



February 17, 2026

**House Public Safety Committee_HF1567 opposed
Chair Novotny, Chair Moller, members of the House Public Safety Committee,**

We submit this letter in opposition to HF1567. It is telling that after several months of armed, masked, and unidentified agents of the state menacing Minnesotans that among the first bills this committee is hearing would further shield law enforcement from public reporting and public accountability rather than protect the data privacy rights of everyday Minnesotans.

The ACLU-MN has documented the stories of at least 115 Minnesotans who have been threatened and abused by federal agents, including more than a dozen incidents where federal agents arrived at Minnesotans' homes masked and armed.

See, for example, the sworn Declaration of Emily Beltz¹ submitted in *Tincher v. Noem*, which details the threatening conduct of federal law enforcement:

"11. A woman wearing a gaiter-style mask then leaned out of the front passenger side window of the SUV. She yelled, "Emily, Emily, we're going to take you home." She then repeated my name again and repeated that they would take me home. She then said my address. She repeated, in a mocking tone, that they were going to escort me home.

12. I was freaked out. I did not care that they had my name, but I was scared for my family. The agents had told me, in effect, that they knew where I lived and could come and get me and my family at anytime.

15. That night, I felt very scared. I did not feel safe observing federal agents again. I have seen on the news how federal agents have brutalized protesters and observers, and I did not want them to target my family.

16. The next morning, however, I decided that I could not let the federal agents intimidate me. They want to intimidate us to stop observing and protesting against them. I could not let them do that. Since then, I have continued to drive around my neighborhood during my commute to look for signs of federal agent activity."

Instead of protecting Minnesotans, this bill would penalize Minnesotans—and in fact provide more avenues for law enforcement agent to harass and threaten people through the creation of a cause of action to sue individuals for their speech. Minnesotans would be better served by the creation of a cause of action for damages for violations of their state constitutional rights.

Given that the committee is considering this bill, and in line with our opposition to the Judicial Security bill from the 2024 legislative session, we oppose passage of this bill. The definition of personal information in Section 3 is far too broad. Coverage of law enforcement, spouses, and children – including adult children – encompasses too broad a range of individuals.

In our opinion, this committee would make better use of its time by discussing how to protect Minnesotans from the federal government's use of intimidation to suppress the First Amendment, rather than proposing further violations of the First Amendment. In a year in which Minnesotans have been threatened in their homes, the government has asserted the right of warrantless entry, and

agents of the federal government (masked and unaccountable) have asserted “absolute immunity” for the violence they have unleashed, this committee should reconsider the prioritization of bills like this and instead focus on addressing the real public safety concerns of Minnesotans.

We strongly urge you to vote against HF 1567.

John Boehler
Policy Counsel, ACLU-MN