Charles Coleman

1518 5th Ave N
Sauk Rapids, MN 56379
865-214-2508
arcsnsparks98@gmail.com

February 23, 2026

To whom it may concern,

I am reaching out in regards to the proposed legislation attempting to further regulate firearm ownership. I am 45 years old so I am old enough to remember all the way back to the assault weapons ban of the Clinton era. I grew up in the country, you know the kind of place where you could shoot your 22 off the back porch and it was just fine. Now I live in town so I go to the local shooting range to enjoy my hobby responsibly.

I do not consider myself a legal scholar by any means, but I'm always fascinated with proposed legislation that is based on emotion and not actual data. It's probably going to sound cliche or like a tired argument but still, bans of this type only punish law abiding citizens without impacting those that wish to do harm. It also turns law abiding citizens into defacto criminals. In the event of a ban on magazines, I can assure you that myself and people like me will never surrender them.

As left leaning people n, we make fun of the ignorance of the right for blaming trans people for corrupting sports or being a major contributor to violent crimes. Well, now it's time for the finger to turn and point to the folks in the Minnesota legislature who think this will somehow make Minnesota safer. It will make Minnesota safer the same way tariffs made farmers great again this year. Never mind the staggering bailout.

My wife tells me I'm terrible with analogies but I'm going to give it a shot. Whenever there is a plane crash and dozens of people are killed, it's horrific and really grabs the headlines. Nonetheless, air travel is still by far the safest form of transportation available to us. We don't say airplanes have to fly slower or say only 10 can be in the air at once.

This proposed legislation reeks of politicians proposing new laws based on emotion and not facts and would be doing a considerable disservice to their constituents without actually

accomplishing any real change. Instead of focusing on banning the firearm, let's focus on strengthening mental health resources in schools and in the communities at large.

Best regards,

Charles Coleman

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing in opposition to a bill that would limit magazine capacities in Minnesota. My concerns are rooted in the impact such legislation would have on responsible, law-abiding gun owners like myself. If enacted, this bill would instantly criminalize thousands of Minnesotans who have legally owned these magazines for years, including veterans and individuals with no criminal history. For example, I possess several 30-round magazines from my time in the United States Army, yet I do not own a rifle that uses them. These magazines I own are simply left over equipment from when I left the Army. Despite their lack of practical danger, this bill would make me a felon overnight, even though I have served honorably, maintained a spotless record (even held a Top Secret / SCI Clearance), and have had these magazines for over two decades.

I am also concerned about the impact this legislation would have on hunters in Minnesota. While some may question why a hunter would need more than ten rounds, the reality is that hunting preferences and equipment vary widely. Some hunters use rifles capable of holding more than ten rounds, while others prefer bolt-action firearms or different setups. This diversity is part of what makes hunting accessible and enjoyable for many.

Additionally, I worry that this bill could discourage out-of-state hunters, particularly those from North Dakota, from coming to Minnesota. If there is even a remote possibility that someone could be criminalized for using a magazine they have lawfully owned for years, it would create unnecessary fear and uncertainty. This could negatively affect our local hunting community and economy, as fewer hunters may choose to visit Minnesota.

Moreover, it is unlikely that individuals who engage in criminal activity will pay any attention to a proposed ban—that is, by definition, what makes them criminals. Instead, these capacity restrictions will primarily impact law-abiding citizens who wish to remain compliant with the law. Thousands of responsible Minnesotans have possessed these magazines for years without any history of criminal behavior, and this legislation would unfairly penalize them.

Can you truly justify telling a Veteran (or any citizen really, but Veterans especially) that they are now considered a felon for possessing something that was once entirely legal? How does such a measure contribute to making Minnesota a safer place?

I have contacted both Senator Kupec and Representative Keeler. I have no faith in Representative Keeler, as she will certainly vote to ban these magazines, but will continue to contact Senator Kupec to maintain he will vote no when and if this bill hits the senate. I would like to thank the Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus and the United States Concealed Carry Association (USCCA) for their strong efforts to support the 2nd Amendment for all citizens.

Thank you for considering my perspective. I urge you to carefully weigh the unintended consequences and the impact on responsible citizens before moving forward with this legislation.

Respectfully,

Aaron Wolf
Moorhead, MN

Christopher Sackett

902 County Rd D West, Apt 315

New Brighton, MN 55112

February 23, 2026

Representative Ellen McDaniel, R

Ellen.McDaniel@house.mn.gov

Representative Brad Tabke

rep.brad.tabke@house.mn.gov

Minnesota State Legislature

RE: OPPOSE HF 3433, HF 3434, and HF 3402 — Semi-Automatic Firearm and Magazine Ban Bills

Dear Representatives McDaniel, & Tabke

I am submitting this letter as written testimony in opposition to HF 3433, HF 3434, and HF 3402. I would strongly prefer to appear before the committee in person to share my concerns directly, but the nature of my work makes that impractical — I cannot step away from my professional responsibilities on short notice, as the safety of others depends on my presence. I hope this written testimony will be given the same consideration as in-person testimony, and I ask that it be entered into the official record.

I am writing as your constituent to strongly urge you to vote NO on HF 3433, HF 3434, and HF 3402 — bills that would impose sweeping bans on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms and standard-capacity magazines in Minnesota.

I want to speak to you not only as a gun owner, but as someone whose life and safety depend on these firearms in a very direct, daily way. I am a permit to carry holder who works in a profession where calling the police is often not an option — or where police response, even if requested, could be many minutes away. Over the course of my career, I have had drug traffickers, human traffickers, hijackers, passengers armed with large knives and firearms, and individuals later identified as murderers fleeing from law enforcement. I have relied on my right to carry and my ability to defend myself and my passengers in these life-threatening situations. These bills would restrict the tools

available to law-abiding Minnesotans like me who face genuine danger — while doing nothing to stop the criminals who threaten us.

I also want to be clear: I am a DFL supporter. I believe in many of the values this party stands for. But this legislation has unintended consequences that will fall hardest on responsible, law-abiding gun owners across the political spectrum — including many who vote Democrat. Pushing these bills risks alienating a significant portion of the DFL base who support both gun rights and progressive values. This is not a partisan issue; it is a safety and civil liberties issue.

These are not fringe or obscure weapons.

Americans own nearly 25 million AR and AK platform firearms, and these firearms are used every single day by peaceable Minnesotans for self-defense, hunting, predator control, sport shooting, and training. AR-15 style weapons are commonly used in Minnesota for predator hunting, varmint control, and deer hunting. Banning them does not just restrict criminals — it criminalizes the conduct of law-abiding citizens who have done nothing wrong.

These Bills Will Not Make Minnesota Safer

I urge you to look at what the research actually says before voting on this legislation. The RAND Corporation identified seven studies evaluating federal and state assault weapon bans, and the overall available evidence on their effect on violent crime is inconclusive. A congressionally mandated study of the federal assault weapon ban that was in effect from 1994 to 2004 found that the banned guns were never used in more than a modest fraction of gun murders, and a follow-up study concluded that the ban's effects on gun violence are likely to be small at best and perhaps too small for reliable measurement. Put plainly: this type of legislation has been tried before at the federal level, studied extensively, and found to have no meaningful impact on crime.

FBI Uniform Crime Reporting data shows that more than three times as many individuals are killed with knives or cutting instruments than with rifles of any kind — and rifles were used in fewer homicides than hands, fists, and feet. The problem these bills claim to solve simply does not match the statistical reality of how violent crime is committed in this country.

These Bills Turn Law-Abiding Citizens Into Criminals Overnight

HF 3433 and its companion HF 3434 would ban the sale, transfer, and possession of almost all semi-automatic rifles in Minnesota, with grandfathering limited to current owners only, with no transfers permitted. Owners must obtain a certificate at an unknown cost, submit to warrantless home inspections by law enforcement for “safe storage,” and the firearm may only be kept at home or at a licensed firing range. Hunting with such firearms would be prohibited.

HF 3402 goes even further — there is no grandfather clause at all. Any magazine capable of holding over 10 rounds must be moved out of state, modified, destroyed, or surrendered to law enforcement. A person who violates this provision is guilty of a felony and may be sentenced to imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $25,000, or both. Minnesota gun owners who have legally owned standard-capacity magazines for years — perhaps decades — will be transformed into felons by July 1, 2026 if they fail to comply. This is not public safety legislation. It is the criminalization of ordinary, peaceful Minnesotans.

These Bills Are Unconstitutional

The U.S. Supreme Court has been clear that the Second Amendment protects firearms that are in common use for lawful purposes. With tens of millions of these firearms owned by Americans, HF 3433 bans commonly owned gas-operated semiautomatic firearms, directly violating the Second Amendment’s “common use” standard. These bills will face immediate legal challenge and are unlikely to survive judicial scrutiny — meaning Minnesota taxpayers will bear the cost of defending legislation that does nothing to reduce crime.

There Are Better Paths Forward

If the goal is truly public safety, I ask why Democrats in the House moved to gut a bill that would have imposed meaningful prison sentences on repeat, violent offenders who use firearms in the commission of crimes. Republicans presented such a bill, and the Democrat response was effectively “no — we want to disarm everyone else.” That is the wrong priority. Criminals do not comply with magazine restrictions or registration requirements. They never have. These bills will be obeyed only by the responsible, law-abiding gun owners they seek to punish.

My Ask Is Simple

Vote NO on HF 3433, HF 3434, and HF 3402. Do not support any amendment that would insert similar language into unrelated legislation. Focus instead on measures that target violent criminals, strengthen prosecution of those who misuse firearms, and support the mental health resources that address the root causes of violence.

I am a member and supporter of the Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus, and they speak for me at the Capitol. But today I am speaking directly for myself: I am your constituent, I am a law-abiding gun owner and permit to carry holder, and I am watching this vote closely.

For more information on this legislation, see:

https://gunowners.mn/take-action/2026-session/2-24-2026-house-public-safety/

Sincerely,

Christopher Sackett

902 County Rd D West, Apt 315

New Brighton, MN 55112

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

February 23, 2026

Re: NSSF Opposition to HF3433; Banning semiautomatic shotguns, rifles, pistols

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. For more than 50 years, NSSF has encouraged gun owners to safely handle and securely store firearms. We provide valuable resources and free firearm safety kits, including cable-style gun locks through the Project ChildSafe® program, to help prevent firearms accidents, thefts and misuse, including suicide.

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 strong opposition to HF3433 which seeks to ban many common semiautomatic rifles and shotguns, as well as certain pistols.

The bill bans a long list of specific firearms but doesn't stop there. Striking an exception for firearms recognized as 'particularly suitable for or readily adaptable to sporting purposes' is a blatant attempt to make the most popular firearms in America today illegal under state law.

This legislation doesn't even attempt to hide the fact that rifles, pistols, and shotguns commonly owned and used for self-defense, the shooting sports, and even hunting here in Minnesota would be banned outright and their owners would be guilty of a felony and subject to thousands of dollars in fines and years in prison if they don't remove their firearms from the state or pay to have them registered.

It could even be argued that registering a covered firearm under this bill would prevent an individual from later selling the firearm to a federal firearms licensee as a method of disposing it. If an individual didn't immediately want to sell their collection and opted to pay whatever fees and jump through the hoops to get a 'certificate of ownership' for each of their covered firearms, they would be limiting their future ability to sell the firearm, instead being required to surrender the firearm to law enforcement for destruction.

Hunting leases and public access land for hunting are not approved locations for a person obtaining a 'certificate of ownership' to possess their firearms so even if an individual registered their firearms to use them at a range, they would no longer be allowed to hunt with them.

These issues with the bill are, of course, in addition to the fact that the covered firearms are commonly-owned and in common use by millions of Americans and tens-of-thousands of Minnesotans.

According to data NSSF collected and released in our *2025 Firearm Production in the United States* report, more than 32 million Modern Sporting Rifles (MSRs) are in circulation in the United States. The report compiles data from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tabacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) and industry manufacturing records and shows that 32,091,000 MSRs have been produced domestically or imported from international manufacturers since 1990.
Just one subset of the firearms covered by this bill, MSRs, are the most popular centerfire rifle in America. There are more MSRs in circulation than Ford F-150s on the road today.

But the bill doesn't only limit the possession of semiautomatic centerfire rifles commonly used in hunting and target shooting, it also limits many common shotguns.

Many of these shotguns are favored for their ease of use in home defense scenarios. Additionally, a thumbhole stock whether it is on a shotgun or rifle is not a military feature but is often preferred for safer control and favored by many with disabilities. Telescoping stocks allow for "length-of-pull' adjustment for users of different stature and are very popular among women and youth getting started in the shooting sports, as well as individuals in climates where you might be hunting or shooting with a heavy coat one season and a t-shirt another.

I have attached to my testimony a number of examples of firearms that would be banned under this bill if passed as currently written. I would urge you to review that list which is far from exhaustive.

The commonly owned status of these firearms carries significant legal weight. Under the Supreme Court's 2008 *Heller* decision and the 2025 *Smith & Wesson Brands, Inc. v. Estados Unidos Mexicanos* ruling, the Court affirmed that firearms "widely legal and bought by many ordinary citizens" cannot be banned. All nine justices on the US Supreme Court even agreed with the statement made by Justice Elena Kagan in her opinion in the latter case that AR-15s are "widely legal and bought by many ordinary citizens" and are "the most popular rifle in the country." Banning these firearms as this bill proposes to do is a direct violation of the Second Amendment as interpreted by the US Supreme Court.

The other practical problem, of course, with such laws is that criminals routinely ignore them (after all, they are criminals). Law-abiding citizens involved in legal activities are the ones who suffer.

NSSF appreciates the desire to reduce casualties when violent aggressors attack innocent people but violating the rights of millions of Minnesotans who choose these products for self-defense, as well as visitors coming to the state for hunting and recreation, is not the answer.

The systematic failure of state and federal government to "keep us safe" continues to be the common theme in these horrific tragedies. All the warning signs are there and yet they too often go ignored. NSSF joins others in calling for a comprehensive approach that addresses many complex social issues, including school safety, preventing unauthorized firearms access, mental health, personal privacy, and enforcing existing laws while safeguarding constitutional rights.

We must all work together to help prevent those who exhibit reckless disregard for human life and values access to firearms for criminal purposes. But we must also preserve the constitutional rights of tens of millions of law-abiding Americans to safely and responsibly own, store and use firearms for personal protection, hunting and recreation.

America's firearms industry welcomes the opportunity to be a part of a respectful and constructive dialogue on this important topic and urge you to oppose HF3433.

Sincerely,
Moriah Day

These common hunting/home defense shotguns would be banned in Minnesota based on HF3433.

Mossberg 935 12 gauge semiautomatic turkey shotgun.

Mossberg 930 12 gauge semiautomatic hunting / home defense shotgun.

Remington SP-10 12 gauge semiautomatic turkey shotgun.

Common "traditional" .308 caliber semi-auto hunting rifles will be banned with detachable magazines from the factory. No functional difference from the AR-15, but much more powerful.

Remington 750 Semiautomatic .308 caliber with detachable magazine in traditional wood stock.

Same Remington 750 Semiautomatic, but in thumbhole hunting stock.

Turnbull TAR-10 (AR-10) .308 semi-automatic hunting rifle in traditional wood stocks. Also comes in less powerful .223 TAR-15 (AR-15) version

Common .223 caliber Semi-automatic Rifles. All are the same caliber and function as the AR-15 "modern sporting rifle". Most or all would be illegal in Minnesota under HF3433.

Ruger Mini 14 Ranch Rifle / Mini 30.
.223 caliber (5.56mm) / .30 caliber (7.62mm).
Shown with standard factory 10 round magazine,

Same Rifle in "Target" version with thumbhole stock for stability (Olympic stock). Harmonic Dampener on front, not a "silencer".

Remington R-15 VTR hunting model. .223 / 5.56 caliber "AR-15". Standard factory magazines with 10, 20, and 30 round capacity.

Remington R-15 VTR Thumbhole hunting model. .223 / 5.56 caliber "AR-15". Standard factory magazines with 10, 20, and 30 round capacity.

Chris Kreger
23534 Serpent Road
P.O.Box 160
Deerwood, MN 56444
(612) 840-5597

February 23, 2026

To: the Minnesota Legislature and relevant committees

RE: HF3402 and HF3433

I am very tired of this constant drumbeat encroaching upon my right the keep and bear arms. This right is borne upon us to protect our freedom: freedoms you seem to be intent upon removing. These actions are the reason our founders identified this right in the amendments to our constitution. Stop with your assault!

Charlie Kirk pointed out that we accept, as a cost*, that many people will die, so that we may drive our cars and maintain our freedom to travel. You also must accept that some** will perish in order to maintain our **right** to keep and bear arms.

You are wasting our time and money on this cause. This State has way more important problems to deal with. Deal with the Fraud! It affects way more people than guns do.

By the way: the only thing that stops a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. Guns, regardless of the style or how much ammo they hold, are not the problem: People are. We need to identify and restrain those with mental health issues, not restrain law abiding individuals from protecting themselves and protecting our freedom.

BTW: the only oppression I find in my life is from my government.

Sincerely,

Chris Kreger, a law-abiding citizen.

* Approximately 477 in 2024 in MN.

** Approximately 582 in 2024 in MN. An estimated 406 of those were suicide who would have found another way to kill themselves.

HF 3433

This proposed law is a blatantly ignorant of both the 2nd and 4th amendments. It's not terribly clear what this law is meant to do other than put undue restrictions on gun owners. State law has mandated, since 2023, that transfers are required to meet certain criteria (permit to purchase, plus paperwork when doing private party). Striking the text referring to readily adapted to sporting purposes further displays not only ignorance, but also disdain for the rifles in question. I have used rifles that fall under this clause in both competition and class settings. While I don't believe there should be any regulations on what I can own, this is a seemingly pointless bill that clearly lacks logic and reason and serves only to create more criminals to fill cells with.

HF 3402

This bill is downright egregious in the manner it's been introduced. As it's been proven, most violent gun crimes occur with a pistol. More often than not, it was a stolen or otherwise illegally procured handgun in possession by a prohibited person. Banning magazines with a massive, sweeping bill like this serves only to create tens (to hundreds) of thousands of criminals overnight. It will do nothing to change how criminals operate or their motives. If a violent offender is in possession of a firearm, how is a magazine capacity law going to change their actions? This law focuses on causing more issues instead of addressing the revolving door of violent criminals who are sentenced with leniency, only to go back out and reoffend. If public safety was actually a concern, keeping these people behind bars would be a priority. This bill is again devoid of any rationale and serves simply to push an agenda, and will end up creating criminals out of otherwise law abiding citizens.

Minnesota HF 3433 and HF 3402 go far beyond targeting criminals and instead impose sweeping bans on common arms and magazines that millions of law-abiding Americans own for lawful purposes, raising serious Second Amendment concerns while offering at best marginal benefits for public safety.

What these Minnesota bills actually do

- HF 3433 bans possession of "semiautomatic military-style assault weapons," defined broadly to include many ordinary semiautomatic rifles and shotguns based on features like detachable magazines, threaded barrels, and fixed magazines over 10 rounds.
- The bill prohibits sale, transfer, and in most cases even future transfer of currently owned rifles, meaning you cannot lawfully sell, gift, or bequeath them in Minnesota; current owners must seek a state "certificate" and are subject to storage and location restrictions.
- HF 3402 defines a "large-capacity magazine" as any feeding device over 10 rounds and makes it unlawful to manufacture, import, transfer, own, or possess such magazines in Minnesota.
- Existing owners must, by a fixed deadline, either surrender their magazines to law enforcement for destruction, permanently alter them to 10 rounds or fewer, sell them out of state, or otherwise get them out of Minnesota, with no general grandfathering.

These provisions directly target common semiautomatic rifles and standard magazines, not just criminal misuse of firearms.

Why crime in Minnesota is not driven by these rifles

- Minnesota already has one of the lower gun homicide rates in the country; in 2023 it ranked 8th lowest among states for gun homicide, even as its overall gun death rate (including suicide) rose 35% from 2014–2023.
- Nationally, FBI Uniform Crime Reports and multiple criminological reviews show that rifles of all types, including so-called "assault weapons," account for a very small fraction of gun homicides each year; most gun murders involve handguns, not rifles.
- A federal review of the 1994 Federal Assault Weapons Ban (FAWB) concluded that even under that national law, assault weapons were "rarely used in gun crimes" and therefore any effect on overall gun violence would be small.

- HF 3433 focuses on a class of rifles that are statistically uncommon in day-to-day Minnesota crime, rather than on the illegal handgun trafficking, repeat violent offenders, and stolen firearms that dominate gun crime.

In other words, the bill is aimed at a politically salient category of firearm rather than the weapons actually driving most shootings.

Evidence from prior "assault-weapon" and magazine bans

Limited impact on overall violent crime

- Scholarly reviews of the federal ban and state "assault-weapon" restrictions consistently find little or no measurable impact on overall violent crime or homicides, largely because these weapons are used so rarely in crime to begin with.
- One NIH-indexed review noted that while use of assault rifles in crime did fall during the FAWB, "overall violent crime is decreasing" and the rarity of assault-weapon use meant any effect on total gun violence was limited and hard to detect.
- Counterfactual analyses of the FAWB show that the number of public mass shootings involving assault weapons and large-capacity magazines fell during the ban, with estimates that the law may have prevented several mass shootings, but those events are statistically rare compared with everyday homicides, robberies, and assaults.

So even studies favorable to bans tend to show narrow, event-specific benefits, not broad reductions in overall crime proportional to the burden placed on millions of lawful owners.

Mixed and limited evidence on magazine bans

- A 2018 American Journal of Public Health study found that states with large-capacity magazine (LCM) bans had fewer "high-fatality" mass shootings and lower death tolls in those incidents, but it focused specifically on rare, high-profile events, not general gun crime.
- The same study acknowledged that high-fatality mass shootings are very uncommon, averaging about 2.5 per year nationally between 1990 and 2017, with an average of 25 people killed annually in such attacks.
- A later analysis of the FAWB estimated that the combination of the assault-weapon and LCM bans may have prevented up to 5 public mass shootings over the 10-year federal ban, and projected additional events might have been prevented if it had continued—but those estimates carried wide confidence intervals.

- Advocacy summaries highlight that mass-shooting fatalities were “70% less likely” during the federal ban and that states with LCM bans have fewer mass shootings, but they also acknowledge design limitations, loopholes, and the fact that the federal ban allowed existing weapons and magazines to remain in private hands.

Taken together, the research most favorable to these policies suggests at best a modest, narrowly focused reduction in some types of mass shootings, not a comprehensive solution to broader violent crime—and even those benefits are subject to significant uncertainty.

Second Amendment and constitutional concerns

- In District of Columbia v. Heller, the Supreme Court held that the Second Amendment protects arms “in common use” by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes and rejected bans that amount to prohibitions on entire classes of commonly used firearms.
- Heller explained that the Amendment extends “to all instruments that constitute bearable arms,” which legal scholars and litigants have argued includes detachable magazines of all capacities, because a magazine is an integral component of the functioning firearm.
- Subsequent cases have emphasized that governments cannot simply outlaw arms that law-abiding citizens commonly choose for self-defense, home defense, and other lawful uses, even if those arms are sometimes misused by criminals.
- HF 3433 and HF 3402 target precisely these common arms and magazines: semiautomatic rifles with detachable magazines and standard-capacity magazines over 10 rounds, which are ubiquitous in lawful ownership nationwide and commonly used for home defense, competition, and hunting.

By banning possession, transfer, and in the case of magazines even the continued ownership of previously lawful property, these bills look less like focused crime-control measures and more like categorical prohibitions on a broad class of commonly used arms, bringing them into direct tension with the core holding of Heller.

Why these bills function as punitive measures against lawful owners

- HF 3433 requires current owners to obtain a certificate, subjects them to home inspections for “safe storage,” restricts where they may keep and use their rifles, and forbids almost all future transfers, effectively freezing firearms in one owner’s hands for life.

- HF 3402 compels law-abiding Minnesotans either to surrender their standard-capacity magazines for destruction, permanently alter them, or remove them from the state, turning ordinary property they lawfully purchased into contraband on a set date.
- Neither bill adds significant penalties focused on felons in possession, straw purchasers, gang activity, or illegal trafficking—areas that criminologists consistently identify as the main channels by which guns flow into violent crime.
- Minnesota already has a relatively low gun homicide rate compared to most states, suggesting that broad, confiscatory bans on commonly owned rifles and magazines are not a proportionate or targeted response to the state's crime profile.

A more effective and constitutionally sound approach would prioritize enforcement against violent offenders, illegal gun trafficking, and repeat criminals, rather than criminalizing ordinary ownership of semiautomatic rifles and standard magazines that are rarely used in Minnesota's day-to-day crime but are central to many citizens' lawful exercise of their Second Amendment rights.

