

Haggerty, Katie

From: Donald Palmer <donaldp2@cox.net>
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2015 12:06 AM
To: JudTestimony
Subject: Judiciary Committee Bills, I OPPOSE Senate Bill 650, HB6962, HB6848

April 9, 2015

Subject: Judiciary Committee Bills
I OPPOSE Senate Bill 650, HB6962, HB6848

Dear Committee Member,

I am writing to you because I am **OPPOSED** to several bills that have come before your committee. I urge you to **REJECT THESE BILLS NOW**, before they harm the good citizens of Connecticut. Several of these bills not only violate the United States Constitution, but also place undue burden and restrictions on law abiding citizens. Connecticut already has laws on the books to cover these areas. We need spend our limited and valuable resources enforcing existing laws and prosecuting the real criminals, not our law abiding citizens.

Proposed Senate Bill 650 – An Act Concerning Temporary Restraining Orders – OPPOSE

First of all, the reasoning for this bill is statistically flawed. There are over 7,900 restraining orders issued in Connecticut each year. Of these, there are only 14 victims of violence due to violations of restraining orders. That is 14/7900 or 1/10 of a percent. The majority of these violent attacks, (60%) are attacked with knives, blunt objects, hammers or hands. Only Thirty-nine percent involve hand guns. If the attacker wants to harm someone, taking his gun away will not stop them. There are plenty of hammers at home depot. Punishing citizens who have not committed a crime is wrong.

This bill would allow anyone (doctors, angry neighbors, ex-husbands, ex-wives, etc.), to place a restraining order on you, with little or no evidence that you are threat. It would strip you of your gun rights without due process of the law. This is in direct violation of the 4th Amendment, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated....".

This legislation would require a sworn police officer to serve all temporary restraining orders when the applicant indicates on the application that the respondent has access to a firearm or ammunition, or holds a valid state-issued firearm or ammunition permit or eligibility certificate, in order to immediately take "temporary" possession of all legally-owned firearms, ammunition and permits. Current law already provides a mechanism for committing dangerous persons involuntarily in an emergency situation, which already results in the committed person being prohibited from possessing firearms. Furthermore, Connecticut law already provides for "imminent risk warrants" to be issued, allowing law enforcement to seize firearms and ammunition when probable cause exists to warrant such necessary action. This bill takes unnecessary steps to blatantly circumvent our legal rights. **I urge you to reject this bill.**

HB 6962 – An Act Concerning Firearm Safety – OPPOSE

This bill would impose liability and penalties on firearm owners that do not lock up their *unloaded* firearms to prevent any person (not only minors) from potentially accessing the firearm.

I am a strong proponent of responsible gun ownership. As are most legal gun owners. **I urge you to reject this bill.**

The changes to "Section 1. Section 29-37i" that remove all of the current exclusions replacing them with "any person" language are vague and poorly written. This can only lead to many unintended consequences and problems.

The portion that replaces "Sec. 4 Subsection (d) of section 29-38c" that reverses the burden of proof obligation, placing the burden of proof on the citizen is completely contrary to the way this nation operates with the concept of "innocent until proven guilty."

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

As I read the bill, it seeks to confiscate legally-acquired firearms and ammunition without due process of the law. This bill would give those served with a restraining or protective order 24 hours to transfer all firearms and ammunition to a federally licensed firearms dealer (FFL) or surrender them to the Commissioner of Emergency Services and Protection. There seems to be no provisions for returning the firearms once the decision is appealed. This would legally force the owner to permanently dispose of his property while the order is being appealed. Currently I believe Connecticut allows the gun owner remove them from his possession by allowing a legally licensed relative to hold the firearms for them during the restraining order process. I believe current CT law is sufficient and no more restrictive laws are required. **Reject this bill.**

I urge you to reject these bills, as they unduly restrict the Constitutional rights of legal, law abiding citizens of Connecticut. Connecticut has plenty of existing laws on the books. We need spend our limited and valuable resources enforcing these laws and prosecuting the real criminals, not our law abiding citizens.

Thanks you for your precious time.
Don Palmer
Manchester ,CT