



## *Judicial Professional Employees*

AFT/CFEPE AFL-CIO

705 NORTH MOUNTAIN ROAD, NEWINGTON, CONNECTICUT 06111  
TELEPHONE (860) 953-1316 1-800-842-4443

Testimony of: Thomas P. Culley, Executive Director  
Judicial Professional Employees Union, AFT / AFT-CT, AFL-CIO

Submitted to: The Judiciary Committee  
March 3, 2006

Re: Raised Bill 5535 An Act Concerning The Privacy Of Residential Addresses Of  
Employees Of The Judicial Branch

Senator McDonald, Representative Lawlor, Members of the Judiciary Committee:

This testimony is offered in support of Raised Bill 5535, An Act Concerning the  
Privacy of Residential Addresses of Employees of the Judicial Branch.

By permitting them to substitute their business address, CGS 14-10, subsection  
(e) extends to some court, custodial and law enforcement personnel the  
opportunity to protect their residential address from public disclosure by the Department  
of Motor Vehicles. Under the statute as presently written, that opportunity is denied to  
our members.

The members of our Union who provide support services to the court routinely  
become involved in adversarial relationships with criminal offenders, deadbeat dads and  
divorcing parents. It is common for them to be threatened with physical assault, lawsuit  
or some other form of personal retaliation. Public disclosure of their residential address  
extends that very real threat to their families as well. CGS 14-10, subsection (e) permits

Judges to protect their residential address but denies the opportunity to Probation Officers whose sentencing recommendation the Judge often follows. Employees of the Parole Board are covered but, again, Probation Officers are not despite the fact that they perform virtually identical offender monitoring services in the community. Support Enforcement Officers often act as de facto Prosecutors when presenting child support cases in court. A Prosecutor's residential address is protected while a Support Enforcement Officer's is not. Family Relations Counselors lack protection under the statute even though they routinely make painful and disruptive child support and divorce settlement decisions.

I could go on but I'm sure you get my point. Our member's daily professional activities place them at as much risk for retaliation through the public availability of their residential addresses as any group currently protected by CGS 14-10, subsection (e). It is imperative that the protection of the statute now be extended to them. I therefore urge the passage of Raised Bill 5535. Thank you.