



Minnesota House Public Safety Finance & Policy Committee
March 23, 2026

On behalf of the Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus, we write regarding HF 4359.

We want to be clear at the outset. We are **neutral on the provisions addressing straw purchasing of firearms**.

Targeting criminal conduct and unlawful transfers to prohibited persons is a legitimate area for legislative action and one that can garner broad bipartisan support.

However, we strongly oppose HF 4359 as drafted because it combines that issue with the reenactment of the “trigger activator” ban, which raises serious constitutional concerns and remains the subject of ongoing litigation.

These Issues Should Not Be Combined

HF 4359 combines two fundamentally different policy questions into a single bill.

One addresses criminal misuse of firearms through straw purchasing. The other restricts the components and functionality of firearms, raising Second Amendment concerns.

These are not the same issue. They should not be legislated together.

Combining them forces legislators into an unnecessary choice. Members who support stronger penalties for criminal conduct should not be required to also support a constitutionally questionable restriction on lawful firearm ownership.

If separated, the straw purchase provisions would likely receive strong bipartisan support and move forward on their own merits.

The Trigger Activator Ban Remains Constitutionally Suspect

The reenactment of the trigger activator ban is not a technical fix. It is a substantive policy that directly implicates the Second Amendment.

As the Supreme Court made clear, when the Second Amendment’s plain text covers an individual’s conduct, the government must demonstrate that a restriction is consistent with the Nation’s historical tradition of firearm regulation.

There is no historical tradition of banning firearm trigger mechanisms or internal components commonly possessed for lawful purposes.



This is not a regulation of misuse. It is a prohibition on a category of firearm functionality.

That places the provision on constitutionally unstable ground and invites further litigation.

Conclusion

HF 4359, as drafted, unnecessarily combines a broadly supported criminal enforcement measure with a controversial and constitutionally suspect firearms restriction.

The Legislature should separate these issues.

Advance the straw purchase provisions as a standalone bill.

Debate the trigger activator ban on its own merits.

For these reasons, we respectfully urge you to oppose HF 4359 in its current form.

Sincerely,

Bryan Strawser
Chair

Anna Leamy
Director, Government Relations & Advocacy

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

INSTITUTE FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

11250 WAPLES MILL ROAD

FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA 22030



NRA

March 22, 2026

Public Safety Finance and Policy
75 Rev Dr Martin Luther King Jr Blvd
St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Chair Novotny and Chair Moller:

The National Rifle Association (NRA) would like to express our strong opposition to HF 4359.

The NRA has a number of concerns regarding some of the policies set forth in this bill. HF 4359 seeks to ban certain types of triggers, particularly, the binary trigger. This is a departure from what our neighboring state of North Dakota did in 2019 in which it passed a law specifically allowing for binary triggers.

The ATF has determined that the binary trigger does not make a firearm a machine gun. The next logical determination would be that it is also not dangerous or unusual.

HF 4359 attempts to make its application retroactive as well stating, “reenacted retroactively and without interruption from January 1, 2025.” There is nothing in the bill about compensating Minnesotans for their loss of property. This would seem to be a government taking of personal property without just compensation.

HF 4359 also seeks to repeal the affirmative defense currently in law for transferring a firearm under duress or threats of substantial bodily harm or death to a family member who is a prohibited person. This change would put law-abiding citizens in great danger from dangerous family members.

For these reasons and several others, the NRA is opposed to the passage of HF 4359.

Sincerely,

Brian Gosch
Minnesota State Director



MORIAH DAY

Director, Government Relations - State Affairs

mday@nssf.org | 203-426-1320 x291 | nssf.org

400 N. Capitol Street NW, Suite 475, Washington, D.C. 20001

March 24, 2026

Re: NSSF Opposition to HF 4359; Criminalizing Certain Legal Triggers, Costs and Compensation.

Honorable Co-Chairs and Members of the Committee:

The National Shooting Sports Foundation (NSSF) is the trade association for the firearms, ammunition, hunting and recreational shooting sports industry.

Our membership includes Minnesota based federally licensed firearms retailers. Our manufacturer members make the firearms and ammunition used by law-abiding Minnesota sportsmen, the US military and law enforcement agencies throughout the state.

This letter is to express our opposition to HF 4359 which seeks to put into effect the criminalization of certain legal triggers for firearms. We believe treating these triggers akin to “machine guns” is inaccurate. As we have previously argued, a ban on the possession of these devices constitutes an uncompensated “taking” from legal firearm businesses and owners by the State and is a violation of Minnesota citizens’ Second Amendment rights.

In March of 2022, the common trigger type known as a binary trigger was specifically cited by the ATF as a device that would NOT qualify as a machine gun component, as binary triggers do not allow a firearm to discharge more than one round through a single function of the trigger. However, despite this clear guidance from the agency responsible for enforcing federal firearms law, the state of Minnesota still chose to adopt restrictions on these products as restrictive as the State’s prohibition on machine guns.

