that by creating clearer expectations for both tenants and landlords, this legislation advances a more predictable and transparent rental market. He stated that this bill does not remove property right but defines the circumstances under which a tenancy may be ended and preserves the long-standing grounds for eviction(s). He emphasized that this legislation acts as a guardrail against arbitrary displacement while maintaining the core operational authority of property owners.

[Leonardo Pavon](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation stating that housing should be a human right for every American. He stated that people need places to live, and no one should profit off someone else's basic human right.

[Connecticut Legal Services, Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation stating that no landlord evicts without a reason, and no-fault evictions are a cover for an undisclosed reason not to extend a tenancy. He pointed out that Just Cause protections already exist for adults over the age of 62 and disabled individuals if they live in a building or complex with five or more units. He emphasized that no landlord is covered by this legislation who is not already covered by that existing statute, and mom and pop landlords who rent out one-to-four-unit buildings, are not affected by this legislation. He expressed that this legislation still allows landlords to evict tenants for the same reasons as under the existing just cause law and allows landlords to evict if a tenant refuses to agree to a fair and equitable rent increase. He shared that the bill allows a landlord to evict based on lapse of time at the end of the first year of tenancy or evict a tenant for cause. He emphasized that no-cause evictions have been used repeatedly by new property owners who buy buildings and create vacancies by eviction for lapse of time and raise rents much higher, which denies tenants the opportunity to file a fair rent complaint. He stated that no-cause evictions deny tenants their right to cure violations and make tenants afraid to file a complaint. He noted that this legislation protects renters from arbitrary, discriminatory, and retaliatory evictions.

[Planned Parenthood of Southern New England, Inc., Gretchen Raffa, Chief Policy and Advocacy Officer](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that no-fault evictions are often motivated by illegal discrimination or are brought after a tenant has requested repairs, contacted the town about unsafe conditions, or organized with neighbors. Gretchen emphasized that housing is a human right, and every person deserves economic security to care for themselves and their family with dignity. She stated that for people who face an unintended pregnancy, housing insecurity could mean the difference between paying for an abortion and paying for rent. She expressed that homelessness could have a tremendous impact on children's education, health, sense of safety, and overall development. She emphasized that this is a racial, reproductive, and gender justice issue.

[Town of Guilford Planning and Zoning and Affordable Housing Commissions, Larry Rizzolo, Member](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that it would reduce homelessness by requiring a landlord to provide a reason for an eviction and would not present the landlord with undue hardship. He expressed that despite the efforts of Guilford's

commissions to increase affordable housing, building more housing is a slow long-term solution, where a rapid short-term solution is needed. He emphasized that just cause eviction should be an asset for the state in addressing that problem. He submitted a [second testimony](#).

[Friendship Service Center, Inc., Caitlin Rose, Chief Executive Officer](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that the state has incredibly weak protections for tenants. She expressed that this legislation is a common-sense policy that protects tenants from stress, burden, and retaliation that some landlords are currently willing and able to inflict.

[Tim Gabriele](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He begins by noting that rent costs are rising across the nation, particularly in Connecticut. As a former renter, he recalls the power dynamic between landlord and tenant, and as a result, he urges the committee to pass this legislation.

[Open Communities Alliance, Victoria Asfalg, Policy and Data Analyst](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that the most lapse of time evictions go unseen. She shares many residents do not try and fight to stay in their home but instead move out and find new housing. She states that while lapse of time evictions may not account for a large percentage of total evictions, the number of families this bill will help is much larger.

[Thomas Broderick](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation stating that evictions are devastating for families, and anything that can be done to prevent unnecessary ones will have positive effects for years. He stated that when a property owner decides to initiate eviction proceedings, they condemn a family to cascading housing insecurity and long-term harm. Thomas noted that evictions disrupt many aspects of individual's lives, especially children, as it has the potential to affect their physical health, education, and mental health. He notes that having stability for renters and protections for landlords strikes the appropriate balance, and benefits communities and the state generally, when residents have stability.

[The Housing Collective, Melissa Kaplan-Macey, Chief Initiative Officer](#) submitted testimony on behalf of The Housing Collective in support of the bill. They emphasize that these protections have existed for 40 years for individuals who are 62 or older or disabled, and that protections should be expanded. They state that Connecticut is one of the worst states in the country for renters, and that this legislation would go toward being one of the best.

[Linda Bronstein](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that if someone chooses to rent out their property as homes for tenants, then there are rules that the landlord and the tenant must both comply with. She notes that there are protections for the elderly and disabled, but protections should be extended to prevent landlords from uprooting any tenant's life and livelihood without just cause. She advises that the wording in S.B. 257 could be clarified to provide that the first year of a lease would be a probationary period, at the end of which, the landlord can choose whether to renew a lease without having to prove a just cause. She notes that tenants who are going to create problems will generally show their true colors within the first year. She adds that evictions are traumatic ordeals and can weigh on someone's mental well-being and family relationships.

[SEIU Healthcare District 1199 NE](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation stating that landlords should have legitimate reasons for evicting a family from their home, though

that has not always been the case. They share that this legislation will work to address the housing stability crisis in the state, which has historically been exacerbated by racial, socioeconomic, and gender inequities. They add that this legislation would place the burden of proof on landlords to prove their evictions are following the law and forces them to inform tenants of their rights with one-page written summaries.

