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| **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE** Interested parties suggest that property owners who allow the carrying of handguns on their property can be subject to too much liability. S.B. 1736 seeks to reform the liability of a person who allows handguns to be carried on property owned, controlled, or managed by the person. |
| **CRIMINAL JUSTICE IMPACT**It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly create a criminal offense, increase the punishment for an existing criminal offense or category of offenses, or change the eligibility of a person for community supervision, parole, or mandatory supervision. |
| **RULEMAKING AUTHORITY** It is the committee's opinion that this bill does not expressly grant any additional rulemaking authority to a state officer, department, agency, or institution. |
| **ANALYSIS** S.B. 1736 amends the Civil Practice and Remedies Code to make the fact that a card, sign, or other document prohibiting a handgun license holder from entering a property with a concealed or openly carried handgun is not posted on the property of a business or any other evidence that a person failed to exercise the person's option to forbid the carrying of a handgun by a license holder on the property inadmissible as evidence in trial on the merits in an action against a person, including a business or other entity, who owns, controls, or manages the property, and in which the cause of action arises from an injury sustained on the property. The bill establishes that such a fact does not support such a cause of action against such a person.  |
| **EFFECTIVE DATE** September 1, 2017. |