



# Senate

General Assembly

**File No. 495**

February Session, 2026

Senate Bill No. 290

*Senate, April 8, 2026*

The Committee on Judiciary reported through SEN. WINFIELD of the 10th Dist., Chairperson of the Committee on the part of the Senate, that the bill ought to pass.

***AN ACT CLARIFYING THE MEANINGS OF "SEXUAL INTERCOURSE" AND "SEXUAL CONTACT".***

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

- 1 Section 1. (NEW) (*Effective from passage and applicable to acts occurring*
- 2 *before, on or after said date*) Any prosecution for a violation of sections 53a-
- 3 70 to 53a-73a, inclusive, of the general statutes may be brought on the
- 4 basis of a single act or two or more acts committed over a period of time
- 5 as a continuous course of conduct.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	<i>from passage and applicable to acts occurring before, on or after said date</i>	New section

**JUD**      *Joint Favorable*

The following Fiscal Impact Statement and Bill Analysis are prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and do not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose. In general, fiscal impacts are based upon a variety of informational sources, including the analyst's professional knowledge. Whenever applicable, agency data is consulted as part of the analysis, however final products do not necessarily reflect an assessment from any specific department.

**OFA Fiscal Note**

**State Impact:**

Agency Affected	Fund-Effect	FY 27 \$	FY 28 \$
Correction, Dept.; Judicial Dept. (Probation)	GF - Potential Cost	Minimal	Minimal
Resources of the General Fund	GF - Potential Revenue Gain	Minimal	Minimal

Note: GF=General Fund

**Municipal Impact:** None

**Explanation**

The bill, which allows sexual assault prosecutions to be based on multiple acts committed over time as a continuous course of conduct, results in a potential cost to the Department of Correction and the Judicial Department for incarceration or probation and a potential revenue gain to the General Fund from fines to the extent more individuals are found criminally liable. On average, the marginal cost to the state for incarcerating an offender for the year is \$3,300<sup>1</sup> while the average marginal cost for supervision in the community is less than \$600<sup>2</sup> each year for adults and \$450 each year for juveniles.

**The Out Years**

The annualized ongoing fiscal impact identified above would

<sup>1</sup> Inmate marginal cost is based on increased consumables (e.g., food, clothing, water, sewage, living supplies, etc.) This does not include a change in staffing costs or utility expenses because these expenses would only be realized if a unit or facility opened.

<sup>2</sup> Probation marginal cost is based on services provided by private providers and only includes costs that increase with each additional participant. This does not include a cost for additional supervision by a probation officer unless a new offense is anticipated to result in enough additional offenders to require additional probation officers.

continue into the future subject to the number of offenses and fines collected.

**OLR Bill Analysis****SB 290****AN ACT CLARIFYING THE MEANINGS OF "SEXUAL INTERCOURSE" AND "SEXUAL CONTACT".****SUMMARY**

This bill allows sexual assault prosecutions to be based on a single act or multiple acts committed over time as a continuous course of conduct. Current law, as interpreted by the state Supreme Court, does not allow for the latter.

In a 2022 state Supreme Court case involving 1st degree sexual assault, the court held that the existing sexual assault laws criminalize only individual acts and not a continuing course of conduct (*State v. Joseph V.*, 345 Conn. 516 (2022)). The court applied its ruling from another opinion released the same day, *State v. Douglas C.*, 345 Conn. 421 (2022) (see below), and reversed the 1st degree sexual assault conviction in the *Joseph* case and remanded it for a new trial.

Under *Douglas C.*, the court held that a defendant's constitutional right to jury unanimity is violated if (1) the defendant was charged with a single count for a single statutory violation; (2) the evidence supported separate incidents, each of which could independently establish the violation; and (3) there was not a specific unanimity instruction to the jury or a bill of particulars (a detailed itemization of the charges given upon the defendant's request). In this situation, the defendant is entitled to a new trial if there is the risk that the conviction was due to different jurors concluding that the defendant committed different acts of that crime.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Upon passage and applicable to acts occurring before, on, or after that date.

**COMMITTEE ACTION**

Judiciary Committee

Joint Favorable

Yea 41 Nay 0 (03/23/2026)