[Community Foundation of Eastern Connecticut, Maryam Elahi, President & CEO](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation noting that the rise in evictions in recent years has an outsized impact on children, which causes disruptions in their lives and leaves them vulnerable to many challenges. She notes that eviction not only separates families and disrupts many aspects of familial life but also leaves children worrying about where they will sleep, if they will have enough to eat, and if they will be forced to stay somewhere unsafe. She adds that children rely on stability and predictability to thrive and develop. She states that families with low incomes that have young children face constrained housing choices which makes them vulnerable to eviction and housing instability, which perpetuates a cycle of poverty and housing insecurity that has broader consequences. She notes that requiring cause for evictions provides critical stability for renters and helps prevent displacement, particularly in communities where housing options are limited. She states that adopting this legislation would be an important step toward ending child poverty.

[New Haven Legal Assistance Association, Amy Eppler-Epstein, Attorney](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing her experience of witnessing multiple examples where landlords, often corporate owners, or LLCs, frequently made up of out of state investors, buy buildings and immediately move to evict all tenants who are not protected by a written lease. She says that she is currently representing a tenant who always paid her rent on time, but her landlord wants more profit and has served that tenant with eviction notices and all other long-time tenants. She stated that unless current law is changed and this legislation is adopted, nothing is stopping landlords from destabilizing neighborhoods, and wreaking havoc in the lives of tenants. She notes that landlords that prioritize profit can circumvent Fair Rent Commissions by bringing a “no cause” eviction case, noting Fair Rent Commissions were established by the legislature as vital to keeping rents fair and affordable. She suggests if any changes were to be made with this legislation, add good cause protections to apply to “all landlords and affiliates of the landlord who collectively own five or more separate dwelling units”.

[Congress of CT Community Colleges, Seth Freeman, President](#) submitted testimony in support of this legislation sharing that renters deserve the same rights and dignity that he is afforded as a homeowner. He expressed that this legislation would provide important protections and increase housing security for the workforce and serve students.

[Connecticut Tenants Union, Luke Melonakos, Vice President](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill on behalf of the CTTU. They strongly support the bill as a protective measure that will raise the standard of living for many households who rent. They believe that by increasing housing stability, the bill will reduce eviction rates, therefore improving community safety, reducing hospitalizations, promoting neighborhood wellbeing.

[Dr. Jenna Gage, MD](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. She states that evictions result in devastating impacts on people’s lives, including difficulty maintaining employment,

uprooting families, and causing immense emotional stress. She believes that passing this bill will help address the inequalities in the housing market.

[Partnership for Strong Communities, Sean Ghio, Policy Director](#) submitted testimony on behalf of PSC in support of the bill. They believe that the bill will be a critical step toward housing stability in Connecticut, as low renters are disproportionately facing more consequences of the affordability crisis. PSC also explains that evictions worsen housing security, increase homelessness, and destabilize communities. Additionally, they describe how evictions impact young children, which include negative impacts on health, emotion and behavior, education, and familial instability. PSC believes that this bill is essential to ensuring stable, safe, and affordable housing for tenants.

[CTTU, Sarah Giovanniello, Vice President](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. She believes that the bill would give tenants more stability and diminish the power difference between landlords and tenants.

[Kylie Kelsey](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. She states that the law would ensure that people remain housed and provide vulnerable populations with much needed stability and security.

[Connecticut Citizen Action Group, Natasha Kuranko](#) submitted testimony on behalf of CCAG in support of the bill. CCAG states that as we are in a housing crisis, no-fault evictions lead to unexpected moving costs, job instability, educational disruption, and family instability. They believe this bill is a practical, low-cost protection that sets a standard of fairness and helps people stay housed.

[Pro-Homes CT, Nick Kantor, Program Director](#) submitted testimony on behalf of Pro-Homes CT in support of the bill. They believe that this bill would provide a good measure of predictability and security to tenants.

[New Haven Peoples Center, Henry Lowendorf](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He notes that most of his neighbors rent apartments and they deserve the dignity and stability that he believes this bill would provide. He believes it would mean a better life for those living around him.

[Connecticut AFL-CIO, Ed Hawthorne, President](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. He states that as no-fault evictions have doubled since the pandemic, as a result, families are displaced, workers lose their jobs, and child education is disrupted. He notes that the bill is not an attack on landlords, but rather it requires justification for eviction.

[Caroline Golino, Doctor](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. She states that housing instability has a strong, negative impact on public health. Therefore, she is in support of the bill as it would strengthen protections for renters against unjust evictions.

[Collaborative Center for Justice, Teran Loeppke, Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. The CCJ believe housing is a human right, and with the complex housing issues facing the state, this bill is a commonsense proposal that will help support renters in the state.

[Center for Children’s Advocacy, Sarah Mervine, Attorney](#) submitted testimony on behalf of CCA. They note that a large portion of the children they see live in substandard housing conditions, leading to illness. They explain that families fear the retaliation of a no-fault eviction if they speak up and ask their landlords to fix the problems. CCA states that once an eviction is filed against a family and is on their record, it becomes nearly impossible to find new housing. The CCA asks the committee to support this bill.

[CTTU, Daniel Lopez, Architectural Designer](#) supports the bill. He explains that as an architectural designer, the work he was doing was not to design homes, but rather to maximize profits. He believes this reflects the broader reality of today’s housing market. He states that tenants are in vulnerable positions, and therefore this bill is necessary to protect tenant rights and stability.

[New Haven Rising, Jaime McPhail](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. McPhail states that with thin protection laws, predatory landlords force renters out of their homes for profit. They believe that the bill would be a simple and powerful step toward stabilizing the lives of tenants in their city and in the state.

[Raymond Hagan](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. He believes that reducing no-fault evictions will have a beneficial impact on the community. He states that individuals will feel more responsible for the physical condition of their neighborhoods and will be more involved in upkeep.

