

Dear members of the Joint Judiciary Committee,

I am writing to express **my support** for HB 5054 *An Act Protecting Victims of Domestic Violence*, SB 429 *An Act Concerning Service of Restraining Orders* and HB 5623 *An Act Concerning Violence Against Women And Victims Of Human Trafficking*.

It is vitally important that domestic abusers be disarmed if there is a restraining order against them, regardless of whether it is temporary or permanent. To put it succinctly, the benefits outweigh the risks: it is a matter of life or death for the victim. For an abuser to be allowed to keep his firearm during such a volatile time is absurd and inhumane.

There is no logic to disarming abusers subject to a permanent restraining order but **not** a temporary restraining order. Ex-parte orders have withstood constitutional challenges. I believe this will too.

I **strongly oppose** HB 5597 because it uses the risk warrant process instead of immediately removing firearms in the possession of the abuser. An in-depth study by the nonpartisan Battered Women's Justice Project concludes "giving judges the discretion and authority to order the surrender of firearms in an ex parte or temporary civil restraining order to be a substantially sounder policy because the responsibility and burden shifts from the victim to the state and courts and it does not add an extra hurdle for victims. At least twenty states concur and have passed legislation authorizing or requiring the surrender of firearms at the ex parte stage."

Thank you for your consideration of this life or death matter.

Shira Tarantino
Stamford, CT
March 14, 2016