



## **Ohio Gun Owners**

Chris Dorr, Director

Proponent Testimony on House Bill 142  
May 16, 2017

---

Chair Roegner, Vice Chair Lipps, Ranking Member Leland, and members of the Federalism and Interstate Relations Committee, thank you for the opportunity to offer testimony in support of House Bill 142 today.

My name is Christopher Dorr, I live in Spring Valley, OH and I'm the executive Director of a newer organization in Ohio called Ohio Gun Owners that works to mobilize grassroots gun owners across Ohio in support of or defense of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment.

We support House Bill 142 because it accomplishes a couple of things for law-abiding concealed carriers that the firearms community believes need to be addressed.

The first issue House Bill 142 addresses is the Constitutional infringement on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment rights of gun owners.

Citizens exercising their 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right to free speech are not required to notify law enforcement before doing so.

Citizens are not required to notify law enforcement before they exercise their right to peaceably assemble.

And citizens are not required to placard their homes or persons in order to exercise their right to be secure in their persons or homes against unreasonable searches and seizures, either.

Requirements to the contrary go against our God-given, Constitutionally enshrined rights as a free people.

Secondly, House Bill 142 addresses and fixes the practical issues and problems that have arisen from our current law.

The "duty to notify" sets up and HAS set up needless opportunities for dangerous encounters between law enforcement officers and otherwise law-abiding citizens.

For example, new patrol officers, new concealed carriers or perhaps even both at the same time can create a toxic scenario that shouldn't happen.

What is the best way to inform the officer that you are carrying a firearm?

On the side of a noisy highway or perhaps in a noisy shopping center, what if all the officer hears when someone is trying to overcome their environment in order to do their due diligence to notify the officer that they are concealed carrying is somebody shouting the word "gun?"

Such examples aren't "worse case scenarios," either, as a quick google search can prove, and the law as written sets law enforcement and citizens up for these tense encounters.

The third reason we believe the "duty to notify" should be stricken is because the "duty to notify" is a solution in search of a problem.

We don't have problems here in Ohio with law abiding gun owners threatening law enforcement officers.

As someone with direct family members involved in the law enforcement profession, I have a love and respect for peace officers, and nobody wishes more for their safety than I do.

And that love and respect and wish for their safety is shared by the law-abiding gun owner community, too.

It isn't law-abiding gun owners that disrespect, threaten or shoot law enforcement officers.

Those people are criminals, gang bangers and thugs.

And to state the often-ignored but obvious truth, criminals willing to commit acts of violence like threatening an officer, shooting an officer or murdering an officer or any other citizen for that matter aren't going to bother notifying an officer that they have a firearm, anyway.

But when it comes to law-enforcement having no problems with the law-abiding gun owner community, don't just take my word for it.

PoliceOne.com, which is one of the largest trade publications in the peace officer profession, conducted a survey in April of 2013 of 15,000 verified law enforcement officers.

In that survey, 91 percent of the officers support the concealed carry of firearms by civilians. 86 percent of the officers felt that tragedies like Newtown or Aurora could have been reduced if a legally-armed citizen was present.

In addition, when asked "on a scale of one to five - one being low and five being high - how important do you think legally-armed citizens are to reducing crime rates overall?"

Seventy-five percent of respondents answered either four or five, with more than 50 percent answering five.

I reference this survey to illustrate and reinforce what law-abiding Ohio gun owners and law enforcement officers know to be true, that is, law-enforcement does not have a problem with legal gun owners and carriers.

In fact, we share a common goal of protecting innocent life.

I thank you for this opportunity to testify before you today in favor of House Bill 142.