

**PA12-186**

HB5534

House	8242-8244, 8288-8290	6
Judiciary	4388-4393, 4537-4540	10
<u>Senate</u>	<u>4485-4486, 4496-4499</u>	<u>6</u>
		<b>22</b>

**H – 1147**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2012**

**VOL.55  
PART 25  
8215 - 8555**

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

383  
May 9, 2012

Hearing none, the House -- the item is added to the consent calendar.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 402.

THE CLERK:

On page 16, Calendar 402, House Bill Number 5534, AN ACT CONCERNING ROBBERY COMMITTED AT A BANK OR CREDIT UNION, favorable report by the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Gerry Fox.

REP. G. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move for the acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on acceptance and passage.

Will you remark?

REP. G. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk has a strike-all amendment, LCO Number 5215. I would ask that that be called and I be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Clerk please call LCO 5215, designated House "A."

THE CLERK:

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

384  
May 9, 2012

LCO 5215, House "A," offered by Representative Fox,  
Alberts, Aresimowicz.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Any objection to summarization?

Hearing none, Representative, you may proceed.

REP. G. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment which becomes the bill makes it a crime to commit a larceny in a bank, even though if you do not have a weapon, though, that would also be very similar to a bank robbery with a weapon.

But what it is, is it enables the banks that came and testified before the Judiciary Committee, it will allow them to increase the penalty in those situations. And I move adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on adoption.

Will you remark? Remark further? Remark further?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

385  
May 9, 2012

All those opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Remark further on the bill as amended? Remark  
further on the bill?

Representative Fox.

REP. G. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If there's no objection, I would move that this be  
placed on the consent calendar.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The motion is to place this item on the consent  
calendar.

Any objection?

Hearing none, the item is placed on the consent  
calendar.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 407.

THE CLERK:

On page 36, Calendar 407, Substitute for House Bill  
Number 5555, AN ACT CONCERNING DIVERSIONARY PROGRAMS,  
favorable report by the Committee on Appropriations.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Gerry Fox.

REP. G. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

429  
May 9, 2012

calendar.

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker..

Mr. Speaker, I'm about to call the items again that are on the consent calendar, but I would like to alert the Clerk to two bills that we will be taking off the consent calendar. They are Calendars 380, and Calendars 431. Those are Calendars 380 and Calendar 431.

HB5333  
SB130

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 204.

THE CLERK:

On page 6, Calendar 204, Substitute for House Bill Number 530, AN ACT CONCERNING THE BOARD IN CONTROL OF THE CONNECTICUT AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, favorable report by the Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With that, let me -- I was looking to just list the calendar numbers again that we are planning to put on the consent calendar before I move them. I'll be doing this

in numerical order by calendar number.

They are Calendar Number 71, Calendar 204, Calendar 205, Calendar 287, Calendar 292, Calendar 330, Calendar 402, Calendar 407, Calendar 412, Calendar 417, Calendar 425, Calendar 426, Calendar 442, Calendar 458, Calendar 460.

Calendar 463, Calendar 492, Calendar 495, Calendar 499, Calendar 500, Calendar 501, Calendar 506, Calendar 507, Calendar 508, Calendar 512, Calendar 515, Calendar 516, Calendar 530, Calendar 538 and Calendar 545.

And I'd also like to add to that -- I'm sorry. I omitted one which is Calendar 275.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question before us is passage of the bills on today's consent calendar.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take their seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call.  
Members to the Chamber. The House is voting the consent calendar by roll call. Members to the Chamber, please.

HB5025  
HB5368  
HB5326  
HB5539  
HB5146  
SB328  
HB5534  
HB5555  
SB157  
SB232  
SB339  
SB340  
SB41  
SB98  
SB116  
SB196  
SB97  
SB188  
SB234  
SB237  
SB299  
SB347  
SB371  
SB391  
SB345  
SB383  
SB384  
SB29  
SB354  
HB5327  
SB254

mr/ch/rgd/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

431  
May 9, 2012

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted?

Please check the roll call board to make sure your vote has been properly cast.

If all the members have voted the machine will be locked. The Clerk will please take a tally.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's consent calendar.