Hello,

I am writing to inform you that I oppose both HF 3433 (Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban) and HF 3402 (Total Ban on Possession of Magazines holding more than 10 rounds).

It is my belief that these bills are clearly not constitutional and that they will have no effect on their intended purpose. They will only serve to criminalize good, law abiding, Minnesotans.

HF 3433

What this bill does and why it is bad.

This bill does not just ban “assault weapons”. It will criminalize the possession of nearly all semi-automatic rifles, even rifles that were not intended for military use and do not have a history with sporting rifle applications. This bill would ban many semi-automatic who primary intent was strictly for hunting.

Ownership certification. This is blatantly one of the most obserd and insane propositions I have ever heard. Mandating a certificate of ownership at an undisclosed cost is irresponsiblensible to say the least. This will obviously be abused by city governments to deny people of their constitutionally protected rights to own firearms.

Mandating that people be forced to let law enforcement into their homes to inspect for “safe storage” is asinine. Never have I heard of mandating law enforcement have free and unfettered access to someone's home in order to exercise constitutionally protected rights.

Mandating where a firearm is stored and transferred to is irresponsible and will only serve to turn good and honest Minnesotan into criminals. After going shooting with friends, it is common to meet at someone's house and clean together while hanging out. This bill would make that a crime.

AR and other similar platforms are hunting rifles. They have become one of the most widespread and common use hunting rifles today.

What this bill doesn't do.

This bill will not prevent criminals from obtaining firearms. Felons in Minnesota are still able to obtain firearms. The law has clearly been unsuccessful in preventing criminals from illegally obtaing firearms. This bill will also not prevent criminals and people of bad intent from obtaining firearms. This bill will only serve to turn the good and honest people of Minnesota into criminals or strip them of their constitutionally protected rights.

HF 3402

This bill will not stop or prevent crimes from occurring. It will not stop or prevent people with bad intent from committing crimes it mass shootings in Minnesota. Magazines with capacities over 10 rounds will still be readily available with a short drive to any of our 5 neighboring states. This bill will not be successful at stopping mass shootings in Minnesota. Criminals will not be surrendering or destroying their magazines. It will only turn common use standard capacity magazines into a crime.

Sincerely,
Alexander Hrabe

Opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402

Dear Representatives,

I am writing to urge you to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402. These bills are not a reasonable solution to public safety concerns in the state of Minnesota. They criminalize citizens and will negatively impact families and communities across the state.

As a public servant and a librarian, I see firsthand that gun ownership crosses all demographics and political lines. The semi-automatic rifles and standard magazines targeted by this legislation are common tools used for lawful purposes by hundreds of thousands of Minnesotans.

Criminalizing peaceable citizens for possession does nothing to deter violent crime; it only erodes the essential balance of power between the people and the state. Please stand with your law-abiding constituents and oppose these bills.

Sincerely,
Amy Fettig
4731 344th LN NW
Cambridge, MN 55008

Testimony in Opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402 (Minnesota House)

HF 3433 – Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban

HF 3402 – Ban on Possession of Magazines Holding More Than 10 Rounds

Chair and members of the committee,

My name is Andy Konzelmann, and I am a Minnesota resident. I'm writing to respectfully urge you to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402.

These bills focus on restricting firearms and magazine capacity for law-abiding people, but they do not address the core problem: crime and violent offenders. Minnesota should be prioritizing policies that target the individuals who actually commit violence, rather than limiting the rights and safety options of responsible citizens who follow the law.

I also want to share a personal perspective. I came from Germany, a country with very strict gun control. In that environment, the laws mainly affected lawful people. Criminals still found ways to obtain illegal weapons, or they used other tools to commit harm, including knives and even vehicles. The lesson from that experience is simple: people who intend to do violence do not follow bans. They find another method. Meanwhile, ordinary citizens are left with fewer options to defend themselves and their families.

HF 3433 and HF 3402 would create broad new restrictions and potential criminal penalties that fall mostly on responsible gun owners. These proposals risk turning otherwise law-abiding people into offenders over possession of common equipment, without a clear, proven reduction in crime.

Instead of passing sweeping bans, I urge you to focus on measures that directly reduce violence, such as:

Enforcing existing laws against violent criminals.

Strong penalties for prohibited possessors who use or traffic guns.

Improving prosecution of repeat offenders.

Supporting effective mental health intervention and threat prevention.

Strengthening resources for local law enforcement to target gangs and illegal firearms.

Minnesotans deserve safety and freedom. Punishing lawful ownership is the wrong approach. Please vote no on HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Andy Konzelmann

New London, MN
andreas@konzelmn.com

Chair Moller and Members of the Committee,

My name is Andrés Velasco and I am a resident of Saint Paul. I am writing today to voice my strong opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402. These bills represent an unprecedented infringement on the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding Minnesotans and fail to address the root causes of violent crime.

My parents fled Colombia for a better life, a more peaceful life.

In looking at laws like these (banning all guns), we need to examine the way these laws are applied in other countries. Colombia has instituted some of the most restrictive gun laws in the world over the past few decades, including the near total ban on the lawful carrying of firearms. These types of regulations were created to help reduce violence, but they have only resulted in disarming law-abiding citizens and leaving law-abiding citizens defenseless while the drug cartels and other criminal organizations continue to purchase and own unlawful firearms without any issues.

The humanitarian situation in Colombia has steadily worsened over the past two years, with armed groups increasingly encroaching on the rights of civilians, who are not allowed to use lawful means in order to protect themselves from such groups. Making it illegal for the law-abiding citizens to possess guns does not make an individual or the society as a whole safer; it ensures that only those individuals who disregard the law will have a gun.

I urge the committee not to disenfranchise minority populations by restricting access to the essential tools of self-defense. For many in our communities, having these means is what provides us the confidence and the actual capability to defend our lives and the lives of our loved ones.

Opposition to HF 3433 - The Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban

Millions of Americans lawfully possess semi-automatic rifles to defend their homes and families, hunt for food and amusement, and participate in competitive shooting. Under the common use test created by the Supreme Court of the United States, the government cannot ban a person from possessing a rifle.

Opposition to HF 3402 (Magazine Capacity Ban)

This law would turn thousands of peaceful Minnesotans into felons overnight for possessing private property. Arbitrary limits do not deter criminals—who by definition ignore the law—but they do put law-abiding citizens at a disadvantage when defending their homes and families.

Rather than focusing on legislation that turns peaceful citizens into felons and creates a "safe zone" for criminals, I urge this committee to focus on the effective enforcement of

existing laws. I ask that you vote "NO" on HF 3433 and HF 3402. **Do not let our country turn into the countries that immigrant families fled from.**

Thank you for your time and for considering my testimony.

Sincerely,

Andrés Velasco

To: House Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee

Subject: Opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402

I, Andrew Becken, a lifelong resident of Minnesota, am strongly opposed to the semi-automatic rifle ban in HF 3433 and the high-capacity magazine ban in HF 3402, both scheduled for a critical hearing in the Minnesota House Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee on February 24, 2026. These bills strike at the heart of the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms, a fundamental protection affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in District of Columbia v. Heller and New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen. Semi-automatic rifles and standard-capacity magazines are among the most commonly owned firearms and accessories in the country, used daily for lawful self-defense, home protection, hunting, and sport shooting by hundreds of thousands of responsible Minnesotans. Banning them does not target criminals—it disarms law-abiding citizens who follow every existing rule and background check.

The magazine ban in HF 3402 is especially egregious because it imposes a total prohibition on the manufacture, sale, transfer, and possession of any magazine holding more than 10 rounds, with no grandfathering provision whatsoever. Lawful owners would be forced to destroy, surrender, or remove their property from the state by July 1, 2026, or face felony charges. This is outright confiscation of tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of privately owned items that millions of Americans use safely every day. In a real self-defense scenario, whether a home invasion or an active threat, those extra rounds can mean the difference between stopping an attacker and running out of ammunition while reloading under stress. Criminals will never comply with a 10-round limit; they already obtain guns and magazines illegally, so this law only handicaps law abiding citizens.

HF 3433's assault-weapon-style ban on most semi-automatic rifles is no better. Even if current owners receive limited grandfathering, the bill reportedly requires a special certificate, warrantless home inspections by law enforcement to verify "safe storage," and severe restrictions that limit use to the owner's property or a licensed range—effectively ending hunting and practical training with those firearms. This turns a constitutional right into a heavily regulated privilege that only the wealthy or well-connected can navigate, while honest citizens risk becoming felons over paperwork errors or an unexpected knock on the door. History shows these "feature-based" bans achieve nothing except to create new classes of prohibited items that criminals ignore.

I urge you to consider the above and vote NO to these proposals.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Written Testimony in Opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402

Chair and Members of the House Public Safety Committee,

My name is Andrew Campbell, and I am a law-abiding resident of Waconia, Minnesota. I am submitting this testimony in **opposition** to **HF 3433** and **HF 3402**.

Opposition to HF 3433 – Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban

HF 3433 proposes a near-total ban on the possession, sale, and transfer of most semi-automatic rifles in Minnesota. Under this proposal:

- Current owners would need to obtain a certificate at an unknown cost.
- Law enforcement could conduct warrantless "safe storage" inspections of private homes.
- Rifles could only be kept at home or at a licensed range, effectively prohibiting normal lawful activities such as hunting and sport shooting.
- Transfers — even between family members — would be prohibited.
- Failure to comply could turn everyday gun owners into criminals overnight.

I oppose HF 3433 because it unduly restricts the rights of law-abiding Minnesotans to keep commonly owned firearms. The proposal imposes substantial burdens on personal property, invades private homes with warrantless inspections, and effectively criminalizes lawful conduct without due process.

Opposition to HF 3402 – 10-Round Magazine Ban

HF 3402 would ban the manufacture, sale, transfer, and possession of magazines holding more than ten rounds, without grandfathering protections. Owners of standard-capacity magazines would be forced to **destroy them, surrender them to law enforcement, or remove them from the state by July 1, 2026**.

I oppose HF 3402 because:

- It confiscates legally purchased personal property.
- It does not respect grandfathering for existing owners or legitimate uses such as self-defense, competition, and sport shooting.
- It places harsh penalties on otherwise lawful citizens rather than focusing on criminals who do not comply with any existing laws.

Constitutional and Practical Concerns

Both bills raise serious constitutional concerns under the U.S. Supreme Court's decisions in *District of Columbia v. Heller* and *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen*, which affirm an individual right to possess commonly owned firearms for lawful purposes such as self-defense and sport. These proposals would likely face legal challenges if enacted.

Practically, history shows that restrictive gun laws primarily impact lawful owners, while criminals — by definition — do not follow legal prohibitions. Making law-abiding citizens felons for lawful ownership does little to improve public safety.

Conclusion

For these reasons, I respectfully urge members of the House Public Safety Committee to **oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402**. Laws should protect public safety without infringing on constitutional rights or penalizing lawful Americans for exercising those rights.

Thank you for your consideration. Do the right thing and vote NO on these bills.

Respectfully,

Andrew Campbell
Waconia, MN 55387

HF 3433

OPPOSE (strongly)

A total ban on possession of semi-automatic rifles would on its face appear to be a complete violation of the 2nd amendment. Similar bans have already been challenged and overturned in states like California and Illinois in 2023 and 2024.

This also opens up conversations around 4th amendment rights when discussing "safe storage" requirements and law enforcement's ability to inspect a private residence for compliance.

This bill is outlandish, and any assertion that this ban would create a safer community is faulty on its face. We know factually that gun restrictions do not prevent criminals from obtaining or possessing illegal firearms and we know that stricter gun laws do not directly lead to reduced gun violence.

Common sense gun laws can be beneficial to community safety, but this bill lacks any form of common sense and appears to be a notable violation of our constitutional rights.

Thank you for your time. Your tireless dedication to keeping all Minnesotan's safe is appreciated.

Austin Sonterre

763-291-8082

Hello.

As a law-abiding gun owner with a spotless criminal record, I vehemently oppose HF 3433 (Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban) and HF 3402 (Total Ban on Possession of Magazines holding more than 10 rounds).

The idea that HF 3433 would allow law enforcement to conduct an inspection for “safe storage” without a warrant is a violation of due process. Why would there even be a consideration of passing such legislation which would immediately be challenged in court and likely thrown out due to its unconstitutional nature? Also, the legal costs associated with the state of Minnesota having to defend such legislation (which, again, would ultimately be struck down) gets passed on to the state’s taxpayers.

Regarding HF 3402, this legislation, were it to become law, would turn literally thousands of law-abiding citizens such as myself into felons on 7/1/2026 merely by possessing a commonly owned handgun with a 15-round magazine. There has never been a coherent explanation as to how such a ban would make our communities safer. Is the implication that a spree killer with less rounds at their disposal couldn’t commit as many atrocities? If so, that logic seems flawed. Someone who is motivated to enact violence likely wouldn’t adhere to such a ban. But for the sake argument, let’s suppose criminal elements utilized firearms with a 10-round mag. A motivated killer proficient in firearms would merely obtain additional magazines and thus have little problem replacing empty mags in an expeditious manner.

Brad Carlson

Ramsey, MN

I would quickly like to express my dismay at the Democrats of Minnesota once again attempting to trample on the U.S. constitution, and the rights of every honest law abiding citizen of this state. I am an avid sport shooter and hunter and have been for most of my 70 years. Most new semi-automatic hand guns come standard with 12 to 15 round magazines and to have to replace them would be quite expensive (as in hundreds of dollars).

It is also ridiculous for anyone to suggest that 10 rounds is somehow safer than say 12 rounds.

semi-automatic rifles have been a staple of Minnesota big game hunting for years and years, most of which only

hold about 4 or 5 rounds.

If I wanted these kinds of restrictions I would just move to California

The bottom line is that Congress needs to focus on criminals who couldn't care less about gun law's to begin with.

This latest round of nonsense has also convinced me to never vote Democrat again.

Thank you for your time

Brad Stormo

Dear Legislators,

As a law-abiding, lifelong resident of the ok state of Minnesota, I would like to signal my opposition to HF 3433, HF 3402, and other measures including:

- An "assault weapon" ban
- A semi-auto ban (this technology is nearly 150 years old)
- A ban on standard-capacity (greater than 10 round) magazines
- A "Ghost" gun/3D printed gun ban (the cat is way out of the bag at this point)

These measures are not only very likely unconstitutional, they also only punish the law-abiding. Indeed, violent criminals will ignore these gun control laws, just as they ignore the laws they break.

For myself and other responsible gun owners in the state, these bills are insulting. If they became law, I would be forced to turn in, move out of state, or destroy property that I have spent thousands of dollars on for the lawful purposes of self-defense, sport, and family protection. The alternative is that I become a felon overnight for simply possessing things that I have peaceably owned for years. Honestly, the real rub isn't the financial aspect; it is incremental disarmament. I don't think that my children will be any safer if these laws come to pass. In fact, I suspect they would be made more vulnerable. The 2nd Amendment, and the overwhelmingly law-abiding armed populace it enables, is an important check on government overreach. We would be unwise to intentionally weaken it.

We should focus on enforcing the laws that we already have on the books, with harsh penalties, rather than making new unconstitutional laws that are unlikely to be effective at reducing negative outcomes.

Thanks,
Ben H
Carver, MN

University of Minnesota - Duluth alumnus
B.S. - Computer Science

Ben Koren
Lanesboro, MN
benkoren@gmail.com
507-494-8400

February 23, 2026

Ellen McDaniel
House Public Safety Committee
Minnesota House of Representatives
Email: Ellen.McDaniel@house.mn.gov

Re: Strong Opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402 – Hearing on February 24, 2026

To the Chair and Members of the House Public Safety Committee,

Bills HF 3433 and HF 3402 will be reviewed soon, and I am writing to inform you that I strongly and wholly OPPOSE them. These bills are severe infringements upon our constitutional rights, and will greatly reduce public safety - taking firearms from law-abiding citizens does nothing to address the criminals that already disregard the laws.

HF 3433 (semi-automatics) and HF 3402 (handgun capacities) criminalizes common constitutionally-protected firearms that allow us to defend ourselves. Such restrictions violate the U.S. Supreme Court's "common use" standard from Heller and Bruen.

Criminals often travel in packs: a bolt-action rifle or a handgun with severely limited capacity puts us LAWFUL citizens at a severe disadvantage to the CRIMINALS.

Stripping Americans of the tools needed to defend ourselves and take responsibility for our own safety only weakens us. A weak populace is not a safe populace, but rather the contrary: a weak populace only strengthens and emboldens criminals.

As Lt. Col. Jeff Cooper famously stated: *"If violent crime is to be curbed, it is only the intended victim who can do it. The felon does not fear the police, and he fears neither judge nor jury. Therefore what he must be taught to fear is his victim."*

Criminals are kept in check by the threat of force, especially from their would-be victims. Gun restrictions such as these do not make us safer - they create victims.

Best regards,

Ben Koren

To: Members of the Committee on consideration of the Firearms bills in MN

From: Mr. and Mrs. William Hawley, 8130 Hayland Rd N, Embarrass MN 55732

218-341-5665

Concerning: Opposition to Both Bills that will restrict and criminalize the ownership of firearms and accessories in MN. Semi Auto Ban, and Magazine Ban

We strongly object to the proposed bills that would ban Semi Auto Firearms and Magazine restrictions in the State of Minnesota. These bills are socialist driven and take the basic freedoms we cherish and trample on them. Both bills will make lawful citizens like my wife and I criminals with their passage. Neither of these bills has had any good thought or means put towards them and a direct attack on the very rights we have with lawful, respectful and responsible gun ownership. I have served as a law enforcement officer in MN (retired) and a member of our Air National Guard in MN, and served proudly to defend the rights of our citizens, this goes completely against our way of life! Blatantly moving these bills forward is a direct assault on our very own rights granted under the Constitution. If you want to do anything then ensure that mental health is addressed instead. Recent shootings have been carried out by those with mental health issues, more specific to transgender mental health issues, deal with that instead of trying to make us all criminals. We both stand strongly against these bills and ask of our State Reps to vote against these horrendous bills. Again, we are opposed, period to these actions!

William and Bea Hawley, Embarrass MN

218-341-5665

February 23, 2026

Minnesota House Public Safety Committee
Minnesota House of Representatives
Saint Paul, Minnesota

Re: Opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402

Chairs and Members of the Committee,

My name is Marshal Fitch, and I am the President of the Bluff Country Chapter of Minnesota Deer Hunters Association. We have over 450 members in our chapter, with the majority residing in Southeast Minnesota.

Most of our members own firearms, with many having firearms that are targeted in these bills. Many of us use those firearms for hunting, sport shooting, and self-defense.

I am writing on behalf of the members of my chapter to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402 because they would turn many of our members into felons for owning these common firearms and accessories. The modern sporting rifle is quickly becoming the most common type of firearm used for hunting in Minnesota and across the country. It has become widely used by younger and smaller frame hunters as well, due to the ease of use and the lower recoil of them.

These bills do nothing to target criminals or lower crime, they're solely targeted at peaceful citizens.

We urge you to vote NO on HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Thank you,
Marshal Fitch
President - Bluff Country Chapter MDHA
Winona, Minnesota

To the Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee,

I am writing to strongly urge you to oppose any proposed ban on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms, standard-capacity magazines, or similar legislation. These firearms and magazines are used every day by peaceable Minnesotans for self-defense, hunting, sport shooting, and training — and they are clearly protected under the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Constitution of the United States
Second Amendment
A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Banning them will not make Minnesota safer. It will only punish law-abiding gun owners while doing nothing to stop criminals who ignore the law. I expect you to vote NO on any attempt to ban semi-automatic firearms or magazines. The second amendment to the constitution is clear. “Shall not be infringed.”

I am a 26 year Marine Veteran who enjoys sport shooting at various indoor and outdoor ranges. As a carry permit holder for the last 15 years, and allowed by the 2nd amendment, a gun levels the playing field if an unlawful criminal approach with intent to harm.
Minnesota already has strong gun laws in place. Please focus on removing unlawful criminals that have no regard for our laws.

Thank you for your service & dedication to protecting all Minnesotans.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bob Kjer
320-267-7912
USMC Retired

February 23rd, 2026

Ellen McDaniel

Committee Administrator, DFL Caucus

Minnesota House of Representatives

RE: HF 3433 and HF 3402

Good afternoon,

My name is Brandon Eley. I am a lawful firearms owner, a proud Minnesotan and Veteran of the United States Air Force Reserves. I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Like many responsible gun owners across our state, I rely on firearms for lawful purposes including self-defense, hunting, and sport shooting. I am deeply concerned that these proposed bills would impose sweeping restrictions on law-abiding citizens while doing little to address the root causes of violent crime.

Criminals, by definition, do not follow firearm regulations. Broad prohibitions and additional restrictions primarily affect those of us who already comply with existing laws. Policies that limit magazine capacity or ban commonly owned firearms risk placing responsible citizens at a disadvantage while failing to deter individuals who are intent on committing violent acts, regardless of the law. Quite the contrary, they would empower and embolden criminals that would be well aware of the handicaps placed on law-abiding citizens.

I respectfully urge lawmakers to focus on solutions that directly address violence at its source. Investments in mental health services, substance abuse treatment, community-based intervention programs, and stronger enforcement of existing laws may offer more meaningful results than additional restrictions on responsible gun owners.

I take firearm ownership seriously and remain committed to following all state and federal laws. I ask that you and the members of the committee carefully consider the unintended consequences these bills may have on lawful Minnesotans who simply wish to protect themselves and their families. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Brandon Eley

Brandon Eley

To the Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee,

I am writing to strongly urge you to oppose any proposed ban on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms, standard-capacity magazines, or similar legislation. These firearms and magazines are used every day by peaceable Minnesotans for self-defense, hunting, sport shooting, and training — and they are clearly protected under the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Constitution of the United States
Second Amendment
A well-regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

Banning them will not make Minnesota safer. It will only punish law-abiding gun owners while doing nothing to stop criminals who ignore the law. I expect you to vote NO on any attempt to ban semi-automatic firearms or magazines. The second amendment to the constitution is clear. “Shall not be infringed.”

Thank you for your service & dedication to protecting all Minnesotans.

Brent Morris
9450 Marshview Rdg
Brainerd, MN 56401
218-330-6650

Representative McDaniel,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HF 3402 and HF 3433.

These bills do not address the root causes of gun violence and instead punish lawful, responsible gun owners who have committed no crime. A total ban on magazines over 10 rounds and a ban on commonly owned semi-automatic rifles violate the Second Amendment and set a troubling precedent of ignoring constitutional limits.

These proposals would also affect my family directly. My children and I regularly go to the range together. It is something we enjoy and a way to teach them responsibility, safety, and respect. With inflation and the rising cost of everyday life, adding a recurring three-year “fee,” with no stated cap, simply to keep firearms I already own legally would make this pastime much harder to afford, if not impossible depending on the cost.

We are also avid hunters. Small-game hunting is a long-standing Minnesota tradition that I share with my children, and these bills would ban firearms commonly used for that purpose. That directly impacts lawful outdoor activities that have nothing to do with violent crime.

I am especially concerned with how the bill defines a “semi-automatic military-style assault weapon” based on cosmetic or ergonomic features rather than function. Banning firearms based on cosmetic features is no different than banning a spoiler on a Honda Civic because it makes the car look faster. It focuses on how something looks instead of what it actually does.

For example, a folding or telescoping stock is designed to allow a firearm to fit the shooter properly. Proper fit improves control and safe handling, reducing the likelihood of injury or stray shots. It does not increase lethality; it improves safe operation.

A pistol grip or thumbhole stock allows the shooter to maintain better control of the firearm. That control increases safety, especially when teaching my children at the range or while hunting. It does not make the firearm shoot “harder” or faster. It simply allows for safer handling.

A flash suppressor is commonly misunderstood. Its primary purpose is to reduce visible muzzle flash, which helps preserve the shooter’s vision in low light and can improve control between shots. It does not make a firearm more powerful or more dangerous.

The inclusion of threaded barrels capable of accepting accessories is also troubling. In particular, suppressors are often portrayed inaccurately. A suppressor does not silence a firearm. Most unsuppressed firearms produce between roughly 140 and 180 decibels. A suppressor typically reduces that sound by about 20 to 35 decibels, often bringing it closer to the threshold associated with immediate hearing damage, but still very loud. An example would be military jet takeoffs, tornado sirens, and thunderclaps, these all fall within the 130-140 decibel range and you know they are not quiet. Suppressors are

safety equipment. They help protect hearing and make communication at the range more manageable. When my children are shooting, being able to give instructions without shouting improves safety, not the opposite.

These features focus on appearance and accessories rather than on criminal misuse. Targeting them does nothing to address violent crime while directly affecting lawful owners like myself.