[Laboni Hoque, MD](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. They mention a personal experience as a medical professional that shaped her perspective on the issue. While they have concerns about how the bill might impact small property owners, they recognize that the bill exists in statute for seniors and disabled peoples, so they support expanding it to all renters.

[LISC Connecticut, James Horan, Senior Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in strong support of the legislation. LISC emphasizes the need for this legislation to protect the most vulnerable communities in the state. Additionally, they believe the bill would provide stability to tenants and empower them to advocate for improved living conditions without fear of retaliation.

[Daniel Mulligan, Postdoctoral Fellow](#) submitted testimony in support of SB 257. He states that as renters in Connecticut are facing rising housing costs, displacement, and limited protection from unjust evictions. He states that the bill would strengthen communities, prevent homelessness, promote public health, and promote economic stability.

[Yale School of Public Health, Danya Keene, Professor](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. Keene emphasizes that evictions can be a life-or-death matter for tenants, and that the state cannot have healthy communities when members are living with the threat or consequences of eviction.

[Sierra Club, Julianna Larue, Organizer](#) submitted testimony on behalf of the Sierra Club in support of the bill. They note that in the wake of disasters, tenants see increased evictions and rents, and stable housing can contribute to surviving those disasters. They believe that

the bill is a critical step toward housing stability, environmental justice, and protecting vulnerable communities from climate change.

[GHIAA, Fr. Michael Johnson, OFM](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He approaches the issue from a Franciscan perspective. He believes this issue is about human dignity and the common good, and how detrimental evictions and the threat of evictions can be on individuals. He states that by support this bill, it reflects a commitment to balance: protecting property rights while simultaneously protecting stability of families, elders, and vulnerable people.

[CT Tenants Union, Jay Osborne, Vice President](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He describes his personal experience with his neighbors in his building avoiding requesting repairs in fear of retaliation, and despite his protections, there were multiple attempts at a no-fault eviction. He believes the bill will maintain stability, continuity in education and healthcare, peace of mind, and preservation of existing affordable housing.

[CT Tenants Union, Cristher Estrada-Perez, Member](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. She notes many issues that impact her support of the bill. First, that moving is extremely expensive, which people who are evicted often cannot afford. Second, that tenants must “jump through hoops” for housing, which is disruptive and economically sets families back. Third, that evictions are a mark on tenants’ records, which makes it more difficult to secure future housing.

[CT Tenants Union, Calder Hudson](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. His testimony describes corporate landlords, specifically out of state landlords, using no-fault evictions to clear out space and raise prices. He believes that instances like these contribute to the rising homelessness crisis, and that this bill would be a step toward preventing future increases in homeless populations.

[CT Tenants Union, Alexander Manevitz](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He believes that all tenants should be afforded the protections that this bill would bring. He states the bill’s protections are essential at a time of economic, political, and environmental uncertainty.

[CT Tenants Union, Benjamin Hurley](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He states that without protections, renter’s lives are more difficult, strain state resources, and hurt local economies. Hurley also believes that the bill’s protections would not encroach on property owner’s rights, as often property rights in the country have been limited for the public good. He urges passage of the bill.

[Hartford Families Working Party, Addison Moses, Intern](#) submitted testimony in support of the legislation. She believes that the bill would help correct the power imbalance between tenant and landlord and help achieve greater housing stability.

These individuals from Greater Hartford Gives’ policy team submitted joint testimony in support of the bill. The foundation supports the bill, as they believe that it can empower tenants to assert their right to safe and stable housing and reduce discriminatory eviction practices:

[Greater Hartford Gives, J McBride, Public Policy Team](#)  
[Greater Hartford Gives, J McBride, Public Policy Team](#)

The following submitted testimony in support, sharing their personal experiences including being evicted or knowing someone who was. These testimonies also discuss the risks, fear, and potential retaliation tenants have experienced or will experience due to lack of Just Cause protections:

[Party for Socialism and Liberation, Lucy A.](#)

[Amy Arlin](#)

[Journalist, Thomas Birmingham](#)

[Angelo Bochanis](#)

[Marie Bravo](#)

[Patricia Bresette](#)

[CT Democratic Socialists of America, Tom Catricala](#)

[Victory Gardens Tenant Union, Saray Chappell, Vice President](#)

[Erika Christensen](#)

[Physician Assistant, Andrew Christie](#)

[Marianna Codianni](#)

[Attorney, Chelsea Connery](#)

[CT Communist Party, Thomas Connolly, Member](#)

[Hillary Desideraggio](#)

[People's Center, Joelle Fishman, Coordinator](#)

[Nancy Foster](#)

[Isidro Fuentes](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Make the Road CT, Flor Galindo, Tenant](#)

[Chris Garaffa](#)

[Kristian Hart, Tenant](#)

[Make the Road CT, Sandra Hercules, Tenant](#)

[Jessica Hill](#)

[RJ Hinds](#)

[Dorothy Jedson](#)

[Nadine Jemmott](#)

[CT Tenants Union, Victoria Johnson](#)

[Kristin Santamaria](#)

[Karen Serio](#)

[Johnny Shively](#)

[Alexis Terry](#)

[Rhett Tock](#)

[John Vasko](#)

[Cynthia Vega Vierya](#)

[Patricia Williams](#)

[Joy Young](#)

[Grady Martin](#)

[Make the Road CT, Maria Martinez](#)

[Sinclair McCutcheon](#)

[CTTU, Stephanie McHugh](#)

[Make the Road CT, Juana Mendez, Tenant](#)

[Hartford City Council, John Michtom](#)

[Molina Cruz](#)

