



subscribe

## This just in...

Viewing By Entry / Main

May 14, 2007

# Eight gay couples bring case for marriage to Connecticut

# Supreme Court

Posted At : 3:33 PM | Posted By : newsroom Related Categories: <u>Regional, News, New England, Legal, Gay issues</u>, <u>Connecticut</u>

HARTFORD, Conn. (AP) - An attorney for eight gay couples told the state Supreme Court Monday that their constitutional rights have been violated by the state's refusal to grant them marriage licenses.

Connecticut was the first state to allow civil unions without court pressure, but the couples say that's not enough.

They want the court to rule that the state's marriage law is unconstitutional because it applies only to heterosexual couples, effectively denying gay couples the financial, social and emotional benefits of marriage.

"What is denied to these families is something that goes to the heart of equal protection, which is the right to be part of the fabric of society when they are just the same as other couples and

### **Get Email Alerts**

Enter your email address to receive email alerts from this blog.



### **Recent Entries**

Calendar

marriage to Connecticut Supreme Court

other families," said their attorney, Bennett Klein.

Assistant Attorney General Jane Rosenberg, representing the state, argued that civil unions give gay couples the same rights by state law as married couples.

"(The question) is really, is the Legislature constitutionally required to use the word marriage when it's referring to the package of rights and benefits it has given to same-sex couples. And the answer is clearly no," Rosenberg said.

Arguments wrapped up after about three hours Monday, and the justices are expected to rule later this year.

Attorneys on both sides say a decision in the couples' favor could have nationwide implications for states that have adopted or are considering civil union-like legislation.

Currently, only Massachusetts allows same-sex couples to marry. Connecticut, Vermont, California, New Jersey, Maine and Washington have laws allowing either civil unions or domestic partnerships, with New Hampshire set to join in January. Hawaii extends certain spousal rights to same-sex couples and cohabiting heterosexual pairs.

The Connecticut couples who sued have been together between 10 and 32 years and say civil unions are inferior to marriage and violate their rights to equal protection and due process.

Married couples have federal rights related to taxes, Social Security beneficiary rules, veterans' benefits and other laws that people in civil unions don't have. Because civil unions aren't recognized nationwide, other rights, such as the ability to make medical decisions for an incapacitated partner, disappear when couples cross state lines.

The couples' claim was dismissed last year by a judge who said they received the equality they sought when Connecticut passed its civil unions law. The couples appealed.

In court Monday, the justices fired off questions at Klein.

"How can it reasonably be done or logically be done to sort of delink the long-standing, deeply held institutional aspect of marriage, that it's a union between a man and a woman, and then define marriage as something other than that for purposes of this argument?" asked Justice Richard Palmer.

Klein replied that the fundamental principles of marriage are not based on gender.

"It is really a relationship of two legal equals based on mutual consent by which they take responsibility for each other, and that relationship is protected by the state," he said.

The lawsuit names state Department of Public Health and the Madison town clerk's office, which denied marriage licenses to the couples based on state Attorney General Richard Blumenthal's advice.

A bill is pending in Connecticut's legislature to approve same-sex marriage, but leaders of the Judiciary Committee say they want to pull it from consideration this session because they do not believe enough lawmakers would vote to approve it. Republican Gov. M. Jodi Rell, who signed the civil unions bill into law, has said she would veto a gay marriage bill.

| -   |        |                |         | • ••  | •    | •      |            |
|---|--------|----------------|---------|-------|------|--------|------------|
| · · <u>jet, schedules CPA vote for next</u> |        |                |         |       |      |        |            |
|   | ··· •• | · · ··         |         | -     | ts E | Blog:  | Live       |
| f antic 10 Softball                         |        |                |         |       |      |        |            |
| -   |        |                |         |       | -    |        |            |
|   |        | -              |         | -     |      |        | -          |
| -   |        | <u>al arre</u> | st at 2 | 2004  | Rej  | public | <u>can</u> |
| hou   | -      | or C&S a       | mmo     | nia l | eak  | took   | 8          |
| not   | 115    |                |         |       |      |        |            |

Comments

#### Posted By Johnny Thunder:

Did New York City admit that it was a "wrongful" arrest or did they just decide to settle? \$2,500 is hardly large ...

#### Posted By JL:

Averge or not, clearly Boston wasn't looking at this side of the state (surprise!), which certainly peaked and stay ...

#### Posted By Johnny Thunder:

Gee, Bob. It wasn't as if I called you a left-wing pinhead. Lighten up.

#### Posted By Bob Merkin:

In America, we never leave wars to the military. As Commander-in-Chief, the president orders troops into combat. Th ...

#### Posted By Johnny Thunder:

Would have thought all the wackos in Shutesbury had died by now. Inbreeding appears to be alive and well there.



Archives By Subject

2006 election [43]
2006 primary [22]
2008 election [12]
Academy of Music [2]
Amh<u>erst [166]</u>

Amherst College [8]