

Judiciary Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-291 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES OF THE
STATE MARSHAL COMMISSION, THE STATE MARSHALS ADVISORY

Title: BOARD AND STATE MARSHALS.

Vote Date: 3/30/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

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:

This bill modernizes and clarifies the governance and administration of the state marshal system. It achieves this by reforming the State Marshal Commission, establishing minimum professional qualifications for commission members, ensuring timely and reliable access to state marshals for the service of a protective order, and revising the fees associated with removal actions.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language removes changes to the transfer and payment of protective orders between counties and removes some of the proposed requirements for membership to the State Marshal Commission.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

External Affairs Division, State of Connecticut Judicial Branch, submitted testimony on the bill, specifically speaking to the financial impacts of Section 3 on the Judicial Branch. The change leads to a fee of fifty dollars and reimbursement for actual postage or overnight delivery costs reasonably incurred changing this cost from state marshal to the Judicial Branch. The Branch requests that it be referred to the Appropriations Committee for an assessment on the fiscal impact.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

Meghan Scanlon, CEO, Connecticut Coalition Against Domestic Violence, supports SB 291 on the grounds it strengthens existing practices for service of family violence restraining orders while also clarifying information while encouraging service of orders.

The State Marshal Association of Connecticut Supports SB 291, on the grounds it allows for more effective operations in the courts, bar, and public. They also argue SB 291 promotes predictability and fairness in ensuring timely and reliable access to state marshals for the service of restraining orders while ensuring an improved Marshal appointment process by establishing a defined recruitment and training framework.

Two Anonymous people support SB 291.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Barbara Coffey, CT State Marshal, Opposes SB 291 on the grounds it sabotages the State Marshal Commission's oversight, as it gives marshals voting rights, without enough action taken to deal with conflicts of interest. The bill also allows for too much influence from State Marshals. It is also argued the union which proposed the bill does not represent most State Marshals' interests.

Reported by: Giovanni DeSantis

Date: April 6, 2026