

Submitter: Ryan Killion
On Behalf Of:
Committee: House Committee On Judiciary
Measure: HB2005

I oppose this measure due to its vague definitions of parts and types of weapons. An example I would like to use is someone who works in private armed security. If this person finds a broken component on their firearm that they need to use for the primary source of income, they cannot work if they do not have a working firearm. If this person had a 3-D printer that could print the broken component of the firearm that is not part of the serialized portion of the firearm (already illegal federally), then they could print that component and return to work with minimal delay. Otherwise, they would have to try to find a local gun smith who hopefully has that component in-stock to repair it or order the component; either way, they would miss at least 1 day of work, but likely much more. Another example of this bill would be a gun-smith themselves. There is no text in here about private gun-smiths being able to print components to repair firearms, particularly discontinued firearms where there is only a finite number of donor parts available as a result. These are just a couple of examples of why this bill should not be put into law.