Total Number Voting 150

Necessary for Adoption 76

Those Voting Yea 150

Those Voting Nay 0

Those Absent and Not Voting 1

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The consent calendar passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 443.

THE CLERK:

On page 20, Calendar 443, Senate Bill Number 60, AN ACT PROHIBITING PRICE GOUGING DURING SEVERE WEATHER EVENTS, favorable report by the Committee on the Judiciary.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:



**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY  
PART 14  
4346- 4668**

**2012**

I've seen that change personally through a juvenile that I know, that I heard reference to in a poem. And all of that is true and there was so much more to that, and as a certified nursing assistant, not a public physician's assistant, but I thank you very much for your time and taking time to hear everyone today. Thank you.

REP. FOX: Thank you. Are there any questions?  
No. Thanks again for your testimony.

BETH HOGAN: Thank you.

REP. FOX: Frank Teti.

FRANK TETI: Good afternoon, members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is -- I'm -- we're here on behalf of the Connecticut Banker's Association in support of Bill 5534 AN ACT CONCERNING ROBBERY COMMITTED AT BANK OR CREDIT UNION.

My name is Frank Teti. I'm with the Corporate Security Department of Webster Bank. And this is Thomas Fee, who is with the Corporate Security of Department of First Niagara Bank.

Despite significant investment by banking industry and security measures bank robberies still remain very high in Connecticut and it's a very high common threat. There are an average of 100 bank robberies in credit unions and banks in the state of Connecticut per year.

The robbery statute no longer is a deterrent today to bank robbers. Law enforcement and prosecutors need a statute that provides a clearer path to enforcement charges and prosecution to deter and combat these crimes more on a uniform basis.

All too often robbers will not display a weapon or make overly threatening statements; they will instead wear masks, disguises and engage in -- in contact which causes bank tellers and others to fear for possible physical harm.

These implied threats are just traumatizing and have some practical impact as a robber who actually displays a weapon. Unfortunately however, some of the courts in our state have refused to apply the robbery statute to the crimes and I -- are charging the robbers with either larcenies or breach of peace.

Law enforcement personnel and security officers convinced that robbers are aware of these deficiencies in Connecticut and are not deterred by the threat of a larceny or a charge of breach of the peace, but the ultimate impact to the crime is just the same as -- as a robbery.

I would like to turn this over to Tom Fee to explain some of the human impacts at this time.

THOMAS FEE: Chairman Fox, members of the committee, thank you for the time to testify this afternoon regarding this bill.

One of the things I want to address this afternoon is the forgotten element of the crime of bank robbery is the human impact. We see this unfortunately almost on a weekly basis in our world.

It doesn't -- it doesn't appear to be a week goes by that a bank is not subject to a robbery in the state of Connecticut, and working together with bank security directors

and, again, I represent First Niagara Bank. We share our stories. We share our common interest or common impacts on our people.

And often the impact comes well after the incident. The residual effect is -- is felt. Our employees have left employment, have requested transfers to back office, they've received counseling. We provide that through employee assistance programs and there's also fear of retribution to the employees.

Many times employees will tell us that they do not want to go back on a line because they believe the individual is coming back for them. So it -- it -- it's a significant impact in their lives.

From the customer's standpoint we've had customers say they will not go to a certain branch because they were subjected to a bank robbery in that particular branch or they heard about it through a friend or family member and they will not go to that branch and is there any way we can assist them. This particularly affects the elderly where they do not want to go to that branch.

So clarifying the statute will -- I believe will lessen the number of customers and employees impacted by the trauma of the crime of bank robbery. We've had a coalition of support for this clarification, which includes obviously the Connecticut bankers association, but also the Police Chief's Association of the state of Connecticut, which does represent the Chiefs of Police in most municipalities in this state.

I believe the committee does have a letter submitted by the Connecticut Police Chief's Association -- testimony supporting this bill.

If you do not, obviously I can supply you with a copy of that in my testimony.

So we respectfully we suggest that certain statements or conduct should automatically be constituted as threatening the immediate use of physical force when it comes to bank robbery. Thank you.

REP. FOX: Thank you. Are there questions?  
Senator Gomes.