[Anonymous](#)  
[MRCT, Wilfredo Parra, Member](#)  
[Lauren Pittman, Tenant](#)  
[TCP Action Fund, Elijah Price, Canvasser](#)  
[Make the Road CT, Teresa Quintana, Organizer](#)  
[Make the Road CT, Leida Ramos, Tenant](#)  
[Make the Road CT, Rosalina Rojano, Tenant](#)  
[Make the Road CT, Cinthia Rubina, Tenant](#)  
[Brooke Ramlakhan](#)

These members of the Greater Hartford Interfaith Action Alliance (GHIAA) due to alignment of values and obligation of the state to secure housing:

[Rev. Jocelyn Gardner Spencer, Lead Organizer](#)  
[Gail Gagnon](#)  
[Robert Janis, Minister](#)  
[Eleta Jones](#)  
[Katherine Salk](#)  
[Elaine Shapiro](#)  
[Norris Taylor](#)  
[Ellen Thomson](#)  
[Jane Torrey](#)  
[Darrel Urban](#)  
[Monica van Beusekom](#)  
[William White](#)  
[Jane Zande](#)  
[Susan L. Carey, Member](#)  
[Rob Dakers, Member](#)  
[Holly DeYoung, Member](#)  
[Peter Benner, Member](#)  
[Mario J. Chiappetti, Member](#)  
[Rabbi Andi Fliegel, Member](#)  
[Cori Mackey, Executive Director](#)  
[William Marut](#)  
[Stanley Maticka](#)  
[Holly McGrath](#)  
[Joan Nicoll](#)  
[Josh Pawelek, Member](#)

Members of the Blake Street Tenants Union shared their experiences:

[Blake Street Tenants Union, Yenimar C.](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, David Beers, Member](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, Jacqueline Dohna, Member](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, Carolyn Axt, Member](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, Anonymous, Member](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, Steven Lopez](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, Omar P, Member](#)  
[Blake Street Tenants Union, Claudia Potosme, Member](#)

The following submitted testimony noting there is a lack of landlord accountability, and the bill would protect vulnerable communities:

[Tanya Burley](#)

[Jared Cavagnuolo](#)

[Sacred Heart University, Liam Conway, Student](#)

[Stonegate Tenants Union, Sarah Doyle, Member](#)

[Robin Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Mothers and Others for Justice, Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Giulia Gambale](#)

[Sierra-Marie Gerfao, Reverend](#)

[Leona Kelly](#)

[Todd Sample](#)

[Emma Scott](#)

[Evonne Klein](#)

[Teamsters Local 191, Jason Ruiz, Member](#)

These individuals submitted testimony in general support of the legislation:

[Tahj Galberth](#)

[Theresa Goodman](#)

[Margaret Goodwin](#)

[Christine Graesser](#)

[Scott Guertin](#)

[Mary Hunt](#)

[Braedyn Inmon](#)

[Sophie Kandul](#)

[Rebecca Schneider](#)

[Margaret O'Shea](#)

[Jessica Stamp](#)

[Jason Voorhees](#)

[James Usdavin](#)

[Karen DuBois Walton](#)

[Casey Wizner](#)

[Connecticut Tenants Union, Hillary Rivera, Member](#)

[Fairfield County's Community Foundation, Mendi Blue Paca, President & CEO](#)

[Meredith Hanrahan-Boshes](#)

[Roger Boshes](#)

[James O'Brien](#)

[Julia Byron](#)

[New London Homeless Hospitality Center, Jose Colon](#)

[Not Just Us, Brian Donahue, Founder](#)

[Chris Carlson](#)

[John DiGiacomo](#)

[Maureen Lopes](#)

[Kirke Elsass](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[David Liscinsky](#)  
[Gregory Matta](#)  
[Carter McCaskill](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Heather N](#)  
[Honorah O'Neill](#)  
[Fabiola Oubida](#)  
[Jacqueline Paige](#)  
[Kara Papa](#)  
[Working Families Party, Rose Reyes, Member](#)  
[Maureen Reubelt](#)  
[Mark Richard](#)  
[Janis Pizanowski](#)

#### **NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

[Kevin Gendron](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the proposed legislation. He states that lapse of time evictions makes up a small number of total evictions and are crucial to property owners. He also believes the bill would make it difficult to deal with squatters. He finally notes that the legislation removes essential tools without offering workable alternatives.

[CT Realtors, Jim Heckman, General Counsel](#) opposes the legislation. He states that the issue is by adding mobile home parks to the bill, he believes there is no reason for why that property type should be treated separately. He says that property owners must have the ability to make decisions about their own properties, including when to replace units, handling problem tenants, and other financial risks.

[Guihong Geremia](#) submitted written testimony in opposition to the bill. They believe that keeping current lapse time evictions, while promoting accountability on both sides, prevents abuse, reduces harm, and leads to better outcomes for tenants and property owners.

[Moshe Goldstein](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He believes it puts a burden on property owners, causes delays, increases costs, and is government overreach.

[Himmelstein Financial, Paul Himmelstein, Owner](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He describes a few instances where he had tenants who were causing issues for other tenants in the building, and the only way he was able to solve the issue was using lapse of time evictions.

[Town of Greenwich, Fred Camillo, First Selectman](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it amounts to blatant discrimination against the property owner and protections for those who ignore written contracts that they reviewed, agreed to, and signed. First Selectman Camillo expressed that the state is already not considered a rental property owner friendly state, and this would only further move the state in the wrong direction. He

noted that the state should promote basic fairness and reasonable expectations that contracts entered willingly will be honored. He stated that failing to do so will exacerbate the exodus that the state has been experiencing, but for mom-and-pop rental property owners. He emphasized that if this legislation passes, legislators will have bigger issues to confront with less people in the state to pick up the tab.

