



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  
Judiciary Committee Public Hearing  
April 5, 2013

**House Bill 6686, An Act Concerning The Allocation Of Seized Criminal Assets  
Toward The Payment Of Past-Due Child Support Obligations**

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony on behalf of the Judicial Branch regarding **House Bill 6686, *An Act Concerning the Allocation of Seized Criminal Assets Toward the Payment of Past-Due Child Support Obligations***. While this bill has the worthy goal of re-directing seized assets toward past-due child support obligations, it presents numerous implementation concerns for the Judicial Branch.

As members of the Committee may be aware, the disposition of seized property is typically handled by the criminal court at the time of sentencing. It is unclear how a criminal court judge would be made aware of a past-due child support obligation on the part of the owner. The criminal clerk's office will not be able to make the court aware of this fact, because it does not have the necessary information; the clerk merely has information about the property seized. It should also be noted that the "owner" is not necessarily the defendant; it could be also be the victim or a third-party. If there is any expectation that the clerk will have to determine who owns the property and then investigate whether or not a child support order exists, additional staff in each criminal court will be necessary.

Even if these issues could be resolved, the bill still leaves other unanswered questions. For example, how can the court craft a specific order pertaining to past due support if information about the proceeds derived from the sale of property are not available contemporaneously with the court's order of property disposition? Or how should payment be prioritized if the owner of the seized property has multiple arrearages?

In short, the bill raises many more questions than it does answers. While the Judicial Branch certainly supports of holding people accountable for their arrearages, we would respectfully submit that this bill leaves too many unanswered questions.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony on this bill.