



**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
JUDICIAL BRANCH**

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION

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

**Testimony of Stephen N. Ment
Human Services Committee Public Hearing
March 13, 2007**

**House Bill 7361, An Act Concerning Child Support Enforcement
Program Compliance and Improvements**

Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony on behalf of the Judicial Branch in support of **House Bill 7361, *An Act Concerning Child Support Enforcement Program Compliance and Improvements***. This bill contains numerous provisions that would assist in the collection of child support.

While the Judicial Branch supports the bill, and urges the Committee to act favorably on it, we do have some very specific comments and suggestions to offer.

In regards to the numerous references to the clause "... shall be on forms prescribed by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator" (please see lines 168, 356, 461, 467, 1769, and 1777), we would respectfully request the entire clause be deleted. Rather than try to differentiate between IV-D forms and non-IV-D forms, removal of this clause will permit forms to be drafted by others, including the Department of Social Services (DSS). Otherwise, as written, the Chief Court Administrator would be obligated to create and maintain non-IV-D forms, which are rarely needed. The provision was originally needed to create statewide, standardized forms, but is no longer necessary because DSS and the Support Enforcement Services (SES) division of the Judicial Branch now have the capability and commitment to create and maintain statewide, standardized forms.

In lines 1066-1073, the Branch respectfully suggests that the phrase "specific identifying information" be replaced by the phrase "location information", as the rules of court do not permit the use of pseudonyms in family cases.

In lines 1468-1469, query whether it is anticipated that a judge of the Superior Court, as opposed to a family support magistrate, would now hear Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA) cases. If so, this could have a significant impact on their caseloads and would require significant training for them.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this bill. The Branch supports it and would appreciate any consideration given to the comments expressed above.