[Eric Amodio, Landlord](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that he has seen instances where tenants who receive full rental assistance are disruptive to other tenants and not subject to a non-payment eviction, therefore leaving lapse of time as the only workable solution. He noted that this legislation also removes “no right or privilege to occupy” which would make it harder to remove squatters. He expressed that this is a private property matter, and this legislation tramples the essence of private property ownership. He emphasized once a contract is over between a landlord and tenant, they can mutually agree to renew it or can part, but the state should not intervene.

[Peter Anderson](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that few housing providers want to evict good renters from their property. He stated that this legislation makes corrective efforts to maintain the quiet enjoyment of private property highly confrontational, administratively cumbersome, and costly. He noted that legal fees will get passed on to renters, and if left unpaid, will cause rents to increase for others.

[Connecticut Manufactured Housing Association, Mark Asnes, President](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation pointing out that lapse of time is not an eviction. He added that for owners of mobile home communities, lapse of time evictions are rarely used, but often the only effective tool available to remove a resident who is repeatedly breaking lease terms and threatening the quiet enjoyment of the community. He says that even with carve-outs, it is still a necessary tool used only in extreme circumstances. He noted that this legislation will negatively impact a mobile manufactured housing provider’s ability to support and maintain the assets they own to provide safe, well-maintained housing and communities for residents. He emphasized that eliminating a property owner’s ability to end a lease at the agreed upon expiration date creates the potential for perpetual tenancy which undermines private property rights and contract laws which the nation was founded on. He stated that these changes will restrict a mobile manufactured home community owner’s ability to support and protect neighboring residents, which would create the conditions that the legislation intends to prevent. He expressed that existing law strikes an appropriate and reasonable balance but expanding those protections to all renters is dramatic and unnecessary.

[Peter Black](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that proving lease violations can be extremely difficult to prove in court. He noted that the hearsay rule requires tenants and neighbors to testify in court, which is an onerous burden that subjects them to retaliation. Peter stated that in most cases, injured tenants will move, which initiates a downward spiral of bad behaving occupants. He adds that in situations like that, lapse of time evictions are the simplest way to go. He expressed that twelve months of great occupancy does not mean that a good tenant will not move in a bad actor or sublet the property to an irresponsible relative or friend.

[Simon Brecher](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it limits landlords’ ability to manage risk which will result in fewer tenants being approved, properties

going unimproved, and housing being harder to find. He noted that this legislation will hurt tenants the most.

[Weichert Realtors Briotti Group, Stephen Briotti, Broker](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that landlords must be able to terminate their lease upon expiration. He adds that it is not fair to landlords and other non-disruptive tenants to put up with a tenant who creates problems. He stated that legislation must make it possible for a building owner to remove squatters as they are not tenants but occupants.

[Barnett Brodie](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting his experience dealing with another tenant that created problems in the building. He noted that the landlord told him if he were willing to testify, he could pursue an eviction, but he declined because he did not feel safe doing so, as the individual was intimidating. Barnett stated that the alternative was to wait for the lease to expire to keep his identity private. He stated that this legislation puts ordinary people at risk. He added that landlords do not remove paying tenants without a reason. He expressed that this legislation would make it more difficult to address legitimate safety and quality-of-life issues, while placing neighbors in uncomfortable and potentially dangerous positions.

[Susan Burt, Landlord](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting her experience as a landlord and having a unit that brought in a third party that had bad credit, a bankruptcy, and had lied on their rental application at the time of renewal. She stated that if this legislation passes, she will have to renew that unit. She stated that it concerned her that it would have taken months to remove that tenant, even though that was not the individual she originally leased the unit to. She expressed that this legislation is vague and new buyers will be turned off from purchasing units, thereby devaluing her investment. She emphasized that she will sell two of her units if this legislation passes, to get her under the five-unit threshold and that will be two less units available in the state.

[Jerzy Ostrowski, Property Owner](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it goes beyond fair treatment and strong protections for tenants and creates new problems for tenants and landlords. Jerzy noted that when the law forces a lease to continue indefinitely, it increases the likelihood of disputes, pushes more issues into court, and strains relationships between tenants and housing providers. Jerzy emphasized that tenant protections and property rights do not have to be in conflict.

[Michael Ostrowski, Property Owner](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that eliminating lapse of time evictions removes a critical management tool. He notes that in many cases, allowing a lease to expire is the only practical and lawful method for removing a disruptive tenant. He emphasizes that this will have a negative impact on responsible tenants who deserve to enjoy their homes peacefully. He stated that this legislation will not result in housing justice, but rather in housing deterioration.

[Paredim Communities, David Parisier, Managing Director](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that there is currently scarcity in housing in the state and the goal of housing providers is to provide the best available housing to all qualified residents. He noted that 83% of Connecticut residents live in a municipality with a fair rent commission. He expressed that tenant protections, oversight, and due process all exist and that this legislation would not create balance. He stated that housing stability is a shared goal, but

stability without safety is not stability. He explains that policy that limits responsible management does not protect communities but rather puts them at risk. He emphasized that the state needs policies that support residents and housing providers who maintain homes and communities.