What disappoints me most is the continued focus on restricting rights instead of investing time and resources into identifying and addressing the real causes of violence. Mental health, enforcement of existing laws, and meaningful community solutions deserve serious attention.

I urge you to oppose HF 3402 and HF 3433 and to support policies that genuinely reduce violence without infringing on constitutional rights or harming Minnesota families and traditions.

Respectfully,
Brian Martin

February 20, 2026

Minnesota House Public Safety Committee
c/o Ellen.McDaniel@house.mn.gov

I oppose HF 3402 & HF 3433. I do not agree that these bills will reduce crime in Minnesota. These bills are only ceremonial.

The vast majority of serious crimes in Minnesota are not committed by sportsmen or legal gun owners. But, they are the ones who bear the brunt of these proposed enactments.

Felonies in Minnesota are most often committed by individuals who have already forfeited their rights to even own or use firearms.

It is this group that strong enforcement efforts must be directed toward.

So, these bills will not affect reducing crime whatsoever.

Respectfully,
Brian Rajala
3030 Isleview Rd
Grand Rapids, MN. 55744

Subject: Written Testimony in Opposition to HF 3433, SF 3654, HF 3402 & SF 3714

Dear Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Casey McKinstrey, and I am submitting this written testimony in strong opposition to HF 3433, SF 3654, HF 3402, and SF 3714. These proposals would directly and negatively impact me, my family, and countless other law-abiding Minnesotans by substantially restricting our constitutional rights, our property, and our ability to engage in lawful and traditional activities.

HF 3433 & SF 3654 – Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban

These bills would prohibit the sale, transfer, and possession of nearly all semi-automatic rifles, with limited grandfathering applicable only to current owners and no ability to transfer ownership in the future.

As a law-abiding citizen, this legislation would immediately restrict my ability to acquire commonly owned firearms that are widely used for lawful purposes such as sport shooting, training, and hunting. It would also prevent me from transferring legally owned property to family members, including my children in the future. The inability to transfer ownership strips these firearms of both their practical and financial value and interferes with long-standing traditions of passing down lawful property across generations.

The certification requirement—at an unknown cost—adds a financial burden to the exercise of a constitutional right. More concerning is the provision permitting warrantless home inspections to verify "safe storage." Requiring me to submit to discretionary, suspicion-less inspections of my home in order to retain lawfully owned property undermines my reasonable expectation of privacy and places me in the position of choosing between my Second Amendment rights and my Fourth Amendment protections.

The restriction limiting possession strictly to my home or a licensed firing range effectively eliminates lawful uses such as hunting on public or private land not owned by me. This would directly prevent me and others from participating in Minnesota's longstanding hunting traditions using commonly owned firearms. Lawful conduct would be prohibited not because of misuse, but because of the type of firearm possessed.

In effect, this legislation narrows the practical ability of law-abiding citizens to meaningfully exercise their Second Amendment rights by banning an entire class of commonly used firearms and severely limiting how and where they may be possessed.

HF 3402 & SF 3714 – Magazine Ban

These bills impose a total ban on the manufacture, sale, transfer, and possession of magazines capable of holding more than ten rounds, with no grandfathering provision.

This would directly affect me and other lawful owners who currently possess standard-capacity magazines that are factory standard for many commonly owned firearms. Under this proposal, I would be required to destroy my property, surrender it to law enforcement, or remove it from the state by July 1, 2026. That is a forced forfeiture of legally acquired property without compensation.

Beyond property loss, the restriction materially limits the functionality of firearms that are lawfully owned and commonly used. Standard-capacity magazines are part of the ordinary configuration of many firearms in circulation. Criminalizing their possession does not target misuse; it targets ownership itself.

For law-abiding Minnesotans, this bill transforms responsible citizens into potential criminals based solely on continued possession of previously lawful items. It creates legal jeopardy not because of harmful conduct, but because of the configuration of commonly owned equipment.

Taken together, these bills impose sweeping prohibitions that disproportionately burden responsible citizens while doing little to address those who intentionally violate the law. They restrict my freedom to acquire, retain, and transfer lawful property; they limit how I may exercise my constitutional rights; and they condition those rights on intrusive government oversight.

The practical effect is not regulation of misuse, but erosion of lawful ownership. Many Minnesotans who comply with background checks, safe storage practices, and existing firearm laws would face new criminal exposure, financial burdens, and loss of property—without having committed any wrongdoing.

Public safety is a legitimate goal. However, policies must be narrowly tailored, constitutionally sound, and focused on criminal conduct rather than broad prohibitions affecting responsible citizens. These proposals fail to strike that balance.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose HF 3433, SF 3654, HF 3402, and SF 3714.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Casey McKinstrey

Chaska, MN 55318

I am writing in regards to my extreme opposition to the unconstitutional HF 3402 and HF 3433! It seems the DFL in Minnesota has nothing better to do than try and take away my rights and freedoms as well as the items that law abiding Minnesota gun owners have legally purchased! These items have been used for hunting and self defense also just plain shooting fun for many years and now a bunch of anti American thugs want to make it a crime to own them! Don't you think with all the fraud of billions of taxpayer dollars you would have better things to go after than law abiding Americans? But miraculously this is what you choose to do the first chance you get! I also have to wonder how many of you have actually even held a firearm or even have a shred of knowledge about one!

Unrespectfully CHAD HALVORSON

23 February 2026

Written Testimony for HF 3433 and HF 3402

My name is Charles LeMont and I live in St. Cloud MN. I am a veteran who has obeyed the laws, paid my taxes and contributed to Minnesota all of my life. I have been a responsible gun owner who take this right seriously and responsibly.

I find HF 3433 and HF 3402 very disturbing. I do not understand what I and thousands of others have done to have these rights taken away. I feel that HF 3433 and HF 3402 places me in the same category as felons who are denied ownership and possession of firearms.

I would like to know how often these firearms are used in gun crime. My guess is that it very seldom. If these firearms are very seldom used in gun violence, then these laws will not have much effect and will only cause great expense and a lot of wasted effort. Innocent people could also be persecuted.

I find another disturbing thing about HF 3433 and HF 3402 is the confiscation of my property without compensation. I do not know why I have to lose thousands of dollars in this taking.

Minnesota has strong gun control laws. I feel a better approach to the gun violence problem would be to strictly enforce existing laws before adding new laws that only punish law-abiding citizens.

I try not to be a single-issue voter but it is hard not to be when a proposed laws attack your rights, and take thousands of dollars from you without compensation. Not to mention making ownership of lawfully purchased firearms and accessories criminal.

Charles LeMont
1127 30th Ave N
St. Cloud, MN 56030

320-251-4497

cflemont@gmail.com

Hello,

I'm writing to urge reconsideration on bills HF 3402 & SF 3714 Large Capacity Magazine Bans and HF 3433 & SF 3654 Assault Weapon Bans.

In light of the Federal occupation of Minnesota this year, and specifically the profound sense of Federal government betrayal from Operation Metro Surge, these bills warrant revision and potentially total reconsideration.

I've worked in big tech with medical records and financial systems for the past 15 years and have a family history of military service and Federal government defense contracting. I believe that the extreme proliferation of firearms in the civilian population, while something I'm generally uncomfortable with, has played a silent yet significant role in deterring a more dangerous situation on the ground here in Minnesota so far in 2026.

I purchased a firearm for the first time in my life this month. I did so despite the fact that it was never a priority prior to 2026, and I never plan or desire to ever shoot a firearm towards a living being. I did so because I believe that there is enough available data about firearm purchases that a company such as Palantir could, with money and connections, feasibly build out profiles for every citizen in the US. The software applications that direct the actions of the DHS agents in our communities likely take into account aggregated economic, demographic, and propensity that households are armed when targeting their paramilitary-style actions.

It was amazing to me how easy it was to purchase what I consider to be an extremely dangerous weapon in the form of a pump-action shotgun. It took about 10 minutes for a background check and I didn't require any sort of permit to purchase it. The legislation that is proposed here does nothing to make acquiring that or even more dangerous semi-automatic shotguns any more difficult.

Both bills contain exemptions for Government agents, and the assault weapon ban text exempts all government employees. I feel less safe from these populations having guns than the general public, and advocate for legislation that mandates demilitarization of all Government forces in the state of Minnesota commensurate with any demilitarization of the civilian populace.

The Assault Weapon Ban bills include additional administrative costs including significant administrative burden and open-ended licensing fees at a time when the state budget is already under intense, previously unexpected pressure. The provision for mandatory home inspections, while not strictly unconstitutional, will certainly be seen as such for any privacy advocates.

As someone with both a mother and sister who are Catholic high school teachers in the Twin Cities metro, I do understand how profoundly the shooting last year at Annunciation shook our community. I completely understand how this legislation aims to mitigate the amount of harm that can be caused should similar tragic events continue to occur. I believe the most important thing we can do for prevention is strong social welfare programs, including single payer healthcare

and adequate support for housing and food. Right now more than ever, those need to be our legislative priorities.

My concern for the bills is rooted in pragmatism: this has the potential to politically cripple the DFL at a time when we have an unprecedented opportunity to build the varied coalition that we need in order to pass legislative priorities, which should be focused on social welfare to assist those most vulnerable members of our community. More and more people to whom the second amendment is a real priority are currently politically disenfranchised. We may forever lose the opportunity to gain their support if they can remember when the Government murdered their neighbors, they saw no justice, and then the DFL voted to take away their guns.

If we show now that the voting public needs to choose between the most corrupt political party in history and a party that is vowing to strip them of their constitutionally protected ability to own firearms and turn hundreds of thousands of Minnesotans into felons by inaction and spend their tax dollars to it, we will continue to perpetuate the same environment rife with division and political apathy that caused this dangerous Federal administration to be elected in the first place.

Your constituent and neighbor,
Chris Bevington
Oregon Ave, St Louis Park, MN

Dear Committee members,

The attempt to ban any semi automatic rifles is a travesty to us law abiding citizens. Firearms with a pistol grip are a great platform for women and young shooters to learn on. Semi automatic firearms are great for youth and women to shoot because they don't have the kick with the higher calibers as the gas control makes it nicer to during sustained target practice. The pistol grip allows them to control the firearm as well. The small hands of women and youth sometimes make it more dangerous handling a typical stock. My children all shoot very well with the modern sporting rifles and I wish I had the luxury to shoot more at a younger age. One thing I will add is that when people take firearm safety and learn how to responsibly handle a firearm everyone is more safe because of that.

I also do not support the ban of High capacity magazines. We hunt varmints and predators and when we are hunting we typically aren't carrying lose boxes of ammo and want to have as much as we can in limited magazines the 20/30 round magazines are nice for a walk through a section. From a personal defense standpoint I want to have as much ammo in my firearm because if there are numerous intruders I want to make sure my family is protected from any and all that are coming through my front door uninvited. I shouldn't have to reload and take valuable seconds needed to defend myself or my family!

Thanks for your consideration in terminating the bills that are being presented.

Sincerely,

Chris Meyer

Apple Valley Mn.

This data is internal to Brunswick.

Dear Representatives, I am writing you in regards to HF 3433, and HF 3402.

I am a lifelong Minnesota resident with roots dating back to the Dakota tribe of Native Americans, I have watched our once great state go from one of the safest and known as " the most sensible blue state" to a dangerous nanny state in only a few years. In the past few years violent crimes have skyrocketed, the places I used to walk with my grandmother are now dangerous and filled with drug users. We have a district attorney proudly proclaiming she will not prosecute certain crimes in the most populated county, and judges standing on political ideals releasing criminals of violent crimes back to the streets instantly. In the past couple years I have been attacked by a drug user in Minneapolis, a drunk homeless man in St Paul, and a drug dealer/ woman beater in Sartell just for too close to their activities while doing my job of delivering fuel. Firearms are the great equaliser and have been used in 15 million defensive situations a year, and are the safest method for Women, Elderly, and the LGBT community, to pass such draconian and unconstitutional laws would put them in danger. The same DFL sponsoring these bills just last week were praising the black men and women exercising their second amendment right at the anti-ice protests by holding M&P 15-22's and stating Thomas Pretti had a right to carry his P320 at these protests for safety are now trying to ban these exact firearms. I was at the range just this past weekend stationed between a group of Korean americans practicing and talking about joining the National Guard, and 3 LGBT folk consisting of 2 trans women and a biological woman training for self defense, their self defense firearms would land them 5 years prison under these bills.

We see this year in and year out the states with the highest levels of gun control have the most dangerous metros and continue to be decades into their insanely restrictive laws: LA, Portland, Seattle, Chicago, Delaware. Now with Ohio and Florida rolling back their gun control bills they have seen significant drops in violent crime, Ohio passed constitutional carry and in the same year 6 or their 8 most dangerous cities had irrefutable drops in crime in the first year and onward. Houston, Austin, and Dallas have similar populations to LA, Seattle, and Portland, but without the violent crime rates. On the other hand a woman in California was murdered last year by her abusive ex partner while she was in the long arduous process of obtaining a firearm for her own defense. Per the FBI long guns only make up 5% of guns used in crimes, yet the ar-15 is the most commonly owned firearm and used millions of times a year for home defense. A rifle is by far the easiest and safest platform for lower skilled shooters and those of weaker stature to safely operate given its length of hold, low recoil, and simple operating. All the characteristics banned in these bills exist to increase accuracy and ensure a safe comfortable hold preventing missed shots unintentionally creating a casualty.

On the topic of Magazine capacity the standard capacity included with nearly all rifles is 30 rounds and 17 for pistols. Why would anyone need 30 rounds you ask? Well in have you heard of feral hogs? They're starting to invade Minnesota and super dangerous to people. Have you heard of coyotes? When they're desperate they will attack people, just outside the cities we've seen a significant rise in coyote encounters even seeping into the suburbs. Have you heard of Methamphetamines? We have countless videos of metheads attacking people and police stepping in needing more than 10 rounds to stop the threat, on that note we have video from California or looters breaking into stores in numbers topping 50 heads and charging the store manager with malicious intent only to be stopped by oh look at that an ar-15 with a standard magazine which scared them off without a shot being fired. Minnesota's rioters have proven to

use the same overwhelming numbers technique in their anti law enforcement protests and severely injuring multiple people with zero mercy until police step in, targeting indiscriminately even attacking their own supporters.

In summary these laws violate not only our Second amendment rights which protect our First and fourth amendment rights, but also violate our Fourth and Fifth amendment rights violating the takings clause and the undue searches and seizure clause. As well as violating the rulings in Bruin, Heller, and the gun owners privacy act. The supreme court has stated time and time again you can't ban arms in common use such as America's most common firearms. We are the only blue state in our circuit and these laws would be struck down certainly by the supreme court even on a three judge panel. On top of all this it creates a two class system exempting state employees and law enforcement, the ruling elite, and the unprotected populace. On a side note the grandfathering clause creates undue burden on a constitutional right which has also been a determining factor for the supreme court. Criminals don't follow the law, they get arms even the regular citizen can't through illegal means, these laws do nothing but endanger law abiding citizens, and I think if these bills should pass that said responsibility should weigh heavy on anyone that votes in favor of these bills anytime a citizen is unable to protect themselves.

Thank you for your time,
Christopher Sutton
Wright County

House Public Safety Committee:

I am writing in opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402.

These bills are commonly referred to as “bans” on certain firearms and accessories, but that’s not what they are.

If these bills are passed, the armed gunmen of the political class—like the men who killed George Floyd, Alex Pretti, and Renee Good—will still have semi-automatic weapons and high-capacity magazines. So the guns and accessories themselves will not be banned or restricted. Instead, the People of Minnesota, “in whom all political power is inherent” according to the Minnesota Constitution, will be banned from owning them and restricted in their political power. Minnesotans like George Floyd, Alex Pretti, and Renee Good will have less power, and the political class will have more. These bills are not anti-gun; they are anti-citizen, and pro-tyranny.

January 2026 taught left-leaning Minnesotans what many right-leaning Minnesotans have understood for years—that at times, citizens are morally obligated to resist and restrain government by force. These bills directly undermine the citizens’ ability to do that. Ironically, these bills may undue much of the political division in Minnesota by bringing left and right Minnesotans together in opposition to the political class which is seeking to divide, disarm, and oppress us.

Vote “no” on these bills.

Cory Genelin
33818 316 Street
Le Sueur, MN 56058

Date: February 23, 2026
To: House Public Safety Committee
Re: HF 3433 and HF 3402

Written Testimony from:
Craig Burris
19766 Holloway Lane
Lakeville, MN 55044

Members of the House Public Safety Committee,

I respectfully urge you to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402.

These bills place significant burdens on law-abiding citizens while offering little evidence that they will reduce violent crime. Policies should target criminal behavior. These proposals primarily affect individuals who already follow the law.

HF 3433 restricts certain semi-automatic rifles based largely on external features rather than mechanical function. The firearms covered by this bill operate the same way as many other commonly owned semi-automatic firearms that are not included. The focus on cosmetic characteristics does not meaningfully address criminal misuse.

The bill would also impose substantial financial and legal burdens on Minnesotans who lawfully purchased their property. Owners would be forced to surrender legally acquired firearms without compensation, store them out of state, or comply with a registration and certification process that includes potential costs and compliance requirements. For many families, this represents a significant hardship despite no wrongdoing.

HF 3402 prohibits magazines holding more than ten rounds, including those that are standard for many commonly owned firearms. After enactment, simple possession would constitute a felony. That means an otherwise law-abiding citizen who unknowingly retains a magazine purchased years earlier could face serious criminal penalties. Turning technical possession issues into felonies risks criminalizing ordinary citizens rather than deterring violent offenders.

Experience in other jurisdictions shows that individuals intent on committing violent crimes do not comply with magazine limits or firearm feature bans. Criminals, by definition, ignore prohibitions. Expanding restrictions on lawful ownership does not address the root causes of violent crime.

Public safety is a serious responsibility. Legislation should focus on prosecuting violent offenders, strengthening mental health intervention, and enforcing existing laws. Broad prohibitions on commonly owned firearms and standard equipment shift the burden to responsible citizens while offering uncertain benefits.

I ask you to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402 and instead pursue solutions that directly target criminal behavior while respecting the constitutional rights of law-abiding Minnesotans.

Respectfully,

Craig Burris

I'm writing in opposition to the proposed magazine ban HF3402. This is another case of so called "well-intentioned" legislation that does not impact those with bad intentions, only those like myself with extensive training and only good intention would comply.

Does anyone really think the "bad guys" will be turning theirs in as suggested? No they will not.

It seems as though there are several mental health issues that are not being addressed, at the expense of law-abiding citizens.

I've heard of knife attacks, yet no call for knife control. How about helping with preventable medical errors in hospitals. This would be a more noble cause as they cause over 200,000 deaths annually in the US, yet you're going after an inanimate object like a magazine size for a legal firearm.

How about we have reasonable common sense medical error control laws? Check out the landmark publication "To Err is Human."

It's not like those people with bad intentions are going to comply anyway leaving those of us with training that would comply being at a major disadvantage. It's already illegal to intentionally shoot someone isn't it?

Sincerely,

Daniel Baumgardner

Vadnais Heights, MN 55127

I just want to preface with the fact that I'm a Democrat and have voted blue in every election up to this point. HF 3433 and HF 3402 are going to diminish and infringe on the rights of Minnesotans, make us more vulnerable to an authoritarian fascist administration in the White House, and specifically make minorities more vulnerable. Armed citizens are harder to oppress, and that's what the Republicans are trying to do to us right now.

With Donald Trump's authoritarian regime in the white house murdering Minnesotans in the street for exercising their constitutional rights, how is it possible that the DFL thinks NOW is a good time to disarm the population? Right after we just watched fellow Americans get gunned down in the street and smeared as domestic terrorists for speaking out against the administration. I cannot fathom why anyone would think this a good idea with a Fascist in the white house, who is proving time and time again that the law does not matter to him or his administration one bit. How are we actually safer if we were all disarmed, given that the Trump administration clearly will not respect the law, or our constitutional rights? It won't bring over any Republicans or Independents that are sick of Trump, and is basically giving away an easy Democrat win in the elections this November. Telling blue voters in MN that disarming them when a hostile administration is actively targeting them is insane right now.

An Assault weapons ban, especially given the current circumstances, makes no sense if the goal truly is to reduce gun violence in communities by targeting legislation at the biggest sources of gun violence. Rifles in general only constitute 3-5 percent of gun homicides in the country on a given year. Semi-Automatic rifles like AR-15s are barely used in crime, and are the best weapon to carry out the actual purpose of the 2nd Amendment: to resist an Authoritarian government that doesn't respect the rule of law. Which we currently have. An armed population is harder to oppress, and the President and the Republicans are trying their hardest to do that and crack down on opposition in the most draconian way possible. Armed Minorities are harder to oppress, including people of color and LGBT people.

A standard capacity magazine for a handgun is 15 rounds, and a standard capacity magazine for a Semi-Automatic rifle is 30 rounds. These are not high-capacity magazines. The majority of firearms in ownership right now in MN would be made illegal and their owners rendered felons by HF 3402. This is diminishing the rights of Minnesotans to self-defense as established in DC v Heller (08). This decision affirms that Americans have the right to firearms for self-defense. Again, the most common magazine size for handguns is 15 rounds, meaning that most Minnesotans that own firearms likely own a Semi-Automatic pistol with a 15 round magazine. 38-45 percent of Minnesotan households own firearms, and it would be a safe bet that most of these households have at least 1 15 round magazine pistol. This bill would make all of these families into felons for having a commonly used firearm for self defense.

These gun control measures are insane when a rogue Republican administration is murdering Democrats in the streets. These bills cannot be passed. They are taking away the rights of Minnesotans and seizing their property with no compensation. They are empowering fascists in the White House. Do the Democrats want to give more power to the fascist Trump administration by disarming their populations? This makes it really hard to vote for Democrats.

Dear Members of the Minnesota Legislature,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to proposed bills HF3433, HF3402, and HF4300. As a Minnesota citizen, I believe these measures infringe upon fundamental constitutional protections guaranteed to me under the Second and Fourth Amendments of the United States Constitution.

The Second Amendment clearly affirms the right of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms. Any legislation that unduly restricts this right—whether through broad prohibitions, excessive regulatory burdens, or measures that presume guilt rather than innocence—erodes a core liberty that has long been recognized as an individual right. Responsible firearm ownership is not only a constitutional guarantee, but also an integral part of personal security, family protection, and Minnesota's longstanding cultural heritage.

Equally concerning are the Fourth Amendment implications raised by these bills. The Constitution protects citizens against unreasonable searches and seizures and requires due process before the government may deprive individuals of property or liberty. Provisions that enable confiscation, monitoring, or investigative action without robust procedural safeguards undermine the fundamental principle that citizens are presumed innocent and entitled to due process under the law.

Public safety is an important and legitimate objective. However, legislation that compromises constitutional protections in pursuit of that goal sets a troubling precedent. Effective policy must balance safety with liberty, ensuring that the rights of law-abiding citizens are not diminished in the process.

I respectfully urge you to vote against HF3433, HF3402, and HF4300. These bills, as proposed, represent an overreach that threatens constitutionally protected freedoms. I ask that you instead pursue solutions that address public safety concerns without infringing upon the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

Thank you for your time and your service to the people of Minnesota. I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,
Darwin Stinton

David Andreasen
818 Main Street SW
Menahga, MN 56464

February 23, 2026

Ellen McDaniel
Minnesota State House of Representatives

Sent by email to: Ellen.McDaniel@house.mn.gov

Representative McDaniel,

I am a law-abiding owner of semi-automatic rifles. I also own magazines for those rifles that hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition.

I am strongly opposed to bills HF 3433 (Semi-automatic Rifle Ban) and HF 3402 (Ban on possession of magazines holding more than 10 rounds). These bills will take away my property - which is against the United States Constitution. Not being able to own these items means I won't be able to enjoy target shooting and hunting with these weapons and magazines.

I also oppose the provisions that allow police officers to search my home if I store these items without a warrant. Searching my home without a warrant is unconstitutional. It is an abuse of power we see with ICE searches. Which were also illegal.

I appreciate your time and consideration.

David Andreasen

Dear Members of the Legislature,

I am writing as a concerned resident of Minnesota to respectfully express my opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402.

While I understand that these bills may be intended to promote public safety, I am deeply concerned that their practical effect would be to create greater uncertainty and legal risk for law-abiding LGBTQ gun owners who rely on their Second Amendment rights for personal protection, particularly in today's tense and polarized political climate.

Many LGBTQ individuals face unique and well documented threats, including harassment, hate crimes, and targeted violence. For some, lawful firearm ownership is not a political statement but a deeply personal safety decision. Measures that expand restrictions, increase administrative burdens, or introduce ambiguous compliance standards can unintentionally place responsible gun owners at risk of falling afoul of complex regulations, despite acting in good faith.

