

Haggerty, Katie

From: Leif Eric Petterson Sr. <leifp@norsesys.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 1:48 PM
To: JudTestimony
Subject: SB-650 2015 SESSION

Gentlemen / Ladies,

I urge you to oppose SB-650 in its current form. The right to be treated as “innocent until proven guilty” and to have an opportunity to defend your rights in court before you are stripped of them is a fundamental element of our freedom. The low incidence of gun violence perpetrated by law abiding gun owners, especially those with carry permits, suggests that there is little justification for preemptive removal of second amendment rights, in connection with a mere request for restraining order. Certainly if an individual was disposed to settle a dispute with a firearm, they would likely not wait until after a restraining order was issued to do so. An individual who has been “suitable” to own and or carry a firearm, perhaps for many years, does not automatically become “unsuitable” without an opportunity to defend themselves simply because they are named in a domestic dispute.

The imposition of a restraining order is designed to cool a heated situation.. and can provide protection only if the restrained party is in fact law abiding. To strip a law abiding citizen of their rights without a hearing will not make the restraining order more effective, it may in fact make the situation worse. Legislators need to guard against getting caught up in their own imaginations, when law making. A restraining order is only a legal limitation it doesn't prevent criminal activity, if the restrained party is in fact not disposed to obey the law. If the restrained party is going to respond to the order, that is they are disposed to obey the law there is no reason to impose preemptive punishments on them. If they are not disposed to obey the law the restraining order is a fantasy, like an unprotected no fly zone.

Leif Eric Petterson Sr.
leifp@norsesys.com