SENATOR GOMES: I -- I just wanted to ask a question. You said some of these people were charged with breach of peace?

FRANK TETI: That's right.

SENATOR GOMES: And -- and what was the second one, larceny?

FRANK TETI: Yes, sir.

SENATOR GOMES: And -- and what was the basis of the court giving that sort of sentence? I mean, a lesser charge.

FRANK TETI: Because the court did not feel there was a significant threat. We had a situation where a person came -- a robber came and jumped over the teller line. It was in this space of the teller and all he said was, you know, give me the money. She pointed to the drawer, he took the money out the drawer. He was charged by -- with robbery and the court reduced it to larceny in the fourth degree because he didn't feel it was a threat there. He came in with a mask and everything.

SENATOR GOMES: Larceny in the fourth degree is what?

FRANK TETI: It's a theft I believe 2,500 or less.

SENATOR GOMES: That's what I thought it -- amount of money -- amount of money when you talk about larceny has to be -- has to be asserted. I just wanted to get to that figure. Was this all that you're talking about cure that?

FRANK TETI: Ultimately what ended up happening, the teller asked for a transfer to another branch where she would not be behind the teller line.

SENATOR GOMES: Well that -- what if somebody -- like you said somebody shoves a piece of paper across the counter and says give me all the money, he's not going to be charged with larceny because he hasn't asked for any specific amount and no specific amount was given to him, right?

FRANK TETI: That's what's been happening and we're asking if they're coming in with a mask that the employees are still threatened by that. They feel threatened and they're in fear of physical harm. That's not --

SENATOR GOMES: I'm -- I'm not against what you guys are saying. I'm not for it. I'm not against it. I'm just trying to get an explanation of why anybody comes in there is not charged with larceny and I always understood larceny has to specify a certain amount of money and you just -- you just confirmed that. That's all I wanted to hear about it.

THOMAS FEE: Senator, if I may along those lines, the element of fear is not being introduced. That's one of the reasons why it's being downgraded to a larceny and that's interpreted

by either prosecutors or the court that the individuals and bank robbers are being educated along those lines.

They are not -- they're not introducing a so called, element of fear by just standing there and saying give me 50's, give me 100's or the note not implying that there's going to be physical violence or force if you don't cooperate.

Our position is the mere presence that they're standing there demanding money is implying -- is instilling fear into the employees. So the element that they've educated themselves that they're not introducing that, into the physical act itself. Where they're saying do this or I will do that to you.

They're just demanding do this period. And to us that's being interpreted by our employees as an element of fear is being introduced. They're cooperating because they're afraid of their own safety.

REP. FOX: Thank you. Are there other questions or comments? No. Thank you very much for your testimony.

FRANK TETI: Thank you very much.

REP. FOX: Thanks for being here all day. Kimberly Larson.

KIMBERLY LARSON: Good evening.

REP. FOX: Good evening.

KIMBERLY LARSON: Good evening, Chairperson Fox and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee. I'm here in support of Senate Bill 417. My name is Kimberly Larson. I'm an



## CONNECTICUT POLICE CHIEFS ASSOCIATION

1800 Silas Deane Highway-Rear Bldg., Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06070

(860) 324-5726 (860) 324-6285 Fax: (860) 529-4265

Web site: [www.cpcanet.org](http://www.cpcanet.org)

March 23, 2012

### Testimony presented to the Joint Committee on Judiciary

Chief Anthony Salvatore and Chief Matthew Reed for the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association

The Connecticut Police Chiefs Association (CPCA) represents all municipal police departments in Connecticut as well as police departments at private and state universities.

The Connecticut Police Chiefs Association **SUPPORTS H.B. 5534, AAC Robbery Committed at a Bank or Credit Union.**

This proposal will amend Connecticut's robbery statute to include conduct not previously codified as constituting robbery but nonetheless out to be considered as such. The proposed bill will add to the definition of physical force or threatened physical force the act of wearing a mask, hood or other device designed to conceal the identity of such person and causing another person to reasonably fear for his or her safety.

In the past, the investigation of a bank robbery has been challenged when investigators learned that the alleged robber simply approached a bank employee, and handed to the employee a note demanding money. The robber may have been wearing a mask or other material clearly meant to disguise or protect their appearance. However, the robber did not make any overt threat or imply the possession of a weapon. Nonetheless, the employee is frightened and certainly is made to feel that he or she must comply with the demands of the robber.

