

RUTKIN, OLDHAM & GRIFFIN, L.L.C.

ARNOLD H. RUTKIN
SARAH STARK OLDHAM
DAVID W. GRIFFIN
ALEXANDER J. CUDA
LANE L. MARMON
RANDI R. NELSON

PLEASE RESPOND TO:

P.O. BOX 295
5 IMPERIAL AVENUE
WESTPORT, CONNECTICUT 06881
(203) 227-7301
FAX: (203) 222-9295

TWO LAFAYETTE COURT
GREENWICH, CONNECTICUT 06830
(203) 869-7277

EMAIL - law@rutkinoldham.com

OF COUNSEL
KATHLEEN A. HOGANH

‡Also admitted in Colorado

April 4, 2013

Via E-mail (JUD.testimony@cga.ct.gov)

Joint Committee on Judiciary
Legislative Office Building, Room 2500
300 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: Raised Bill No. 1155 and Raised Bill No. 6688

Dear Joint Committee on Judiciary:

As a young female member of the Connecticut Bar Association and Family Law Section, I believe it is my duty to express my opinion regarding Raised Bill No. 1155 and Raised Bill No. 6688, which are scheduled for public hearing on April 5, 2013, as these raised bills will have a lasting and strong impact on my career.

After careful consideration, I am opposed to RB No. 1155 and I support in its entirety RB No. 6688.

RB 1155:

RB 1155 has several flaws, which make the proposed bill impossible to support. As a female who is newly married and residing in the State of Connecticut, I believe RB 1155 is a threat to other women and poorer individuals who are gainfully employed, but earn less than their spouse or former spouse.

It is disappointing that RB 1155 would even be discussed considering it was drafted by a committee of four without feedback or support from other individuals and organizations that would be interested in or affected by such an amendment. Furthermore, I understand that there is no data to support the proposed alimony calculation and percentages outlined in this proposed bill. It is hard to believe that anyone would support a bill that would drastically affect alimony without any research or data. The State of Connecticut Commission for Child Support Guidelines has

RUTKIN, OLDHAM & GRIFFIN, L.L.C.

Joint Committee on Judiciary
April 4, 2013
Page 2

conducted several studies to evaluate and re-evaluate the Child Support Guidelines of the State of Connecticut, yet the same consideration is not being done with respect to the alimony statute. Without research into the effects this bill would have on alimony orders, we as a legal community are being negligent and will detrimentally affect individuals in this state.

Moreover, RB 1155 provides strict guidelines with certain percentages and formulas that Judges are required or mandated to follow unless they specifically state "the factors... that resulted in the court's declining to use such calculations." Not everything is black and white and can be plugged into a simple formula to generate the proper result. There are many factors that need to be considered when determining alimony that are lost when applying this simple formula. Overworked and nervous Judges will more likely than not utilize the guidelines outlined in this proposed bill, rather than enumerating factors which caused a differing result.

Instead of enacting RB 1155 which would drastically change the Connecticut Alimony Statute for the worse, we should enact RB 6688, which would institute a study into alimony actions in the State of Connecticut prior to enacting a rigid set of guidelines that Judges are required to follow.

RB 6688:

RB 6688 contains beneficial and modernistic changes to our existing family law statutes. Furthermore, this bill would enact a study to research "the fairness and adequacy of the state statute relating to the award of alimony in actions for dissolution of marriage, legal separation or annulment." I would think that it would be helpful to conduct research and understand the pitfalls of the alimony statutes prior to modifying the statute to enact strict guidelines that Judges would be required to follow, which is what is being proposed in RB 1155.

RB 6688 also would require Judges to articulate with specificity the basis for any non-modifiable, permanent alimony awards, which would enable individuals to understand the basis for any award.

Therefore, I unequivocally support RB No. 6688 and strongly oppose RB No. 1155.

Very truly yours,



Lane L. Marmon