When laws are unclear, rapidly changing, or subject to broad interpretation, marginalized communities will often feel the greatest anxiety about whether they will be treated fairly in enforcement. The possibility of inconsistent application or bureaucratic delays in obtaining, renewing, or maintaining lawful ownership can leave vulnerable individuals feeling exposed rather than protected.

Public safety policy should focus on violent offenders and those who misuse firearms, not on adding layers of uncertainty for law-abiding citizens who have completed requisite background checks and taken steps to protect themselves responsibly and legally. Any legislation in this area must carefully balance community safety with the fundamental rights and legitimate self-defense concerns of all residents, including LGBTQ Minnesotans.

I urge you to reconsider HF 3433 and HF 3402 in their current form and to work toward solutions that enhance safety without placing additional burdens or uncertainty on responsible, law-abiding gun owners.

Thank you for your time and your service to our state.

Sincerely,
Karina Katherine Duran

To all members of the Minnesota legislature;

I am writing to make my opposition to bill HF 3402 and its Senate companion bill a formal part of the public record. This bill is in direct conflict with the wishes of many law-abiding citizens of Minnesota. As part of the Democrat Farmer-Labor Party, Democrat lawmakers in Minnesota need to make a greater effort to represent the desires of the very farmers and laborers they claim to represent.

As a law-abiding citizen of Minnesota, this ban on the manufacture, sale, transfer, and possession of magazines with a larger capacity than ten rounds directly conflicts with my and my family's ability to hunt and protect our farms against nuisance animals that destroy our crops and vegetable gardens.

But even if this bill did NOT conflict with my family's customs, I would still strongly oppose it, because:

This bill is a part of an ongoing effort to disarm the populace, punishing law-abiding citizens for the actions of criminals. Criminals will continue to ignore the law anyway. Furthermore, HF 3402 and its Senate companion bill directly conflicts with the Second Amendment rights of American citizens; the Second Amendment states: “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” Prohibiting magazines of a certain capacity is a direct infringement of and attack on the people's right to keep and bear arms.

If the Minnesota legislature passes this bill, it will not be the end of the Minnesota legislature's attack on the rights of Minnesota citizens. It will continue to whittle away at the rights of every gun owner to keep and bear arms until every gun and every piece of ammunition in Minnesota is confiscated.

I oppose bill HF 3402 and its companion bill in the Senate.

Sincerely,
Dr. Melanie Piltingsrud
New Richland, MN
(507) 514-3620

HF 3433 – Written Opposition

I am submitting this statement in opposition to HF 3433. While I understand the importance of public safety discussions, this bill raises serious constitutional and practical concerns that deserve careful reconsideration.

First, there are legitimate questions about how this proposal aligns with both Second and Fourth Amendment protections. The language of the bill appears broad and somewhat unclear, which creates uncertainty for lawful firearm owners while offering little clarity about how it would prevent criminal misuse. Laws that affect constitutional rights should be narrowly tailored, clearly written, and supported by strong evidence that they will achieve their intended purpose.

Minnesota already strengthened firearm transfer requirements in recent years, including permits to purchase and documentation for private sales. These existing regulations provide mechanisms for oversight and accountability. Adding additional layers without clear data showing a gap in effectiveness risks regulatory duplication rather than meaningful safety improvement.

Another concern is the removal of references to firearms “readily adapted to sporting purposes.” Many rifles that fall into this category are routinely used in legitimate competition, training, and sporting activities. Policy changes that overlook these lawful uses may unintentionally burden responsible owners while failing to address criminal behavior, which typically operates outside legal compliance altogether.

Even for those open to reasonable regulation, legislation should focus on measurable outcomes. Expanding restrictions without demonstrating how they reduce violent crime can erode public confidence in policymaking and shift attention away from approaches that may be more effective, such as enforcement of existing laws or intervention strategies aimed at high-risk offenders.

For these reasons, I respectfully oppose HF 3433 as currently written.

HF 3402 – Written Opposition

I also wish to express opposition to HF 3402. The scope of this proposal is significant, and there is reason to believe it may create unintended consequences without producing meaningful gains in public safety.

Available data consistently shows that most violent firearm offenses involve handguns, frequently obtained through theft or illegal channels by individuals already prohibited from possession. Restrictions focused primarily on magazine capacity do not directly address these pathways. Individuals intent on criminal activity often bypass legal requirements entirely, meaning additional restrictions tend to affect compliant citizens far more than offenders.

A sweeping ban on commonly owned magazines could place many otherwise law-abiding individuals in a difficult legal position overnight. When legislation risks

criminalizing possession of items that were legally obtained and widely owned, it raises concerns about fairness, enforceability, and overall public trust in the law.

Public safety efforts may yield greater results by focusing on consistent enforcement of existing statutes, addressing repeat violent offenders, improving reporting and tracing of stolen firearms, and investing in prevention strategies that address root causes of violence. These approaches target behavior rather than broadly restricting lawful ownership.

Effective legislation should be grounded in clear evidence, constitutional awareness, and realistic expectations about enforcement. In its current form, HF 3402 does not appear to meet those standards, and I therefore oppose its advancement.

Minnesota House of Representatives
Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee

Re: HF 3433 and HF 3402
Position: Opposition

Written Testimony

Chair and Members of the Committee:

My name is Dru DeLange. I am a lifelong Minnesotan, a husband, a father, a hunter, and a law-abiding citizen. I respectfully submit this written testimony in opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402. My objection is not partisan; it is constitutional.

These bills do not represent careful regulation. They represent sweeping prohibition and cross multiple constitutional boundaries.

Second Amendment

HF 3433 bans the sale, transfer, and possession of commonly owned semi-automatic rifles. HF 3402 bans standard-capacity magazines possessed lawfully by millions of Americans.

Semi-automatic firearms have existed for well over a century and have been in ordinary civilian use for generations. They are standard, common, and widely used for lawful purposes including self-defense, hunting, and sport shooting.

The Second Amendment protects the right of the people to keep and bear arms. That protection extends to arms in common use. A categorical ban on ordinary, widely possessed arms is not regulation—it is elimination. The Constitution does not authorize the legislature to prohibit protected arms because they are politically controversial.

Fifth Amendment

HF 3402 requires citizens to destroy, surrender, or remove from the state lawfully acquired property without compensation and without wrongdoing.

When government mandates forfeiture or destruction of private property absent misconduct, it raises serious constitutional concerns under the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment. Legislative preference does not nullify property rights.

Fourth Amendment

HF 3433 contemplates inspection authority involving private homes to verify compliance.

The Fourth Amendment protects the right of the people to be secure in their homes against unreasonable searches and seizures. The home receives the highest degree of constitutional

protection. Conditioning the exercise of one enumerated right on potential government intrusion into the home fundamentally disrupts that protection. No constitutional right should require surrendering another.

Fourteenth Amendment

These bills transform previously lawful possession into criminal liability through sweeping reclassification. When government converts ordinary, peaceable conduct into a crime by statute, due process protections under the Fourteenth Amendment are directly implicated. Constitutional rights cannot be withdrawn from law-abiding citizens by legislative declaration alone.

Personal Impact

I hunt with a semi-automatic rifle and use it responsibly and lawfully. Under HF 3433, I would be prohibited from passing that rifle to my son. A lawful family heirloom becomes legally stranded—transferable to no one. That is not public safety reform; it is prohibition by attrition.

HF 3402 demands that citizens like me destroy or surrender magazines we have owned responsibly for years—not because of misuse, but because of legislative reclassification. Criminals will not comply with these mandates. Law-abiding citizens will bear the burden.

My great-grandfather fought at Omaha Beach and helped liberate Europe. I am a direct descendant of a soldier in the Continental Army who served under General Washington. I invoke that history not for sentiment, but for perspective. The liberties secured in those conflicts were structural limits placed upon government power. I take seriously my responsibility to steward those liberties, not surrender them quietly.

Conclusion

Public safety is an important and legitimate concern. Constitutional guarantees, however, are binding limits on government power.

If enacted, these bills would assert that enumerated rights may be nullified by majority vote, that lawfully owned property may be destroyed without compensation, and that the exercise of one constitutional right may depend upon surrendering another. That is not a minor policy shift; it is a structural break.

Should these bills become law, they will mark the beginning of constitutional review. The authority of this legislature is substantial, but it is not unlimited. It is constrained by the Constitution each member has sworn to uphold. That oath matters.

I urge you, firmly and without reservation, to reject HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Respectfully,

Dru DeLange
Lester Prairie, MN

To the Minnesota legislature: as a legal gun owner that still resides in Minnesota full time I would like to say that passing laws that ban semiautomatic firearms and limit the size of magazines to 10 rounds will have very little effect on criminals but will greatly affect law abiding Minnesotans.

This is how I see the two current bills under consideration affecting my family and myself, both personally and professionally.

Personally: as a sportsman, who no longer hunts but still uses my semiautomatic firearms for sport and competitive events as my local gun range puts on several 2 and 3 gun competitive events throughout the summer and fall. It's a great way to spend a day with the my 3 sons, who all enjoy competitive shooting sports and spend time hunting together.

I also use my semiautomatic firearms as a self-defensive tool to protect my home and my family. As a parent of a physically disabled adult-child living at home, who is unable to defend themself or is unable to 'retreat' from harms way, it is imperative that we are able to defend ourselves possibly against multiple attackers. Both at home or in public.

Yes I am one of the over 400,000 law abiding Minnesota citizens with a permit to carry in our state.

All of my semiautomatic weapons come with standard magazines that they were purchased with, all over the 10 round magazine capacity.

Professionally: for the last 10 plus years I have been a Minnesota licensed armed security guard working on an Armored car. We are required to do training and qualify annually. Both in the classroom and on the range having to Meet the standard set by the state of Minnesota.

Passing and enforcement of these proposed bills would leave myself and my team tactically disadvantaged to those who would choose to do us harm. We would be out gunned, and at a disadvantage. We actually already are, as we are only allowed to carry a single side arm, no rifles, shotguns or AR15 style firearms including the pistols and SBR's.

I didn't see any carve outs for security personnel in these bills. Typically this style bill would have exemptions for law enforcement and military personnel and should also include armed security, with the training.

I would ask that these bills be dropped as they will only affect those who are law abiding and give an advantage to those who are already committing the crimes.

Instead let's enforce current laws and punish those who use a gun to commit a crime. Many times we see criminals who use a firearm to commit a crime are offered plea deals to plead guilty and have their gun charges dropped in exchange for that guilty plea.

Duane Black Jr.
Bemidji Mn.

Dear Ms. McDaniel,

As a 39-year-old husband and father from St. Cloud, Minnesota, I strongly oppose House File 3433 and House File 3402. These bills would criminalize the lawful possession of firearms and magazines that millions of responsible Minnesotans own and use for self-defense, family protection, and constitutional rights.

I advocate for personal responsibility, safety, and the freedoms our country was built on. My wife and I prioritize our children's security, and I keep a firearm for home defense in case of emergencies like home invasions or delayed first responders due to stand down orders, weather or distance. These bills would remove this ability without making my family or community safer.

Recent events underscore the importance of preserving the Second Amendment. In recent months, aggressive federal immigration enforcement by ICE, especially here in Minnesota and cities like Minneapolis, Portland, and Los Angeles, has led to large-scale protests, some escalating into riots and civil unrest. Federal agents have used tear gas, flash-bangs, and force against demonstrators, including peaceful crowds with children and families. Local police responses have been delayed, limited, or insufficient due to the scale of unrest, resource demands, or tensions between local and federal authorities. For example, during surges of protests in Minneapolis following fatal incidents involving ICE agents, crowds faced chaotic scenes with inadequate help from traditional law enforcement. Similar patterns emerged in Portland, where federal agents handled crowd control directly, and in Los Angeles, where protests turned violent amid delayed or escalating responses.

These aren't hypothetical scenarios they're happening now in our state of Minnesota. When riots erupt, property is damaged, or violence breaks out, and police can't or won't respond quickly enough due to overwhelmed resources, jurisdictional conflicts, or sheer volume, law-abiding citizens must defend themselves, their homes, and their families. The Second Amendment ensures that individuals aren't helpless when government protection fails. Disarming responsible people through bans on common semi-automatic rifles and standard-capacity magazines would leave families vulnerable in these unpredictable crises. We need the right to keep and bear arms to protect ourselves when the system breaks down, not more restrictions that only burden the law-abiding.

HF 3433 would ban possession of most semi-automatic rifles, labeling them "semiautomatic military-style assault weapons" based on cosmetic features or detachable magazines. These are not machine guns; they're common, modern sporting rifles like the AR-15 platform, owned by law-abiding citizens for lawful purposes. The U.S. Supreme Court in Heller (2008) and Bruen (2022) made it clear that the Second Amendment protects arms "in common use" for self-defense and other lawful activities. These rifles fit that description perfectly—they're used for protection, training, and in some cases, hunting or sport shooting here in Central Minnesota.

The "grandfathering" in this bill is illusory: current owners face mandatory registration, home inspections by law enforcement without warrants, severe storage restrictions, no transfers (even to family), and bans on hunting or range use beyond limited locations. This turns responsible owners into second-class citizens and sets up future generations to lose this right entirely. It does nothing to stop criminals, who ignore laws by definition.

HF 3402 bans possession of magazines holding more than 10 rounds, with no grandfathering. Owners must destroy, surrender, modify, or remove them by July 1, 2027, or face felony

charges up to 5 years in prison and $25,000 fines. Standard-capacity magazines 15–30 rounds are essential for effective self-defense, especially in high-stress situations.

These restrictions lack historical tradition under Bruen and have no proven track record of reducing crime. Studies show magazine bans don't meaningfully impact mass shootings or overall violence. Attackers simply carry more magazines or use other methods. Meanwhile, law-abiding families lose tools that could save lives.

As a husband and dad, my top priority is keeping my family safe. These bills don't address root causes like mental health failures, illegal gun trafficking, or prosecuting violent criminals. Instead, they target responsible citizens who have never misused their rights.

I respectfully urge the House Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402 and recommend against their passage. Support real solutions better enforcement of existing laws, mental health resources, and community safety programs that don't infringe on our rights.

Thank you for considering my perspective. I appreciate any acknowledgment or update on the committee's consideration of these bills.

Sincerely,

Dustin Guggenberger

St. Cloud, MN

I want to write that I oppose the support of house bill H3380DE2. I believe that these regressive policies will put many people in the state on the wrong side of the law without even knowing firearms bans are being discussed in the house. The state of Minnesota is home to hearty independent people that enjoy the hobby of firearms. We also have a robust community of competitors in practical shooting groups that would be fully blocked from their chosen pastime. Not to mention people that have built up a collection of firearms that they take pride in and spent a considerable amount of money on. This bill is not in the interest of the people and could very well hurt more people than it deems to help.

To whom it may concern,

My name is Erik and I've lived in Minnesota my entire life. I am writing to express my complete opposition to bills HF 3433 and HF 3402. These bills are unconstitutional and authoritarian. Practicing our 2nd Amendment rights has allowed law abiding gun owners like myself to build small businesses and strong communities, and passing these bills will crush all of that for nothing. Gun control doesn't work. Criminals will not obey these laws. These laws will not prevent mass shootings; all we need to do to prove that is to look at other nations that pass strict gun control laws and see that they still have mass casualty events. Australia has strict gun control yet they still suffered the Bondi Beach shooting. Canada has strict gun control yet still they suffered the Tumbler Ridge shooting. These laws will not save your constituents, they will merely oppress us.

Minnesotans patience with the Democrat Party is wearing thin. They allowed historic fraud to take place under their watch and now they seek to strip us of our constitutional rights. For those of you in the House that still have sense, do not allow these radical elements to sink you with them. Oppose these bills, or else myself and many others will be forced to leave our beloved home state for new homes. If these bills pass, I will not stick around to pay taxes to authoritarian fraudsters.

To Whom it may concern,

I am writing as your constituent to strongly urge you to oppose any proposed ban on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms, standard-capacity magazines, or similar legislation.

These firearms and magazines are used every day by peaceable Minnesotans for self-defense, hunting, sport shooting, and training — and they are clearly protected under the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Banning them will not make Minnesota safer. It will only punish law-abiding gun owners while doing nothing to stop criminals who ignore the law.

As your constituent, I expect you to vote NO on any attempt to ban semi-automatic firearms or magazines.

I am a member and supporter of the Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus — and they speak for me at the Capitol. But today, I'm speaking directly for myself: I want you to oppose any such legislation.

Ethan Eggler
Ethaneggler@gmail.com
(507)-269-4911

Statement on Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban

I cannot, in good conscience, support a ban on semi-automatic rifles and magazines. I have personally witnessed the trauma inflicted on the Twin Cities metro area during Operation Metro Surge over the past several months. I've seen what I believe to be tyranny in the streets of America, and I have witnessed what felt like a military occupation. The rights of my fellow citizens and non-citizens alike have been trampled.

Witnessing these incidents sparked a political awakening in me that led me to attend my first DFL caucus this year and to volunteer and get involved as much as possible. However, I refuse to abandon my strong convictions and beliefs in the Second Amendment, and I will not support any infringement on the right to bear arms.

Rushing to pass emotionally driven legislation following a tragedy has happened before in America. The creation of the Department of Homeland Security after 9/11 contributed to many of the structural problems we are still grappling with today. We cannot afford to repeat those mistakes. School shootings are a tragedy, and we must address mental health and community safety seriously. We can make progress if we work together as a society, but I believe weapons bans are shortsighted and not in the best interest of citizens.

Good morning,
As a former law enforcement officer, current first responder, and outdoor guide in MN, I fully oppose these bills. There is ample case law and research that demonstrate they don't stop criminals. We already have laws against assault and murder. Legal gun owners should not have any of their Constitutional rights violated. These proposed bills are unconstitutional and should not be discussed. They will hurt our economy and cause a devastating environmental impact if enforced.

Greg Beach

Captain, Director of Angling Operations
Beach Outdoors
5039 White Pine St.
Hermantown, MN 55811

To: Ellen McDaniel and The Minnesota House Public Safety Committee

From: Ron Broberg, Coon Rapids, Minnesota

Regarding: HF 3402

Date: 2/23/2026

Thank you for your service for the State of Minnesota. We all want Minnesota to be a safe place-how do we get there? I oppose HF 3402 and encourage the House Public Safety Committee to NOT support this bill. Please note the following:

- The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution states citizens have the right to keep and bare arms.
- The Third Circuit and D.C. Circuit Courts have held that large capacity magazines (one with more than ten rounds) are "arms" under the Second Amendment and receive constitutional protection.
- Typical magazines owned by law-abiding citizens range from 10 to 30 rounds in a magazine and are used for self-defense and sport shooting/competitions.
- These magazines are standard equipment for many of the most popular handguns and rifles sold in the United States and prohibiting the manufacturing, sale, transfer, and possession of these magazines would negatively impact millions of ordinary law-abiding citizens in Minnesota.

Let us all think logically for a moment:

- "The Bad Guy" will use several 10 round magazines-if the goal is to commit a horrific tragedy in Minnesota.
- Banning "large capacity" magazines will not prevent mass shootings.

Respectfully-please know these answers before you start your work:

- Do you know what is a "high capacity" magazine?
- Have you defined what the purpose is for eliminating "high capacity" magazines"?
- Do you know how many homicides are caused by individuals who have used "high capacity" magazines in the history of the State of Minnesota?
- If we don't have the above data, why not? How do we make policy and law without accurate facts?
- Do you know the questions asked when applying for a firearm at a gun shop?
- How is a background checked through technology to assure only law-abiding citizens are approved for purchasing a firearm?
- Does this technology need to be enhanced to assure safety?

It is time for the legislature to do the real work:

- Funding for School Resource Officers in all schools.
- Funding for upgraded security technology in all schools.
- Funding for in/out-patient chemical and mental health treatment.
- Violent criminals serving their full incarcerated time in the corrections facility.
- Preventing those who are mentally ill or violent from purchasing a firearm.
- Eliminating ghost gun loopholes.
- Let's put our energy into something productive with long term real impact. Size of a magazine one can use isn't worth the energy and won't make Minnesota a safer place.

From: Jeff Jenior jjenior@yahoo.com
Subject: HF3402 and HF3433
Date: Feb 23, 2026 at 1:22:40 PM
To: Jeff Jenior jjenior@yahoo.com

Attn.: Ellen Mc Danielle,

I am strongly opposed to the above unconstitutional proposed legislation per my 2nd and 4th Amendment Rights and urge you to oppose ratification of HF3402 and HF3433.

Gun owners like myself are not a threat to you or society. I own a gun for both recreational enjoyment and protection of vulnerable unarmed people should they face grave danger. I am well aware of the legal consequences (nightmare) of carrying a firearm should I ever remove it from my holster without just cause. I am not looking for nor ever want confrontation with my state and local government authorities but this bill will make me a FELON if I resist complying. Totally unfair! I respectfully ask only to be left alone and not infringed upon. I am a lawful carry private citizen. Why is it that Minnesota Democrat legislators refuse to respect that? Magazine quantity is irrelevant. This is just a stepping stone to even more control in the near future. "Assault guns" is a ridiculous ,childish label for a NOT FULLY AUTOMATIC civilian firearm meant to generate hysteria for banning them. These bills are intentionally vague and dangerous to those of us who choose to have what is currently legal firearms. I plead with you to strike down both of these bills. We are the protectors and law abiding peacekeepers.

Respectfully,

Jeff Jenior
Wayzata, MN

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

February 23, 2026

Re: NSSF Opposition to HF3402; banning possession of common magazines.

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. For more than 50 years, NSSF has encouraged gun owners to safely handle and securely store firearms. We provide valuable resources and free firearm safety kits, including cable-style gun locks through the Project ChildSafe® program, to help prevent firearms accidents, thefts and misuse, including suicide.

Our membership includes Minnesota based federally licensed firearms retailers, many of which are small or family-owned businesses that are the backbone of the state's economy. 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 strong opposition to HF3402 magazine capacity bans. There was, and still is, no rational basis upon which to justify the enactment of this proposed legislation.

Magazines come in many different capacities for many different purposes, such as home defense, collecting, and use in the shooting sports. To ask whether one magazine is more legitimate than another is to miss the point concerning legal vs. irrational criminal activity.

Unfortunately, advocates of this bill do not seem to be aware of the wide-ranging implications and impacts of the legislation on law-abiding firearm owners. Many firearms, both historical and modern, do not have 10 round or smaller magazines available for them. This legislation would make some very valuable firearms unable to function.

I've attached a copy of an industry study NSSF published as the *Detachable Magazine Report*. While I would encourage you to review this study in greater detail, I recognize your time is valuable so I will summarize a couple of key findings here. The report surveyed 30-plus years of detachable magazine production and distribution, demonstrating that of the conservatively estimated 963,772,000 detachable magazines supplied from a firearm manufacturer and in the aftermarket, at least 717,900,000 have a capacity exceeding 10 rounds.

The report confirms what many firearm owners could tell you anecdotally – that the national standard for magazine capacity is greater than 10 rounds. With nearly 1 billion detachable rifle and pistol magazines in circulation, they are unquestionably commonly-owned and commonly-used for lawful firearm use, including recreational target shooting, hunting and self-defense.

The consumer market totals of rifle magazines not included with the firearm at sale show 30+ capacity magazines, over 413 million, are over 30 times the amount available than 10 and below capacity rifle magazines, about 13 million.

Further examination of the data proves that 717,900,000 detachable magazines for pistols and rifles have a capacity greater than 10 rounds. Just 245,872,000 pistol and rifle magazines in circulation have a capacity of 10 rounds or less.

The data is clear, detachable magazines with a capacity exceeding 10 rounds are the overwhelming standard for law-abiding firearm owners in the US for lawful purposes including self-defense, target shooting and hunting. Detachable magazines are integral to the design of, and necessary for the proper functioning of, today's modern semi-automatic firearms. The magazines addressed by this bill are "arms" within the meaning of the Second Amendment.

NSSF appreciates the desire to reduce casualties when violent aggressors attack innocent people but violating the rights of millions of Minnesotans who choose these products for self-defense, as well as visitors coming to the state for hunting and recreation, is not the way to do so. Efforts to reduce the availability of these firearm components to Minnesotans when nearly a billion detachable magazines are in circulation across the country are a waste of state and local resources that will only make legislators feel like they did something.

The systematic failure of state and federal government to "keep us safe" continues to be the common theme in these horrific tragedies. All the warning signs are there and yet they too often go ignored. NSSF joins others in calling for a comprehensive approach that addresses many complex social issues, including school safety, preventing unauthorized firearms access, mental health, personal privacy, and enforcing existing laws while safeguarding constitutional rights.

