

Testimony for the Judiciary Committee on 3.11.2015

My name is E. Jonathan Hardy and I am a resident of Middletown, CT. I am also the Pistol Permit Specialist for Connecticut's largest grass roots firearms rights organization, the Connecticut Citizens Defense League (CCDL).

I strongly oppose all three of these bills present here today.

Proposed Bill No. 650 – An act concerning temporary restraining orders.

Position: **STRONGLY OPPOSED**

The stated purpose is simply misleading. From the current language, I quote "To provide greater protection to applicants who are granted temporary restraining orders by Connecticut courts."

Who is being protected? The vast majority of ex parte restraining orders do not get renewed because there was simply no threat. In fact, most ex parte orders as standard procedure during the dissolution of a relationship. Often, with no threat present at all.

I turn 44 tomorrow. In my entire life, I have had zero arrests. 15 years ago, I was served an ex parte order for one simple reason: My ex girlfriend was angry and it was a method used to prevent me from seeing my son.

Since there was no violence during this relationship, why can a simple and unverified claim cause one to go through such a process regarding firearms, without both parties being present.

At that time, I didn't have any firearms. However, if the same order was placed today, it would be a nightmare going through the court process. There are no provisions for returning property that has been seized under this bill. Currently, I own some firearms that are falsely referred to as "assault weapons". Combined with the last round of laws passed, there is no procedure in this bill for these items to be returned.

There is also nothing here for protection for those with permits and seeking to obtain any firearms permits or eligibility certificates. Under our current laws, you are issued a permit if you pass vague "suitability" scrutiny. That same level of scrutiny can be used to revoke your permit as well.

Quite simply: This bill is a solution looking for a problem but satisfies the agenda for those that do not like certain civil rights, mainly those that fall under the second amendment and our own state constitution Article 1, Sec. 15 "Every citizen has a right to bear arms in defense of himself and the state".

Raised Bill 6962 – An Act Concerning Firearms Safety

Position: **STRONGLY OPPOSED**

I understand the approach taken here is to change the law from a gun owner being responsible for the storage of their firearm from a minor to responsible for anyone having access.

Gun owners are responsible. You hear far more articles in the news about "professionals" and accidents (which we call negligence) over that of average citizens that happen to be gun owners. Many take additional training on how to protect their families with their firearms.

In a self defense situation, you simply do not have time to fumble with safes, lockboxes and such while a home invasion is in progress. Fight or flight reflexes kick in, adrenaline is mass produced and you are at a heightened sense of awareness. Fumbling around with a safe can be a matter of life or death.

Each household has a different dynamic. When my son was a child, I made my own provisions regarding safe storage so he wouldn't have access to a functioning firearm. All CT citizens should be able to make a plan that works out for their individual family needs, not legislators without the same experience and training.

Further, I would also add, this could end up embarking on another costly lawsuit for the state as these provisions also encroach on the Supreme Court decision in Heller v DC. In that case, mandatory storage requirements were struck down.

Governors Bill 6848 - AN ACT PROTECTING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

Position: **STRONGLY OPPOSED**

I strongly oppose this bill for the same reasons I oppose bill no. 650.

I'd further add that both of these bills provide no procedures to return ammunition once it is confiscated under an unverified complaint of another individual. Given the cost of ammunition and the falsely called "assault rifles", all of this is a clear violation of ones constitutionally guaranteed rights. Confiscation without representation at a hearing of any kind is simply unconstitutional.

Both of these bills, combined with the passage of SB 1160 a couple years ago, raise serious concerns over violating our own state constitution as well as the US Constitution and these concerns should be considered far above any agenda against CT's gun owners.