

## **STATE MARSHAL AFSCME LOCAL 2193:**

Supports SB 650

Opposes SB 1030

Opposes SB 6929

### **Judiciary Committee Public Hearing, March 11, 2015**

My name is Mark D'Angelis. I am the president of the State Marshal AFSCME Local 2193.

We support **SB 650, An Act Concerning Temporary Restraining Orders**. We appreciate the hard work that the restraining order task force has performed. The task force looked thoroughly and comprehensively into improving the service to domestic violence victims. We agree with many of the task force's finding. One of our members, Marshal Lisa Stevenson, participated as a task force member. Our local agrees with the idea of a police officer delivering orders to households in which it is indicated that a gun is present. Marshals would continue to deliver service on all other restraining orders. State marshals are licensed, bonded agents of the state. We take our duties very seriously. Of all the duties that we perform, we realize that delivering restraining orders is the top priority. We feel that we do it well and with great understanding of the urgency, and the stress experienced by all parties in such circumstances.

We oppose **Senate Bill 1030, An Act Implementing Recommendations of the Task Force to Study Methods for Improving the Collection of Past Due Child Support**. Currently, this is work done by state marshals. It is work that has been done on a long term basis by state marshals (previously known as sheriffs.) We are unaware of any problems with the service of these warrants or capias mittimus orders. If there is any issue we are happy to meet with the Department of Social Services, any state administrators, policy makers or members of the public who have a concern with current service. We are trained professionals who constantly seek to improve our profession.

One very problematic part of the bill is section 2. This says that a copy or electronic image of an original document can be served to someone in a courthouse by a judicial marshal. The law has always been that the original document must be served. If a copy is served in a courthouse, then it would be very easy for the original to be served again to an individual at his house or on the street. This could lead to a second arrest or a false arrest

because the marshal serving the original capias may not know that a copy has already been served. This bill was rejected by the Human Services Committee last year for just such reasons as we have stated.

This bill mentions allowing DSS employees who serve such orders access to "Connecticut on-line law enforcement communications teleprocessing system without charge." State marshals would also like access to such data bases. That would be of assistance to us in our work.

**We oppose House Bill 6929 An Act Establishing a Pilot Program in the City of Bridgeport to Allow for the Service of a Capius Mittimus Order by an Off-Duty City Police Officer.**

This bill would allow off-duty Bridgeport police officers to serve capias mittimus orders or warrants in family support matters.

We believe that the service of capias mittimus is best left in the hands of state marshals, rather than used as a side job for police officers. We have great respect for the Bridgeport police, but we do not feel that this arrangement is necessary, or will lead to service in a more rapid or efficient manner.

Thank you for your consideration and if I can provide any additional information, please let me know.