

Judiciary Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No: HB-5428 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

AN ACT CONCERNING THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF THE
Title: INSPECTOR GENERAL.

Vote Date: 3/24/2026

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 3/18/2026

File No.:

***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:

Judiciary Committee

CO-SPONSORS:

Rep. Antonio Felipe, 130th Dist.

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill provides clarification as to the scope of the powers and duties of the Inspector General. It clarifies physical custody as the requirement for in-custody death, that the Inspector General makes recommendations to law enforcement agencies and may issue reports regarding the death of any person who dies in the physical custody of the Commissioner of Correction, that the Inspector General has the authority to investigate in-custody deaths, and that their subpoena power extends to compelling attendance and testimony of any person having knowledge pertinent to any Inspector general investigation.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Patrick Griffin, Chief States Attorney, Division of Criminal Justice: Patrick Griffin supports the legislation, because it clarifies the statutory powers and duties of the Office of the Inspector General. He notes that the bill specifies the Inspector General's jurisdiction over in-custody deaths applies only when a person dies in the physical custody of a peace officer, law enforcement agency, or the Department of Correction. This ensures the provision does not extend to individuals who remain in the DOC's legal custody, such as those on parole. The bill also clarifies the Inspector General's authority to issue reports and make recommendations to law enforcement agencies and the Commissioner of Correction

following investigations and ensures that the office's subpoena power extends to compelling testimony at investigative depositions conducted by the Inspector General or a designee.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

None expressed.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Florencio Cotto, President, Police Officers Association of Connecticut (POACT):

Florencio Cotto and the Police Officers Association of Connecticut (POACT) oppose the legislation, because it would expand the authority of the Office of the Inspector General in ways that are unfair, unnecessary, and harmful to police officers and other public safety personnel. He argues that police officers are already subject to significant scrutiny and oversight, and the bill would create an additional pathway for discipline or termination despite existing accountability systems. He also raises concerns that the bill expands the Inspector General's authority into the Department of Correction, which is unnecessary given the existing role of the DOC Ombudsman. It could create overlapping authority and inconsistent outcomes. He believes the proposal interferes with local control and broadens the Inspector General's subpoena power in ways that could create fairness and due process concerns.

Zak Leavy, Deputy Director, AFSCME Council 4: Zak Leavy opposes the legislation, because it would expand the authority of the Office of the Inspector General beyond its current scope and create another avenue for terminating police officers' employment. He contends that police officers already face a high level of scrutiny and that the bill would also unnecessarily expand the Inspector General's role into the Department of Correction, which already has an Ombudsman to ensure accountability. Leavy also raises concerns about provisions that would direct the Inspector General's recommendations to law enforcement agencies. This could interfere with local decision-making by police chiefs and elected officials and could unfairly prejudice departments that decline to follow such recommendations. Provisions expanding the Inspector General's subpoena power could be overly broad and could allow the office to compel testimony without clear limits.

Reported by: Justin Lamoureux

Date: March 30, 2026