

**I OPPOSE [SB 567].**

I am concerned some Defendants, when their actions, although socially and morally repugnant, and do not escalate into the commission of an overt act involving any touching, will be required to "Register as a Sex Offender"

From the "Text of [SB 567, [Page (1) at] (19-20)]" below:

**"...or with the intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, annoy or degrade the person..."**

**\*\*\*WARNING POSSIBLE OFFENSIVE FACT PATTERN FOLLOWS\*\*\***

Defendant, at a party meets a young woman who participated in a "Wet T-shirt Contest" and states, "Ma'am you do sure have a nice pair of tits."

The aforementioned young woman calls Police and files a "sex crime" complaint against Defendant using language contained in [SB 567].

Under [SB 567] language, Did defendant, have intent to; abuse, humiliate, harass, annoy or degrade the young woman with the alleged "nice pair of tits?"

Absent an "affirmative defense of truthfulness," i.e. the Jury at Trial agrees, the aforementioned young woman does have "a nice pair of tits," no problem. If the Jury rules otherwise, did Defendant commit a sex crime requiring Defendant to "Register as a Sex Offender?" Under [SB 567] language, Defendant may be required to do so.

**I do not belittle the severity and long lasting pain and suffering associated with any and all "sex crimes." Quite the contrary, I believe the punishments for sex crimes should be swift, certain and extremely severe.**

The language amendment contained in [SB 567] is too vague and ambiguous and may result in the travesties associated with injustice.

David S. Wall  
Mr. Oregon Conkurs.

///  
///  
///