

Submitter: Seth Kezar
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Rules
Measure, Appointment or Topic: SB243

I currently serve as a law enforcement with 15 years of experience in criminal investigations, firearms enforcement, and public safety operations. I appreciate the opportunity to provide testimony today in strong opposition to the proposed legislation that would create the new crime of unlawful transport, manufacture, or transfer of a so-called “rapid fire activator.”

While I recognize the legislature’s responsibility to ensure public safety and reduce the risk of gun violence, this bill as written presents multiple concerns from a law enforcement perspective—both in its practicality and in its potential unintended consequences.

1. Vague and overly broad definitions create enforcement challenges.

The term “rapid fire activator” is often vaguely defined in such legislation and can encompass a wide range of devices—some of which are legal under federal law, commonly used by law-abiding gun owners, and have legitimate sporting or recreational purposes. Without clear, technically specific definitions, enforcement becomes ambiguous, placing officers in difficult positions and risking arbitrary or inconsistent application of the law.

2. The bill criminalizes possession and transport without demonstrating criminal intent.

As written, the bill may punish individuals for mere transportation or possession of these devices, even in the absence of malicious intent or criminal activity. Law enforcement resources should be focused on individuals who pose a genuine threat to public safety—not responsible citizens who may legally own or transport firearms and accessories under current federal law.

3. This legislation duplicates existing federal regulations.

Federal law already restricts devices like bump stocks and certain trigger mechanisms through the National Firearms Act and ATF rulings. This bill does little to expand enforcement capability and instead adds confusion for both law enforcement officers and the public. Rather than enhancing public safety, it risks criminalizing conduct that is already regulated or not clearly illegal at the federal level.

4. It diverts resources from more pressing threats.

Enforcing this law would require time, training, and investigative resources that could be more effectively used to combat violent offenders, drug trafficking, and organized criminal activity. Creating a new, low-level criminal offense related to an accessory—

rather than the firearm itself—does not meaningfully advance public safety objectives.

In conclusion, I urge you to reject this bill. While I support laws that enhance officer and community safety, this proposal as written is overly broad, duplicative, and will ultimately be ineffective in deterring violent crime. It places unnecessary burdens on responsible gun owners and creates new challenges for front-line officers who must interpret and apply unclear legal standards in the field.