[HBRA of CT, Jim Perras, CEO](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it expands eviction for cause requirements without a demonstrated need and in a manner that risks significant unintended consequences for housing providers, tenants, and the overall housing supply. He stated that this legislation shifts discretion away from property owners, reduces flexibility, and constrains the ability of multifamily owners and managers to respond to changing property conditions, tenant behavior, and legitimate business needs. Jim pointed out that this legislation does not identify a pattern of abuse or enforcement failure that would justify such a broad expansion of restrictions on property owners. He expressed that he is also concerned about the implications on the broader housing supply, as it will place increased administrative and compliance burdens on housing providers. He emphasized that this legislation should not pass unless and until a clear, evidence-based need for these expanded mandates is demonstrated.

[HBRA of the CT River Region, Eric Person, CEO](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it reduces flexibility, increases legal risk, and makes housing operations more uncertain. He emphasized that this legislation would discourage reinvestment in existing properties and make new rental housing less attractive to finance and develop, which will result in fewer available units and higher costs for all.

[Jacob Rocco](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it will ultimately harm the individuals it seeks to help. He noted that he believes in giving people second chances but has only been able to do so because he had reasonable options to mitigate risk. He emphasized that knowing options existed made him more comfortable and willing to work with tenants who might struggle to secure housing. He pointed out that this legislation removes tools to mitigate risk and will result in landlords like him being less willing to be flexible and more cautious during tenant selection.

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that lapse of time evictions represent less than ten percent of all evictions in the state, and those are not arbitrary actions, but rather the most effective way for a landlord to remove unruly or disruptive renters who create problems for other residents without triggering more severe eviction grounds. They noted that this legislation eliminates a critical tool to protect good tenants and prioritizes problem occupants over the well-being of the community. They noted that this legislation removes “no right or privilege to occupy” which would make it impossible to remove squatters from a property. They emphasized that banks would also be impacted as it would increase their liability and lead to reduced lending. They pointed out that without the ability to address problem tenants efficiently, landlords would be forced to implement more stringent screening processes which could exclude qualified applicants and limit access to housing. They stated that this would discourage many from becoming or remaining housing providers, thereby reducing overall supply of rental units and driving up rents:

[Gabrielle Peters](#)

[Lawrence Rabago, Landlord](#)

[Tara Ramlal](#)

[Alexander Riccio](#)

[Eric Polinsky](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing he is concerned because lapse of time evictions are a small but necessary tool for landlords. He stated that eliminating “no right or privilege to occupy” in this legislation creates serious legal gaps as it relates to unauthorized occupants and squatters. He added that law enforcement has been hindered in their ability to intervene in situations involving unauthorized occupancy or severe tenant misconduct due to the Police Accountability Act. He stated that he is concerned about property rights being undermined and that there could be banking and economic ramifications to this legislation.

[Hongying Qian](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it would undermine property rights, worsen housing stability for law-abiding tenants, and create serious unintended consequences for landlords, lenders, and communities throughout the state. They emphasized that this legislation would discourage investment and hurt the tenants it seeks to protect.

[Carrier Group Inc., Johnny Carrier, VP](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that most of the state’s rental housing operators are owned and managed by individuals, families, or local businesses that operate on narrow margins, with limited staff, and direct, hands-on management responsibilities. He noted that adopting this legislation would reduce flexibility in managing properties, increase legal exposure, and create greater operational uncertainty. Johnny stated that for small and mid-sized owners, additional regulatory burden can have three outcomes, converting units for other uses, selling to larger operators, or choosing not to reinvest in upgrades and maintenance. He noted that not of those outcomes increase housing supply or improve affordability, as they may accelerate consolidation of housing stock into larger corporate ownership structures, reducing local and community-based management. Johnny expressed that the state is in a housing shortage and if more housing production is wanted it is imperative to maintain a stable and predictable regulatory environment.

[Law Offices of Michael Clinton, Michael Clinton, Attorney](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that lapse of time evictions and no-fault evictions are a valuable tool for housing providers to regain possession of a unit that has had a lease expire or where no lease ever existed. He noted that there are numerous valid reasons a housing provider may need a unit back. Michael added that despite complaining, innocent neighbors are too frightened to come to court to testify against bad actors out of fear of retribution. He stated that the only useful solution is to use lapse of time or right or privilege terminated, where a housing provider does not have to put innocent tenants at risk by testifying against their neighbor. He expressed that removing this valuable housing provider right will result in violence in housing as neighbors are pitted against each other and housing provider is pitted against the offending resident. He emphasized that better alternatives exist to address the housing crisis.

[Cheryl Crevier](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that she has a squatter living in her home and is unable to get her to leave because unfair laws that work against homeowners.

[Harold Crevier](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it is unfair and would only add unnecessary expense to homeowners with individuals unwilling to leave their property.

[Gary Criscuolo](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that most landlords are mom and pop shops rather than large corporations. He noted that this legislation would empower the minority of disruptive renters.

[Michael Darcy, Landlord](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that some tenants do not feel comfortable testifying against another intimidating tenant. He noted that he does not take the decision to start an eviction lightly. He expressed that removing no cause evictions would result in good tenants suffering.

[J Davidson, Affordable Housing Provider](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it would empower a tenant to stay forever, grants legal status to squatters, and will cause banks to stop lending in the state. J noted that the state ranks low for new housing production, has a massive unit shortage, and has a high buyer to seller ratio. J pointed out that this legislation could lead to capital flight. He expressed that the committee should modernize the language of the general statutes from “landlord” and “tenant” to “housing provider (Lessor)” and “resident (Lessee)”.