A binary trigger is a relatively expensive firearm component. The market value is in the \$400 range. A statewide ban on these devices results in a loss of value to their owners, and the need to purchase and install some other equivalent (high end) trigger. The process requires a professional gunsmith; and is not easy or inexpensive. We estimate the cost at \$800 per firearm in total value lost, new component cost, and gunsmithing expenses.

We still see no evidence that Minnesota will adopt a “grandfather” clause covering existing binary triggers in circulation, nor a proposed budget to reimburse owners who are mandated to modify their firearms. Again, these triggers are not illegal at the federal level. As such, their criminalization in a single state when they are legal elsewhere destroys a firearm’s value and constitutes a “taking” from the owner. The Minnesota Constitution, Article 1 Section 13 reads:

“Private property shall not be taken, destroyed or damaged for public use without just compensation therefor, first paid or secured.”

The Minnesota provision is similar to the US Constitution’s “Takings Clause”.

“nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”

We have still seen no recognition by this body of the cost associated with this prohibition. We have seen no mechanism to control what would be done with removed trigger assemblies. We question if there had been adequate consideration of the fiscal repercussions of this decision –

on the State and on the individual firearm owners who have hurt no one by choosing to exercise their Constitutionally-protected right to purchase a binary trigger which the ATF has recognized as legal for years.

There have certainly been many thousands of these triggers installed legally on firearms in the State of Minnesota in recent years. This action criminalizes thousands of Minnesotans, creates millions in cost to avoid criminality, and still leaves doubt as to the fate of the components and firearms in question. We urge you to reconsider this prohibition, and protect the rights of Minnesota citizens.

We respectfully urge you to oppose HF 4359.

Sincerely,
Moriah Day

Testimony Opposing H.F. No. 4359

To: Members of the House Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee

Re: Opposition to H.F. No. 4359

Date: March 21, 2026

Co-Chairs and Members of the Committee,

My name is Michael Babcock, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to H.F. 4359. As a parent, a military veteran, and a firearm enthusiast, I have dedicated my life to protecting others and upholding the Constitution. I am deeply invested in public safety, but I cannot support legislation that tramples on foundational rights, bypasses judicial rulings, and actively endangers victims of abuse. I urge this committee to vote "NO" on this legislation.

This bill seeks to retroactively reenact the 2024 bans on trigger activators and the changes to straw purchase crimes. It should never have passed in 2024, as it was inappropriately buried inside a massive, 1,400-page omnibus bill.

I urge you to carefully consider the following severe flaws in this legislation:

1. Procedural Evasion and the Single-Subject Rule

H.F. 4359 is a transparent attempt to bypass the judicial branch. In August 2025, a Ramsey County judge rightfully struck down the 2024 binary trigger ban because its inclusion in a sprawling tax omnibus bill violated the single-subject clause of the Minnesota Constitution. By attempting to reenact this ban "retroactively and without interruption from January 1, 2025", this legislature is doubling down on a flawed, unconstitutional lawmaking process instead of fostering transparent public debate.

2. Infringement on Second Amendment Rights and Supreme Court Precedent

H.F. 4359's reenactment of the ban on trigger activators directly conflicts with recent United States Supreme Court precedent regarding firearm mechanics and the Second Amendment:

- **Garland v. Cargill (2024):** The Supreme Court recently struck down the ATF's ban on bump stocks, explicitly rejecting the government's attempt to classify rate-accelerating accessories as machine guns. The Court established that a mechanism does not become an illegal automatic weapon if it cannot fire more than one shot "by a single function of the trigger." Binary triggers operate on this exact mechanical distinction—requiring a discrete function (pull and release) for each round fired. Banning them ignores the Court's strict textual definitions.

- **New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen (2022):** The Supreme Court established that any modern firearm regulation must be consistent with this Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation. The broad prohibitions reaffirmed in H.F. 4359 fail the *Bruen* test, as there is no historical analogue for criminalizing the possession of these specific mechanical components.

3. The Cruel Repeal of Protections for Domestic Abuse Victims

Perhaps the most egregious component of H.F. 4359 is its explicit repeal of the affirmative defense found in Minnesota Statutes section 624.7141, subdivision 4.

- This specific subdivision protects family or household members who transfer a firearm to an ineligible person only because they are under extreme compulsion and explicit or implicit threats.
- The current law protects a victim who transfers a weapon because they have a "reasonable apprehension" that refusing to do so would result in the abuser inflicting "substantial bodily harm or death".
- Under current law, the fact finder is explicitly allowed to consider evidence of past domestic abuse, criminal sexual conduct, sexual extortion, or sex trafficking by the transferee toward the defendant.

By repealing this section, H.F. 4359 actively strips away life-saving legal protections from victims of severe domestic violence. It effectively tells abuse victims that the state will penalize them for actions they took to avoid being murdered by their abusers.

Conclusion

H.F. 4359 represents an end-run around the Minnesota judiciary, defies recent United States Supreme Court rulings on firearm mechanisms, and cruelly punishes victims of domestic abuse who act under the threat of death. I strongly urge this committee to respect the Constitution, protect vulnerable Minnesotans, and vote "NO" on H.F. 4359.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Michael Babcock
Saint Paul, MN 55106