

PA13-87

SB1157

House	6913-6926	14
Senate	2147-2152	6
		20

H – 1170

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 21
6911 – 7260**

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

374
May 28, 2013

Yes, Mr. Speaker. On page 31, Calendar Number 617, Favorable Report, the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary, Senate Bill Number 1157, AN ACT REQUIRING THE INCLUSION OF THE GRANTEE'S MAILING ADDRESS IN A DOCUMENT CONVEYING LAND.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Ritter of the 1st District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. What do you remark, sir?

REP. RITTER (1st):

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker, we are essentially changing the statutory provisions governing the conveyance of land. In this case, we're requiring, as the title sort of specifies, that the grantee's mailing address be included in it. However, I would add that we are also amending the insubstantial defect statute, 47- 36aa. So, essentially, if you were not

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

375
May 28, 2013

to do this, it would not have any -- the omission of the grantee's mailing address would not be a defect that would somehow undo the conveyance of land.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

Do you care to remark further on the bill that's before us?

Representative Cafero, the distinguished Minority Leader.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions, through you, to the proponent.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that if this bill were to pass and the grantee -- that's the person who's buying the property -- neglects to put their address on the conveyance document, it would not be a fatal error to that conveyance. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

376
May 28, 2013

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

That is correct, through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (1ST):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I guess I would ask, if that's the case, why are we doing this bill? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the testimony before the Judiciary Committee basically talked about some of the problems that municipalities have had, town clerks have had where they felt this would be helpful tool for them, particularly for things like blighted properties and things like that. And so the feeling was although, as the good Minority Leader refers to it, it's not a fatal defect, but putting this provision in, in some instances, may help town clerks and municipalities know who owns certain properties, particularly those that become problem

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

377
May 28, 2013

properties in the town or municipality. Through you,
Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this document, or the bill that's before us, does not comment on the fact that anybody who buys land has to be listed as an owner on state tax records and other various records that are related to the piece of property in question. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

That is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (1^{42nd}):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If it's the case that document, a conveyance document really is a snapshot in time, meaning at that particular time, it indicates who the seller was and who the buyer was at that time. And with regard to any address of the seller or the

med/gbr

378

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 28, 2013

buyer, that could change over time. Is that not correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

That is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you. So, Mr. Speaker, if the purpose of the bill is to assist town clerks in sort of identifying or locating the buyer, and we understand that the document in question that we're asking them to put their address on is a snapshot in time, and we recognize the fact that people who buy property can move once, twice, three, four, five, twenty times in the course of ten years, five years, one year, then that address that would have been listed on the conveyance document could be of absolutely no significance at the time in which the town clerk wants that information.

Isn't there another place the town clerk, based on tax records or otherwise, could find out the

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

379
May 28, 2013

address of the owner of the property? Through you,
Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is true. I mean there also may be instances, though, and this is what the testimony said, where the feeling was that the addresses that were given were not always accurate. They were complicated. Sometimes they would have multiple addresses or PO boxes and things like that, so the more specificity they could get, the better. But I would certainly say that there might be some examples where this particular statutory scheme would not necessarily achieve the end which it is trying to achieve in this particular instance, but certainly in the original conveyance, it might be helpful for municipalities. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, is there any fee associated with the underlying bill; in other words, would the grantee either have to

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

380
May 28, 2013

pay a fee if they didn't list their name or a penalty or any such thing? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Not to my knowledge. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Chamber, at twenty minutes to eleven with about a week left to this session, we find ourselves doing this bill. And like many of you, you might see on your computers or in hard copy the history of the bill. And usually, in the history, they give a summary after the actual bill language, and they talk about sources of support, sources of opposition, response from an administrative agency, et cetera.

In this particular case, the response from the administrative agency is none. The nature and sources of support is none. The nature and sources of opposition is none. And it begs the question, at twenty minutes to eleven on May 28th, why in God's name

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

381
May 28, 2013

we're doing this. We don't have a budget. We haven't done so many other important things, but we decide to do this bill, which I think, with due respect and no reflection on the good Representative Ritter who brought it out, is meaningless.

