

Government Administration and Elections Committee
JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-6872

AN ACT CONCERNING FAITHLESS PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS AND
AUTHORIZING MANDAMUS ACTIONS RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION
Title: OR DECLARATION OF ELECTION RESULTS.

Vote Date: 03/15/2023

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/10/2023

File No.: 336

***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:

Government Administration and Elections Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This Bill, firstly nullifies the vote of, removes, replaces, and imposes certain penalties upon faithless presidential electors. Secondly this bill also allows for mandamus actions to be brought in the Supreme Court to compel certain officers to comply with laws relating to certification or declaration of election results. The ability to do this was legally upheld in a unanimous vote by the Federal Supreme Court in the Chiafalo v. Washington case.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

None

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Debbie Esposito: Ms. Esposito has grave concerns over the changes in the elector process. Her concerns arise over the topic election integrity. She concludes her testimony by stating that "This Is a Constitutional Change and Requires An Amendment Be Put To A Vote".

Linda Dalessio, Taxpayer: Ms. Dalessio begins her testimony, by claiming that 2020 was a fraudulent election, and claims that it casts Connecticut and the United States down a path towards communist and socialist control in the state of Connecticut and the United States as well. Ms. Dalesssio then calls for "transparency, fairness and truth in our elections regardless of party". To conclude her testimony, she asks that Connecticut leave the ERIC contract and notes that many Secretaries of state have and asks why Connecticut has not.

Reported by: Thomas Togneri

Date: 03-15-2023