

I am against policy that is unconstitutional and that has a strong undercurrent of being a mode for new taxes. Most of your propositions have been just that. No pen stroke of a bureaucrat is going to make the problems of man just disappear. Along with the truth that criminals don't follow laws, so more law must be the answer...right?

People with mental issues are the problem. So if you want to start attacking someone maybe start with taking away guns from people who take any medication for some sort of mental disease, for example depression.

Make back ground checks more invasive and required for any and all guns. Adding taxing and insurance doesn't do anything for prevention aside from aid in people not being able to afford to protect themselves, which leads to my main point below, that has been cited and proved.

Several cited court cases below... the golden ring on this story, WE need our pistol permits and to be trained on how to protect yourself. Don't assume some superhero with a badge will save you, they are just there to fill out paper work.

Bowers v. DeVito, U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit,  
686 F.2d 616 (1982)

Cal. Govt. Code Sections 821,845,846

Calogrides v. City of Mobile, 475 So. 2d 560 (S.Ct. Ala. 1985) Chapman v. City of Philadelphia, 434 A.2d 753 (Sup. Ct. Penn. 1981) Davidson v. City of Westminster, 32 C.3d 197,185 Cal. Rptr. 252,649 P.2d 894 (S.Ct. Cal. 1982) Hartzler v. City of San Jose, App., 120 Cal. Rptr 5 (1975) Ill. Rev. Stat. 4-102 Keane v. City of Chicago, 98 Ill App 2d 460 (1968) Keane v. Chicago, 48 Ill. App. 567 (1977) Lynch v. N.C. Dept. of Justice, 376 S.E. 2nd 247 (N.C. App. 1989) Marshall v. Winston, 389 S.E. 2nd 902 (Va. 1990) Morgan v. District of Columbia, 468 A.2d 1306 (D.C. App. 1983) Morris v. Musser, 478 A.2d 937 (1984) Reiff v. City of Philadelphia, 477F. Supp. 1262 (E.D.Pa. 1979) Riss v. City of New York, 293 N.Y. 2d 897 (1968) Sapp v. Tallahassee, 348 So.2d 363 (Fla. App. 1977) Silver v. Minneapolis 170 N.W.2d 206 (Minn, 1969) Simpson's Food Fair v. Evansville, 272 N.E.2d 871 (Ind. App.) Stone v. State 106 Cal.App.3d 924, 165 Cal. Rep 339 (1980) Warren v. District of Columbia, D.C. App., 444 A.2d 1 (1981) Weutrich v. Delia, 155 N.J. Super. 324, 326, 382 A.2d 929, 930 (1978)

"Law enforcement agencies and personnel have no duty to protect individuals from the criminal acts of others; instead their duty is to preserve the peace and arrest law breakers for the protection of the general public." (Lynch v. NC Dept. Justice)

The law in New York remains as decided by the Court of Appeals case Riss v. New York: the government is not liable even for a grossly negligent failure to protect a crime victim. In the Riss case, a young woman telephoned the police and begged for help because her ex-boyfriend had repeatedly threatened "If I can't have you, not one else will have you, and when I get through with you, no one else will want you." The day after she had pleaded for police protection, the ex-boyfriend threw lye in her face, blinding her in one eye, severely damaging the other, and permanently scarring her features. "What makes the City's position particularly difficult to understand", wrote a dissenting opinion, "is that, in conformity to the dictates of the law, Linda did not carry any weapon for self-defense. Thus by a rather bitter irony she was required to rely for protection on the City of New York which now denies all responsibility to her." Riss v. New York, 22 N.Y.2d 579,293 N.Y.S.2d 897, 240 N.E.2d 806 (1958).

Ruth Brunell called the police on twenty different occasions to beg for protection from her husband. He was arrested only one time. One evening Mr. Brunell telephoned his wife and told her he was coming over to kill her.

When she called police, they refused her request that they come to protect her. They told her to call back when he got there. Mr. Brunell stabbed his wife to death before she could call the police to tell them that he

was there. The court held that the San Jose police were not liable for ignoring Mrs. Brunell's pleas for help. Hartzler v. City of San Jose, 46 Cal. App. 3d 6 (1975).

Good luck on your journey to create reasonable legislation, please don't infringe upon the constitution you took an oath to uphold.

Sincerely

Anthony J Dorsey  
Sent via B-Berry w/ actual buttons-