

Judiciary Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HJ-68

RESOLUTION GRANTING THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER AN EXTENSION OF
Title: TIME TO DISPOSE OF CERTAIN CLAIMS.

Vote Date: 4/8/2021

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/26/2021

File No.: 584

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

The substitute language consolidated the claims of 29 claimants (30 claims) into one resolution for efficiency and simplicity due to the volume of claim extensions.

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill grants the Claims Commissioner an extension of one year from the final adoption of this resolution by the General Assembly to dispose of the 29 claims against the state listed in the bill.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language consolidated the claims of 29 claimants (30 claims) into one resolution for efficiency and simplicity due to the volume of claim extensions.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None stated.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

None stated.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Koskoff Koskoff & Bieder PC, Attorney, Alinor C. Sterling, Esq. opposes HJ 92 (Section 20 of the substitute language) on behalf of client Bonni Bossi stating the procedural history of the case which involves a medical malpractice claim related to a significant delay in the commencement of cancer treatment. It is stated that the claim was filed three and a half

years ago, and no action has been taken. It is also stated that the delay of the claim may deprive the client the opportunity to participate and asks that the claim to be permitted to proceed in Superior Court.

Walsh Woodard LLC, Attorney, Michael J. Walsh opposes HJ 95 (Section 23 of the substitute language on behalf of client Angela Britton stating the procedural history of the case which involves serious injuries when the client hit concrete causing the client to crash into a guardrail. It is stated that Connecticut Department of Transportation employees had thrown the piece of concrete from a highway overpass bridge, intending for it to drop into a dump truck but missed, resulting in the concrete bouncing into the client's lane. It is also stated that the claim has had no action taken in three years and asks that the Committee deny the Commissioner's request for an extension and grant the client permission to sue.

Reported by: Peter B. Andrews

Date: April 14, 2021