



## State of Connecticut

### DIVISION OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICES

Office of Chief Public Defender  
55 Farmington Avenue, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hartford, Connecticut 06105  
(860) 509-6405 Telephone  
(860) 509-6495 Fax

Deborah Del Prete Sullivan  
Legal Counsel, Director  
[deborah.d.sullivan@pds.ct.gov](mailto:deborah.d.sullivan@pds.ct.gov)

Testimony of John R. DelBarba, Assistant Legal Counsel  
Office of Chief Public Defender

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE - MARCH 2, 2026

Raised S.B. 292

#### AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEFINITION OF "CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE MATERIAL"

The Office of Chief Public Defender (OCPD) strongly opposes Raised Bill 292, *An Act Concerning the Definition of "Child Sexual Abuse Material,"* which follows last session's Raised S.B. Bill 1439, *An Act Concerning the Definition of "Child Sexual Material"*<sup>1</sup>. This office believes that this is a very important issue - now involving Generative AI - that should minimally be examined further by either a working group and/or the Connecticut Sentencing Commission, as the rapid advancement of Generative AI continues to develop and expand into all areas of our lives. The Sentencing Commission prepared a 68-page report in 2018 that thoroughly examined the complex issues and supported H.B. 5578, *An Act Concerning the Recommendations of the Connecticut Sentencing Commission with Respect to the Sexual Offender Registry*.<sup>2</sup>

At that time the Sentencing Commission developed a new proposal to reform the outdated child pornography statutes.<sup>3</sup> While the outcome of its efforts did in fact lead to proposed recommendations of the Sentencing Commission with respect to this and other areas, unfortunately, the proposal was not raised for a public hearing at that time.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.cga.ct.gov/2025/TOB/S/PDF/2025SB-01439-R00-SB.PDF>

<sup>2</sup> See Annual Report 2018: Connecticut Sentencing Commission. This was one of two bills thoroughly examined by the Commission.

<sup>3</sup> [An-Act-Concerning-Recommendations-of-the-Sentencing-Commission-with-Respect-to-Penalties-for-Sex-Offenders.pdf](#)

Fast forward to 2025, and last session’s *Raised S.B. 2*<sup>4</sup> as well as *Raised S.B. 1440*<sup>5</sup> that further introduced the Dissemination of Generative AI images which this office provided testimony on and raised – and continues to raise – several serious constitutional concerns with the language, in addition to the fact that this collective legislation is an attempt at creating a new form of criminal conduct based on Generative AI that generates images that appear real - but are simply not. This office continues to suggest that there appear to be provisions in these bills that are overbroad and vague, chilling production of works protected by the First Amendment.

Prior proposed bills were an attempt – an ultimately successful one – at addressing what is commonly known as revenge porn. This bill attempts to go even further. This bill is an attempt to expand the definition of child porn. The intent here is different but still based on Generative AI. Furthermore, this office would suggest that images of people who are NOT real and do NOT represent images of real people is a line that must be considered in whether or not to go down the path of creating and expanding further criminal offenses in the real world for the State of Connecticut.

Lastly, an overarching concern regarding child pornography and by groups such as the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children is the continued distribution of *real* victim’s images. (“[I]mages and videos document victims’ exploitation and abuse, but when these files are shared across the internet, child victims suffer re-victimization each time the image of *their sexual abuse* is viewed. In a recent survey led by the Canadian Centre for Child Protection, 67% of CSAM survivors said the *distribution of their images* impacts them differently than the hands-on abuse they suffered because the distribution never ends and the images are permanent (emphasis added)).”<sup>6</sup> While this office understands the serious nature of child porn, the images addressed in this bill are not real. They are not indistinguishable from real children who are child victims. They are not real at all.

As a result, the Office of Chief Public Defender **opposes** this bill as drafted and asks that the Committee take no action. In the alternative, this office respectfully proposes either the creation of a Working Group and/or the re-examination and potential continuation of the exhaustive work of the Sentencing Commission. Thank you for your consideration.

---

<sup>44</sup> [https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&which\\_year=2025&bill\\_num=2](https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&which_year=2025&bill_num=2)

<sup>55</sup> [https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&which\\_year=2025&bill\\_num=1440](https://www.cga.ct.gov/asp/cgabillstatus/cgabillstatus.asp?selBillType=Bill&which_year=2025&bill_num=1440)

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.missingkids.org/theissues/csam>