There's no fee associated with it. There's no penalty if you don't follow it. We recognize the fact that every piece of property has to have a listed owner in the tax records. We recognize the fact that any document that's a conveyance document is a snapshot in time and that the grantee's address could change and does change often. Why the heck are we doing it? But here it is before us. No support, no opposition, no response from an agency. No reason to do it, but here it is. Not a good use of time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Thank you, sir.

Would you care to remark further on the bill that is before us?

Representative Rebimbas of the 70th District.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker, I think I'm going to certainly echo the

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

382
May 28, 2013

sentiments that have already been represented by Representative Cafero. But just for clarification purposes, a few questions to the proponent of the bill. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Please proceed, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, Mr. Speaker, what exactly is the purpose of the bill that is before us? Through you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I believe that the purpose of the bill is to make sure that, again, as in the testimony that we heard or was before the Judiciary Committee, when it was moved on unanimously, sort of indicated was to allow -- help town clerks and municipalities have a better and easier handle of the grantee's mailing address in issuance of the conveyance of land. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Rebinbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

383
May 28, 2013

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't that information already be available to town hall as a result of the tax bill that they send to the grantee? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly in some instances, but again, there was some feeling that, and particularly, I suppose, in some larger municipalities or some larger corporation where they own a lot of land that there was some confusion at times about who to notify about certain problems in the municipality. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I can appreciate the response, but putting feelings aside, if there's someone that you need to contact regarding issues regarding the property, whether that be blight issues or any other type of issues, you already have the address. You're sending a tax bill. So, but for an

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

384
May 28, 2013

issue of a nonpayment of a tax bill, which quite frankly, you're not going to find an address on, then, the deed that's going to be a correct address, where is there a need? This is certainly a bill, once again, maybe identifying a potential problem, but it certainly is not a resolution to that problem. If the town cannot find a proper address for a grantee or a property owner where they're sending a tax bill already, asking them to put the address on a deed is going to do absolutely no good. So this is a waste.

I looked at the voting record of the Judiciary Committee, and I recall this very well. We did pass this out of committee because, quite frankly, there was nothing actually offensive about it. But as we are here today on the House floor, at this late hour, to identify appropriately what the intent of the bill is and know that the bill before us does not address that, it's just, again, one more mandate on the grantee to assure that there is an address on the document, one more mandate on those attorneys who are doing the transaction to make sure that it's on the document.

There's already so much information that's going to be required on the document. I would actually say,

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

385
May 28, 2013

because the document recording carries fees, if this actually carries on to an additional page, once again, that person who's recording the document may actually have an additional fee. So, although the bill that's before us does not actually say and there's a fee associated with the recording or not recording of the address, if the address actually carries the deed on to be an additional page, there could potentially be a fee here. For what purpose? For no purpose.

So although this bill was voted out of Judiciary unanimous, I think, Mr. Speaker, it's about time that we start identifying the necessities of the importance of the bills that we are addressing here on the House floor and that we need to vote on and for purposes of, again, identifying the fact that this does not address any sort of need and the information is already readily available, I will be voting no.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Thank you, madam.

Would you care to remark further on the bill that's before us? Would you care to remark further?

If not, staff and guests to the well of the House. Members take your seats and the machine will be open.

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

386
May 28, 2013

THE CLERK:

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

SPEAKER SHARKEY

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

I would just ask -- we will be doing a brief bit of business after the vote is taken, so I just ask that members not leave the Chamber just yet after the vote is tallied.

But if all the members have voted, please check the board. Make sure your vote is properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

In concurrence with the Senate, Senate Bill
Number 1157:

Total number voting	137
Necessary for passage	69
Those voting Yea	104

med/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

387
May 28, 2013

Those voting Nay 33

Those absent and not voting 13

SPEAKER SHARKEY

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

Representative Aresimowicz.

REP. ARESIMOWICZ (30th):

Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of an announcement, please.

