

Haggerty, Katie

From: Mvrckmr <mvrckmr@aim.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2015 4:05 PM
To: JudTestimony
Cc: Sen. Kissel, John A.; Rep. Sayers, Peggy
Subject: Raised Bill 6962, Proposed Bill 650, Governor's Bill 6848

Chairman Coleman, Chairman Tong, Vice Chairman Doyle, Vice Chairman Fox, Senator Kissel, Representative Rebimbas, Members of the Committee,

I am a voter from the town of Windsor Locks, and I oppose the following Bills:

Raised bill 6962 An Act Concerning Firearm Safety

Proposed Bill 650 An Act Concerning Temporary Restraining Orders

Governor's Bill 6848 An Act Protecting Victims of Domestic Violence

To be more specific I OPPOSE bill 6962 because it changes the language of existing law to differentiate storage of loaded firearms versus unloaded firearms. This is unnecessary as responsible law abiding firearm owners treat all firearms as if they were loaded. Criminals ignore laws by definition, so if this law were passed they would continue to ignore safe storage laws. This law will only affect the law abiding, so it is a solution looking for a problem that is not there. Also, this law makes the firearm owner strictly liable for damages if someone accesses their firearms and causes damage. This just lowers or removes the burden of proof required to collect damages. It is a sneaky way to hurt legal firearm owners. Another problem is the penalty for this law being increased to be a class D felony. It is inappropriate because we do not extend this the punishment to this level for any other item or tool (car, hammer, etc) that someone steals and harms another with.

My OPPOSITION to bill 650 has to do with the requirement that a police officer serve temporary restraining orders if the person owns firearms. Marshals handle this job just fine, and have no reason to escalate to violence as police do. We see it happen all the time where a police department escalates a simple administrative action into a high stress SWAT raid where citizens' homes are destroyed and people are unjustifiably killed. Also, I do not believe this bill addresses whom firearms are transferred to. A citizen who must transfer firearms must be given a reasonable time to do so, and not forced to transfer them to the state, or the police department with a firearm pointed at them. The citizen must be allowed to transfer them to a person of their choice, and then they are responsible for them.

Finally, I OPPOSE bill 6848 because of the language that it changes. The requirement to transfer firearms would be changed from 2 days to 24 hours. 2 days is barely workable in this situation as the order could be signed on Friday as the court is closing, and most FFLs are closed on the weekend, so making it less time is an undue hardship, and unfair to the citizen subject to the order. The only other option in this case is to surrender to the police. This is unfair, as when the final judgement is that the firearms are to be returned to the owner, the police are not immediately compliant with the order, or they drag the process out making it hard for the exonerated citizen. Another problem with the bill is the language change deleting the words, "and an opportunity to be heard". We are dealing with confiscation of citizens' personal property and as such, should err on the side of caution to not trample Constitutional rights. Every citizens deserves "an opportunity to be heard".

Sincerely,
M. Marek
Windsor Locks, CT