

# Judiciary Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** SB-475 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

**Title:** AN ACT CONCERNING JUDICIAL BRANCH OPERATIONS.

**Vote Date:** 3/30/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 3/20/2026

**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 is the annual Judicial Branch bill regarding court operations designed to streamline and simplify processes, resolve small drafting errors, keep up with technology, and enhance access to justice.

## **SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:**

The substitute language made changes to section one, added a new section two, changed effective date of sections ten and sixteen and made changes in sections eleven and eighteen. In addition, former section three regarding fees for medical records was removed and former section 30, which repealed C.G.S. 51-6b was removed.

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

**Justice Joan K. Alexander, Chief Court Administrator, Judicial Branch:** This is the annual court operations bill that is designed to streamline and simplify court processes, provide flexibility in managing the facilities, take advantage of technology enhancements and resolve minor statutory drafting errors. While the Branch feels all 30 sections of the bill are important, she feels that Section 17 of the bill is extremely important as public officials, elected officials, state employees, and residents are being targeted by false liens on land records.

**Deborah Del Prete Sullivan, Legal Counsel, Director, Office of Chief of Public Defender, Division of Public Defender Services:** The Office of the Public Defender takes no position on most of the bill but has concerns over Sections 5,8,12, and 14. The office has proposed

substitute language for Sections 5 and 14, a solution for Section 8, and they ask Section 12 be stricken from the bill. The Office of the Chief Public Defender appreciates the Judicial Branch for meeting with their office to discuss these concerns and look forward to continued discussions.

**Michele Gilman, Commissioner, Department of Administrative Services (DAS):**

Commissioner Gilman states that the DAS is neutral on the bill, however, would like to see revisions to Section 1 to ensure that it aligns with current practices and statutory requirements.

**Patrick Griffin, Chief State Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice:** Chief State's Attorney Griffin has thoughts on Section 11, where a probation officer must apply for an arrest warrant when a serious firearm offender has violated the conditions of their probation. The Division asks for thoughtful consideration before departing from the carefully crafted parameters that are established in P.A. 23-53 from three years ago. He believes Section 11 undermines the original purpose of the earlier Act.

**Susan Hamilton, Interim Commissioner the Department of Children and Families:**

Susan Hamilton wrote in support of Sections, 5, 6, and 7 of SB 475. Section 5 of the bill would build on Public Act 25-91, which allowed the Judicial Branch and DCF to share information; this section would allow them to continue this progress. Sections 6 and 7 would expand the definition of relatives in the statutes to reflect language in the Parentage Act. She explained that national research supports that there are better outcomes for children placed with kin compared to traditional foster homes.

**NATURE AND SOURCES SUPPORTS:**

**Liza Andrews: VP of Government and Public Relations, Connecticut Coalition of**

**Domestic Violence:** Liza Andrews supports section 19 of this bill. It expands the definition of emotional harm to include mental or emotional impairment that is caused intentionally by another person. It will increase the ability of victims of crime to access compensation for needed therapy or other safety measures. This bill will expand the compensation that a victim can obtain as it is critical for survivors to access trauma-based therapy.

**Andrew (Drew) Bloom, President, Fugitive Recovery Agency, Executive Vice President, 3-Bail Bonds, Inc. Immediate Past President: Bail Bond Association of Connecticut (BAC), Member, Professional Bondsmen of the United States (PBUS):**

Andrew Bloom supports this bill, stating that bail bonds are the only form of pretrial release that monitors and enforces appearance for non-complying individuals who are released while their court case is pending. By making notifications of forfeitures and court reports electronic it will save on postage and printing, as well as speed up notice of the forfeitures, case continuances, or closure to the responsible party.

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

**Connecticut Hospital Association (CHA):** CHA opposes Section 3 of the bill, stating it goes beyond lawyer requests, and this would interfere widely with hospital operations and have a negative impact on patient care.

**Elizabeth Delahoussaye, RHIA, CHPS, Chief Privacy Officer, Sharecare:** Elizabeth Delahoussaye opposes this bill as the release of health information is misunderstood. She explained that obtaining records is not a push of a button and uploading a file and sending records by email. She stated that there is a lot to go through when releasing medical records and it is more complex given all the mergers and acquisitions that are happening in the healthcare field. She asked that Sharecare and Association for Health Information Operations and Standards be consulted regarding costs for providing release of information to Connecticut's medical providers.

**Adrienne B. Morrell, Vice President, Government Affairs, MRO Corp.:**

Adrienne Morrell opposes this bill, particularly Section 3 which amends C.G.S. 19a-25g. Despite advances in interoperability, retrieving protected health information (PHI) cannot be done with a single click of a mouse. Releasing of information involves certain specific steps and each step presents its own complexities and compliance risks. MRO urges the committee to oppose SB 475 and instead work with providers, ROI experts, and patient advocates to build a system that works.

**Elizabeth Notz McElhiney, MHA, CHPS, CPHIMS, CDH-L, CRIS, CC, Director of Legislative Affairs, Alliance for Health Information Operations and Standards, (AHIOS):**

Elizabeth Notz McElhiney is in opposition of SB 475, specifically Section 3. The fee structure is conflicting and unclear, there is risk to patient privacy and compliance, and this language may cause delays and administrative burdens. AHIOS supports modernizing health information laws, but such efforts must be clear, workable, and aligned with the existing legal framework. SB 475 as drafted does not consider the real-world complexity of the ROI process.

**Kyle Probst, Deputy General Counsel, Director of Government Relations, Datavant:**

Kyle Probst opposes this bill as there are significant concerns regarding the language in lines 91-99. Datavant believes SB 475 would cause confusion and inconsistency in the billing for medical records. Alliance for Health Information Operations and Datavant ask that they be consulted regarding appropriate fees and maximum amounts for providing these valuable release of information services to Connecticut providers.

**Reported by:** Bonnie Gray

**Date:** April 13, 2026