

Housing Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: SB-337 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

Title: AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROPERTY OF EVICTED TENANTS.

Vote Date: 3/10/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

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:

The bill would require that property owners store the personal property of evicted tenants for 15 days and allow them to dispose of the property as they see fit following those 15 days.

Some municipalities have expressed their dissatisfaction with the financial and administrative costs of storing the personal property of evicted tenants. The committee proposed this bill to attempt to alleviate those concerns.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language modifies this bill into a task force to study the system of removal and storage of the property of evicted tenants under section 47a-42 of the general statutes.

After hearing public testimony, the committee acknowledged the concerns with the bill, and modified it to become a task force to study the post-eviction storage process.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None Expressed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Connecticut General Assembly, Rob Sampson, State Senator](#) submitted testimony in support of the proposed legislation. He believes it addresses a longstanding issue with a portion of the eviction process. He discusses the content of the bill, and how it eliminates the municipal role involved in storing the property of evicted tenants. He believes the bill simplifies the process, reduces administrative overhead, and restores the responsibility to the parties directly involved with the eviction process.

[City of New London, Rain Daugherty, Community Development](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. Rain explains that in his oversight of community staff who manage the storage and administrative responsibilities associated with post-eviction storage, he believes that there are operational, financial, and logistical issues with the law as it stands. He says that this legislation properly realigns responsibility to landlords, relieving the burden on municipalities to hold and store property, allowing them to focus on public service.

[CT Coalition of Property Owners, John Souza, President](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill with modifications. He states his appreciation for the bill's intent but would suggest modifications to avoid new concerns. He believes that any bill on the issue should state that "as soon as the judgment and stay of execution expire, the court issues an order (e.g. execution) permitting the landlord to dispose of the property in the manner the landlord sees fit after 5 days." He believes this amendment would save money for towns and property owners, keeping rents affordable.

[Connecticut Council of Small Towns, Betsy Gara, Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. She believes that the current law imposes unnecessary costs on towns and cities. She continues, saying that the costs hit municipalities at a time where they are struggling to provide residents adequate services without raising taxes.

These individuals submitted similar testimony in support of SB 337 with amendments. He believes the bill can alleviate expenses on both landlords and municipalities. He lists two amendments in his written testimony. First, amend the bill to provide protections for both the municipality and landlord against claims that "valuable" property is missing or stolen. Second, amend the bill to allow the landlord to opt out of storing the items or to move them provided they notify the tenant in a reasonable amount of time:

[GELA, Paul Januszewski, President](#)

[David Marasow](#)

[Dan McDonald](#)

[Eric Polinsky](#)

[Dan Saunders](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. He believes the current structure of the eviction property storage process creates an unnecessary expense for both housing providers and municipalities. He says the bill would help towns and housing providers save money and simultaneously lower operating costs, keeping rents more stable over time.

[Paula Licitra, Member Manager](#) submitted written testimony in opposition to the bill. She believes that the money that goes toward storage can be used for more important services.

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#) submitted testimony in support of the bill. They believe that this legislation will save landlords and municipalities the cost of removing evicted tenant possessions.

These individuals submitted testimony in general support of the bill:

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#)

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#)

[Janet Dahlberg](#)

[Marcella C. Kurowski](#)

[Phil Marasco](#)

[Saumya Mittal](#)

[Tara Ramlal](#)

[Harold Ryan, Homeowner](#)

[Sadlon Properties, Richard Sadlon, Owner](#)

[Mike Santangelo](#)

[Kali Sukumar](#)

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

[State Marshal Association of Connecticut](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. They state that the bill would rid of the long-standing requirement of marshal involvement in belongings removal during a court-ordered eviction. This, in their opinion, would generate serious safety, legal, and practical problems for both marshals and property owners. They note that while the bill suggests shifting responsibility to the landlord to store belongings, the result will be that tenants will lose their possessions and it would heighten conflicts. The Association state that it is normal practice to keep landlords away from the premises during evictions to minimize disputes, and by shifting responsibility of storage to landlords, it will heighten tensions in situations that already are emotional and unpredictable. Additionally, they note that the bill could also generate more disputes over access, retrieval, damage, and ownership of items during the 15-day period. Overall, the Association believes that the bill would disrupt and add risk to an already sensitive process.

[Partnership for Strong Communities, Amy Peltier, Coalition and Advocacy Director](#) submitted testimony on behalf of PSC. They believe that the existing statute addresses the public health, safety, and welfare responsibility of towns, as well as maintain the prevention of personal confrontations between landlord and tenant. This confrontation, in their opinion, has the potential to turn hostile and create public safety risks. They continue, saying that keeping towns as a neutral party avoids the risk that landlords can be exposed to liability for damages to property inventory/conditions, as well as avoiding accusations of harassment if personal property is held to satisfy a debt or for any other reason. Ultimately, they believe the statute should be left as is.

[Connecticut Legal Services, Inc., Rafael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate](#) submitted testimony in opposition to SB 337. He states that the bill results in many tenants losing their possessions following an eviction. He believes that the role of marshals in removing possessions and the town in controlling disposition is crucial to the process. Finally, he states that the current statute is there to provide safeguards against confrontation between a landlord and their tenant, and that this bill would rid of that.

[Connecticut Fair Housing Center, Chelsea Connery, Attorney](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. She notes that while several acts have modified the statute over time, municipalities have continued to play an important role in the process. She believes that if municipalities are removed, it could lead to tenants losing their possessions.

[CT DSA, Hillary Desideraggio](#) submitted testimony in opposition so SB 337. Hillary believes that the bill would add stress, uncertainty, and costs on tenants who are going through the eviction process. Additionally, Hillary states that there is no incentive for landlords to maintain and keep the tenants' property, risking losing all their possessions.

[Home Builders & Remodelers Association of Connecticut, Jim Perras, CEO](#) submitted testimony on behalf of HBRA in opposition to the bill. They believe that the legislation would be particularly burdensome for small landlords who lack the available space for storage of belongings, as well as legal resources. They also say that the bill does not address the health, safety, and security issues that may arise when considering potential handling of hazardous, perishable, or unsafe items left behind following an eviction. HBRA urges the committee to seek alternative approaches that preserve tenant protections while maintaining a clear and workable post-eviction process.

[Connecticut Legal Rights Project, Kathy Flaherty, Executive Director](#) submitted testimony in opposition to the bill. She believes that by changing the statute and altering the responsibility from the municipality, it would make it less likely that the tenant would be able to receive their belongings.

These individuals submitted similar testimony in opposition to the bill. While they appreciate the intent of the bill, they are concerned that as written, the bill would shift substantial logistical and legal risks onto housing providers while removing the neutral role that municipalities and state marshals play. They believe the requirement for property owners to store belongings for 15 days can be problematic, primarily for smaller housing providers. Ultimately, they believe that the responsibility should be handled through a neutral municipal process.

[Turquoise Blue](#)

[Paredim Communities, Alexandra Downey, Property Manager](#)

[Trio Properties, Jeff Feron, President](#)

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

[CTAA, Morgan Miller](#)

[Paredim Partners, David Parisier, Managing Member](#)

[CTAA, Lauren Tagliatela, Volunteer](#)

These individuals submitted testimony in general opposition to the bill:

[Anonymous, Anonymous](#)

[Sullivan Real Estate, Michael Flaherty, Real Estate Broker and Landlord](#)

[CTAA, Krystal Garcia, Assistant Property Manager](#)

[Robert Jackson](#)

[Mo Lev](#)

[Parc at Glenbrook, Jose Llanos, Property Manager](#)

[Kali Sukumar](#)

Reported by: Michael Flynn

Date: 3/19/2026