[CTPOA, Bob De Cosmo, Manager](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that in 2025, New Hampshire repealed their Just Cause Protections. He stated that this legislation fails to distinguish that a squatter is an occupant and not a tenant. He pointed out that this legislation removes three other existing grounds to bring an eviction outside of Lapse of Time. He stated that when a renter is receiving a fully subsidized rental, they would have a perpetual lease even if they are troublesome renters. He expressed that when a bank forecloses on a multi-family property, they will not be able to empty buildings as they do not want the liability of owning and operating a rental property. He noted that Lapse of Time evictions are time consuming and that the process of an eviction should be shorter. He emphasized that if this legislation passes, owners will tighten their leasing criteria, which will make finding an apartment in the state more difficult for tenants and potentially increasing homelessness.

[Menachem Dietsch](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it shifts too much risk onto housing providers and will reduce the availability of quality rental units in the state. They noted that this legislation could have unintended consequences which discourages responsible investment and property maintenance. Menachem emphasized that policies that reduce financial safeguards make it harder to maintain properties, reinvest in improvements, and keep housing stock available.

[Matis Dier](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it removes flexibility and shifts too much risk onto small housing providers and discourages future investment in Connecticut’s rental market. They emphasize that when small landlords feel trapped, they will leave the market, thereby reducing supply and increasing rents.

[Yan Dong](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it removes a critical management tool, would negatively impact responsible tenants, weaken property rights, and have economic ramifications. Yan noted that New Hampshire repealed their Just

Cause protections. He emphasized that this legislation would be devastating to small property owners.

[August Miller](#) submitted testimony in opposition of the bill. She states that lapse of time evictions are crucial when landlords are confronted by a problem tenant.

[Brian Fitzpatrick](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it promotes squatting. He advises leaving the legal authority to law enforcement to remove tenants that have broken Lapse of Time. He stated that landlords are not responsible for and there are precautions that protect tenants' inability to pay rent.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting it would limit the ability of a landlord to remove a disruptive, hostile, and negligent renter who creates problems. They note that lapse of time is used very rarely and that removing the no right or privilege to occupy option for an eviction makes it impossible to remove a squatter from a unit. They emphasize that when problems arise in renting out housing, more landlords, especially small landlords will quit, which will make housing affordability worse. They added that increasing housing is the way to make housing affordable, but implementing restrictions like this legislation makes it harder to find housing and penalizes tenants not causing problems.

[Anonymous New Haven Resident](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that one disruptive unit can destabilize other non-disruptive units. They noted that the state has an eviction crisis and should focus on prevention through more supply, targeted assistance, and practical tools that keep buildings livable. They stated that by removing the normal end of lease off-ramp, there is not a removal of conflict, but rather longer, riskier disputes.

[Cameron Norfleet, Real Estate Professional](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. She states that the bill will: limit small property owners' abilities to deal with problem tenants, cap the growth of minority-owned businesses, increase barriers to entry, and eliminate small housing providers.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it will lead to stricter screening, higher upfront requirements, and fewer second chances. They noted that when supply is tight, any policy that increases landlord risk will not lower rent, as it will get priced in or avoided with stricter selection. They expressed that if this legislation brings more disputes into court, it will not create fairness, it will result in tenants paying for it.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting the importance of building safety. They stated there are ways to prevent homelessness but removing the lease-end boundary is not one of them. They noted that this legislation makes it harder to restore peace without escalating into long legal conflicts.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it could have the unintended result of problems lingering longer and seniors feeling it most. They noted the state is dealing with an intense eviction situation and the way to deal with it is through prevention and more housing. They expressed turning lease endings into more complicated legal confrontations does not prevent stress but rather redistributes it.

[Larew Doyle & Associates, Jeffrey Miller, Senior Vice President](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. He believes that the bill reduces flexibility of property management, increases legal risks, and makes housing operations unpredictable. Additionally, he states that it would make new rental housing less attractive to finance and develop.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that the state has an overly regulated system that has removed many protections of housing providers that forces situations to court. They stated that in a shortage market, renters do not win when supply shrinks or when landlords become afraid of being stuck in a long conflict. They suggest that if the state wants fewer evictions and less displacement it should focus on prevention dollars, mediation, right-to-counsel capacity, and housing production.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that instead of eliminating lapse of time evictions, the focus should be on educating tenants and landlords. They noted that when there are greater regulations, there is an increase in costs which could affect jobs, local businesses, and the community.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that tenants that are given the ability to nullify a lease will drive landlords out of housing providing. They noted that a contract is a 2-sided agreement. They expressed that if this legislation passes, they will sell their units and invest in the Midwest where their ability to provide and maintain housing is welcome.

[Paul Newport, RN](#) submitted testimony in opposition to SB 257. He states that the bill would expose good neighbors to problem tenants, undermines property rights, risks reducing housing supply, and is unnecessary due to existing protections.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that she is a single mom and does not want her neighbors to be trapped next to someone who is threatening or harassing others while in this process. She added that this can also be expensive for property owners, and if those owners lose flexibility and must pay, those costs will be shifted to renters to cover higher risk, administration, and legal costs.

[Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation sharing that it will result in dangerous environments, higher expenses, stricter screenings, and fewer second chances. They expressed that making it more expensive and riskier for landlords also raises prices for everyone else. They advised adopting legislation to expedite removal of career tenants that abuse the system and create expense and problems.

[MREIN, Erik Manley, Landlord](#) submitted testimony with concerns about the legislation. He states that while he feels the legislation comes from a good place, he has experienced incidents with tenants of his own where he had to use lapse of time evictions to solve the issue. He feels as if the bill would be bad for tenants.

[JMJ CT Property Management, Jan Maria Jagush, Owner](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. They state that property owners are facing increasing costs, this bill restricts landlords' ability to respond to those rising costs.