You only have to look back to the 1994 "Assault Weapons" Ban to find legislation which did little to increase public safety. One of the sections of this law was halting the production of "high capacity" magazines. This gun control strategy soon proved to be a failure. A comprehensive study by the Centers for Disease Control looked at the full panoply of gun control measures, including this proposed magazine ban, and concluded that none could be proven to reduce crime. Another study, commissioned by Congress, found that bans were not effective since "the banned weapons and magazines were never used in more than a modest fraction of all gun murders." These studies show that a ban did not increase public safety.

The problem, of course, with such laws is that criminals routinely ignore them (after all, they are criminals). Law-abiding citizens are the ones who suffer.

We must all work together to help prevent those who exhibit reckless disregard for human life and values access to firearms for criminal purposes. But we must also preserve the constitutional rights of tens of millions of law-abiding Americans to safely and responsibly own, store and use firearms for personal protection, hunting and recreation. America's firearms industry welcomes the opportunity to be a part of a respectful and constructive dialogue on this important topic and urge you to oppose HF3402.

Sincerely,
Moriah Day

DETACHABLE MAGAZINE REPORT

1990 - 2021

nssf.org/research

NSSF®
The Firearm Industry Trade Association

NSSF® DETACHABLE MAGAZINE REPORT
(1990 – 2021)

NSSF
The Firearm Industry Trade Association

PURPOSE

Estimate the number of detachable firearm magazines, segmented by capacity, that have been sold and made available using the latest information (2023 initial study period). Estimate the number of magazines provided "in the box" with firearms made available to consumers along with secondary market / direct consumer purchase of firearm magazines. This is done as part of NSSF's ongoing industry research to provide insights into the firearm and ammunition industry.

METHODOLOGY

Utilize Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) Annual Firearms Manufacturers Export Reports (AFMER) to identify firearm manufacturers and corresponding firearm manufacturing activity of pistols and rifles. ATF AFMER reporting is segmented by Pistol, Revolver, Rifle, and Shotgun categories of manufacturing and export. Identify and remove firearm manufacturers that do not produce pistols and rifles that accept detachable magazines such as derringers, single shot pistols, and fixed magazine rifles. Master totals were created for the top 15 pistol manufacturers (~80 percent of pistols) and top 15 rifle manufacturers (~60 percent of rifles) produced in the 2021 ATF AFMER. Independent research and direct survey of firearm and magazine manufacturers yielded information on how many magazines, and their capacity, were provided with each firearm and made available to the U.S. consumer market from 1990 to 2021 through wholesalers, retailers, and sold directly to consumers. If historical information was not available, a value of one magazine per pistol and rifle was used for the list of top manufacturers. Organizing the data collected from top pistol and rifle manufacturers, industry averages of magazines and capacity were applied to all other pistol and rifle manufacturers reported by ATF AFMER for the study period (1990-2021). Consumer market totals were taken directly from participating magazine manufacturers with no adjustment. Totals of each segment were rounded to the closest thousand.

RESULTS

Independent research and direct survey of firearm and magazine manufacturers yielded industry averages for pistol and rifle magazines that come "in the box." Pistol magazines had an industry average of 2.1 magazines per firearm from the manufacturer with 44 percent being 10 and below capacity. Rifle magazines had an industry average of 1.8 magazines per firearm from the manufacturer with half being 10 and below capacity, 20 percent being 11-29 round capacity, and 30 percent being 30+ round capacity.

Of the firearm magazines estimated in this study, 29 percent originate from detachable magazines provided "in the box" with each newly manufactured firearm and 71 percent of detachable magazines were distributed to the consumer market as an "aftermarket"

product. An estimated 963 million magazines were produced and entered the commercial market between 1990 and 2021. Of the estimated 963 million magazines, approximately 74 percent, or 717 million magazines, have a capacity of 11+ rounds. A majority of the 11+ round capacity magazines are rifle magazines. About 46 percent of the magazines estimated in this study are rifle magazines with 30+ round capacity. The percentage of detachable magazines at 11+ capacity is about 55 percent of total pistol magazines. The amount of 10 and below capacity rifle magazines supplied from the manufacturer is over one and a half times the amount of 30+ capacity rifle magazines. The consumer market totals of rifle magazines show 30+ capacity magazines, over 413 million, are over thirty times the amount available than 10 and below capacity rifle magazines, about 13 million.

Firearm Magazine Estimate 1990 – 2021					
	Pistol 10 below	**Pistol 11+**	**Rifle 10 below**	**Rifle 11-29**	**Rifle 30+**
Manufacturer Total	64,099,000	96,148,000	57,362,000	22,945,000	34,417,000
Consumer Market Total	110,694,000	112,997,000	13,717,000	37,441,000	413,952,000
Manufacturer and Consumer Totals	174,793,000	209,145,000	71,079,000	60,386,000	448,369,000
Grand Total: 963,772,000					

LIMITATIONS

Not all magazine manufacturers that support and supply firearm manufacturers and the consumer market responded to the survey/provided data; therefore, the results are a conservative estimate. Not all segments of detachable magazines could be counted due to lack of public information or availability of records. For example, detachable shotgun magazines are prevalent in certain shooting sports and tactical applications but were not counted. Military and law enforcement sales were not counted. This analysis did not account for breakage or magazines that were destroyed/discarded as no data exists. No reliable data exists prior to 1990 to estimate historic detachable magazines that may still be available for sale or in working condition. This is due to lack of ATF AFMER reporting prior to 1990. This study does not claim all the magazines estimated in this study are owned by Americans; these are both magazines estimated to be in circulation and made available for sale at some point from 1990 to 2021.

DISCUSSION

The popularity of small "conceal carry" pistols highly influenced the distribution of pistol magazines in most recent years, but following trends in manufacturing, many of these pistols are being updated with higher capacity magazines as designs are updated. Magazine-fed semiautomatic pistols and rifles are becoming increasingly popular. Based on magazines alone, 11+ round capacity, market share of these firearms in the United States should be expected hold pace with historic trends.[1] [2]

A recent study of the general population within the United States identified that over 1,300 firearm owners provided more insight to magazine ownership. Results suggest that more than a third (36.3 percent) of the U.S. population are currently firearm owners.[3] Those identified as firearm owners were asked to share details about their detachable magazine ownership. More than half (53.2 percent) of firearm owners reported owning a detachable magazine for a handgun, and nearly a third (32.7 percent) reported owning a detachable magazine for a rifle. Nearly a third (35.9 percent) of firearm owners reported owning a detachable handgun magazine with a capacity of 11 or more rounds, while nearly a quarter (24.3 percent) of firearm owners reported owning a detachable rifle magazine with a capacity of 11 or more rounds. Overall, 43.3 percent of firearm owners reported owning a detachable magazine with a capacity of 11 or more rounds. These findings indicate that approximately 8.9 percent of the U.S. population owns a magazine holding 11 or more rounds.[4]

According to a recent NSSF study, Modern Sporting Rifle (MSR) Comprehensive Consumer Report 2022, magazines were one of the most common components purchased among the 2,185 usable responses. "Over half (52%) of MSR owners stated the detachable magazine capacity of their MSR is 30 rounds. When asked why they chose their respective capacity, most frequent responses were related to popularity / standard and being readily available."[5] The latest estimate of MSRs produced between 1990–2021 is over 28 million[6], making aftermarket magazines for these firearms abundant in the United States, where such capacity magazines are not banned[7]. These rifle magazines, like all categories of magazines in this study, are those that are provided "in the box" from the manufacturer and made available for sale. The proportion of owned magazines versus magazines available for sale is currently unattainable.

CONCLUSION

The findings in this report give some insight to the volume and capacity of detachable firearm magazines in the United States for the study period. A more comprehensive estimate would be attainable if participation from firearm and magazine manufacturers increased in future updates. Consumer preferences of 11+ capacity magazines are reflected in the manufacturing activity of the firearm industry. Changes in legislation outlawing or granting access to these magazines may change overall market proportions but the preference to have more ammunition available is clear.

---

[1] Association, N. R. (n.d.). 33 new concealed-carry guns for 2018. An Official Journal Of The NRA. https://www.shootingillustrated.com/content/33-new-concealed-carry-guns-for-2018/

[2] Association, N. R. (n.d.-a). 10 popular concealed carry guns. An Official Journal Of The NRA. https://www.shootingillustrated.com/content/10-popular-concealed-carry-guns/

[3] NSSF 2022 Magazine Capacity Study.

[4] Id.

[5] NSSF Modern Sporting Rifle Comprehensive Consumer Report 2022.

[6] (2024, January 11). NSSF releases most recent firearm production figures. NSSF. https://www.nssf.org/articles/nssf-releases-most-recent-firearm-production-figures-2024/#:~:text=Data%20indicates%20that%2028%2C144%2C000%20Modern,24.4%20million%20to%2028.1%20million.

[7] Cal. Penal Code § 16350, 16740, 16890, 32310-32450., Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 18-12-301, 302, 303., Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 53-202w, 53-202q., Del. Code Ann. Tit. 11, § 1469(a)., D.C. Code Ann. §§ 7-2506.01(b); 7-2507.06(a)(4)., Haw. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 134–8(c)., 720 ILCS 5/24-1.10 (enacted January 10, 2023 by 2021 IL HB 5471., Md. Code Ann., Crim. Law § 4-305., Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 140, §§ 121, 131M., N.J. Stat. Ann. §§ 2C:39-1(y), 2C:39-3(j), 2C:39-9(h)., N.Y. Penal Law §§ 265.00(23), 265.02(8), 265.10, 265.11, 265.20(7-f), 265.36-265.37., See 2022 Oregon Ballot Measure 114, SEC. 11., R.I. Gen. Laws §§ 11-47.1-2, 11-47.1-3(a)., Vt. Stat. Ann. tit. 13, § 4021 (enacted by 2017 VT S 55, Sec. 8)., RCW 9.41.370.

Gunnar Melin

844 3rd Ave, Apt 104

Excelsior, MN, 55331

Gunnarm1208@gmail.com

02/23/2026

Good afternoon, Ellen and the MN House of Representatives,

I am writing as a concerned Minnesota resident to express my strong opposition to HF3433 and HF3402. I believe these proposed bills blatantly violate my constitutional rights as a US citizen, while failing to meaningfully address violent crime in our state.

First and foremost, these bills appear to infringe upon the constitutional rights guaranteed under the Second Amendment and raise significant Fourth Amendment concerns regarding lawful citizens' privacy and protections against unreasonable government intrusion. Law-abiding Minnesotans have long exercised their right to firearm ownership responsibly for lawful purposes including self-defense, sport shooting, hunting, and personal protection. Legislation that broadly restricts access to commonly owned firearms or accessories risks penalizing citizens who follow the law rather than those who break it.

Equally important, available crime data consistently shows that the majority of gun-related crimes are committed using handguns and are frequently carried out by individuals who are already legally prohibited from possessing firearms. Additional restrictions placed on lawful ownership do not address this underlying reality. Individuals intent on committing crimes do not obtain firearms through legal methods and are unlikely to comply with new regulations.

Furthermore, technological developments, including the increasing accessibility of home manufacturing tools such as modern 3D printers, demonstrate that individuals determined to acquire prohibited items will continue to find unlawful means to do so. As a result,

legislation focused primarily on restricting legal ownership risks having little measurable impact on criminal activity while placing additional burdens on responsible citizens.

I respectfully urge you to consider policies that directly target violent offenders, illegal trafficking, and repeat criminal behavior rather than measures that primarily affect compliant, law-abiding citizens. Effective public safety policy should focus on enforcement of existing laws, prevention efforts, mental health resources, and strategies that address criminal misuse without eroding constitutional protections.

Minnesotans value both public safety and constitutional liberty. These goals are not mutually exclusive, and I encourage the legislature to pursue solutions that strengthen community safety while preserving the rights guaranteed to citizens under the United States Constitution.

Thank you for your time, your service to our state, and your consideration of my concerns. I respectfully ask that you oppose HF3433 and HF3402.

Sincerely,

Gunnar Melin

Gus Sandberg
1826 James Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55105
651 707 6564
gsand841@gmail.com

February 23, 2026

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee,

I write to you today to express my strong opposition to Bills HF3403/SF 3714 and HF3433/SF 3654.

As a member of the MN Gun Owners Caucus I find the language of these bills to be unconstitutional and a violation of both the 2nd and 4th amendments .

One of the bill's authors Representative Brad Tabke (DFL, HD 54A) has passionately spoken about 4th amendment issues related to Operation Metro Surge. I find it very hypocritical to argue against warrantless searches as it relates to immigration enforcement but turn around and advocate for warrantless searches of law abiding gun owners. If warrantless searches are unconstitutional in one situation they are unconstitutional in every situation.

Both of the bills would have long reaching consequences for thousands of law abiding gun owners. The proposed legislation would turn peaceable gun owners into felons overnight and much of the text of the bills is completely unenforceable. New Mexico just had similar legislation overturned and that will happen in Minnesota if these bills somehow make it through the legislature and are signed by the Governor.

Are you really going to advocate for law enforcement to kick down doors and enter peoples homes whenever they want with no warrants? Perhaps the MN GOP should put forth a bill banning warrantless searches altogether. That would effectively get rid of the current Red Flag Laws which are also unconstitutional and a violation of the 4th Amendment.

The point is this. As a free society we should not pick and choose when we follow the Constitution of the United States. As one of the members of the MN Gun Owners Caucus pointed out recently we are so entrenched in a Red

vs Blue that the lines are becoming blurred as it relates to legal questions. We all have a tendency to cheer a crackdown on the opposite side of the aisle's rights when it suits us and scream and cry that it's a violation of those rights when the shoe is on the other foot. What we need in this state is some Common Sense and not knee jerk reactions to the very difficult problems that face our State and our country.

I urge you to vote no on the bills while they are still in committee and keep them from ever reaching a House or Senate vote. Passing these bills will not prevent future tragedies like the recent Church shooting from happening. We should be focused on mental health in a bipartisan fashion. That is the clearest solution to bring us into the light and out of the darkness we face.

.

Sincerely,

Gus Sandberg

Ellen McDaniel,

I'm writing in regards to some of the new Minnesota House bills introduced to further erode gun rights, most specifically HF 3402.

I am a 52 year old, law-abiding, software engineer. I've made my home in south Minneapolis since 1997. I'm also a gun owner. One of my legally obtained guns came standard with a 13-round magazine. This bill will make that illegal. It will also ensure that without an additional financial investment, to either permanently alter my existing magazine or buy a new lower capacity magazine (if that's even available for my model), I'll have a worthless hunk of metal.

I also see this as doing very little to impact gun violence. We have numerous laws on the books right now that could and should be used to curb gun violence that aren't being properly enforced, such as Minnesota Statutes 609.165 and 624.713 preventing felons from owning firearms or ammunition and MN Statute 609.67 which prevents the use of trigger activator devices.

I am against more gun restrictions, especially the magazine capacity restriction, as this will only have a negative impact on me. Please share my concerns with all involved.

Thank you
A. Brooks Nagel

I am writing today to provide my written testimony in opposition to HR-3402 Magazine Ban; a bill being introduced to the Minnesota legislature this session. I completely oppose this ridiculous, arbitrary, and senseless bill.

Banning standard capacity magazines (referred to as "high capacity magazines" in the proposed bill,) will not prevent violent crimes or make communities safer. In fact, this ban would protect violent criminals and make Minnesota communities less safe. Violent criminals will not be turning their "high capacity" magazines in to law enforcement for destruction. They will not alter those magazines so they can no longer hold more than 10 rounds. Criminals will not remove the magazines in question from the state. Violent criminals will not comply with this bill because, by definition, they are criminals. They have already decided to ignore the laws that already make it illegal to murder, assault, abduct, rape, and otherwise violently attack people, so what makes anyone that supports this bill think that these violent people will change their ways because their magazine holds too many rounds? To compound the stupidity of this bill, the only people who might comply would be lawful and peaceful gun owners which would restrict their ability to defend themselves from the very violent criminals that will be ignoring the law anyway.

Turning otherwise lawful and peaceful gun owners into felons because of the criminal actions of a small segment of society is irresponsible legislation. The violent criminals will still be out there committing violent crimes and their victims will be less able to effectively defend themselves. Even if the criminals did comply with this proposed law, they still wouldn't stop committing their violent crimes. You cannot ban your way to safety.

From a Constitutional perspective, this ban is unconstitutional. The supreme court has ruled that you cannot ban arms "in common use." As magazines are an integral part of said arms, and magazines that hold more than 10 rounds are absolutely in common use, they cannot be lawfully banned by a government body. Would you be okay applying similar restrictions on any of our other Constitutionally protected rights? Would you support a bill that bans "high capacity" books? If a book holds more than so many pages, it must be destroyed, altered to have less pages, turned in to law enforcement, or moved out of state? How about "high capacity" places of worship? Would you be okay with limiting the number of congregants at a place of worship? Or limiting how often they can gather to worship? Let's try our right to peacefully assemble; should the state be able to limit how many people can peacefully assemble? If there are too many people at an assembly, should they all be felons?

Again, this bill is ridiculous and will do nothing but protect criminals and endanger the rest of us. It is unconstitutional and immoral and would place undue burdens on millions of lawful, responsible, peaceful gun owners in Minnesota. There are millions of lawful gun owners in this state that own millions of guns and I would wager that most of them own at least one firearm

that accepts a magazine that holds more than 10 rounds. I am one of them, and this bill would negatively affect my safety. I oppose this bill and it should be voted down immediately.

Sincerely,

Andy Paroczai

Written Testimony **Against** HF 3402: Magazine Ban

I wish to make clear that I **oppose** HF 3402, a ban on commonly owned firearm magazines, in all its potential forms.

This bill is an obvious infringement of the rights identified in the 2nd, 5th and 8th Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

The language of the bill is also inflammatory and, therefore, immediately suspect. These are not "large-capacity." These parts are designed with the firearm. They are **standard** size.

And in common use. There are easily tens of millions of these magazines – rifle and pistol – in the state.

Robbing us of this property, or forcing us to spend time and money modifying our property, is wrong. Punishing Minnesotans with massive fines and prison sentences for a piece of plastic or metal is wrong. And corrosive to the rule of law.

All for zero increase in public safety.

Gun control in all its forms does not work because criminals, by definition, do not follow the law. And sweeping bans reduce public safety as evidenced by past alcohol and current drug prohibitions.

I oppose this bill and any legislation like it.

Sincerely,

Aric Czarnowski
9849 Beard Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431

Written Testimony in Opposition to House File 3402 – Large Capacity Magazine Ban
Before the House Public Safety Committee
Minnesota Legislature

Date: February 20, 2026
Submitted by: Ashley Scharffbillig
Position: Oppose

Chair and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this written testimony regarding **House File 3402**. I oppose HF3433 as written and urge the committee to reject this proposal.

This bill will broadly criminalize law-abiding citizens for nothing more than ownership of commonly and widely owned magazines. These magazines are legal under federal law. There is no victim of just owning a magazine of any size and we should not be creating criminals out of citizens who have been law-abiding and responsible.

This bill would also put a large burden of time and strain funding on enforcement agencies at a time when these resources should be directed at addressing actual violent crime through community policing efforts, investigations and supporting those that have been victims. Spending time and funding on something of which there is no victim and only creates criminals of currently responsible and law-abiding citizens only takes those resources away from those who need it. Besides these costs to the taxpayers, the taxpayers will also be paying for the investable lawsuits against this bill, a bill that will untimely, if passed, be struck down. As a taxpayer, at during a time of great fraud within our State, I do not want to waste money on lawsuits the State will lose.

As a US Marine veteran, I can tell you that those currently serving in our reserves and national guard are not entirely covered under this bill. Their ownership only applies when acting within the scope of their duties. Those that only serve a few days of the month are only under official orders for those few days and so the remaining days of the month, when their gear and magazines are stored in their homes, at a time when they are not acting within the scope of their duties. Also many veterans keep the magazines they were issued or are given as part of an award from those they served with. Our veterans will be made criminals, not for acting, not for creating a victim, but for simply owning something that is federally legal.

I also worry about our immigrant population who may have trouble understanding any requirements. They are part of our community and should be afforded all rights under the law to include firearm ownership. I believe that this bill, and laws like it will be used by law enforcement and the justice system to target them.

If the House does care about violence it should be focusing taxpayer funding on helping enforcement agencies in the State with mental health services, community policing and trying to building a non-violent culture. Banning citizens from owning something of which there is no victim in its ownership does not decrease violence, it just makes criminal of citizens, many of which are veterans and immigrants and its wrong to punish them for simply owing magazines. If we as a State are at the point where we are trying to ban objects due to violence then we are at the point where we need to recognize we've failed and that we've allowed the State culture itself to become violent. And if that is the case we should be focusing on building a violent-free culture, dealing with actual violent criminals and not making criminals of veterans, immigrants and other law abiding citizens just for ownership.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Ashley Scharffbillig

St Paul, MN

HF 3402

OPPOSE

A limiting on magazine capacity would on its face appear to be a complete violation of the 2nd amendment. Whether or not a magazine is considered part of a firearm or an accessory appears to be the main argument in the courts as to whether this issue applies to the 2nd amendment. Regardless of one's stance on that questions, this bill would turn thousands of Minnesotans into criminals overnight.

With actual criminals facing an overwhelmed and soft-on-crime justice system for, wasting time, money, and resources on a bill that will hurt law abiding citizens seems foolish.

Additionally, a similar ban in California was overturned in 2023 then reinstated in 2025 and now is headed for potential Supreme Court review. The

This bill is outlandish, and any assertion that this ban would create a safer community is faulty on its face. We know factually that gun restrictions do not prevent criminals from obtaining or possessing illegal firearm accessories and magazine capacity bans do not directly lead to reduced gun violence.

Common sense gun laws can be beneficial to community safety, but this bill lacks any form of common sense and appears to be more of a political stunt than an effort to protect Minnesotans and their individual rights.

Thank you for your time. Your tireless dedication to keeping all Minnesotan's safe is appreciated.

Austin Sonterre

763-291-8082

Hello, I am writing in opposition to HF 3402 (Common Capacity Magazine Ban).

Impact

This bill will have a significant impact on me, many of my family and friends, and thousands of law-abiding gun owners throughout the State of Minnesota.

Many of the arms I have purchased in the past 10 years have come with two or more magazines that would suddenly be banned under this new bill. I have also purchased additional magazines for the purposes of competing in competitions at the cost of hundreds of dollars. This would be the same for most, if not all, of the diverse group of people I compete with.

Constitutionality

As you know, should this bill become law it will certainly be challenged in court, and with good reason.

The 1789 Joint Resolution of Congress Proposing 12 Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which was later ratified to become the Bill of Rights, stated that the authors were concerned that "the Government" would abuse its powers. This was not theoretical to them, they had lived this experience and on April 14, 1775, when the British attempted to disarm Americans, the Revolutionary war began. The fact that this bill exempts "any government officer, agent, or employee" while placing a ban for law-abiding citizens is exactly what the Second Amendment was adopted to prevent.

In District of Columbia v. Heller the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that arms "in common use" for lawful purposes cannot be banned. In later oral arguments the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed that arms with many of the characteristics this bill seeks to ban are in common use.

This bill would almost certainly violate the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment because there would be no compensation to individuals who would be forced to get rid of a significant amount of property.

Hypocrisy

In response to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) surge in the past few months many politicians spoke out about their concerns for the rights of immigrants, both those here legally and illegally, as well as Minnesotans but now, some of those same politicians are attempting to violate the rights of law-abiding Minnesotans.

When Alex Pretti was shot and killed, members of the Trump Administration spoke about how he had no right to be carrying a handgun at a protest. The Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus, and several Democratic Politicians, spoke out about Pretti having that right, which he absolutely did.

Now there is an attempt to take that right away but a right isn't just a right when it's convenient, a right exists or it doesn't. And the handgun Alex Pretti was apparently carrying, a Sig Sauer P320, commonly ships with magazines that would be banned under this bill.

So did he, or did he not have a right to carry the firearm and magazine he was carrying?

Benjamin Pratt

HF 3402 - Total Ban on Possession of Magazines holding more than 10 rounds (In OPPOSITION)

During the Trump administration, controversies surrounding federal immigration enforcement—particularly actions taken by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)—intensified concerns among Minnesotans about federal overreach.

At the core of this perspective is the principle of federalism. The U.S. constitutional system divides power between the federal government and the states, reserving significant authority to states under the Tenth Amendment. When federal agencies are perceived as exceeding their mandates or operating aggressively within states—such as through workplace raids or expanded deportation efforts—citizens become wary of concentrating additional power in government hands.

Since the beginning of Mr. Trump's presidency, ICE has acted in ways that undermined local autonomy, especially in states and cities that adopted sanctuary policies. Minnesota has communities that have debated cooperation with federal immigration authorities. This tension highlights a broader concern: if federal power can expand in one area of law enforcement, it may do so in others. As a result, preserving robust Second Amendment protections at the state level serves as a safeguard potential federal overreach.

