

SB 429 public hearing 3/14/2016

Regarding Proposed bill S.B. No. 429 'AN ACT CONCERNING SERVICE OF RESTRAINING ORDERS'

I am writing in opposition to SB429. The proposed bill singles out legal firearms owners as a special class of citizen merely because they choose to legally own firearms.

Referring to line 133:

"When an application indicates that a respondent holds a permit to carry a pistol or revolver, an eligibility certificate for a pistol or revolver, a long gun eligibility certificate or an ammunition certificate or possesses one or more firearms or ammunition, the applicant may request that service of process be executed by a police officer in lieu of service by a proper officer. When service is to be executed by a police officer, the clerk of"

This is treating gun owners as separate class of citizen, and is implying that because they are permit holders they are more dangerous than non-permit holders. It gives the applicant the option of having police serve, but ONLY if the subjects are permit/cert holders, or have ammo or guns in the house. What about those respondents that possess other materials that can be used to perpetrate violence like knives, bats, clubs and fists? Is the applicant not to be equally protected in those circumstances? Isn't the point to protect ALL applicants who have a valid fear of physical reprisal?

Separating out legal gun owners and permit holders for special treatment does nothing to protect majority of the applicants in the long term. Studies have shown that permit holders are more law abiding than even police officers. Why are you looking to spike out their treatment and promote a standard that is exclusive to firearms owner and yet not based in fact?

This is a poorly conceived law and will not achieve its intended purpose, and I urge the committee to oppose this bill.

Sincerely,
William D. Curlew
60 Basswood Rd
Windsor CT 06095