The statute as it currently exists does not include this conduct as robbery. However, the proposed amendment would allow the described conduct to be deemed a violation of the robbery statute.

CPCA supports this proposed amendment to the robbery statute.

END





# CONNECTICUT BANKERS ASSOCIATION

March 23, 2012

**To: Members of the Judiciary Committee**

**Fr: Connecticut Bankers Association  
Contacts: Tom Mongellow, Fritz Conway**

**Re: H.B. No. 5534 (RAISED) AN ACT CONCERNING ROBBERY  
COMMITTED AT A BANK OR CREDIT UNION.**

**POSITION: SUPPORT**

For decades, banks and their employees have had to deal with bank robberies. The entire industry always has to balance an accessible and friendly bank branch environment for their customers with effective security measures. Despite significant investment by the banking industry in these security measures, bank robberies remain a significant and common threat. In recent years, it has become apparent that certain Connecticut criminal statutes no longer provide an adequate deterrent for common bank robberies. Law enforcement and prosecutors need a statute which provides a clearer path to enforcement, charges and prosecution to deter and combat these crimes on a more uniform basis.

**The State "Robbery" Statute is no longer a deterrent** – Today, bank robberies come in many different forms. Sometimes the robbers will carry weapons and/or make overt threats to tellers and branch personnel. In those particular instances, our existing "robbery" statute clearly applies because the statute covers situations where the robber "uses or threatens the immediate use of physical force".

All too often, however, robbers will not display a weapon or make overtly threatening statements. They will, instead, wear masks and engage in conduct that causes bank tellers and others to fear for the possibility of physical harm. These implied threats are just as traumatizing and have the same practical impact as a robber who actually displays a weapon. Unfortunately, however, several of the courts in our state have refused to apply the "robbery" statute to

these types of crimes (apparently because the crime did not involve the "use" or overt "threat" of physical force).

In these scenarios where implied threats of harm were used by the robber the police and prosecutors, by virtue of the existing statute, will often use the lesser charge of "larceny". Indeed, there have been recent incidents where serial robbers (i.e., criminals who commit multiple robberies, often back-to-back on the same day) are charged with "larceny" or "breach of peace". Defense attorneys are keenly aware of the unenforceability of the "robbery" statute in certain GA's and will frequently seek plea bargains for the lesser charge.

Law enforcement personnel and bank security officers are convinced that bank robbers (particularly serial robbers) are aware of the deficiencies in Connecticut's enforcement scheme. They are not deterred by the threat of "larceny" and "breach of peace" charges and adjust their robbery tactics to avoid the more serious "robbery" charge. But the ultimate impact of this crime is just the same as a "robbery".

**The Forgotten Human Impact** – When people think about bank robberies they often think about the financial loss to the institution. In most cases, however, that is not the most significant concern. The most significant concern for bankers is the *human impact*.

Bank branch tellers and employees are subject to extreme stress during and immediately after a robbery situation. After a robbery employees need and receive counseling, time off and whatever services are necessary to overcome the trauma of the event. However, even with those efforts many are afraid to come back to work for various reason, such as fear of retribution from the criminal. Understandably, they often need extended time off or counseling. They may also request assignment to a different branch or they may never even come back to work.

Customers may also be subject to that extreme stress and there are many examples where they no longer feel safe doing their business in a bank branch that was robbed.

Clarifying the statute will lessen the number of employees and customers subject to the trauma of bank robberies.

**Coalition of support for a clarification** - There is agreement within a coalition of interested groups that this statute needs to be clarified. That coalition currently includes representatives from the CBA and bank security officers. The Police Chiefs Association, the FBI and various District Attorneys are also being briefed on this proposal. We hope and expect that they will also see the need for this important clarification.

**Other states are introducing similar bills** - We are not alone with this concern. Our neighboring state of Massachusetts introduced legislation just last year to clarify and strengthen their bank robbery statute and Pennsylvania passed similar changes in 2010.

