

14 March 2016  
CT Judiciary Committee Public Hearing  
LOB Office Building Room 2C

Dear Chairmen and Members of the Judiciary Committee,

Concerning the list of following bills, I ask that you:

Oppose H.B. No. 5054 'AN ACT PROTECTING VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE'

Oppose H.B. No. 5622 'AN ACT CONCERNING THE AVAILABILITY OF ERASED RECORDS IN DETERMINING WHETHER A PERSON IS A SUITABLE PERSON TO CARRY A PISTOL OR REVOLVER'

Oppose S.B. No. 429 'AN ACT CONCERNING SERVICE OF RESTRAINING ORDERS'

Oppose S.B. No. 442 'AN ACT CONCERNING A VICTIM'S RIGHT TO BE REASONABLY PROTECTED FROM A PERSON ACCUSED OF COMMITTING A CRIME'

Oppose H.B. No. 5623 'AN ACT CONCERNING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND VICTIMS OF HUMAN TRAFFICKING'

I feel there is a disregard for due process of law by issuing an ex parte restraining order, as it relates to firearms, because it denies the opportunity to be heard before a Judge by both parties prior to the execution of the restraining order. The execution of the ex parte restraining order, as it applies to firearms, results in a denial of a right. Rights should not be denied to people without due process of law. The due process of law is something that should occur before a right is denied, not after a right has been denied.

If no penalty exists against a person who wrongly files a frivolous ex parte restraining order against an adversary, you will see an increase in the number being filed in an attempt of the person to "game" the system, to hijack and use the power of government as a tool to dis-arm his/her future victim(s).

The hearing before a Judge will serve to eliminate false claims in this regard.

Sincerely,

Peter Brown  
Middlefield, CT.