

From: Jon G.
To: [SJUD Exhibits](#)
Subject: Testimony for SB 764, SB 797, and SB 868
Date: Monday, April 17, 2017 4:27:21 PM

Dear Senators,

Below are arguments in opposition of the three Senate bills, 764, 797, and 868. Before you cast your vote, please read through them carefully and consider the oath that you took to uphold the Constitution.

SB 764

SB 764 is clearly nothing more than an effort to eliminate lawful concealed carry in Oregon. The requirements proposed in the "dash-2" amendments are onerous, unnecessary and almost impossible to comply with.

I strongly urge you to consider your constituents and not the deep pockets of New York billionaires who are promoting this harmful legislation and vote "NO" on the amended SB 764.

SB 868 is an outrageous assault on liberty, private property and due process. As amended by the "dash 1" amendments it is far worse.

Vote "NO" on SB 868 and the "dash-1" amendments.

SB 797

Among other things, SB 797 would allow the transfer of firearms to be delayed indefinitely if Oregon State Police (OSP) are unable to determine eligibility. Just because someone receives a deferral from OSP doesn't necessarily mean the recipient is prohibited; only that OSP has yet to make a determination.

Right now, federal law allows licensed dealers (FFL) to release a firearm after three business days after receiving a "delay" when conducting the initial background check for firearm transfer. This bill would strip the safeguard preventing the potential shutdown of sales, caused by endless delays, allowing law-abiding citizens to receive the firearm in a reasonable amount of time.

SB 797 is a blatant attack on the Rights of Oregonians, throwing away the Right of Due Process.

Vote "NO" on SB 797.

SB 868

Based on a California law enacted in 2014, SB 868 would create a so-called "Extreme Risk Protection Order" (ERPO) that could be obtained by a law enforcement officer, family member, or household member in an ex parte hearing to deprive someone of their Second Amendment rights without due process of the law.

This ex parte order would be issued by a judge based on the brief statement of the petitioner, and the accused would not be afforded the chance to appear in court to defend themselves against the allegations when the ERPO is issued.

This is in absolute violation of the 4th and 5th Amendments of the Constitution of the United States of America, and essentially strips an individual of their Right of Due Process, and the Right to not have their houses illegally searched and property illegally seized.

Existing law already provides a variety of mechanisms to deal with individuals that pose a high threat to themselves or others, all of which can lead to firearm prohibitions in appropriate cases. The issuance of a protective order does nothing to deal with the underlying cause of danger, nor does it subject the person to any actual physical restraint, ongoing reporting or monitoring requirements, or treatment for any underlying mental health condition.

Vote "NO" on SB 868.

Sincerely,

Jon Grandstaff
Ph: 503-917-9323