**No change in sentencing standards** - It's important to note that we are not suggesting "tougher" sentencing standards; we are only recommending that a bank robbery be uniformly treated as a robbery and not as a minor offense. To this end, we would propose that the robbery statute be amended to clearly cover "implied threats" of physical harm so that all courts in Connecticut have the same view with respect to the application of the "robbery" statute.

**Suggested Revision to H.B. 5534**: The CBA applauds the Committee's proposal to strengthen the State's bank robbery statutes. We are, however, concerned that the bill as presently drafted *could impose overly stringent evidentiary requirements*. As drafted, police and prosecutors would have to find a way to show that the robber had the "intent to cause another person to fear for his physical safety." Proving the "intent" of the robber in many cases, could be problematic and nullify the purpose of the bill.

Respectfully, we suggest that certain statements or conduct should *automatically* be construed as "threatening the immediate use of physical force".

For example, wearing a mask or a disguise (or otherwise attempting to conceal facial features) while taking property from a bank should automatically be viewed as sufficient evidence of intent to commit bank robbery if that conduct reasonably causes a bank teller to fear for his or her physical safety.

We look forward to the opportunity to work with the Judiciary Committee on this important issue and thank you for your consideration of this concept.

**S - 649**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2012**

**VOL. 55  
PART 14  
4223 - 4505**

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr  
SENATE

306  
May 9, 2012

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the first item appears on Senate Agenda Number 1, Substitute House Bill Number 5342, move to place on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

On Senate Agenda Number 3, Madam President, under -- under House Bills Favorably Reported, first is House Bill 5326, move to place the item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar 5025, move to place the item on the consent calendar.

HB 5025

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And Calendar 5534, move to place the item on the consent calendar.

HB 5534

THE CHAIR:

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr  
SENATE

307  
May 9, 2012

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And Substitute House Bill 5539, move to place the item on  
the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Substitute House Bill Number 5320, move to place the item  
on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

An additional item from Senate Agenda Number 1, bottom of  
the first page of that agenda, Substitute House Bill 5462,  
move to place the item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And also, checking another item to see whether -- I'm not  
sure whether it had been previously marked from this copy.  
On the second page of -- of Calendar -- of Senate Agenda  
Number 1, Substitute House Bill 5394, the last item on that  
second page.

That's already on.

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr  
SENATE

317  
May 9, 2012

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

The Calendar Number 444 --

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

-- House Bill 5037 has just been added.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

That's right, Madam President.

And -- and also, Madam President, calendar page -- excuse me, it's -- rather I don't have the calendar page but it's Substitute -- it is Calendar 507, Substitute for House Bill 5467, Madam President, move to place that item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Got it. Thank you, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Now, Madam President, if the Clerk would now proceed to call the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, you may call the consent calendar now.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5358; House Bill 5148; House Bill 5394; House Bill 5326; House Bill 5025; House Bill 5534; House Bill 5539; House Bill 5320; House Bill 5462; House Bill 5394; House Bill 5511.

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr  
SENATE

318  
May 9, 2012

(HB 5283)

On page 3, Calendar 240, House Bill 3283; page 3, Calendar 299, House Bill 5437; page 5, Calendar 349, Senate Bill 374; page 6, Calendar 375, House Bill 5440; page 6, 362, House Bill 5011.

On page 7, Calendar 376, House Bill 5279; on page 7, 387, House Bill 5290; on page 8, 394, House Bill 5032; on page 8, 396, House Bill 5230.

Also on page 8, Calendar 398, House Bill 5241; on page 8, Calendar 393, House Bill 5307; on page 9, Calendar 403, House Bill 5087; on page 9, Calendar 406, House Bill 5276; on page 9, 407, House Bill 5484; on page 11, Calendar 424, House Bill 5495; on page 12, Calendar 435, House Bill 5232; on page 13, Calendar 5 -- excuse me Calendar 450, House Bill 5447; on page 14, Calendar 455, House Bill 3 -- I'm sorry -- House Bill 5353.

On page 14, Calendar 453, House Bill 5543; on page 14, Calendar 459, House Bill 5271; on page 15, Calendar 464, House Bill 5344; on page 15, Calendar 465, House Bill 5034; on page 16, Calendar 469, House Bill 5038; on page 17, Calendar 475, House Bill 5550; on page 17, Calendar 474, House Bill 5233; on page 17, Calendar 477, House Bill 5421.

