

Chairmen Roegner, , Ranking Member Leland, and members of the committee, thank you for considering my testimony today.

My name is Chuck LaRosa and I am a member of the Board of Directors for Ohioans for Concealed Carry.

I submit my testimony against Sub HB 142 on behalf of our organization for the following reasons:

1. Current precedent of the Ohio Supreme Court (*City of Niles v. Howard*, 12 Ohio St. 3d 162) says that municipalities can increase an offense listed in the ORC as a minor misdemeanor to a first degree misdemeanor, even in the case of general laws which are exempted from Home Rule.

Said another way: Even if this passes and becomes law, all the anti-gun areas of the state can simply write their own statutes using the same language, but change the penalty from "minor misdemeanor" to "first degree misdemeanor". Once they figure out they can do that, you can bet they will do that.

2. Upon demand for ID, CHL holder must still interrupt officer and tell him they are armed. Still no right to remain silent. Further, if CHL holder doesn't have his license on his person, it is an arrestable offense.

3. It will be nearly impossible to get rid of

4. The name of the crime for failing to notify is "carrying concealed weapons" *Page 5, ORC 2923.12 (F)
This \$25 ticket has the potential to impact employment in many fields.

5. It costs more to fight than the penalty. This will encourage more tickets and fewer people to challenge them.

6. Adds confusion in that if an officer asks a person for their ID the person must give more than ID or get a ticket. How are out of state drivers to know? How will more than half a million Ohioans know?

7. Most local jurisdictions charge \$65 to \$100 for "court costs" in addition to the fine, so this measly \$25 fine will actually cost the defendant much more than that.

8. The supposed point of this law is “officer safety” Why is it that NO ONE can explain how notification makes officers safer. Unless law enforcement groups can explain logically how this law makes them safer, leaving it on the books shouldn’t even be considered.

The purpose of notification is to make it more difficult for a law-abiding citizen to legally carry a gun for self-defense. Why else would they fight so hard for something they can’t explain? Their track record speaks for itself; they have never supported expanding our freedoms, NEVER.

Yet, they have no problem with their continuing efforts to expand their own rights, right they refuse to allow we normal citizens. Carrying into no gun zones and drinking while armed are two the come to mind quickly.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, OFCC has actively lobbied for notification repeal for several years now. During a recent survey, it emerged as the number one concern that our members wanted us to address. We considered ourselves fortunate when Representative Wiggam sponsored the original HB 142. Now that it has been amended to this sub bill we are saddened to say that we are against it, and greatly concerned that it will become law that we will have to live with for many, many years.

Please, we ask you, for the reasons listed above and in the name of simpler laws to understand and follow, kill this amendment and restore and pass our original HB 142.

It’s the right thing to do

Thank you for your time and consideration

Respectfully,

Chuck LaRosa
Director
Ohioans For Concealed Carry
614-307-1121