

OPPOSITION TESTIMONY
on
H. B. No. 233
by
John Gilchrist
Legislative Counsel
Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police

Madam Chair and Members of the Committee, I am John Gilchrist and I am here on behalf of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police to express the Association's opposition to H. B. No. 233.

The Association believes that if this bill passes, in reality, there will no longer be any prohibited places for CCW licensees. Licensees will knowingly and purposely carry into prohibited places knowing there will be no penalty if they leave when asked. In addition, licensees understand that it is virtually impossible to prove that they knowingly carried into a prohibited place— a person can keep carrying into a prohibited place until he gets caught and when he gets caught he gets a pass. There is no mechanism whereby anyone, including law enforcement, will know of a second violation which apparently has to be committed at the same premises within thirty days before there could be a violation of the criminal trespass provision. So if an individual carries into a prohibited place, a police department for example, in Columbus and then the next day into a police department in Dublin, there is no violation. In addition, if the licensee carries into the same prohibited place thirty one days later, there is no violation.

The Association sees this bill as a step in chipping away the CCW law dealing with carrying into prohibited places—with the goal of total repeal of all restrictions on conceal carry. The proponents' social media also indicates that this is the goal of this legislation.

Most licensees can now carry into prohibited places, and unless there are metal detectors, no one would know they are carrying. So there is a high probability that violations go undetected. Because of this, in those rare cases where a violation is actually detected, the law provides a stiff penalty as a deterrent.

In closing, the Association opposes H. B. No 233.