Marginalized communities distrust of federal law enforcement has not been confined to one political ideology. Civil rights activists, labor organizers, and immigrant communities have all experienced moments of conflict with federal authorities. In this context, limiting civilian access to firearms WILL leave vulnerable populations dependent on the same institutions they already distrust for protection.

While public safety in Minnesota is indeed a concern, HF 3433 and HF 3402 will drastically reduce our marginalized community from defending themselves against government overreach. Hitler disarmed the Jews in 1938 which led to the slaughter of nearly 6-million Jews. Is this Minnesota legislature seriously considering disarming our minority communities in the name of Public Safety?

If Democrats enact this legislation, they will be disarming our most vulnerable groups, and will ensure that Federal overreach can never be countered by Minnesotans. How dare you! Shame on you for wanting to see our poor and marginalized deported, or worse.

Vote NO to HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Bradley Slocum

Itasca County

Supporters of a 10-round magazine limit often frame it as a simple safety measure, but I argue it's a policy built on optics rather than outcomes. Most gun violence involves handguns with standard-capacity magazines that already exceed 10 rounds, and criminals overwhelmingly obtain them through illegal channels. A complete ban does not effectively stop those responsible for violence; instead, it limits items that millions of responsible owners use safely every day.

Opponents also point out that "10 rounds" is an arbitrary political number, not a functional threshold. Many common firearms are designed around magazines larger than that, so a ban effectively criminalizes standard equipment while doing little to deter someone with an intent to harm. Reloading takes seconds, and anyone planning violence can carry multiple magazines, making the restriction easy to bypass while creating major compliance and enforcement headaches for everyone else.

A more fundamental argument is that banning magazines shifts focus away from key safety measures like addressing repeat violent offenders, improving the mental health system, and dismantling trafficking networks that provide illegal firearms. Critics argue that focusing on magazine size is a way to look tough on crime without confronting the systems that enable it.

Their message is blunt: if the goal is real safety, then policy should target dangerous people and not the hardware responsible citizens use daily without incident.

To Minnesota Representatives:

I am writing to inform you that, as law abiding firearms owning residents of Minnesota, we completely oppose bill HR 3402 - the ban on firearm magazines that hold over 10 rounds - on account of it violating the 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

According to New York Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen, any firearms related restrictions must be in accordance with history, text, and tradition. The United States does not have such history, text, or tradition. The founding fathers wrote the 2nd Amendment specifically for the citizens to resist tyrannical government. This has been argued frequently in this state, especially in regard to carrying firearms at the protests against ICE, as the federal government has claimed that carrying multiple magazines over 10 rounds to a protest is illegal and Unconstitutional. The 2nd Amendment is there to protect citizens from the government, and when the government tries to argue that constitutionally protected actions are evil, the inverse has tended to be true.

It has also been proven time and time again that banning magazines does not reduce violent crimes and does not prevent criminals from acquiring these tools. This only affects law abiding citizens from being able to own the most effective tool for protecting themselves and their family. This has been the case everywhere that severe and Unconstitutional firearm related restrictions have been implemented, from Chicago to New York and California. The citizens of Minnesota do not wish for our state to become like these other states and demand that our 2nd Amendment rights be upheld by the people who represent us.

There is no legal basis for a semi-automatic firearms ban, and moreover the citizens of Minnesota did not vote for this. The Minnesota legislature is voted into office to represent the will of the people, and this is not our will. We expect our representatives to vote no on this bill in accordance with our will, otherwise we will make our voices heard at the ballot box.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and i look forward to seeing the will of the people being shown through our representatives.

Cody Bleess

Regarding Magazine Ban HF 3402 / SF 3714

I write against HR 3402 / SF 3714

This bill will only affect law abiding people. Criminals will not care because they know it will not affect them. In Hennepin and Ramsey counties the first charge to be dropped in plea bargaining is typically the gun charge. This magazine ban will be no different. The gang members will keep and use their 30+ round Glock magazines to feed their unlawful "switches." Criminals will not turn in their "high capacity" magazines and buy their 10 round equivalent. A better bill would outlaw the bargaining away of gun charges and hold judges accountable for dismissing or light sentencing gun charges. A mandatory minimum sentence plus mandatory charging for violent gun crimes will do more for citizen safety than this magazine capacity ban. Please affect the criminals not peaceable, law abiding citizens.

On a personal note, I view this magazine capacity ban to be a "taking without compensation" hence unconstitutional. Magazines are not cheap. Replacing all the magazines for all the firearms I own will cost me several hundred dollars. An example, a single 10 round magazine for the popular Sig Sauer P365 at this writing is $49.99 plus shipping. This bill will penalize lower income people and leave them unable to use their lawfully owned firearm and is, therefore, discriminatory on its face. Thank you.

Donald Williams

To: Committee Co-Chair Kelly Moller
c/o DFL Committee Administrator Ellen McDaniel
From: Doug Turner
Date: February 22, 2206
RE: Written Testimony in **OPPOSITION** to HF3402 (Large Capacity Magazines)

Dear Co-Chair Moller and Members of the Public Safety and Finance Committee:

I have read HF 3402 and strongly oppose this legislation and this body *must not* advance this language in the House. The advancement of this legislation makes my family less safe, penalizes law abiding citizens, and does nothing to stop the criminals that will not follow HF 3402. Why does this body think it is appropriate to penalize Minnesotans for simply possessing guns and magazines when 99.9% of us are law abiding?

Instead, the criminals of this state get a "pass," and the "soft on crime" county attorneys and judges of this state stand idly by. Our elected officials, starting with Governor Walz, are soft on crime and the Governor doubles down and appoints "soft on crime" social justice judges. The rule of law is not applied to the criminals of this state. They, (Walz, Ellison, and elected county attorneys) are too concerned that gun crimes affect marginalized communities *because* marginalized communities are committing most of the gun crimes. Criminals go through Hennepin and Ramsey County courts and are not held accountable. Prohibitions against magazine size will not change our officials' approach to crime. HF 3402 will penalize law abiding Minnesotans. How come the authors of this bill have such "tunnel vision" when it comes to gun legislation? This bill is nothing more than a knee jerk reaction that misses the mark and hurts Minnesota families.

This bill makes law abiding Minnesotans instant felons if this bill passes. The bill causes Minnesotans to surrender property to the government, destroy it, or move it out of state. Really! This is not what any Minnesotan wants regardless of your views. You should not substitute your own views for the will of the people. In addition, if passed, you will cause every Minnesotan that seeks to protect themselves, hunt, or recreate to purchase more rifles with standard magazines. Anti-gun legislation drives people to buy more guns and be more fearful of a tyrannical government. HF 3402 will be the best gun and magazine purchasing legislation there is, if passed. Again, your phrasing of "large capacity magazines" is not a thing. Magazines that come with rifles are standard magazines. This bill's attempt to recharacterize magazines, due to their capacity, as something that is *bad* is simply misplaced, unconstitutional, and bad for Minnesotans.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Doug Turner

Doug Turner

Eagan, MN

My name is Joseph J. Betelak. I am a 66 year old husband, father and grandfather who, along with my wife, have been a resident of Apple Valley for more than 39 years. I served on the local volunteer fire department for over 26-1/2 years. I have been a continuous holder of a Minnesota Permit To Carry, (PTC), since July 2003, (issued and renewed a total of 5 times and spanning 25 years). I have been an avid competitive shooter for about a decade now and a dues paying member of the USPSA (United States Practical Shooting Association), the governing body for several popular shooting sports competitions since 2017.

I write today to voice my strong opposition to all new anti-gun rights legislation that has, or will be, proposed in the Minnesota legislature. Today I will focus on **MN HF3402**. (**MN HF 3433** also includes most, if not all of MN HF 3402, in it as well).

MN HF 3402 is clearly unconstitutional and is in direct contradiction to the 2nd amendment as well as Supreme Court prescient in several landmark decisions. That alone should be more than enough reason to vote no on it.

As a competitive shooter this Bill would require me to discard magazines that cost me about $5000 and spend a like amount to replace them without compensation. As a legal, permitted gun owner, it would require me to replace thousands of dollars in magazines for my non-competition guns, again without compensation. Because nearly every handgun, and most semi-automatic rifles, in this state came new from the factory with standard capacity magazines, millions of Minnesotans would be in the same predicament: forced to spend a ridiculous amount of money or risk jail and being a felon for life.

This law would be a disaster for Minnesota's thriving USPSA shooting clubs, matches, and competitors. I, and hundreds of other Minnesotans, travel to out of state USPSA matches each year. I compete in South Dakota, North Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, and Wisconsin regularly, as do dozens of Minnesota competitors I personally know, and scores more I do not know. Likewise hundreds of shooters from the region and even nationally come to Minnesota to compete many time per year. We book hotel rooms, (For at least one night, but typically for 2 to 4 nights for major matches), go out to restaurants, buy fuel for our vehicles, and often bring our families along to sight see and visit tourist sites.

Out of state and top national ranked shooters will no longer attend Minnesota matches. Minnesota shooters will not be able to attend matches in most of the rest of the country and be competitive. Every competitor in 90%+ of our country will be using standard capacity magazines holding 21-28 rounds for pistols and 30 rounds for long guns. Because we won't own any of those we will be using **Neutered** magazines with a completely arbitrary limit of less than 1/2,, or even less than 1/3, the capacity of the overwhelming majority of the country. This law will completely end the sport for me and hundreds more in Minnesota. This law will kill our

sport in Minnesota and Minnesotans who have never done anything wrong will suffer because you want to pass a law that makes you feel good , but will not make anyone safer and only punishes the peaceable, law abiding citizens of our state.

As a Permitted Concealed carrier you will put my life, and my family's safety, in jeopardy. If 10 rounds are enough, why are there exceptions for police? Do they not face the exact same violent criminals that citizens face? Citizens don't have partners, back-up a radio call away, and 3 or 4 magazines at the ready on a duty belt, like police do. Why 10, or any other number of rounds pulled out of thin air, good enough for me, but not good enough for police, state agents and employees, and even YOU? I don't believe in a 2-tierd system of rights. I don't think state employees, agents or police have any more legitimate reason to have unlimited magazine capacity than any ordinary citizen has.

While most of the rest of the country has been going in what I consider the right direction on gun laws, Minnesota has been going in the opposite, wrong direction. Permit less concealed carry is the norm in the vast majority of states. People are freer and safer when they can defend themselves without fees and burdensome regulations. Attacking millions of Minnesota guns owners should NOT be a priority of the legislature. It should not even be a consideration when we have so many more pressing problems that need to be solved. You should put your attention on financial and infrastructure issues and leave gun owners alone.

I do not believe modifications to this bill, such as a "grandfather" clause, would make it acceptable to the millions of Minnesotan gun owners and to the millions of future Minnesota gun owners whose rights are being attacked. Nothing less than outright rejection of this extremism will do.

Respectfully

Joseph J. Betelak

Apple Valley, MN

From: **Codie Wolfe** codiewolfe46@gmail.com
Subject: Bill HF3433
Date: February 23, 2026 at 1:21 PM
To: ellen.mcdaniel@house.mn.gov
Cc: Contact@gunowners.mn

Hello Ellen McDaniel,

My name is Codie Wolfe, and I live in Claremont, Minnesota in Dodge County. I am writing in complete opposition regarding bill HF3433, the proposal addressing semiautomatic military-style firearms and large-capacity magazines.

I recognize the importance of public safety and the difficult policy considerations involved in firearm legislation. At the same time, I have serious concerns about how this proposal may interact with constitutional protections and how it would affect law-abiding citizens in our state more than the criminals who don't follow laws anyway.

In particular, I would ask that careful consideration be given to:

- Whether the bill's definitions and scope align with current Second Amendment jurisprudence concerning commonly owned firearms used for lawful purposes such as self-defense and sport.
- How the proposal would distinguish between individuals who comply with the law and those who are already willing to disregard existing criminal statutes.
- Whether any compliance requirements (registration, surrender, disposal, etc., if applicable) are structured in a way that respects due process, property interests, and the constitution.

My hope is that any legislation enacted in Minnesota both enhances public safety and withstands constitutional scrutiny. Your constituents want you to know that the law-abiding citizens of Minnesota oppose this bill and we urge you to carefully reevaluate bill HF3433 before it advances further. I would appreciate your perspective on whether revisions are being considered to address these concerns.

Thank you for your time and for your service to our district.

Sincerely,

Codie Wolfe

Claremont, MN

Please,

Vote NO on HF 3402

Thank you,

Kathleen Quist SD67

If the intent is to make felons out of otherwise law abiding citizens, HF 3402 is a way to do it.

Kevin Schleppenbach

Minnesota House of Representatives
Ellen McDaniel

February 23rd, 2026

Re: Opposition to HF 3402 – Minnesota Firearms Magazine Ban

Dear Ms. McDaniel and others in the MN House of Representatives:

I am writing to you today in opposition to HF 3433 in the MN House of Representatives. The reason is simple, it is Unconstitutional! We have a Constitutional Right to self-defense as well as to have the ability to keep and bear arms to oppose tyranny. Therefore, this bill should immediately be removed from consideration as it infringes and abolishes that right, listed in the 2nd Amendment to the US Constitution.

I am a Veteran and a lifelong MN Citizen, who signed up to "Protect and Defend" our US Constitution and the State of Minnesota, when I served in the MN Air National Guard from 1991-2006. You all in the MN Legislature (House of Reps) took an Oath to Protect our Rights and to work for the citizens of MN! That is now in jeopardy if this bill (HF 3433) is even brought to the MN House floor for a vote. It is in clear violation of our 2nd Amendment and would undermine the rights of the citizenry of Minnesota! If one right is tossed out and removed, others will fall! Don't be in violation of the US Constitution.

The 2nd Amendment to the US Constitution clearly states: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." This, along with the other first ten Amendments (called the Bill of Rights) were ratified effective December 15th, 1791. This is a very sacred right, that has ensured our freedom, first from the British, then other tyrannical governments, organizations or global groups or entities. Also, there was a US Supreme Court decision called Marbury v Madison, 5US (2 Cranch), 137, 174, 176, (1803) that clearly states: "All laws which are repugnant to the US Constitution are Null and Void." This MN proposed bill (HF 3433) is in clear violation of Marbury v Madison and violates the 2nd Amendment directly, so therefore should be immediately removed from consideration as should ANY Bill that would violate our Constitutional Rights!

If we as a state (Minnesota) allow the attack upon our US Constitutional Rights, we will cease to exist as a state! Do NOT let that happen on your watch! We The People of Minnesota require our legislators (who took an oath) to PROTECT OUR RIGHTS, to do just that! You are NOT ALLOWED TO REMOVE OUR RIGHTS! They are protected!

Regards,

Mark D. Himmer
952-200-2464

To: The Honorable Co-Chairs and Members of the House Public Safety Committee
From: Matthew Thielhorn, Left leaning voter
Date: 2/23/2026
Subject: Opposition to HF3402 – Magazine Capacity Limit Law

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony. I, Matt Thielhorn, am a resident of Burnsville, MN. I am deeply concerned about proposed bill HF3402 and am writing in opposition to the measure as a left-leaning voter.

As this law currently exists, there is no grandfather clause or buyback option. Requiring citizens to sell their legally owned property or permanently modify their property without compensation would amount to a violation of citizens' 5th amendment rights under the "Takings Clause". Even with good intentions meant to reduce harm, the state should not engage in practices that violate citizens' rights or pass legislation that will knowingly be struck down in court, particularly the 8th circuit who share SCOTUS interpretations of 2A.

State legislators should be wary of passing laws that would easily be struck down by the 8th circuit court of appeals, the most conservative leaning circuit court in the country. Split-circuit decisions between the circuit courts will surely accelerate circumstances in which the 6-3 conservative majority Supreme Court would intervene on these issues. Given the 8th circuit's willingness to utilize SCOTUS' Bruen (2022) ruling in the Worth v Jacobson (2024) case, I would caution that the 8th circuit would likely conclude that magazines are 1) in lawful, common use, and 2) that there isn't a historical precedent consistent with the nation's history in limiting such items.

The argument that magazines above 10 rounds are not in common use every day in American households is absurd. Nearly every single semi-automatic firearm comes standard with a magazine above this arbitrary 10 round limit, and while there are aftermarket options for magazines above the standard magazine capacity as designed for a particular firearm, the 10 round limit paints a picture that hundreds of millions of magazines in the United States and in Minnesota are intentionally "extended". This is not the case.

To illustrate how absurd this claim is, imagine you're buying a new car. That car has a 12-gallon gas tank. Congress then passes a law that mandates anything above a 10-gallon gas tank is deemed excessive and harmful to the environment. Millions of vehicles across the country with gas tanks that hold 12, 15, 18, 19, etc. gallons, all previously considered "standard" for their class of vehicle by design of the manufacturer, are deemed excessive. That is equally absurd to the claim being made here.

If this state legislative body is interested in seeing how the current Supreme Court would rule on this issue, creating a nationwide impact, before the federal government has had a chance to rebalance the Supreme Court, perhaps this body should exercise foresight, strategy, and patience rather than press onward in a blatantly unconstitutional manner. Your interpretation of the constitution may in good faith differ from that of the Supreme Court. But ultimately, SCOTUS gets to decide the constitutionality, not us, unless Congress amends the constitution. No matter the intent, I respectfully believe that there are other measures we can take to address harm from gun violence that won't create national, negative implications in the long run.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the committee to vote against HF3402. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Matt Thielhorn

DFL Public Safety Administrator Ellen McDaniel,

My name is Nate Timm and live in West Lakeland township outside Stillwater Minnesota. I work for the Washington County Sheriff's Office. I am emailing to express my opposition to House File 3402 which proposes a ban on firearm magazines over 10 rounds. I have three main concerns with the language of this bill.

The bill's language does have an exemption for law enforcement but does not appear not extend to off duty carry. It is common practice for officer to carry their weapons to and from work, in addition to off duty general carry. Some department policy requires this practice. If the bill passes in present form officers may need to leave standard capacity magazines at work and switch to lower capacity magazines while away from work, especially in today's cultural climate where some metro prosecutors have a thirst to prosecute police officers.

My other concern with this bill is how it impacts collectable firearms. I collect world war two firearms and have a federal collector's license. I own a number of federally registered machine guns. One is a Japanese machine gun made in 1943 and is valued at $20,000. No magazines were made for this weapon after Japan ceased armament production following their defeat in 1945 and no magazines were made for this weapon with less than a 30 round capacity. This same issue applies to other firearms in my collection. This concern would be alleviated by allowing an exemption for Curio and Relic (C&R) firearms. These type of firearms are generally 50 years or older and/or recognized by the ATF as a collector item. The C&R list is maintained by the ATF and can be found by doing a web search for “ATF curio and relic list.”

My final concern is how this bill will impact shooting sports. I participate in Practical Shooting which is a shooting competition where scores are based on speed and accuracy. Using 10 round magazines will greatly impact the way these matches are held and scored.

I get the intent behind this law to reduce the ability of deranged persons to inflict casualties in mass shootings. But with that said those same persons will be able to continue to obtain standard capacity magazines in other adjacent states that do not prohibit them. This bill will impinge on shooting sports, law enforcement, firearms collectors, and others and will have little impact on the desired outcome. Even if the law passes as written a person who has no regard for human life, or the highest crime of murder, will get around the issue by carrying more lower capacity magazines. The recent mass shooting in Australia comes to mind where the shooter used a bolt action rifle with a high degree of speed and precision. These weapons appear to not even be detachable magazine fed.

Respectfully,

Nate Timm, Stillwater MN (West Lakeland Township)

651-430-7863

HF 3402

OPPOSE

A limiting on magazine capacity would on its face appear to be a complete violation of the 2nd amendment. Whether or not a magazine is considered part of a firearm or an accessory appears to be the main argument in the courts as to whether this issue applies to the 2nd amendment. Regardless of one's stance on that questions, this bill would turn thousands of Minnesotans into criminals overnight.

With actual criminals facing an overwhelmed and soft-on-crime justice system for, wasting time, money, and resources on a bill that will hurt law abiding citizens seems foolish.

Additionally, a similar ban in California was overturned in 2023 then reinstated in 2025 and now is headed for potential Supreme Court review. The

This bill is outlandish, and any assertion that this ban would create a safer community is faulty on its face. We know factually that gun restrictions do not prevent criminals from obtaining or possessing illegal firearm accessories and magazine capacity bans do not directly lead to reduced gun violence.

Common sense gun laws can be beneficial to community safety, but this bill lacks any form of common sense and appears to be more of a political stunt than an effort to protect Minnesotans and their individual rights.

Thank you for your time. Your tireless dedication to keeping all Minnesotan's safe is appreciated.

Austin Sonterre

763-291-8082

Richard Ness
708 W Summit Ave
Fergus Falls, MN 56537
(253) 381-0002
richard@nessnet.com

Testifying as an individual

RE: HF 3402

Core Arguments Against HF 3402

Infringement on Second Amendment Rights:
Magazines are integral components of firearms, not mere accessories. Without a functional magazine, many modern firearms simply cannot operate as designed for self-defense.

The "Common Use" Standard:
Based on Supreme Court precedents like **Heller** and **Bruen**, arms in "common use" for lawful purposes cannot be banned. Millions of Americans and Minnesotans **lawfully** own magazines with capacities greater than 10 rounds, making them standard equipment rather than "dangerous and unusual" weapons.

Self-Defense Necessity:
In a high-stress confrontation with a violent attacker, more than 10 rounds can be the difference between life and death. Law enforcement officers universally carry magazines with more than 10 rounds for their own protection - these (>10 round) capacities are necessary for effective self-defense.

Lack of Historical Precedent:
There is no historical tradition from the founding era of limiting the ammunition capacity of firearms. Historical analogues sometimes used by the government, such as 19th-century Bowie knife laws, are often seen as insufficient to justify modern magazine bans.

Impact on Law-Abiding Citizens:
A ban only affects law-abiding citizens while doing nothing to actually stop criminals, who can easily obtain widely available standard equipment magazines or use multiple smaller ones.

Similar laws are being challenged:
Cases, such as Duncan v. Bonta, are currently being petitioned for review by the U.S. Supreme Court. The Supreme Court, if certiorari is granted, will in all likelihood, rule against laws such as HF 3402. Passing such laws is a colossal waste of Minnesota taxpayers dollars. Considering the MUCH more pressing problems currently facing Minnesota, HF 3402 is nothing more than political pandering and should noot even be passed out of the House Public Safety Committee.

Thank you,
Richard Ness

To the esteemed members of the Public Safety Committee of the state of Minnesota,

I am writing to you in opposition of HF 3402. Private ownership of so-called “large capacity magazines” does not pose a danger to the residents of the state of Minnesota. They are in common use, owned by tens of thousands of Minnesotans. By making the possession of what is effectively an open-ended box with a spring inside of it a criminal offense, HF 3402 will only place a further burden on law enforcement, the courts, and the prisons of the state of Minnesota. Enforcement of a ban on the possession of these magazines will only further divert resources away from our communities that need them the most.

Time and effort spent in committee in an effort to eventually pass HF 3402 into state law, in the name of public safety, would be far better spent on measures that may actually have a positive impact on public safety, rather than turning tens of thousands of Minnesotans into criminals in the pursuit of preventing what are statistical anomalies.

Sincerely,
Ronald Heil
Dakota County

To the Chair and Committee members,

I am writing in opposition to HF3402. Why is a governing body trying to erase the Bill of Rights? A person's right to own and bear arms "Shall NOT be Infringed". Back in the colonial era this provision was talking specifically about military grade weaponry.

Furthermore, this is once again a highly partisan bill that interferes with inheritance and our basic civil rights. This is more legislation scapegoating the real issue; human character. Why not go after the root causes of responsibility, accountability, mental health, education on proper firearm use. Not to mention de-stigmatizing the right to defend one's self. Statistics show the safest places are those where firearms are a common appearance. Best way to protect innocents and stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun. Do not forget about greater MN where we still deal with wild animals on a frequent basis. We have been blessed for decades to not have a foreign army invade. That is because it is well know the American people are armed and ready to defend our homeland. This bill weakens our defenses and makes us vulnerable. The only people who are for this legislation are those who are anti-American.

Lastly, why is simply practicing our 2A rights and owning a firearm judged at least 5 times more harshly than actual violent crimes? Assault is 90 days, kidnapping a year while practicing our Constitutional Rights is up charged to a 5 year felony!?

This is bad legislation and everyone knows it.

-Sara B.-

Pine Island

TESTIMONY ON HR 3402

Minnesota House Public Safety Committee

Members of the committee:

I am writing in opposition to HR 3402. I am outraged that the authors of HR 3402, and those who plan on voting for it, think my life, or my family's, isn't worth more than ten rounds of ammunition. If I can't protect myself with ten rounds, should I just put my hands up and say to the real criminal, "OK, you got me. I'm out. Please don't hurt me." ?

