

Judiciary Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-296 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER PROTECTION WITH RESPECT TO THE CONNECTICUT UNFAIR

Title: TRADE PRACTICES ACT AND SPORTS WAGERING.

Vote Date: 3/30/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/4/2026

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 increases the maximum restitution allowable under the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act from \$10,000 to \$25,000 and makes that maximum “per consumer”. Additionally, it updates cheating statutes to include provisions related to sports betting. The Department of Consumer Protection has received an increasing number of complaints involving fraud and damages in excess of \$10,000. Allowing them to prosecute these cases provides a consumer benefit, especially for low-income complainants, in terms of cost and expediency. This bill also removes the 18-month provision related to disclosure of documents because this language conflicts with the Department of Consumer Protection Commissioner’s mandate not to release documents related to an investigation or enforcement action until such case is closed.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

At the request of the Office of the Attorney General, the substitute language includes a conforming change to §42-110c, which now exempts CID responses from FOIA for the duration of the investigation; additional clarifying language is in section 3 to indicate that it applies whenever a wager or event takes place in Connecticut. The language also includes a change in §12-861(c), which provides the AG with enforcement authority, at DCP’s request, to sue to enjoin entities who offer unlicensed sports wagering in contravention of the statutory scheme. Since it’s not currently clear that DCP has authority to enjoin statutory violations by non-licensees, this change would allow DCP to enjoin unlicensed wagering operators including, to the extent consistent with federal preemption principles, Kalshi and other prediction markets.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Bryan Cafferelli, Commissioner, Department of Consumer Protection: The testifier supports this bill, stating that the Department of Consumer Protection feels that the current maximum restitution of \$10,000 is insufficient. The DCP highlights that the amendment related to cheating in sports wagering is necessary because sports wagers were not contemplated when the statute was originally written; allowing the DCP to prosecute cases outlined in section one provides a substantial consumer benefit, especially for low-income complainants.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

None expressed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Pete Myers, Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CBIA): The testifier is opposed to this bill because it would disproportionately impact small businesses. While they support consumer protection and fair enforcement, CBIA claims that the increase in maximum restitution would threaten the viability of small businesses who operate with small margins.

Reported by: James Finlay

Date: April 9, 2026