



# House of Representatives

General Assembly

**File No. 133**

*January Session, 2009*

Substitute House Bill No. 6285

*House of Representatives, March 23, 2009*

The Committee on Public Safety and Security reported through REP. DARGAN of the 115th Dist., Chairperson of the Committee on the part of the House, that the substitute bill ought to pass.

## ***AN ACT CONCERNING FINGERPRINT COLLECTION.***

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

- 1 Section 1. (NEW) (*Effective October 1, 2009*) (a) No employee of a  
2 municipal police department or the Division of State Police within the  
3 Department of Public Safety shall refuse to collect the fingerprints of a  
4 person requesting such fingerprinting for the purposes of a criminal  
5 history records check in accordance with section 29-17a of the general  
6 statutes, or other noncriminal purposes, provided such person works  
7 or resides in the municipality where such department or division is  
8 located.
- 9 (b) The provisions of this section shall not be construed to prohibit a  
10 municipality from establishing a limited period of hours during which  
11 such fingerprints may be collected.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	<i>October 1, 2009</i>	New section

**PS**      *Joint Favorable Subst.*

The following Fiscal Impact Statement and Bill Analysis are prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and do not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose. In general, fiscal impacts are based upon a variety of informational sources, including the analyst's professional knowledge. Whenever applicable, agency data is consulted as part of the analysis, however final products do not necessarily reflect an assessment from any specific department.

### **OFA Fiscal Note**

**State Impact:** None

**Municipal Impact:**

<b>Municipalities</b>	<b>Effect</b>	<b>FY 10 \$</b>	<b>FY 11 \$</b>
Municipal Police Departments	Revenue Gain	Potential Minimal	Potential Minimal

### **Explanation**

The bill requires employees of municipal police departments and State Police divisions to collect residents' fingerprints for criminal history record checks or other noncriminal purposes. This does not result in any fiscal impact to the state, and results in a potential minimal revenue increase for municipalities.

It is the current practice of the Department of Public Safety (DPS) to collect fingerprints for the purposes specified in the bill, and CGS 29-11 provides that a fee be collected for such service.

The bill is not anticipated to result in any additional cost to municipalities as police departments are allowed to establish limited hours during which such service is provided. To the extent that those departments charge a fee for the service, there is a potential minimal revenue increase to municipalities.

### **The Out Years**

The annualized ongoing fiscal impact to municipalities identified above would continue into the future subject to any alterations to fees set for the services specified.

*Source(s): Public Safety and Security Committee Public Hearing 2/3/09*

**OLR Bill Analysis**

**sHB 6285**

***AN ACT CONCERNING FINGERPRINT COLLECTION.***

**SUMMARY:**

This bill requires the Division of State Police or local police department to collect fingerprints for a criminal history record check or other noncriminal purpose (e.g., employment) if the person making the request lives or works in the town where the department or division is located. It allows municipalities to limit the hours for providing this service.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 2009

**COMMITTEE ACTION**

Public Safety and Security Committee

Joint Favorable Substitute

Yea 21 Nay 0 (03/10/2009)