

Peter J Criscuolo, Jr.  
Connecticut State Marshal  
15 Fawn Ridge Road  
North Haven, CT 06473

**S.B. No. 1076 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REDUCTION OF GUN VIOLENCE**

Senator Hartley, Representative Dargan and members of the Public Safety and Security Committee thank you for the opportunity to offer testimony on Senate Bill 1076. My name is Peter Criscuolo, Jr. and I am a Connecticut State Marshal from North Haven. I am here to testify in opposition to Sections 24 and 25 of Senate Bill 1076.

Prior to the passage of 00-99 (Sheriff's Reform Bill) in the year 2000, Deputy Sheriffs were considered sworn peace officers with the ability to carry under their badges. We perform civil arrests (Child support Capias), along with domestic restraining orders, civil evictions, child termination of parental rights and other potentially dangerous civil process. WE STILL DO.

00-99 stripped that ability to "carry" away from the new title (State Marshal) in CGS 29-35 by removing the reference to "sheriff". (See footnote to legislation)

Since that day, Marshals have carried under their carry permits but only after permission of the State Marshal's Commission and ONLY after completing a course of instruction from POST certified instructors (Police Officers Standards and Training) to the equivalency of the same training as municipal police officers. Additionally, our Police Liability Insurance Policy provides for extra coverage. We currently pay for our own training and insurance. There is no cost to the State. THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 30 INDIVIDUALS WITH THIS STATUS OF THE 260+ CT STATE MARSHALS.

We do not want to change this process. We believe the State Marshal's Commission should be the final arbitrator of this status and the standard of POST equivalent training SHOULD be the minimum training requirement.

Since that legislative change, two Marshals have been shot and several assaulted including a couple of potentially deadly assaults

It appears this ability to carry under our badge through this deletion in CGS 29-35 defines our status as officers vs "non officers"

Our "post" 00-99 status, also prevents us from acquiring or wearing body armor (SB 1076) thereby putting all Marshals who may choose to purchase or wear body armor at risk despite the fact that most of the more dangerous situations are directives from the court system itself.

Our status further identifies us as "non officers" when we go through the metal detectors at court. This "non status" means we cannot bring handcuffs or even a handcuff key into court to make a capias arrest. This means we are quite frequently denigrated at our entrance to court and the judicial marshals oftentimes provide little if any assistance. In fact, they sometime insist we walk

our prisoners back through the front door to go outside without handcuffs to get to our vehicles thereby putting the State Marshal at serious risk.

Lastly, our status as "non-officers" means, even in the performance of our duties, a private "gun free zone" prevents us from legally carrying, placing us at risk while performing the orders of the court.

We only ask that State Marshals be re-included in CGS 29-35 with the understanding everyone is included in terms of status but with the understanding that they require State Marshal's Commission permission and training standards in order to comply.

We additionally request that SB 1076 be amended to include us as officers so any of us that choose to wear body armor may do so without penalty or prosecution.

Thank you for your time.