[Connecticut Coalition of Property Owners, John Souza, President](#) and The Connecticut Coalition of Property Owners opposes SB 257, on the grounds of it eliminating lapse of time evictions after a year of residency. This is an overall negative due to being unable to evict to protect tenant's best interests.

[Middlesex County Chamber of Commerce, Haley Stafford](#) and The Middlesex County Chamber of Commerce opposes SB 257, as they argue it limits property owners from reclaiming their rental units even in cases where there is legitimate cause. Property owners must have enough flexibility regarding lease agreements to sustain properties. They argue it also hurts the income of property owners.

These individuals from the Connecticut Apartment Association submitted similar testimony in opposition to the bill. They state that the bill has operational concerns. They believe that the bill could convert many fixed-term leases into indefinite leases and can lead to more formal disputes. They state that legislation must preserve the contractual nature of a lease and a property owner's ability to manage their property:

[Eagle Rock Properties, Cenobia Garvie, Property Manager](#)

[MCR Property Management, Shelly Gosselin, Regional Manager](#)

[CTAA, Kyle Huckle, Community Manager](#)

[Cue Residential, Dassy Kaufman, CFO](#)

[Eagle Rock, Judy Kechejian, Compliance Manager](#)

[Stacey Spooner](#)

[Ryan Stone](#)

[Lauren Tagliatela](#)

[MCR, Christina Baxter, Property Manager](#)

[Eagle Rock Apartments at West Hartford, Diana Bisson, Community Manager](#)

[CTAA, Robert Chesson, Member](#)

[CTAA, Shannon Colon, Member](#)

[CTAA, April Conquest, Member](#)

[CTAA, Maria Dacunha, Member](#)

[CTAA, Jessica Doll, Executive Director](#)

[CTAA, Scott Ferguson, Member](#)

[CTAA, Jeff Ferony, Member](#)

[Marcus-Millichap, Westly Klockner, Managing Director](#)

[Paredim Communities, Brian Lemire, Senior Director of Operations](#)

[CTAA, Morgan Miller](#)

[John Murillo, Maintenance Supervisor](#)

[Paredim Communities, Stephanie Neill, Property Manager](#)

[CTAA, Nakita Norton](#)

[CTAA, Morgan Oleksiak, Member](#)

[IPA-Northeast, Eric Pentore, Senior Managing Director](#)

[CTAA, Dondre Roberts, Member](#)

[Carrie Rowley, Analyst](#)

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation noting that it undermines property rights by eliminating "Lapse of Time" as grounds for an eviction. They note this legislation would have a negative impact on community stability and exacerbate the squatter crisis. They emphasized the risk banks take and the potential financial and economic

ramifications there could be if this legislation passes. They pointed out that New Hampshire recently repealed their Just Cause protections:

[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)

The following submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation, noting the negative impact it would have on small landlords. They also noted it places a tremendous burden and impede on the rights of landlords:

[Barbara Fairbanks](#)  
[Freedom Property LLC, Luke Florian, Member](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous Property Management Employee](#)  
[Anonymous Landlord](#)  
[Anonymous Landlord](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous Landlord](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous Property Owner](#)  
[Diane Gallagher, Property Owner](#)  
[Tara Hawley](#)  
[GELA, Paul Januszewski](#)  
[Chris Johnson, Property Owner](#)  
[Isaac Schwartz](#)  
[Nikoll Selca](#)  
[David Smith](#)  
[Abraham Steinmetz](#)  
[Jen Wells](#)  
[David Klein](#)  
[Shuly Lieber](#)  
[Jose Llanos, Property Manager](#)  
[Henryka Moson, Property Owner](#)  
[S Rifkin](#)  
[Tzvee Rotberg](#)

The following submitted testimony noting that this legislation will negatively affect available housing and reduce housing supply:

[Richard Bouvier](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous](#)  
[Anonymous Bristol Landlord](#)  
[Calcagni Real Estate, Lorrie Maiorano, Realtor](#)  
[Paul Ostrowski, Property Owner](#)  
[Shulem Perl](#)  
[Jorge Rodriguez](#)

These individuals submitted testimony in general opposition to the bill.

[Shimon Handelsman](#)

[Ralph Harris](#)

[Jeneesa Hernandez, Assistant Property Manager](#)

[Levi Judgin](#)

[Richard Sadlon](#)

[Eric Santini](#)

[Manny Santos](#)

[Joshua Schechter](#)

[Robert Schneider](#)

[Peter Sosnow](#)

[Hillary Stoudt](#)

[Justin Sudol](#)

[Z. Wang](#)

[Spencer Weinkle](#)

[Brain Withington](#)

[Yan Yong](#)

[Bo Yang](#)

[Tracy Yang](#)

[Chip Banker, Landlord](#)

[Joseph Braunstein](#)

[Burkamp Real Estate, Kenneth Burkamp, Small Landlord](#)

[Parkwood Communities, Adrian Furlotte, Managing Partner](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous Tenant](#)

[Neil Kraimer](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous](#)

[C. Marcella Kurowski](#)

[Paula L](#)

[Roberta Lauria](#)

[Rachel Meyer](#)

[Garen Mirzoian](#)

[Evon Muschinsky](#)

[Mahesh Nimmagadda](#)

[Victor Nolletti](#)

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS:**

[CCEH, Melissa Dzierlatka](#) submitted testimony providing suggestions for the language of the bill. She stated that she does not believe that landlords misuse the summary process procedure to evict tenants but is supportive of the idea of expanding protections to others.

She emphasized that a subsidized tenant should never lose their housing subsidy due to an eviction.

**Reported by: Michael Flynn  
Tyler Fisher  
Giovanni DeSantis**

**Date: 3/26/2026**