



State of Connecticut  
Department of Developmental Services

**DDS**

Dannel P. Malloy  
Governor

Terrence W. Macy, Ph.D.  
Commissioner

Joseph W. Drexler, Esq.  
Deputy Commissioner

**DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL SERVICES TESTIMONY  
BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**

**S.B. No. 986 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPLICABILITY OF PROBATE COURT ORDERS  
TO STATE AGENCIES**

**March 4, 2013**

Senator Coleman, Representative Fox and members of the Judiciary Committee. I am Terrence W. Macy, Ph.D., Commissioner of the Department of Developmental Services. Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony with the department's concerns on **S.B. No. 986 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE APPLICABILITY OF PROBATE COURT ORDERS TO STATE AGENCIES**.

Our department's concerns with **S.B. No. 986** center on provisions in section 1 that would enable the Probate Courts to require any state agency to follow a Probate Court's order or decree applicable to state agencies even though the Courts of Probate are courts of limited jurisdiction. We believe that this new provision could invite orders which exceed the Probate Courts' statutory authority. For instance, with an order from the court to fund an individual for services, or provide services to an individual, our agency's only recourse would be a Superior court appeal. An appeal to the Superior court should not be the only recourse for agencies in such situations. In addition, an order finding a person to have intellectual disability for purposes of the appointment of a guardian, could usurp the "contested case" UAPA rights for department eligibility determinations.

The probate courts already have the authority to enforce orders by convening a contempt "show cause" hearing if it is alleged that an agency has not complied with an order. The agency would have the opportunity to address the possible exercise of authority beyond what is conferred by statute, and if the Court still maintained its order, hold the agency in contempt, which could then be appealed to Superior court. In *Bellonio v. Richardson*, 2 Conn. Rpter 789, 1990 WL 274581 (1990), the Superior court ruled that the alleged failure of a state agency (DMR) to comply with an order within the limited jurisdiction of the probate court should be left to the probate courts' contempt authority for enforcement.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify to DDS's concerns with **S.B. No. 986**. Please contact Christine Pollio Cooney, Director of Legislative and Executive Affairs at (860) 418-6066, if you have any questions.

Phone: 860 418-6000 ♦ TDD 860 418-6079 ♦ Fax: 860 418-6001  
460 Capitol Avenue ♦ Hartford, Connecticut 06106  
[www.ct.gov/dds](http://www.ct.gov/dds) ♦ e-mail: [ddsct.co@ct.gov](mailto:ddsct.co@ct.gov)  
*An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer*