STATE OF CONNECTICUT, CHILD SUPPORT GUIDELINES COMMISSION MEETING

***These are draft minutes and have not yet been approved by the Commission**

Formatted: Font color: Red

Minutes for the October 2, 2025, meeting held via Zoom, YouTube live, and in person in Room 1E of the Legislative Office Building, 300 Capital Avenue, Hartford, CT. Agenda items are bolded.
Scribe: Gregory Bennett, DSS/OCSS

5:03pm – Call to order, provision for meeting minutes.
Roll Call
Present: CFSM Michael Ferguson, Chair, Graham Shaffer, Carolyn Signorelli, Campbell D. Barrett, Virginia Brown, Darren Pruslow, Allison E Post, Cara Pavalock D'Amato, and Susan Hamilton.

Not present: Gary Winfield, Amy Calvo MacNamara, Michael Werner, Scott Storms.

Minutes from the September 11, 2025 meeting moved to adopt by Graham Shaffer. Motion carried unanimously.

5:06 pm – Receipt of comments on proposed regulation

Magistrate Michael Ferguson began the meeting and stated there is a list of people who signed up and they have 3 minutes. He called on Cheryl Vallareal. There was no response, and it appeared there were technical difficulties. Magistrate Ferguson then called on Henry Martocchio. Henry stated that he was hoping to get a little bit into what is actually going on with the child support guidelines here because he was not sure it was notified to him. He stated that he believes a 3-day notice but couldn't get any technical assistance or technical guidance to what this even committee is involved in. He respectfully requested that we figure out what is going on and what we're amending here to the child support guidelines because 4DS is going to be taken away from "you people" very shortly and stated that he is a part of the people who are doing that. Henry stated that the corruption that has occurred throughout his life with his child in family courts, all types of situations, he says all program services and activity of the State of Connecticut involving state actors, state players, bar associations, non bar members, and even your Honor. He asked Magistrate Ferguson who is 28CFR35.107 and stated that it has been a 17 year request to him for Judicial to identify even after numerous settlement agreements with the Department of Justice. He stated this commission here, as a legislative body, also has a settlement agreement underneath Raymond v Rowland. Henry stated that everyone continues to be non-compliant of the administrative duties of Title 2, Title 3. He stated that he could care less about Title 1 which is employees of the State of Connecticut. He stated that he is another advocate aspect and is informing this panel right here now, because again, he has no idea why this panel is convening, and he could not get the technical published information that's needed to make an adequate argument. Henry stated that we have 17 days ladies and gentlemen, and you'll be learning about the Family Justice and Accountability Act. He stated that in that Act 2025 that has been introduced in a public hearing, and already has sponsorship, we're not sharing nothing with you people, just like you're doing nothing now. He stated we have to leave the State of Connecticut to get our fundamental constitutional rights enforced by our government. He said that state actors and state players of this system, not only if we're going to talk about child support, that is a forced contract with threat of duration, to be arrested, and your credit is destroyed. He stated if we look at the 1935 Social Security Act that gives your funding, he'd like you ladies and gentlemen to read the purpose. He state that the purpose is not defined there and in 1935 most households were run by one parent working and the other one staying at

home taking care of their family and children. He said that today upon your decrees, that is a forced contract by threat and by the way he was a parent supposed to be getting paid, he was told we don't put women in jail in the state of Connecticut. He stated that he finds the whole civil system in family court not even to be considered a court system and there is no due process whatsoever within the system. He stated that again, he is telling you now on the 17th you ought to pay attention to what is going on at our Congress, at the US Capitol. He stated that he had to work outside the system because there's not one in my State, representatives of Congress would even talk to us about this. He stated this is a fact that's been going on even underneath the GAL reform that was supposed to happen in 2016. He stated nothing has changed, Probate Courts were supposed to change. He started to say he has attorneys when Magistrate Michael Ferguson interjected to inform Henry that his time is up and stated if he would like to wrap it up he will let him wrap it up and summarize but his time is up. Henry stated that he would like to think it would be appropriate for this panel to explain what we are even convening for on the Child Support Guideline Commission. He asked what are we investigating, did he miss something last year, did he miss the appointment of this Commissioner, and can you please identify as he is a public person asking for information and advising this committee that it doesn't matter because the way our bill is written in Congress which we use case law that gives yourselves absolute immunity since 1870, we stripped that out too Your Honor. He said these people never gave the Bar Association a meeting. Magistrate Ferguson stated that he is well over, thanked Henry, and asked if any of the commission members had any questions for the gentlemen. Seeing none, Magistrate Ferguson stated we will move to the next person that signed up.

Magistrate Michael Ferguson called on Anna Cambridge to speak next and informed her that she has 3 minutes and may begin. Anna Cambridge stated that she is a resident of Hartford, CT and that she is in agreeance with Henry. Anna stated that she is not aware of why the panel is convening and does know that it has been quite some time since there have been any updates to the Connecticut Child Support Guidelines, with the year being in 2005. She stated that was 19 years ago and she was 17 at the time. She stated fast forward to now, 19 years later I am 37 years old and a proud mother of 3 beautiful children who she has not seen since March of 2023 because of the great State of Connecticut improperly modified a foreign out of state custody decree from the great State of California. Anna stated that rather than honoring the Constitution under the Full Faith Credit Clause for recognizing court orders from sister states, Connecticut turned the other cheek to allow any access or visitation to my children. She stated however, the great State of Connecticut did not turn the other cheek when it came to finding me, harassing me, and threatening me for child support. She stated that she already had a child support order from another state, and tried to present that to the Connecticut state and rather than being heard she was ignored and threatened with an arrearage. Anna stated that she was threatened with her license being suspended and wage of garnishment but the whole time she hadn't seen her children. Anna stated that they had no ear for my voice when it came to the family court, but Connecticut definitely had their ears wide open when it came to collecting child support. She stated Connecticut erred when they did not honor the order from California but rather used federal programs from another state, multiple states, to find her, locate her, when she was fully present the whole entire time. Anna stated hello, here is respondent mother Anna Cambridge, pro se litigant, trying to gain access to her children but was then deemed unable to find, unable to locate. She asked how is that? That's contradicting if she was present and in the courtroom, but then child support agency is saying she's unable to locate and serve. She stated that she was getting threatened with her license getting suspended and arrearage, so none if this makes sense. Anna stated that she feels that this commission needs to really analyze what is going on and what is the true root of the problem. She stated that is deferral funding supporting state programs, we should not be, the states should not be receiving federal money for state to be able to run the state. She stated these are some of the reasons

why people like her and many others are not having access to their children but are getting threatened left and right from the federal program. Magistrate Michael Ferguson interjected and informed Anna that she is over time and if she would like to summarize, she may do so. Anna stated that her summary is that her name is Anna Cambridge and she is the mother of the children that the great state of Connecticut has denied me access to yet has no problem coming after me for a penny.

Magistrate Michael Ferguson then called on the next person on the list, Tasha Persaud. There was no response.

Magistrate Michael Ferguson then called on Dennis Johnson who was present. Magistrate Ferguson informed him that he has 3 minutes and may begin. Dennis Johsnon thanked everyone for this opportunity to share his experience with the committee. He stated that child support guidelines are mystery to him, and he's sure others as well. Dennis stated that the gatekeepers of the Connecticut guidelines seem to be the families services departments, attorneys, and judges. He stated that we, the people, are at their mercy and must trust their honesty. Dennis stated that he has suffered lifelong hardship for what he perceives as a flawed design. He stated that in 2010 his newborn child was taken out of Connecticut, and he was ordered to pay child support despite losing his career, his home, all his retirement accounts, and all investment due to false allegations but no conviction. Dennis stated that at the age of 55 he lost everything he worked for his entire life and still has to pay quite a lot of child support by selling everything he owned. He said fast forward now to 2015 when he became primary custodial parent and retained a law firm. He said two years later in 2017 to modify the order of the child support order so he could stop paying child support and get child support from the non-custodial parent. Dennis said the attorney who represented him drew up an unclear agreement with the child services department that stopped me from paying child support, but he unwillingly gave up his right to collect child support. He stated that no one told him and the gatekeepers did not inform him that he would not be getting child support. Dennis stated that for the next 7 years he went without child support with no known remedy to recoup the large amount of expenses and missing child support for 9 plus years of being a sole parent. He stated in 2024 when he relinquished his primary custody to the other parent and now as a senior, 69, with very serious health issues, abandonment, and child support payments. He stated his motion to modify child support sits in the court with no action being taken while he diligently continues to pay child support despite all other court orders being ignored and not being enforced by the court. Dennis stated he submits that child support should be tied to other court orders such as visitation. His message to this committee is common sense and transparency are missing from the process, and we have no idea how the child support guidelines work, and when an inquiry is made it is complex and computer generated. Dennis stated there needs to be built in considerations for deviations. He then asked do the guidelines take into consideration the potential earnings of the other party, do the guidelines ignore why one parent elects to work part time or not at all, does the process require the financial affidavits to be supported with documentation? He stated he has advocated for shared parenting, but the other party refuses to co-parent, there should be a penalty. Dennis stated the guidelines should consider shared parenting or the refusal to co-parent and verify income of both parties and take into account potential income for those who elect not to work. He stated consideration of the quality of life of all people involved should be addressed, gender roles need to be ignored, no parent should be hoodwinked into giving up their rights to child support, and there should be a remedy. He stated there should be a child support calculator that allows parents to input numbers and get an idea of what they're up against in some sort of deviation or verifiable circumstances. Dennis then thanked everyone for their time and this opportunity.

