



CONNECTICUT
TRIAL
LAWYERS
ASSOCIATION

150 Trumbull Street, 2nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103
p) 860.522.4345 f) 860.522.1027
www.cttriallawyers.org

Raised Bill 244
Public Hearing: 3-2-16

TO: MEMBERS OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
FROM: CONNECTICUT TRIAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION (CTLA)
DATE: MARCH 2, 2016

RE: **OPPOSITION TO SUBSECTION (d) of SB244, AAC THE REPORTING OF INJURIES
RESULTING FROM THE DISCHARGE OF A FIREARM AND STAB WOUNDS**

CTLA, while supportive of the reporting of injuries resulting from the discharge of a firearm and stab wounds, opposes subsection (d) of this bill because it creates immunities from liability for reasonable actions that would never create liability in the first place. Further, the bill would create an unreasonable expansion of our immunity laws, which are only extended where there is some broad overarching public benefit. While there is a great public benefit to the requirements of this bill, there does not seem to be a commensurate public benefit to the extension of the immunity contemplated.

The law seeking to be amended has been in place since 1993 and we are unaware of a single case where a lawsuit has been brought for following the reporting requirements currently mandated. We are also unaware of any lack of reporting out of fear of liability. The expansion of the law to include stab wounds, and further outline what needs to be included in such a report and what needs to be preserved will not create any new liability.

We respectfully request that stab wounds be added to the current statute without the immunity found in subsection (d) of this bill.

Immunity in Connecticut has been reserved for a very few instances. The actions covered by this bill do not fit within those limitations. Nothing about the existing law has deterred reporting injuries resulting from the discharge of a firearm since the reporting requirement was passed into law over twenty-two years ago. Adding stab wounds and further collection requirements to the reporting does not change that fact. The CTLA respectfully contends that the immunity found in subsection (d) of this proposal is unnecessary and against public policy.

WE URGE YOU TO OPPOSE SUBSECTION (d) of SB244. Thank you.