It's been at least forty years since police agencies started removing revolvers from their inventories because officers couldn't protect themselves, much less the public, when issued those limited capacity firearms.

As a retired Minnesota Peace Officer and law enforcement firearms instructor, I can't help but find the arbitrary number ten laughable. It's been universally taught for decades that one shoots in self-defense until the threat is gone. That's a status, it's already case law in Minnesota, and there's no way to quantify it with an arbitrary number. Is it three rounds? Seven rounds? Ten rounds? How about fifteen or twenty?

You don't know. I don't know. We can't know how many is the "right" number; not until our life, or our family's lives, are on the line. And then a hundred rounds might not feel like enough. Survivors of an attempted lethal attack are never going to say, "Gee, I'm so glad I didn't have more than ten rounds in my gun."

Tim Bender
Bemidji, MN
professional.defense@gmail.com

Opposition to HF 3433 - Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban

Gun bans of any commonly owned firearms do not make Minnesota communities safer. They just punish the people who follow the law.

Here's why critics say the policy fails on its own terms:

1. It targets the most visible guns, not the ones driving violence:

Semi-automatic rifles make up a tiny fraction of gun crime. Handguns are used in the overwhelming majority of shootings. This ban goes after what *looks* intimidating instead of what's actually fueling violence. That's why opponents call it "performative safety" because it changes optics, not outcomes.

2. "Semi-automatic" describes almost every modern firearm:

One trigger pull, one round. That's how a semi-automatic rifle works. It's how a Glock operates and how most firearms used by police, hunters, and ordinary citizens work. Banning "semi-automatic rifles" is effectively banning a technology, not a misuse. It sweeps millions of responsible owners into the crossfire.

3. It sidesteps the real drivers of violence:

Critics argue that bans let politicians avoid the hard work:

- Repairing a broken mental-health system
- Sealing with repeat violent offenders
- Fixing a justice system that cycles dangerous people in and out
- Disrupting trafficking networks and stolen-gun pipelines

A ban becomes a shortcut and a way to *look* active without addressing the causes of violence.

4. It creates an unworkable enforcement mess:

A ban means:

- Confiscation or forced buybacks

- Criminalizing people who've harmed no one
- Asking police to enforce a law that pits them against otherwise peaceful citizens

That's a recipe for resentment, noncompliance, and selective enforcement.

5. It's easy to evade and impossible to define cleanly:

Every "assault weapon ban" collapses under its own definitions:

- Cosmetic features
- Arbitrary magazine limits
- Quick manufacturer work arounds

The result is a symbolic law that's easy to dodge and hard to enforce.

6. It drains energy from solutions that actually work:

Gun bans are easy politics. Hard governance. mental-health reform, community intervention, and criminal-justice overhaul will make a difference. Critics argue that bans siphon attention away from the reforms that would reduce violence.

In summary: Gun bans are political theater. They go after the guns that look scary, ignore the forces that drive violence, and divert energy from the reforms that would make a real difference. Gun bans do nothing to improve public safety. All they do is punish responsible gun owners.

To: Whom It May Concern

Re: HF 3433 and HF 3402

I am writing to you today to express my concern about these Gun Control Bills you are introducing and attempting to pass. I am fully aware of the impact firearm accessibility and use can have on individuals and communities. I work as a Mental Health Professional and have worked with many clients who have personally experienced family members affected by firearms or have been the victim of firearms. I am also aware of the many mass shootings the USA and MN have experienced in the past few years and the numerous incidents over the past decades. I feel immense sadness and anger when I hear about another needless mass shooting. I also do not think complete firearms bans are going to have the impact you intend them to have.

I know this isn't a rigid, black and white debate and I know there can be effective solutions to appropriately address, enact, and reinforce; however, I am completely against these bills considering the recent Federal Government acting with lawless order and seemingly countless Constitutional violations. I would like to protect all people and prevent any of them from ever having to experience something as tragic as gun violence anywhere. However, I cannot believe these bills will create and ensure safety and security in the long term, and appear quite tone deaf, given the current political situation now.

I am not an expert in American or Global History; however, this current situation tends to remind me of Germany leading up to World War 2 and Nazi Germany disarming its people and more specifically the Jewish Community, which then left them completely defenseless against a more powerful and armed force. I am fearful the United States of America is on the path to becoming the next "Nazi Germany" and these violations of our Constitutional Rights will only lead to more unsafe and unsecure ways of living in this amazing State of Minnesota, and the Constitutional and Democratic Republic of the United States of America. I am fearful we are at risk of becoming an Authoritarian Government with a President who cares more about his vanity and his bank account than the actual safety of the American People.

Adam Riffe

Written Testimony **Against** HF 3433: Semiautomatic Rifle Ban

I wish to make clear that I **oppose** HF 3433, a ban on commonly owned firearms, in all its potential forms.

This bill is an obvious infringement of Minnesotan's 2nd, 4th, 5th and 8th Amendment rights. It would rob us of our property; the language so encompassing that it captures rifles handed down from grandparents. It includes massively disproportional punishments. And would place people grieving lost loved ones in serious legal jeopardy.

All for zero increase in public safety.

Gun control simply does not work because criminals, by definition, do not follow the law.

And bans do not work, as evidenced by this country's disastrous experience with alcohol prohibition. Bans erode the rule of law, turn otherwise law abiding citizens into criminals and, therefore, reduce public safety.

Finally, despite media hype of isolated events and appeals to emotion, these firearms are rarely used in crime. While, at the same time, being extremely common. There are millions of these rifles in Minnesota.

This bill is *awful* to its core. I oppose it, and any legislation like it.

Sincerely,

Aric Czarnowski
9849 Beard Ave S
Bloomington, MN 55431

Written Testimony in Opposition to House File 3433 – Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban
Before the House Public Safety Committee
Minnesota Legislature

Date: February 20, 2026
Submitted by: Ashley Scharffbillig
Position: Oppose

Chair and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this written testimony regarding **House File 3433**. While I believe reducing violent crime is important, I oppose HF3433 as written and urge the committee to reject this proposal.

If the purpose is to prevent violent crime, this bill does not do it. It only penalizes responsible citizens for ownership and creates burdens. The bills definitions are based on features and not functions which will make it difficult for enforcement. This ambiguous approach to the definitions creates a risk to both responsible law-abiding citizens and law enforcement about what may or may not be legal in any given potential enforcement of a citizen. This approach causes a great amount of risk to the citizens in a state that already has issues with law enforcements actions that have killed citizens. I also need to point out the large immigrant population in Minnesota, many of which do not speak English as a first language. Those immigrants also use firearms for hunting, sporting and defense purposes and this law may make it easier for State law enforcement to take advantage of them.

This law also affects veterans. As a veteran US Marine I was required to qualify with my rifle as were my friends both in the Marines and other services. Member of the reserves, the National Army/Air Guard and the active duty staff here in Minnesota must qualify. Many of our current veterans personally own the types of firearms listed and use them for not just for defense, sporting, or hunting, but also to go to the range to practice to ensure they are proficient with their rifles. Those of us Veterans who are no longer actively serving also continue to own our own rifles. This bill would make veterans' who took an oath to serve criminals just for ownership.

This bill also creates burdens both administratively and monetarily on our citizens, veterans and immigrant populations who are responsible and law abiding. Not only does this give burdens to citizens, but also to enforcement agencies in trying to do the certifications and other things called for in this bill. Enforcement agencies should not be spending time and taxpayer funding on these provisions and should instead be focusing their time on dealing with those citizens who are acting out violently or threatening acts of violence.

If the House truly does care about violence it should focus its efforts on helping enforcement agencies and the State with mental health services so we, as a State, can help identify those who are at risk of committing any kind of violence and provide a space where someone who is going through a mental health crisis can go. The State should also instead provide resources to put more enforcement and community policing in place. The goal should be to reduce violence overall regardless of what is used and take action against those who choose to act violent. This bill only punishes those who own firearms and are already responsible and law-abiding citizens, not those who act and choose to do violence.

In summary, this bill does not address the issue of violence and will only make criminals of our already law-abiding citizens, veterans and immigrant communities. This will also be costly to the State both in the attempt to enforce it and the inevitable lawsuits that will immediately follow. There is no victim in ownership of a firearm, and it is wrong to punish someone for that. Those that do commit acts of violence are who we should be focusing on. If the State is at the point its banning items in an attempt to reduce violence then our issue is not the objects used, but the violent culture that has been allowed to grow and we need to focus on fixing our culture as reduced violence overall means a reduction of violence with fists, knives, firearms or anything else one may use.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Ashley Scharffbillig

St Paul, MN

HF 3433 - Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban (In OPPOSITION)

During the Trump administration, controversies surrounding federal immigration enforcement—particularly actions taken by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE)—intensified concerns among Minnesotans about federal overreach.

At the core of this perspective is the principle of federalism. The U.S. constitutional system divides power between the federal government and the states, reserving significant authority to states under the Tenth Amendment. When federal agencies are perceived as exceeding their mandates or operating aggressively within states—such as through workplace raids or expanded deportation efforts—citizens become wary of concentrating additional power in government hands.

Since the beginning of Mr. Trump's presidency, ICE has acted in ways that undermined local autonomy, especially in states and cities that adopted sanctuary policies. Minnesota has communities that have debated cooperation with federal immigration authorities. This tension highlights a broader concern: if federal power can expand in one area of law enforcement, it may do so in others. As a result, preserving robust Second Amendment protections at the state level serves as a safeguard potential federal overreach.

Marginalized communities distrust of federal law enforcement has not been confined to one political ideology. Civil rights activists, labor organizers, and immigrant communities have all experienced moments of conflict with federal authorities. In this context, limiting civilian access to firearms WILL leave vulnerable populations dependent on the same institutions they already distrust for protection.

While public safety in Minnesota is indeed a concern, HF 3433 and HF 3402 will drastically reduce our marginalized community from defending themselves against government overreach. Hitler disarmed the Jews in 1938 which led to the slaughter of nearly 6-million Jews. Is this Minnesota legislature seriously considering disarming our minority communities in the name of Public Safety?

If Democrats enact this legislation, they will be disarming our most vulnerable groups, and will ensure that Federal overreach can never be countered by Minnesotans. How dare you! Shame on you for wanting to see our poor and marginalized deported, or worse.

Vote NO to HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Bradley Slocum

Itasca County

Hello, I am writing in opposition to HF 3433 (Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban)

Impact

This bill will have a significant impact on me, many of my family and friends, and thousands of law-abiding gun owners throughout the State of Minnesota.

The first rifle my son used for deer hunting was a rifle that was covered by this ban. I chose to have him use that rifle because it had an adjustable stock which allowed it to fit him properly. Another benefit to choosing this rifle was it had the ability to use a suppressor which allowed me to quietly talk him though taking his first deer and not damage his hearing from the sound of a gunshot. This was not an experience I was fortunate enough to have and I know that resulted in hearing damage to me and many other hunters over the years.

I, and many others, also use these arms in shooting competitions. Those competitions are used as a way to exercise, strive for the mastery of a skill, and connect with a community of wonderful individuals from many different walks of life.

Constitutionality

As you know, should this bill become law it will certainly be challenged in court, and with good reason.

The 1789 Joint Resolution of Congress Proposing 12 Amendments to the U.S. Constitution, which was later ratified to become the Bill of Rights, stated that the authors were concerned that “the Government” would abuse its powers. This was not theoretical to them, they had lived this experience and on April 14, 1775, when the British attempted to disarm Americans, the Revolutionary war began. The fact that this bill exempts “any government officer, agent, or employee” while placing a ban for law-abiding citizens is exactly what the Second Amendment was adopted to prevent.

In District of Columbia v. Heller the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that arms “in common use” for lawful purposes cannot be banned. In later oral arguments the Supreme Court of the United States has affirmed that arms with many of the characteristics this bill seeks to ban are in common use.

Hypocrisy

In response to the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) surge in the past few months many politicians spoke out about their concerns for the rights of immigrants, both those here legally and illegally, as well as Minnesotans but now, some of those same politicians are attempting to violate the rights of law-abiding Minnesotans.

Benjamin Pratt

Hello,

The proposed bill HF3433 is a direct violation of the 2nd Amendment. Being involved in competitive shooting all the tools that I use for competition would be made illegal in the State of Minnesota. This will force me and may others to relocate out of Minnesota, otherwise we would be made felons. In the end the only people that are harmed are law abiding Minnesotans, since criminals do not follow the law.

For the above reasons I adamantly disagree and oppose the proposed legislation. Please put it where it belongs in a garbage can.

Cary Rauch
Becker, MN

Dear House Public Safety Committee,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to HF 3433. This bill is far broader than the Assault Weapons Ban of 1994, and bans common firearms that many Americans, myself included, use for sport shooting, training, hunting and self defense. In addition to opposing the ban, I also would like to address the grandfather clause in this bill.

Requiring people who don’t want to surrender their firearms to submit to warrantless searches of their homes is a severe violation of their rights in any circumstance, but is particularly glaring in the current environment where our communities have been terrorized by federal agencies entering homes without warrants to abduct our friends and neighbors.

Sincerely,
Casey Griffith

To Minnesota Representatives:

I am writing to inform you that, as law abiding firearms owning residents of Minnesota, we completely oppose bill HR 3433 - the ban on semi-automatic military style assault weapons - on account of it violating the 2nd Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

According to New York Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen, any firearms related restrictions must be in accordance with history, text, and tradition. The United States does not have such history, text, or tradition. The founding fathers wrote the 2nd Amendment specifically for the citizens to resist tyrannical government. This has been argued frequently in this state, especially in regards to carrying firearms at the protests against ICE, as the federal government has claimed that carrying a semi-automatic weapon to a protest is illegal and Unconstitutional when Minnesota has no law against lawfully carrying at a protest.

It has also been proven time and time again that banning firearms does not reduce violent crimes, and it does not prevent criminals from acquiring these firearms. Bans only affect citizens who use these firearms for legal purposes and will put them more at risk of being the victims of criminals. This has been shown to be the case everywhere that severe and Unconstitutional firearm restrictions have been implemented, from Chicago to New York and California. The citizens of Minnesota do not wish for our state to become like these other states and demand that our 2nd Amendment rights be upheld by the people who represent us.

Besides the 2nd Amendment violations, this bill also violates the 4th Amendment by forcing law abiding citizens to be subject to warrantless searches. This is an incredibly dangerous precedent to try and set, especially when it’s being argued whether or not ICE can enter homes without warrants in search of criminal fugitives.

There is no legal basis for a semi-automatic firearms ban, and moreover the citizens of Minnesota did not vote for this. The Minnesota legislature is voted into office to represent the will of the people, and this is not our will. We expect our representatives to vote no on this bill in accordance with our will, otherwise we will make our voices heard at the ballot box.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I look forward to seeing the will of the people being shown through our representatives.

Cody Bleess

I have prepared this written testimony to voice my opposition to H.F. 3433 which if passed would impose a sweeping ban on nearly all semi-automatic rifles.

Introduction of these bills is proof enough to any law abiding gun owner that the Minnesota DFL is coming for us and wants to take away our guns and strip us of our second amendment rights.

This bill would criminalize peaceable Minnesotans while doing nothing to stop violent criminals. I would urge this committee to oppose any proposed ban on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms along with any bans on magazines over 10 rounds.

The DFL may very well have the gavel on Tuesday, February 24, 2026 and may very well pass this bill out of committee but law abiding gun owners in Minnesota have the Constitution on our side.

These firearms that are proposed to be banned are regularly owned semi-automatic firearms protected under the Second amendment.

These firearms are used every day by peaceable gun owning Minnesotans for self-defense, hunting, sport shooting, and training, and once again they are without a doubt protected under the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Our second amendment rights cannot be infringed upon simply because they are 'politically inconvenient' to the DFL.

The State Legislature has no right whatsoever under the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution to take away my right to obtain and own any one of these guns.

The intent of this bill is very clearly meant to punish each and every law abiding citizen in the State of Minnesota, stripping them of their rights under the Constitution.

Banning these types of weapons will not make Minnesota safer. It only penalizes law-abiding gun owners engaging in their Second Amendment rights, while doing nothing to stop criminals who will ignore the law and obtain these weapons illegally anyways.

Lastly it is a fact that criminals are not going to follow or abide by this law or any provision contained in this law if passed, and they will continue to obtain these types of firearms illegally.

To: Committee Co-Chair Kelly Moller
c/o DFL Committee Administrator Ellen McDaniel
From: Doug Turner Eagan, MN
Date: February 20, 2206
RE: Written Testimony in **OPPOSITION** to HF3433 (Possession of semiautomatic military-style assault weapons banned, and criminal penalties)

Dear Co-Chair Moller and Members of the Public Safety and Finance Committee:

I have read HF 3433 and absolutely oppose this legislation and this body *must not* advance this language in the House. I also oppose the words in the title "semiautomatic military-style assault weapons" as they are used as a pejorative to describe all guns as "bad" and primarily used for those persons (the authors) who are pushing an agenda to ban and confiscate all guns in violation of the United States Constitution.

Semiautomatic rifles with detachable magazines are among the most commonly owned firearms in the United States and in Minnesota. They are possessed and used responsibly by law-abiding citizens. Reclassifying these firearms under a broad and restrictive definition would criminalize ordinary ownership and undermine the rights of responsible gun owners without addressing the root causes of violent crime.

The advancement of HF3433 is unlawful and affects my ability to protect my family, hunt, and recreate. The authors' expanded definition is clearly designed to punish, criminalize and make law abiding Minnesotans less safe. This expansion affects my ability to own a rifle to use in self-defense or to use while hunting. If passed, there would be several rifles that would be illegal to use and possess. Rifles that I currently own and use for hunting. I submit to you that semi-automatic rifles with detachable magazines are commonly used by hunters in Minnesota. Why punish law abiding Minnesotans that hunt?

In addition, the use of semi-automatic rifles in self-defense situations is a "life or death" situation in a multiple attacker situation. Regardless of the authors' belief, there are situations that require semi-automatic rifles to be used in a self-defense environment. In a home invasion situation, where there are multiple attackers - a weapon with the ability to be suppressed and shoot multiple rounds is the weapon of my choice. I protect my family with a semi-automatic rifle. A rifle with the ability to shoot a lot of rounds is a force multiplier by the self-defender. And remember, that the self defender could be a woman, the elderly, or another person that is vulnerable. To take away the ability of a MN citizen's right to protect his/her family is simply wrong and violates the founding principles of the Constitution.

Moreover, if passed, HF 3433 makes it illegal to transfer, own or possess a rifle, and you want Minnesotans charged with a felony with up to 5 years in prison and a $25,000 fine. It is absurd that the authors' could write such language in a bill to punish and criminalize the law abiding Minnesota citizen.

And the "grandfathering clause" is a complete overreach by the state government for what? So, let me get this straight:

- I have to apply for a state-issued certificate of ownership?
- I have to store it according to the ill-managed, unregulated, wild anti-gun group known as the BCA? And they get to writ the rules?
- I have to allow a warrantless search?
- I have to pay a tax every 3 years?
- The rifle can only be on my property or at a firing range? What if I travel with the rifle to the other 49 states to hunt, recreate, shoot, go to another state's firing range.
- And never transfer it? Really.
- So, my only options are to surrender the rifle, disable it, or remove it from the state?
- And, finally, I cannot purchase new rifles?

Finally, this language does nothing to punish the criminals who have not read this language and will not comply with any gun law. How come the authors of this bill do not focus on the following:

- Increased penalties for guns crimes
- Increased education to Judges to follow sentencing guidelines and to lock 'em up. (You should look to the Honorable Chief of Police in Bloomington to his views on violent crime. We need a "Chief Hodges" in the judiciary, the legislature, and in the Governor's office)
- Increased education to Gov Walz to appoint Judge's that are "law and order" judges
- Increased jail time for gun criminals (get these ppl off the streets)
- Increased education to marginalized communities that use guns to commit crimes and the consequences thereof
- Increased education to our left leaning county attorneys that do not charge gun crimes on the proper way
- Increased funding to law enforcement to target people who commit illegal gun crimes

Public safety policy should focus on deterring and prosecuting criminal misuse of firearms rather than restricting the rights of lawful owners. More effective approaches would include strengthening enforcement against violent offenders, ensuring consistent sentencing, and supporting law enforcement efforts to target illegal gun activity.

HF3433 penalizes responsible Minnesotans while offering limited impact on those who already disregard the law. For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Committee decline to advance this bill and instead pursue policies that enhance public safety without infringing on constitutional rights of your constituents.

Respectfully submitted

/s/ Doug Turner

Doug Turner

Testimony in Opposition to HF 3433 - Semi-Automatic Rifle Ban and HF 3402 - Total Ban on Possession of Magazines holding more than 10 rounds

I am writing in opposition to these bills. I am a proud lifelong Minnesotan and resident of Ramsey and Hennepin counties.

These bills would make everyday Minnesotans into Felons overnight.

We have laws that need to be enforced first and now is not the time , nor ever , to introduce such legislation.

I believe in Minnesota and the Second Amendment - you are making me and many Minnesotans lose faith in our State Government in a time when We Need Your Support. We do not need you disarming citizens.

Thank you,

Evan Nelson
37 year old Father and New Brighton Resident

To whom it may concern

I am writing to express my opposition to HF 3433 relating to the prohibition of semiautomatic military-style assault weapons.

Let me begin by saying, I am both a lifelong Democrat and firearm enthusiast. I support common sense measures that reduce gun violence and respect the 2nd Amendment of our constitution. HF 3433 does neither of these things.

According to the FBI, just 4% of firearm murders were committed with rifles of any type in 2023, while 53% were committed with handguns.

It is clear that no good-faith effort was taken to understand the nuances of firearms in this language. As written, this bill would make possession of my single shot, bolt-action hunting rifle a felony due to the ill-thought out “shroud” provision. This bill may make possession of almost all modern shotguns a felony due to the threaded barrel provision, as these are typically internally threaded to accept “chokes” which sometimes extend the barrel length. Line 4.1 is so incredibly vague that any well equipped garage could be construed as an “assault-weapon”. I digress.

I also would like to point out the likelihood of this bill, should it pass, being struck down by our circuit court. While other circuits have upheld AWBs, these laws have not been challenged at that level post-*Bruen* or by an overwhelmingly conservative circuit. Our circuit striking this down will create split decisions among circuits and force the hand of the overwhelmingly conservative supreme court to weigh in. Passage of HF 3433 may very well result in the demise of AWBs nationwide.

Of course, this process would take years and still force law-abiding Minnesotans to surrender or destroy their valuable property which they use for ensuring the safety of themselves & their families as well as recreation. Those who rebuke the laws will simply drive across state lines to procure their weapons of choice for criminal activity.

A good-faith effort at gun violence reduction does not look like this.

Thank you
Grant Flick
Saint Paul MN (67B)

Good afternoon, senators and representatives.

I am writing as your constituent to strongly urge you to oppose any proposed ban on commonly owned semi-automatic firearms, standard-capacity magazines, or similar legislation.

These firearms and magazines are used every day by peaceable Minnesotans for self-defense, hunting, sport shooting, and training — and they are clearly protected under the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Banning them will not make Minnesota safer. It will only punish law-abiding gun owners while doing nothing to stop criminals who ignore the law.

As your constituent, I expect you to vote NO on any attempt to ban semi-automatic firearms or magazines.

After ICE, our constitutional rights took center stage. You're going to join the crowd that shot Alex P and pretended he had no right to protest or carry, and dismantle our tradition of strong 2A rights?

We're a strong people with responsible owners and a belief in individual rights. We stand up to the federal government! Stand up against encroachment on 2A however well meaning.

Josh,
507-381-1295
8700 Logan Ave S
Minneapolis MN 55431
Minnesota firearm owner and Minneapolis lover.

Please,

Vote NO on HF 3433

Thank you,

Kathleen Quist SD67

If the intent is to make felons out of otherwise law abiding citizens, HF 3433 is a way to do it.

Kevin Schleppenbach

Minnesota House of Representatives
Ellen McDaniel

February 23rd, 2026

Re: Opposition to HF 3433 – Minnesota Bill to Ban Firearms

Dear Ms. McDaniel and others in the MN House of Representatives:

I am writing to you today in opposition to HF 3433 in the MN House of Representatives. The reason is simple, it is Unconstitutional! We have a Constitutional Right to self-defense as well as to have the ability to keep and bear arms to oppose tyranny. Therefore, this bill should immediately be removed from consideration as it infringes and abolishes that right, listed in the 2nd Amendment to the US Constitution.

I am a Veteran and a lifelong MN Citizen, who signed up to "Protect and Defend" our US Constitution and the State of Minnesota, when I served in the MN Air National Guard from 1991-2006. You all in the MN Legislature (House of Reps) took an Oath to Protect our Rights and to work for the citizens of MN! That is now in jeopardy if this bill (HF 3433) is even brought to the MN House floor for a vote. It is in clear violation of our 2nd Amendment and would undermine the rights of the citizenry of Minnesota! If one right is tossed out and removed, others will fall! Don't be in violation of the US Constitution.

