

To whom concerned,

I am writing to appose HB 3075. Please consider this testimony as it is my own and not aided by AI.

My reasons are as follows.

- The magazine size restrictions do nothing for a person's capacity to shoot a gun. A simple reload solves the issue. Creating this law only criminalizes law abiding citizens and effectively seizes the property of those in possession of magazines greater than 10 rounds.
- Permit to purchase. While I recognize the need to have restrictions on individuals for criminal or psychiatric issues, I also believe in due process. By including subjective judgments to revoke or deny a permit to purchase from various agencies, due process has been removed. I do not believe citizens should have an obligation to prove the integrity of their rights, but rather the state must use the best available tools to restrict them under due process only. My concern regarding subjective opinions is the potential for their abuse. We have been subject to social movements making statements such as "silence is violence". Our constitutional right is to remain silent, which cannot be used as probable cause when exercising that right. This is just one relevant and current example of local popular political opinions that counter basic constitutional protections. HB 3075 could easily allow abuses from individuals or agencies seeking to oppress opposing groups.
- Direct Harm to FFL's: By implementing this rule with no process in place, ffl's will be experiencing direct damages. Citizens will be denied rights
- Undue cost: I have a CHL, I regularly train and compete in well regulated safe competitions. I have no need for an additional safety course, but since my CHL is greater than 5 years old, I could be subject to taking an additional course. It is a waste of time, money and effort.
- To what end. This law is being proposed to reduce violence associated with firearms. What means can be used to determine if this law had any effect? How do we know that we're actually doing what we propose? How do we restore our rights if no effect can be measured? Adding restrictions until there is a functional ban is clearly not constitutional.

Ben Meyer