SPEAKER SHARKEY

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ARESIMOWICZ:

Mr. Speaker, as we know, this weekend was Memorial Day. Many of us took part in many ceremonies in our local towns, but I wanted to take a moment to honor those in the Chamber. We heard about Representative Adinolfi, and we congratulate him on his service. But we have numerous other veterans in the Chamber, and I'd just like to take this opportunity to have them stand and ask that the Chamber recognize them as such for their service to their country with a nice round of applause for the service. Thank you very much.

If you're a veteran, stand. Only veterans should stand.

S - 658

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 7
1827 - 2152**

Connecticut. So I -- I add my thanks and gratitude to those individuals.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

This time, at this time, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

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:

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

Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 1143.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 26, Calendar 534, Senate Bill Number 1157, AN ACT REQUIRING THE INCLUSION OF THE GRANTEE'S MAILING ADDRESS IN A DOCUMENT CONVEYING LAND, Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Hello, again, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Let's bat all the way.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

I'll move acceptance of the joint committee's
Favorable Report and passage in connection with this
bill.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you
remark, sir?

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Yes, Madam President; thank you.

This bill, very simply, would require any individual
who conveys property to include in the instrument
conveying that property the current mailing address of
the grantee, the recipient of that property.

And this bill is thought to be needed because many
municipalities would like to be assured of an
effective means of being able to communicate with the
owners of property for various purposes, including tax
collection, maintenance, and repair issues and to help
eliminate blight, to list the -- the owner in efforts
to eliminate blight in specific neighborhoods within
the municipality.

I'll urge support for the bill, Madam President.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Sénator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you, very much, Madam President.

It's a good bill, ought to pass. I don't recall that there was any testimony in opposition to the bill, and I think specifically for affording municipalities a means of locating property owners, it would be very advantageous and helpful and be better for all of our communities going forward.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Yes, Madam Chair; I'll be brief.

In Planning and Development Committee, we've had great discussion on this particular topic; in fact, there's a bill pending before us currently, involving a statewide blight study. And part of the major reason that we have the problem is that we can't reach the owners of any of these places, so this is a very valuable bill, and I strongly urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Ayala.

SENATOR AYALA:

Thank you, Madam President.

I -- I want to salute the Chairman of Judiciary for bringing this bill out. This is an important issue that affects us all. I know that in the City of Bridgeport, working with our Blight Department, the director of that department, Mr. Chris Rosario has spoken with me on many instances in regards to the work that he does. And oftentimes the problem exists with the fact that they're not able to communicate with the property owners. And the fact that we get some type of an address that we can be able to send a notice to them to let them know that this property is under some form of blight, it creates an eyesore in our communities, and it makes it just difficult to be able to follow up, because in you don't have an address to be able to reach out to these individuals, it just makes it hard for them to attend to these matters. So I -- I want to thank the Chairman of Judiciary for moving this bill. It's an important bill and I urge support of it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Madam President, I just want to acknowledge Senator Ayala's compliments and also to thank him for his input concerning the bill.

And if there's no, nothing further to be said, I'll ask that the item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection -- oh; there's an objection.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote,
and --

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call --

THE CHAIR:

-- the machine will --

THE CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

If everyone has voted, if everyone has voted, the
machine will be closed.

A VOICE:

(Inaudible.)

THE CHAIR:

Oh, wait a minute. I just closed the machine. I
think I closed it. Sorry. How do we -- what do we
do? Don't go away, Paul.

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Madam Chairman, I apologize. Could I be recorded in
the affirmative?

A VOICE:

That'll work.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle, will you please vote on the machine.
Thank you.

All, if all members have voted, all members have
voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 1157.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Those of you that are here, if you could stay close to
the Chamber.

Senator -- Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thanks, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Oh, sorry. The -- the bill is passed; oops.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President --

THE CHAIR:

Now Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

-- if the Clerk would call as the next item, Calendar
Page 27, Calendar 540, Senate Bill 868, to be followed
by Calendar Page 35, Calendar 39, Senate Bill 597, and
Calendar Page 35, Calendar 171, Senate Bill 845.