Honorable members of the Judiciary Committee:

I ask you to **vote no in OPPOSITION to Bill 6355** for the reasons :

Americans have a Constitutional right to keep and bear arms [Second Amendment to the US Constitution and Article I, Section 15 of the State Constitution].

Citizens have the right to "due process" before they are deemed to be guilty and thus having their rights denied and becoming subject to any penalties, such as the confiscation of their firearms. This Bill does not meet such minimum legal standard.

By allowing a family member to go directly to a judge, it opens our judicial system up to misuse by giving an outlet to family members who have a simple grudge. Not every family squabble rises to the level that should involve our judicial system, but it could be used in that fashion over minor issues. Over my 76 years, I've been through messy divorces and had a hand in raising 10 kids and never once thought about using a firearm to settle family disputes. Could one of those family members have gotten so mad to use a law like this to take out their angst? Possibly. I would not have liked having my collection of firearms taken from me over a divorce dispute or a teenage child unhappy with a parent's disciplinary decision to ground them for being out late at night.

Generally speaking a judge is going to grant every petition for removing firearms. Simply because the judge could probably never know the true motivation of the complainant and would prefer to err by taking my 2nd Amendment Right away rather than risk that I (or anyone else) MIGHT actually use their firearm to settle a family dispute.
The section (Lines 101-111) twists the law backwards requiring the person who had been red-flagged to prove their innocence rather than requiring the State to prove their guilt.
Further, once the firearms are confiscated by the Government, this law denies an otherwise legal firearm owner the right to self-defense *[codified in the 2nd Amendment of the US Constitution and in Article I Section 15 of the CT Constitution] for a minimum of 180 days (one half a year)*. The proposal goes on to allow the court to deny the appeal for another 180 days ***without specifying any conditions*** regarding what grounds the court can use for such denial. Given that many people, including judges and complainants, have a bias against gun ownership, this law could be used inappropriately to put the firearm owner in an impossible situation to regain their 2nd Amendment rights, which is their God given right to self defense, particularly in a time when "Defund the Police" leaves citizens vulnerable to the criminals.
And finally in Lines 113-122, **this bill directs the confiscation of personal firearm(s) and ammunition without any consideration for the monetary value or the antique or family heirloom value.** This is government *taking* at its worst. The *original* language at least allowed the firearm(s) to be transferred to a family member or other party who has a legal right to own it. A relative should be allowed to inherit their great grandfather's musket; or the firearm could be sold for the market value to a firearms

collector. Similarly, there is value to ammunition that the owner should be able to monetize by selling the ammunition to others that are legally able to own such. If all these firearms and ammo were turned over to an FFL, the FFL immediately OWNS them. The original owner has no ability to retrieve their property or even be compensated. The FFL dealer would be enriched while the firearm owner would have the substantial value stripped from him/her. This is WRONG! It is GOVERNMENT harming the individual citizen.

I thank you for this opportunity to provide comment on this bill and ask again that you oppose its passage.

Respectfully
Ronald Liska

Middletown, CT