

To the members of the Judiciary Committee,

I've been busy with another homicide in Danbury, but that's what we are going to be seeing more of with legislation like this. I have a number of issues with this legislation. These are some, but not all.

1) Section 3, (a) (8) reduces recertification requirements from the present 60 hours every three years to 40 hours. How is less training going to help this situation?

2) Revocation, suspension, censures needs due process. What is conduct that "tends to undermine the public confidence in police work?" My constitutional law professor would admonish that such a statement is too vague and broad to hold constitutional muster. This appears to be geared toward whatever the politics of the day is.

3) Section 21/22 Driver/Pedestrian consent - this is being addressed by Attorney Elliot Spector and is fraught with issues, both for Officer Safety and practically. These encounters have a history of case law governing them.

4) Section 22 - searches of women can only be conducted by women. This is not always practical, especially in smaller departments. Although this appears to be limited to searches occurring during search warrant executions, it begs the question why is this an issue in that application? What is the goal in this narrow policy?

5) Section 29 - Use of Force - Section 29 (a) (1) "erroneous though not unreasonable belief that the law is otherwise does not render justified". This is great in hindsight, but in the heat of the moment, a split second decision will adversely affect the officer and place officers in jeopardy, fearing to use any force.

6) Section 30 - duty to intervene, another case where hindsight is wonderful, but in the moment things are not always as clear

7) Section 40 - this just destroyed our patrol rifle program and renders our communities unsafe from many threats, particularly school shootings.

8) Section 41 - Qualified Immunity - Qualified immunity is not guaranteed and there are safeguards in place. This issue will cause many current officers to rethink their current employment status and will severely limit recruitment efforts.

If the goals are to create a better police force, a more diversified police force, then this legislation will not accomplish that. We are running down a rabbit hole and the police are the scapegoats. This legislation is full of unfunded mandates and utopian ideals that don't reconcile with the realities of police work. I am very disappointed, but not surprised.



Dave Antedomenico

President

Danbury Police Union and

Danbury Resident