

Members of the Judiciary Committee:

My name is Nicholas DuBaldo, a resident of Manchester, Connecticut. Many of my family members, friends, customers, neighbors, and numerous other residents of this state are legal possessors of firearms. Among them, I have met many wonderful individuals who are greatly beneficial to the State of Connecticut and would be affected by the following proposed legislative bills:

I oppose: S.B. No. 60 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PRESENTATION OF A CARRY PERMIT.

No citizen should be detained by law enforcement except on probable cause a crime is being or likely to be committed.

I oppose: H.B. No. 7218 AN ACT CONCERNING THE SAFE STORAGE OF FIREARMS IN THE HOME.

The wording of this bill does not clearly define its intent. Rather, it includes language from other bills which may broaden the definitions of weapons to include parts (finished and unfinished), frames, receivers, basically making it onerous and a burden to those individuals who tinker with their firearms. Remember also, that safes are NOT impenetrable; given enough time and determination any locked compartment can and will be opened. Teaching children to respect firearms and to not touch another person's belongings would be far more beneficial.

I oppose: H.B. No. 7219 AN ACT CONCERNING GHOST GUNS.

Many older firearms do not have serial numbers, does this make them "ghostly"? There are already laws on the books pertaining to the construction and completion of unserialized receivers. Further, it is impossible to enforce regulation what an individual can "print" with a 3D printer, just as it is impossible to enforce regulation on what a person can forge or cast in their own home using their own tools likely until after the object has been completed. Placing restrictions on 3D printers specifically could be a violation of the 1st Amendment.

I oppose: H.B. No. 7223 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STORAGE OF A PISTOL OR REVOLVER IN A MOTOR VEHICLE.

If an individual has to exit their vehicle, place their firearm in a separate locked compartment in the trunk, would that not dramatically increase the risk of "outing" that individual as they are more likely to be seen disarming themselves and leaving their firearm unattended? If someone is legally carrying their firearm, would it not make more sense to allow them the privacy to disarm themselves and store their firearm as safely as possible with as few people observing them as possible?

I support: S.B. No. 940 AN ACT AUTHORIZING CERTAIN PERSONS TO CARRY HANDGUNS IN STATE PARKS AND STATE FORESTS.

As Connecticut's wild dog and cat population increases wouldn't it make sense to allow people to protect themselves from potential attacks while in state parks and forests? If a person has the legal right to carry a firearm, should they not be able to have that means of protection while in secluded areas of State property?

I support: H.B. No. 5227 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF FIREARMS BY MUNICIPALITIES.

Connecticut needs uniformity; what is legal according to the state should be legal throughout the state. If different municipalities have unique laws, it places an undue burden upon the legal firearm owner to follow the law. Equal access and equal rights for all firearm owners.

I support: H.B. No. 5870 AN ACT CONCERNING TRANSFER OF ASSAULT WEAPONS AND LARGE CAPACITY MAGAZINES.

Allowing transfers between certificate holders leaves a net zero sum change to the number of “banned” weapons and magazines, and restores the intent of grandfathering the economic value of already owned property and restores a way to sell, trade and exchange with others already recognized by DESPP. In these difficult economic times, shouldn't people be able to sell their own property to others should they have the desire to do so?

I urge you to favorably vote; S.B. 940, H.B. 5227, H.B. 5870 out of the Judiciary Committee and oppose; S.B. 60, H.B. 7218, H.B. 7219, H.B. 7223.

Sincerely,

Nicholas DuBaldo

Manchester, CT