

Submitter: John SCHARF
On Behalf Of: Inalienable Natural Right to Self-Defense
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB2005

House Bill 2005 SECTION 4, 5, and 6 burdens constitutionally protected conduct because possession of firearms and firearm frames and receivers are within the scope of the Second Amendment's right to 'keep and bear Arms' and the State legislature has not shown these firearms and components are not commonly owned by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes.

Further, State legislature offers no evidence that these statutes are consistent with the nation's history of firearm regulation. The right to keep and bear arms implies a corresponding right to manufacture arms. Indeed, the right to keep and bear arms would be meaningless if no individual or entity could manufacture a firearm. Thus, if possessing untraceable firearms is protected by the Second Amendment, then so too is manufacturing them.

Limiting the means by which peaceable people acquire arms is about the unconstitutional and immoral monopolization of power. The State is not entitled to cut off access to self-manufacturing of arms under the US Constitution's Second Amendment or Oregon Constitution's Article 1, Section 27.

SEE:

New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen
District of Columbia v. Heller
McDonald v. City of Chicago

DIVISION 80 LLC, Plaintiff, v. MERRICK GARLAND,
JENNIFER VANDERSTOK, et al., Plaintiffs, v. BLACKHAWK MANUFACTURING
GROUP INC., et al., Intervenor Plaintiffs, v. MERRICK GARLAND, et al.
Defendants. Civil Action No. 4:22-cv-00691-O. United States District Court, N.D.
Texas, Fort Worth Division.

JOHN RIGBY, ALAN KNIGHT, and FIREARMS POLICY COALITION, INC.,
Plaintiffs, v. KATHY JENNINGS, Attorney General of Delaware, Defendant. C.A. No.
21-1523 (MN). United States District Court, D. Delaware. September 23, 2022.