Page 18, 480, House Bill 5258; on page 18, Calendar 479, House Bill 5500; page 18, Calendar 482, House Bill 5106; on page 18, Calendar 483, House Bill 5355; on page 19, Calendar 489, House Bill 5248; on page 19, Calendar 488, House Bill 5321; on page 20, Calendar 496, House Bill 5412.

On page 21, Calendar 504, House Bill 5319; page 21, Calendar 505, House Bill 5328; on page 22, Calendar 508, House Bill 5365; on page 22, Calendar 510, House Bill 5170; on page 23, Calendar 514, House Bill 5540; on page 23, Calendar 517, House Bill 5521.

Page 24, Calendar 521, House Bill 5343; page 24, Calendar 518, House Bill 5298; page 24, Calendar 523, House Bill 5504; page 29, Calendar 355, Senate Bill 418; on page 13, Calendar 444, 5037; and Calendar 507, House Bill 5467.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:





## State of Connecticut

SENATE CLERK'S OFFICE  
STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591  
(860) 240-0500

GAREY E. COLEMAN  
CLERK OF THE SENATE  
ERNEST J. COTNOIR  
ASSISTANT SENATE CLERK

TIMOTHY B. KEHOE  
PERMANENT ASSISTANT  
CLERK OF THE SENATE

### Bills placed on the Consent Calendar on May 9, 2012

5358  
5148  
5394  
5326  
5025  
5534  
5539  
5320  
5462  
5394  
5511  
5283  
5437  
374  
5011  
5440  
5279  
5290  
5307  
5032  
5230  
5241  
5087  
5276  
5484  
5495  
5232  
5447  
5543  
5353  
5271  
5344  
5038



State of Connecticut

SENATE CLERK'S OFFICE  
STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591  
(860) 240-0500

GAREY E COLEMAN  
CLERK OF THE SENATE  
ERNEST J COTNOIR  
ASSISTANT SENATE CLERK

TIMOTHY B KEHOE  
PERMANENT ASSISTANT  
CLERK OF THE SENATE

- 5233
- 5550
- 5258
- 5106
- 5355
- 5521
- 5248
- 5412
- 5319
- 5328
- 5365
- 5170
- 55440
- 5521
- 5298
- 5343
- 5504
- 418
- 5037
- 5467
- 5022
- 5259
- 5496
- 5360



**State of Connecticut**

SENATE CLERK'S OFFICE  
STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591  
(860) 240-0500

GAREY E. COLEMAN  
CLERK OF THE SENATE  
ERNEST J. COTNOIR  
ASSISTANT SENATE CLERK

TIMOTHY B. KEHOE  
PERMANENT ASSISTANT  
CLERK OF THE SENATE

Bills from Senate Agenda Number 3 from the May 9th Senate Session that were placed on the Consent Calendar

HB5304  
HB 5342

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr  
SENATE

319  
May 9, 2012

Good evening, Madam President.

I just want to clarify. I thought I heard the Clerk call House Bill 5034? Is that on the consent calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Do you know what page that is, sir?

SENATOR SUZIO:

No I -- he was reading so fast, Madam, I couldn't get it.

THE CHAIR:

It's -- yes it's 53 -- I don't know.

SENATOR SUZIO:

5034.

THE CHAIR:

5034, yes sir.

SENATOR SUZIO:

I object to that being put on the consent calendar, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Okay, that will be removed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Yes, just seeing that -- ask to remove that item from the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

rgd/tmj/gdm/gbr  
SENATE

320  
May 9, 2012

At this time we'll call a roll call vote on the consent calendar.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.  
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Coleman, we need your vote, sir.

Senator Kissel, Senator Kissel. Senator Kissel, will you vote on the consent calendar please?

All members have voted?

If all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you call the amendment -- I meant the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's consent calendar.

Total Number Voting	36
Necessary for Adoption	19
Those Voting Yea	36
Those Voting Nay	0
Those Absent and Not Voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The consent calendar has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I believe the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 6 for today's session.