

PUBLIC COMMENTS

HB 4448

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON URBAN AFFAIRS

---

Hearing Date: April 21, 2021 10:30 AM - or upon final adjourn./recess or bill referral if permission granted

---

Danny Skolnick, Mr

self

Haslet, TX

I oppose HB 670 This bill, while well-intentioned, could easily criminalize harmless behavior that is currently safe, common, and legal. For example: Test firing a gun in a direction we know is safe, but where there is not a hung target

-Shooting a gun to scare away an animal that one does not want to shoot

-Neighbors making baseless complaints about gun owners shooting safely on their own property or Minorities plinking on private property – they're worried about being unfairly targeted

-Shooting into the air with a shotgun as in shooting skeet – but without clay pigeons in the air

-The bill gives a Class A misdemeanor even when no harm is done – that's an outrageously high penalty

-We have no problem with those who cause harm (including serious bodily injury or harm) being

prosecuted for the harm that they caused – that's already a crime. Deadly conduct remains a crime, too.

-The bill provides only a defense to prosecution for hunting and shooting at ranges. Individuals could still get arrested, get charged, and then burden of proof is on them to show that they met the exception.

I oppose HB 3350 This bill would open the door for many individuals to be wrongly deprived of their firearm rights. I believe that can be two possible good reasons to prohibit a person from possessing firearms: (1)

because the person has been convicted, with full due process, of a heinous violent crime, and has not yet fully paid his debt to society; and (2) because a person, with full due process and in accordance with full medical examinations and input, has been adjudicated as mentally incompetent in a court of law. These processes should include an opportunity to be heard by a jury of one's peers.

- Protective orders as they currently exist are likely often a violation of what we believe is appropriate due process to deprive someone of the ability to possess firearms.

- Expanding these protective orders would potentially deprive large numbers of people of their firearm rights without due process, without them being able to hear the charges against them and defend themselves right away.