

Written Testimony on HB68

Public Safety Committee

Date: June 14, 2025

Submitted by: Sanford Lubin

Chair Abrams, Vice Chair Miller, Ranking Member Thomas, and members of the committee, thank you for allowing me to present opposition testimony to **HB68**.

My name is Sanford Lubin and I am a concerned citizen from Maumee, Ohio. The critical need for common sense gun policies in Ohio and across the country is the reason that this written Testimony is being provided.

As you know, HB 68 is structured to increase the concealed carrying of guns in Ohio, a state that does not require a permit for individuals concealing a hidden gun.

It is important to first understand the impact of further easing permitless concealed carrying of a gun in Ohio. According to study fundings published in the March 2024 *Journal of the American College of Surgeons (JACS)*--

*“In states that relaxed firearm laws to allow **openly carrying a loaded firearm in public without a permit**, significantly more people died by firearms and suicide than in states without permitless open carry laws . . .”*

And, it is important to understand how law enforcement professionals have used **facts and statistical data of gun deaths** to construct its own Firearms Policy Statement as it relates to concealed carry of dangerous weapons. The following is the formal position of the International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP):

*“In response to **the facts and statistics** surrounding gun violence and related risks at U.S. colleges and universities, the IACP supports the prohibition of concealed carry weapons upon U.S. college and university campuses.”*

HB 68 does not follow the guidance of surgeons across the country who deal every day with the results of gun violence, and HB 68 does not head the direction of Chiefs of Police in our nation who are responsible for the safety of police officers under their leadership.

Instead, HB 68 expands the carrying of permitless concealed firearms into buildings or structures that are not a courthouse, but in which a courtroom is located. Knowing that permitless conceal carry of a gun results in increased deaths and suicides, why would the State of Ohio expand this practice to courtrooms that are located in buildings outside of a courthouse where there are adverse parties, and where emotions may be high? What benefits do Ohio citizens and Ohio law enforcement professionals obtain from this proposed new law?

And, HB 68 expands the carrying of permitless concealed firearms by individuals who are not Ohio citizens and who have past Ohio conviction, guilty plea, and/or delinquent child adjudication records. Why would the State of Ohio expand permitless concealed carry guns to individuals from out of state who have past criminal convictions, guilty pleas, and/or delinquent child adjudication records? What benefits do Ohio citizens and Ohio law enforcement professionals obtain from this proposed new law?

HB 68 makes sense if the objective is to increase the sales of weapons by gun dealers in the state. And HB 68 makes sense if the state wants to increase the number of out of state convicted felons who would become able to carry a concealed weapon.

However, if the objective is to increase the safety of Ohio citizens and the safety of Ohio law enforcement officials, HB 68 **must not become Ohio law**.