Magistrate Michael Ferguson stated the next person on this list is Maria McKeon and advised her that she has 3 minutes and may start now. Maria stated that she has served on the commission before, so she knows how much work you are putting into it and appreciates all the work you have been doing. She stated that she would like to give a couple of comments that might help people understand the guidelines better and help the courts understand them better. Maria stated that her first comment is the effective date of the new regulations, and she doesn't know if you can answer to this yet, do you have an effective date of the new regulations yet and it it going to be after. She stated she understands it has to go through the legislative process and have you contemplated when you might make them effective, assuming it goes through this next legislative session. Maria asked if you can answer my questions or if you are just taking comments. Magistrate Michael Ferguson informed her that we are just taking comments at this point. Maria asked if you could just make it clear in some of your regulations, one of the first things she would ask is the schedule that falls in the middle of it, it looks like the schedule of all the amounts for whatever reason it falls in the middle of the regulations. She asked if it could be considered moving to the end of the chart because it falls in the middle of all the language and a lot of people get confused. She stated they think the regulations end once they see the charts and they don't realize a lot of the deviation criteria and things like that are at the end. She stated it also asks if you would put a reference to 52-362B in there which is the statute that says the courts shall automatically withdraw child support from the employers paycheck unless they make a finding on the record that its in the best interest of the child not to do so. Maria stated that she has yet to find a court that understands that this statute even exists. She stated it has been very difficult because you take a lot of time doing it and when they miss it and it doesn't come out that way you have to do a motion to reconsider or appeal. She stated that you don't want to appeal over something like that and it also helps the court system if they do automatically withdraw it from the employer paycheck. Maria stated you don't have the issues of contempt motions come up because when someone doesn't pay their child support they end up having to file a contempt motion and its all on the obligee who has to do that, and they incur legal expense which is almost never paid. She stated in a contempt motion if contempt is even found but they almost never pay the legal fess, so it puts the obligee in the position of not getting the money and making it a difficult barrier to overcome to get the money. Maria stated some of it is lack of education by the courts and even the child support people that receive it. She stated that she is trying to go in order of the regulations, on pg. 39 there is a reference and throughout there is a couple of references to dependency benefits. She stated she knows it refers to the Social Security definition on pg. 7 but the way its used in the regulation it just refers to dependency benefits and one might think that has something to do with if you are getting some sort of welfare benefits or anything like that. Maria stated one would not know it goes together with this definition without doing that and asked if you could just clarify that and either capitalize dependency benefits or make a reference to the definition of page 7 having to do with Social Security that's found on pg. 39. She stated the pages aren't numbered but if she slides down on the Adobe worksheet it is on pg. 79. Magistrate Michael Ferguson stated that her time is up and asked if she can wrap up. Maria stated the other thing is the deviation criteria where it has shared custody, a lot of people are getting this mixed up and a lot of courts are getting it mixed up. She stated there needs a lot more clarity in that to understand that just because you have shared custody its not an automatic deviation and it has happened many times and we see it in the appellate court rulings. Maria stated if we could consider doing gross versus instated of net income because so many times people are using their mortgage and other deductions, they get that lowers their income and then the day after it happens the award is given it changes everything. Maria asked to seriously consider it would make it so much easier that we would be all on the same page instead of the games that get played as far as gross income. Maria stated that the last thing she had is the imputation of income. She stated the 32 hours is very good and she appreciates that. She stated under the share, the deviation criteria where you said two parents, whenever there is two parents it sounds like the

court can do whatever they want without it being sort of in the best interest of the child. She wonders if you might consider putting something in there that sort of modifies it to say in the best interest of the child so it just doesn't give the court free reign to do whatever they want. Maria asked if you don't have any other or too many people in line and you have the extra time at the end of the hearing would you consider allowing a few more minutes to anyone.

Magistrate Michael Ferguson thanked Maria for her comments and were also accepting written comments and based on what you said today you may want to submit something in writing as well with the other issues that you were talking about and possibly want to talk about. Maria asked if there is an email that you would like them sent to. Graham Shaffer clarified there is information on the e-regulation system about where to submit comments. He stated that you can actually submit them directly thought the e-regulation system for Connecticut if you pull up this proposed regulation. He stated that you can also send them to his email address which is listed. Graham mentioned the close of the public comment period is actually October 19th so you have some time.

Magistrate Ferguson stated that we are going to try to go back to Cheryl Veloreal who is having difficulty logging on. No response. Magistrate Ferguson then called on Natasha Persaud. No response. He then asked is there anyone else in the audience or that may be participating remotely. No response. Magistrate Ferguson stated that we are going to take a short recess just to see what is going on with the people trying to get in.

After a short recess Magistrate Michael Ferguson stated we tried to wait to see if there is anyone going to log on or appear in person and seeing none this will conclude the meeting.

5:29 pm – Adjournment