The 2nd Amendment to the US Constitution clearly states: "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." This, along with the other first ten Amendments (called the Bill of Rights) were ratified effective December 15th, 1791. This is a very sacred right, that has ensured our freedom, first from the British, then other tyrannical governments, organizations or global groups or entities. Also, there was a US Supreme Court decision called Marbury v Madison, 5US (2 Cranch), 137, 174, 176, (1803) that clearly states: "All laws which are repugnant to the US Constitution are Null and Void." This MN proposed bill (HF 3433) is in clear violation of Marbury v Madison and violates the 2nd Amendment directly, so therefore should be immediately removed from consideration as should ANY Bill that would violate our Constitutional Rights!

If we as a state (Minnesota) allow the attack upon our US Constitutional Rights, we will cease to exist as a state! Do NOT let that happen on your watch! We The People of Minnesota require our legislators (who took an oath) to PROTECT OUR RIGHTS, to do just that! You are NOT ALLOWED TO REMOVE OUR RIGHTS! They are protected!

Regards,

Mark D. Himmer
952-200-2464

DFL Public Safety Administrator Ellen McDaniel,

My name is Nate Timm and live in West Lakeland township outside Stillwater Minnesota. I work for the Washington County Sheriff's Office. I am emailing to express my opposition to House File 3433 which proposes a ban on firearms classified as assault rifles.

The bill's language does have an exemption for law enforcement and government "while acting within the scope of the person's duties." My interpretation of that language is while the employee is in a working status and being paid or "on duty" status. Many police officer I know, in addition to active duty and Guard military members, personally own rifles meeting the assault weapons definition. These weapons are of the same design and type used in the scope of duty, and are used during personal time for practice and improving shooting ability. These valuable shooting skills are necessary to confront violent persons, especially in a shooting scenario where poor accuracy could result in the injury to bystanders. The law as written would not allow possession of these weapons (outside of the grandfather clause) for those public safety and military members who desire to improve their proficiency with these weapons during off duty time. Many smaller police agencies have only a few range days a year which use does not afford the ability to significantly improve proficiency. The thirst of several metro prosecutors to charge police officers in today's political climate does not bode well for employees who would take such a weapon home in off duty time for practice purposes. My concerns here would be reduced by new language that exempts these persons on and off duty.

My other concern with this bill is how it impacts collectable firearms. I collect world war two firearms and have a federal collector's license. The weapons in my collection are not named in the legacy statute language but will meet the definition of being an assault rifle due to a pistol grip and forward handguard. Some are federally registered machine guns which are allowed to be owned by Minnesota citizens when the weapon is classified as a collector item. These collectable weapons are high value items and are typically worth tens of thousands of dollars. My concern would be alleviated by allowing an exemption for Curio and Relic (C&R) firearms. These type of firearms are generally 50 years or older and/or recognized by the ATF as a collector item. The C&R list is maintained by the ATF and can be found by doing a web search for "ATF curio and relic list."

Minnesota statute allows ownership of rifles with short barrels (generally shorter than 16 inches) that are properly registered with the ATF and BCA. Perhaps a compromise can be reached where this existing avenue can be leveraged for continuing to own these type of weapons now and into the future without enacting a total ban.

I feel strongly that modern sporting rifles / assault rifles are a valuable defense tool. Law enforcement cannot be everywhere, and susceptible to being overwhelmed in large scale events as we have seen in the metro region. The precision, weight, and accuracy of these rifles are important in situations where distance and number of attackers are a factor; the need to practice with these type of weapons in a defensive posture is similar to the need of government agents. I get the intent behind this law being to reduce the ability of deranged persons to inflict casualties in mass shootings. Clearly assault rifles as defined offer the same advantages to an attacker. However It is

unlikely that those persons with intent to commit murder will follow this new statute by surrendering the weapons or moving them out of state. I hope a compromise can be found requiring some additional ownership steps to satisfy the DFL without an outright ban on future in state purchase/transfer of assault rifles.

Respectfully,

Nate Timm, Stillwater MN (West Lakeland Township)

651-430-7863

HF 3433

OPPOSE (strongly)

A total ban on possession of semi-automatic rifles would on its face appear to be a complete violation of the 2nd amendment. Similar bans have already been challenged and overturned in states like California and Illinois in 2023 and 2024.

This also opens up conversations around 4th amendment rights when discussing "safe storage" requirements and law enforcement's ability to inspect a private residence for compliance.

This bill is outlandish, and any assertion that this ban would create a safer community is faulty on its face. We know factually that gun restrictions do not prevent criminals from obtaining or possessing illegal firearms and we know that stricter gun laws do not directly lead to reduced gun violence.

Common sense gun laws can be beneficial to community safety, but this bill lacks any form of common sense and appears to be a notable violation of our constitutional rights.

Thank you for your time. Your tireless dedication to keeping all Minnesotan's safe is appreciated.

Austin Sonterre

763-291-8082

To the esteemed members of the Public Safety Committee of the state of Minnesota,

I am writing to you in opposition of HF 3433. Private ownership of semi-automatic rifles is not as dangerous to the public as items which would seem to be much more ordinary in the everyday lives of the residents of the state of Minnesota. This is not a matter of opinion, it is a matter of fact, easily determined through a review of statistical data. Fists and feet account for more fatalities in the state of Minnesota than do all rifles combined, not just semi-automatic rifles. Again, this is not opinion, it is objective fact.

Time and effort spent in committee in an effort to eventually pass HF 3433 into state law, in the name of public safety, would be far better spent on measures that may actually have a positive impact on public safety, rather than turning tens of thousands of Minnesotans into criminals in the pursuit of preventing what are statistical anomalies.

Sincerely,
Ronald Heil
Dakota County

Rory Scoles
8136 County Road 7/ PO Box 526
Finland, MN 55603

Minnesota House of Representatives,
Public Safety, Finance and Policy Committee

February 23, 2026

Re: HF 3433 & HF3402

I was born and raised in Minnesota and have lived here my entire life. As a young man I contributed to my community by being the head of Security for the annual Mayday Parade from 2001 to 2017 along with other various events so my political background is unique in that I have offered security services to various progressives causes and events for decades. Now as a father of four, husband and able bodied male of these United States I fully understand my grave responsibility to contribute to the common defense of our Nation if the need should so arise. I recognize now that many, if not most, are unable to or unwilling to do the same. I have learned that the vast majority of people are incapable of facing real conflict and violence when it arises. The Swedish refer to this as "Fredskadade" or "injured by peace". I would respectfully put forward that almost all of you suffer from this first world malady. The idea being that a society that experiences nothing but prosperity for too long becomes a danger to it's very existence by becoming ignorant to the realities of war. Not since the Civil War has our country experienced anything like mass scale violence. We have the blessing, so to speak, of fighting all our subsequent wars on foreign soil. Combining this with our dearth of hands on experience with mortality and death we then end up with a population incapable of confronting the harsh, unforgiving reality of human on human violence and the very nature of evil. We may be hardly to blame but for those of who are ultimately responsible for the safety and well being of our wives, children and communities we can not be bound by our peace injury and we can not be hindered in our being well armed in order to secure our rights and the common peace.

Our safety and security has never been more uncertain and the threats to peace and stability have never been more palpable. Our society is broken and it is not becoming less broken. In that spirit and with all due respect, you as elected representatives of the People of the State of Minnesota are aiding, abetting and giving comfort to our enemies by attempting to forward such blatent violations of the Second Amendment and our natural, a priori right to self defense. Our founders clearly and consciously laid out the directive to those who would take up public service to not infringe one iota our ability as the People of the United States to be well equipped and trained to meet all possible threats, foreign and domestic. Bills HF3433 and HF3402 are textbook examples of what our Second Amendment was written to prevent, namely the disarming of the People of the United States. Remove these bills from consideration and hinder not those of us for whom innocent lives are our God given charge and care.

Sincerely,

Rory Scoles

To the Chair and Committee members,

I am writing in opposition to HF3433. Why is a governing body trying to erase the Bill of Rights? A person's right to own and bear arms "Shall NOT be Infringed". Back in the colonial era this provision was talking specifically about military grade weaponry.

Furthermore, this bill uses subjective language and is not clear on which firearms would be included. This opens the way to years of litigation in the courts and will waste both individual and tax payer money.

Lastly, why is simply practicing our 2A rights and owning a firearm judged at least 5 times more harshly than actual violent crimes? Assault is 90 days, kidnapping a year while practicing our Constitutional Rights is up charged to a 5 year felony!?

This is bad legislation and everyone knows it.

-Sara B.-

Pine Island

House Public Safety Committee
Re: HF 3433, Feb. 24, 2026 Hearing

Stephen Berk
District 37A
Corcoran, MN 55374
steveberk@me.com

Testifying as a Minnesota citizen and lawful firearm owner in opposition to HF 3433, Possession of semiautomatic military-style assault weapons banned, and criminal penalties provided.

Chair Moller and Members of the House Public Safety Committee:

The stated goal of public safety is one this committee and all Minnesotans share. However, public safety is not served by legislation that infringes upon the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. True public safety policy targets those who pose a demonstrated threat — not the millions of Minnesotans who lawfully own and responsibly use firearms.

Semi-Automatic Rifles Are Constitutionally Protected
In District of Columbia v. Heller (2008), the Supreme Court confirmed that the Second Amendment protects an individual right to keep and bear arms that are in common use for lawful purposes. Semi-automatic rifles, including AR-15-style firearms, are among the most widely owned firearms in the United States, with tens of millions in lawful civilian circulation. They are used daily for hunting, sport shooting, and home defense across Minnesota and the nation. Under Heller's clear standard, these are protected arms. A legislative ban or severe restriction on their possession is not a regulation — it is an erasure of a constitutional right held by citizens who have done nothing wrong.

The Supreme Court reinforced this framework in New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen (2022), holding that firearm regulations must be rooted in the historical tradition of the Founding era. There is no historical analogue for a categorical ban on a class of commonly owned, commonly used firearms. This committee should not advance legislation it cannot defend in federal court.

Rahimi Does Not Rescue This Legislation
Proponents of restrictions may point to United States v. Rahimi (2024) as evidence that Bruen's historical test permits broader regulation. That argument misreads Rahimi. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the disarmament of an individual who had active civil protective orders against him, had been judicially determined to pose a credible threat of physical violence to an identified person, and whose danger to the public had been established through due process proceedings. Rahimi was not an unknown, law-abiding citizen swept up in a broad legislative presumption of dangerousness. He was a specific individual whose rights were curtailed only after the state met its burden through established legal process.

HF 3433 does no such thing. It treats every Minnesotan who owns a covered firearm as a presumptive threat, without a hearing, without a conviction, and without any individualized determination that they pose a danger to anyone. That is not what Rahimi permits. That is precisely what Rahimi and the broader constitutional framework prohibit.

Fourth Amendment Concerns

Beyond the Second Amendment, this committee should recognize that enforcement of broad firearms restrictions inevitably implicates the Fourth Amendment rights of Minnesota citizens. Intrusive enforcement mechanisms — whether through registration schemes, compliance checks, or search authority — risk subjecting law-abiding gun owners to unreasonable searches and seizures without individualized probable cause. The Constitution does not permit the state to treat lawful ownership as grounds for suspicion.

Conclusion

This committee's obligation is to the Constitution as much as it is to public safety — and properly understood, these obligations are not in conflict. Legislation that strips rights from citizens who have not been charged, convicted, or individually adjudicated dangerous does not make Minnesota safer. It makes Minnesota less free. The committee should reject HF 3433 and instead pursue public safety measures that target demonstrated threats through constitutionally sound, due-process-respecting means.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen Berk
Feb. 20, 2026

TESTIMONY ON HR 3433

Minnesota House Public Safety Committee

Members of the committee:

I am writing in opposition to HR3433.

It's obvious from the language of this proposed law that the ultimate goal is to remove all firearms from the hands of law-abiding citizens. This proposed law clearly violates the Second Amendment and the Fourth Amendment.

It's also obvious that the authors, and the rest of the DFL caucus don't care because they must believe that the ends justify the means. Trampling the rights of Minnesota's citizens is fine, if it fits the authors' and the caucus' goals of disarmament.

If you have been recently complaining about alleged government overreach, unconstitutional activity, and violations of citizen's First, Second, Fourth, and Fifth Amendment rights by the Federal Government within the City of Minneapolis, you should be ashamed of yourself today. You will find your reflection in the mirror a bit "Trumpish."

You're no better than those whom you criticize.

Tim Bender
Bemidji, MN
professional.defense@gmail.com

Feb. 19, 2026
Andy I. Clipperton
20 125th Ln. NW
Minneapolis MN 55448

House Public Safety Committee
c/o Ellen McDaniel
75 Rev Dr Martin Luther King Blvd
St. Paul MN 55155

Dear Committee Members,

HF 3433 is a full-on frontal assault on the right to bear arms that is guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment of the US Constitution. Under the guise of Public Safety, Rep. Emma Greenman has authored a bill that also infringes on—no, entirely eradicates—the prohibition of unreasonable search and seizure provided by the 4th Amendment of that same venerable document.

And if HF 3433 is a frontal assault, HF 3402 is an atomic bomb.

Both of these abominable bills must die in committee. If passed and signed into law, they will have a detrimental effect on public safety, not a beneficial one.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,
Andy I. Clipperton

Dear Ms. McDaniel,

I am registered Democrat, and I have voted Democrat in every major election for my entire life. I am reaching out regarding the bills the DFL is trying to pass regarding the assault weapons ban and magazines holding more than 10 rounds.

As a Minnesotan, gun owner, and supporter of our party, this bill demonstrates the DFL party's ongoing lack of ability to read the room. You have a record number of people applying for a permit to carry or purchase, especially those in our party. We do not feel safe due to the recent invasion of our State by Federal law enforcement and the murders of Renee Good and Alex Pretti. I do not mean to make light of such tragedies such as Annunciation or Red Lake High School, but I feel this legislation tackles these issues without considering the repercussions and infringes upon our rights.

I have been an active proponent of gun safety and second amendment rights, and there is a renewed movement in these beliefs from your constituents. Gun rights and the hobby of firearms should not be exclusive to one party or type of person, and we have the opportunity to change this stigma by embracing our rights and being leaders of promoting gun safety and responsible firearm ownership.

This is also an election year, and this new legislation will only burn bridges from those who have recently warmed up to and trying to gain the DFL party's trust. This legislation would just be another example of our party snatching victory from the jaws of defeat.

I hope you and our fellow party members will reconsider this legislation.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Hoffman

I am writing to respectfully express my opposition to HF 3433 and HF 3402. As a law-abiding Minnesota resident, I have serious constitutional concerns under the Fifth Amendment's Takings Clause and the Fourth Amendment's protections against unreasonable searches and seizures. I am also concerned about the bills' impact on lawful hunting, the unequal burdens they may impose, and their broader implications for the balance between citizens and governmental authority.

HF 3402 would require lawfully owned magazines to be destroyed, surrendered, or removed from the state without grandfathering or compensation. These items were legally purchased and lawfully possessed. Forcing their destruction or surrender without compensation raises substantial concerns under the Takings Clause, which prohibits the taking of private property for public use without just compensation. A mandatory surrender requirement amounts to a total deprivation of lawful use, yet the bill provides no mechanism for compensation.

HF 3433 similarly imposes sweeping restrictions on certain semi-automatic firearms. Although it includes limited grandfathering, it prohibits future transfer and severely limits where and how these firearms may be kept or used. Eliminating the ability to transfer or meaningfully use lawfully acquired property significantly diminishes its value and interferes with reasonable, investment-backed expectations.

The bill also effectively prohibits the use of these firearms for hunting for many Minnesotans by restricting them to private property or licensed ranges. Hunting is a lawful and longstanding practice tied to food sourcing, conservation, and wildlife management. Preventing the use of commonly owned semi-automatic rifles for lawful hunting further reduces their practical utility and deepens the economic impact on owners.

In addition, HF 3433 appears to authorize warrantless home inspections to enforce safe-storage compliance. The home has long received the highest level of constitutional protection. Allowing entry without a warrant, probable cause, or voluntary consent directly implicates the Fourth Amendment. Conditioning lawful ownership on submission to warrantless inspections raises serious privacy concerns.

Beyond these constitutional issues, the practical effect of these bills risks creating unequal burdens. Individuals with substantial financial resources may more easily absorb compliance costs or adapt to regulatory restrictions, while working- and middle-class residents would bear the most direct impact of surrender requirements and diminished property value. Public safety legislation should avoid creating disproportionate burdens in the exercise of lawful rights.

Finally, history shows that expansions of enforcement authority rarely appear concerning at the time they are enacted. They are typically framed as reasonable responses to specific problems. In recent years, we have seen increasingly expansive uses of executive agencies and regulatory enforcement at the federal level. The issue is not the good faith of current officials, but that once enforcement powers expand, they tend to persist. Administrative discretion grows, compliance regimes become more intrusive, and the balance between citizens and the federal government shifts. Future administrations—of any political alignment—inherit those tools. For that reason, permanent reductions in individual rights and property protections deserve heightened scrutiny during periods of expanding federal authority.

Public safety is a legitimate and important objective. However, legislation must remain within constitutional boundaries and account for long-term institutional consequences. These bills impose

sweeping restrictions on individuals who have committed no wrongdoing and raise significant constitutional and structural concerns.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose HF 3433 and HF 3402.

Thank you,

Aaron – Concerned Minneapolis Resident

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to voice my opposition to HF-3433 and HF-3402, two prospective bills that I view as infringements on my constitutional right to bear arms. As a resident of Hennepin County, I feel that these bills will A) have no effect on improving safety in our community and B) increase the vulnerability of peaceful, law-abiding citizens.

I often hear the question “why does anyone need an AR-15?” My answer is simple. Our county has a (recent) history of riots, anarchy, and civil unrest. I became a gun owner because of the George Floyd riots. We saw the National Guard rolling down our streets, were required to stay indoors due to a curfew, and still, somehow saw our businesses vandalized and damaged.

During that time I asked myself, “what could I do to defend my family and home from a mob bent on hurting us and destroying everything that I have worked my whole life for?”

Could I call the police? Sure, but what would they do? Law enforcement wouldn’t even defend their own police station, so I’m sure they would care little about what happens to my family and my home.

As a father, the job of keeping my family safe falls to me and me alone. HF-3433 greatly restricts my ability to do that. In the event that I would have to defend my family from a riotous mob, an “assault rifle” is really our only chance of surviving.

As for HF-3402, I have two points to make. First of all, if possession of a “high capacity” magazine becomes a felony, there will be thousands of Minnesotans who will instantly become criminals. These are people who (like me) have never done anything criminally wrong in their lives. For those of us who have permits to carry a pistol, the rate of criminality is astonishingly low. In fact, in 2022, only 0.03% of permit holders committed a gun crime (thereload.com, S. Gutowski, 03-09-2023). Peaceable, responsible firearms owners are not the problem, and thus, should not be targeted by punitive laws like this.

Secondly, HF-3402 makes women even more vulnerable. I have a few (female) family friends who carry full-size (non-compact) pistols every day. Full size pistols tend to use higher capacity magazines. In fact, one of them carries a Springfield XDM-Elite, with a 19-round magazine. That may sound like a lot, but I do not make it my business to tell women (whom I care about) how many rounds they might need to defend themselves.

Additionally, women do tend to have lower muscle mass, and can have trouble with smaller pistols. The extra weight of a full-size pistol (and its accompaniment of 15 rounds or more) actually helps them to better control the recoil, allowing for more rounds to be safely put on the target. Pistols are chosen as a tool of self defense for women because they are a great equalizer against a potentially larger and stronger attacker. In fact, I would go so far as to argue that you cannot call yourself “pro woman” or “pro feminism” while also being “pro gun control.”

More gun laws will not increase our safety. In fact, the gun laws that we do have are often “plead down” in firearms-related cases, and therefore are not even used. I suspect that these laws would frequently suffer a similar fate. Criminals are not going to get together suddenly, and turn in their “assault rifles” and extended magazines. All these laws will do is increase the vulnerability of law-abiding citizens like me. And that is why I humbly ask for these bills to be voted down.

Thank you,

Aaron Ploetz
Maple Grove, MN

To whom it may concern,

I am deeply troubled by HF 3402 and HF 3433. I am a legal and responsible gun owner, and I feel as though I am being punished because of the actions of people who choose not to follow the law.

Minnesotans are terrified right now. I've had more people ask for help with the process of legally buying a firearm for self defense in the past 2 months than I have in the past 3 years. Bills like these two will not make Minnesotans safer, and I don't believe this is what the majority of Minnesota, DFL or otherwise wants right now.

Criminals will not turn in their magazines or their non grandfathered firearms. Mass shooters will not magically stop because a handgun or rifle magazine is capped at 10. We have the opportunity to pass safer storage laws, increase our spending on mental health care, and many other proven initiatives to curtail gun violence, and instead we are choosing a blatantly unconstitutional and draconian ban to make ourselves feel better.

Regards,
Abe Albrecht

Submitted to: House Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee
Date: February 22, 2026
From: Adam Breitkreutz, Resident of Roseville, Minnesota
Contact: abreik6@gmail.com and (213) 986-5420

Dear Chair Tabke and Members of the Public Safety Finance and Policy Committee, I am a law-abiding resident of Minnesota and a responsible firearm owner who values our constitutional rights and public safety. I am writing to strongly oppose HF 3433, which imposes a broad ban on semiautomatic rifles, and HF 3402, which bans magazines holding more than 10 rounds. These bills infringe on the rights of millions of Minnesotans without meaningfully addressing crime or violence, and they place undue burdens on responsible citizens.

Regarding HF 3433: This bill defines "semiautomatic military-style assault weapons" in an overly broad manner, encompassing many common rifles used for hunting, sport shooting, and self-defense. The prohibition on sale, transfer, and possession, effective August 1, 2026, effectively criminalizes ownership of firearms that are in common use across the country. While there is limited grandfathering for current owners who certify by May 1, 2027, the requirements are invasive and impractical. Owners must submit to warrantless home inspections by law enforcement for "safe storage" compliance, pay unknown fees for certification and renewals every three years, and restrict use to only their property or licensed ranges, effectively making lawful ownership untenable. Transfers are prohibited even to family members, and inheritance forces disposal within 120 days. These provisions violate Second Amendment protections under recent U.S. Supreme Court rulings like Bruen (2022), which affirm the right to bear arms in common use, and they erode privacy rights by allowing government intrusion into homes without probable cause. Moreover, such bans have not proven effective in reducing crime, as criminals rarely comply with firearm laws, leaving law-abiding citizens disarmed.

Regarding HF 3402: This bill bans the manufacture, sale, transfer, and possession of magazines over 10 rounds, effective July 1, 2026, with no grandfathering clause. Current owners must destroy, surrender, modify, or remove these magazines from the state by July 1, 2027, or face felony charges punishable by up to five years in prison and $25,000 fines. This affects standard-capacity magazines that come with many firearms, forcing Minnesotans to alter or discard legally purchased property at their own expense. Arbitrary capacity limits do not prevent mass shootings or crime. Studies from sources like the RAND Corporation show mixed or inconclusive evidence on their effectiveness. Instead, this creates felons out of everyday gun owners who use these for lawful purposes, such as

home defense where multiple rounds may be necessary. The lack of grandfathering is particularly harsh, as it requires disposal of items that were legal when acquired, without compensation.

These bills collectively target law-abiding Minnesotans while doing little to stop illegal firearm use. They divert resources from proven strategies like community policing and mental health initiatives. I urge the committee to reject HF 3433 and HF 3402 to protect our rights and focus on real solutions to violence.

Thank you for considering my testimony. I am available for questions.

Sincerely,
Adam Breitkreutz

HF3433 and HF3402 are nothing short of ridiculous. I am a lawful gun owner in the state of Minnesota, and this law would immediately make me a felon for items that are in extremely common use.

HF3433: Seriously? Do you have any idea how many firearms this covers? My entire collection except for two of my revolvers would be forbidden.

HF3402: Do you understand what a standard capacity for a rifle or handgun is? Most handguns are well over 10 rounds, and rifles triple this amount BY DEFAULT.

I implore you to, before advocating for this, see to it that any security detail at any occasion you attend to follows both of these rules, and let the public know how that effected your personal feeling of

safety. Keep in mind, most of the people you represent must rely on themselves only to immediately defend their lives, as police are minutes away when seconds matter.

I will not hesitate to advocate AGAINST any representative who votes for these idiotic bills, and I will tell anyone who will listen to do the same. Even the consideration of these bills makes reasonable individuals like myself consider moving out of the state.