



**STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
JUDICIAL BRANCH**

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION**

---

231 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106  
(860) 757-2270 Fax (860) 757-2215

**Testimony of Deborah Fuller  
Judiciary Committee Public Hearing  
March 20, 2006**

**Senate Bill 56, An Act Concerning the Registration of Sex Offenders**

Good afternoon. My name is Deborah Fuller and I appear before you today on behalf of the Judicial Branch to testify on *S. B. 56, An Act Concerning the Registration of Sex Offenders*.

While the Judicial Branch supports the purpose of this proposal, we have concerns with some of its provisions. In particular, section 9(b) would require the court, whenever a person receives a case disposition that would require them to register as a sex offender, to "provide a written summary of the offense that includes the age and sex of any victim of the offense and a specific description of the offense" for the registry. It is unclear which entity within the court would provide this information, but we assume it would be the clerk's office, as they are responsible for transmitting conviction information to the Department of Public Safety, which maintains the Registry. The clerk's office would not have this information in most cases. We would respectfully suggest that the arresting police department, or the appropriate state's attorney's office, would be in a better position to provide this information to the registry.

Another concern that we have is with section 24(b), which requires the court to order global positioning system (GPS) monitoring for any offender who is convicted of enumerated offenses. The Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division, which includes Probation, has researched the use of GPS and believes it could be a valuable

tool for some cases. However, we believe that the decision to use GPS should be based on the individual offender's level of risk, as measured by the risk assessment tool that is administered by probation officers. This is a much better predictor of future risk than the charge of which the offender is convicted. In addition, we do not believe that GPS should be mandated for any category of cases, but that it should be ordered based on the facts of each individual case, and the characteristics of each individual defendant. Currently the statutes authorize judges and CSSD to order electronic monitoring; we believe that simply adding references to those sections of the statutes will provide us the necessary authority to utilize GPS.

I would also note that this section allows for GPS monitoring of individuals who have been granted a conditional discharge. Although it is likely that the number of these individuals would be extremely low, if any at all, I must point out that there is no supervisory aspect to conditional discharge, so it is unclear who would monitor the GPS.

On a more technical note, we would like to suggest that the new language in section 13 be broken down into different subsections to better track the different offenses.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify.