

Moniz-Carroll, Rhonda

From: Arthur Mazeau <amazeau@evergreenspringsconsulting.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 10, 2015 1:46 PM
To: JudTestimony
Subject: Testimony on HB6962, HB6848, and SB650

Please accept this as my testimony on the above mentioned bills for your consideration:

To: Connecticut State Judiciary Committee
Subject: Testimony Regarding HB 6962, SB 650, HB6848
Hearing Scheduled for: March 11, 2015 in Room 2E

From: Arthur D. Mazeau
229 Killingworth Turnpike Lot #17
Clinton, Ct. 06413

Members of the Committee:

I am writing to Voice my opposition to all three of these bills as proposed.

HB6962:

I am totally opposed to this bill.

Having no children at home, why should I or my wife, also a license permit holder be prevented from access to the weapons we may need for self-defense?

This bill proposes regulations to prevent access to firearms from "Another Person". While I am a conscientious and safe gun owner that does use locked storage for my firearms, I cannot prevent someone from gaining access to my home when I am not there, breaking into any of my safes, and removing my firearms from my home. The sad thing is that this law will do nothing to prevent that from happening in any way shape or form.

Yet this bill would leave me with the responsibility of proving that I was not negligent, rather than consider the act a crime, and allow the confiscation of my properties and leave me with the burden of proof of compliance and at the same time deprive me of my property. This is a clear violation of my rights and cannot be abided by.

SB650:

I have seen on many occasions where there is a false statement made to police, in effort to remove a spouse from the home. While there may be no way to prove such statement is false, it does happen and is often used by an angry spouse.

Without actual proof that there is a danger, there is no legal right to remove from possession property that has not been used in a crime. That is saying that "You are being charged with the crime of possession of guns, because we think there is a possibility that this person's statement is true". And if the statement is false? Just made to deny the opposite spouse access to the home for no reason? I am not comfortable with taking one person's word over the other just to have an opportunity to confiscate weapons that have never been used in a crime and that are owned by a law abiding citizen. It goes too far and is against my 2nd amendment rights.

HB6848:

I cannot find any reason to change the current 14 day hearing period from Temporary Restraining Order, it should be left as is. As a permit holder that has already been investigated and checked for any reason that would prevent us from obtaining that permit legally, We deserve the right to be treated as any other citizen, and be innocent until proven guilty. There is no legitimate reason that I can think of that would allow the State to deny us that right of due process, and confiscate our legally owned and obtained weapons.

I must also say no to the proposed changes that would give us no rights to dispose of our weapons by offering them for sale to a licensed FFL if served with a Temporary Restraining Order. There is no right of the government to confiscate and keep or destroy my property when I have not been tried and convicted of a crime. If there is, I have to say that that law is criminal in itself.

Respectfully,

Arthur D. Mazeau