

My name is Michael Papas, I am a resident of Cloquet, Minnesota. I am submitting my written testimony in strong opposition to HF14, HF15, HF396, and HF601. No statement here should be taken as being made on the behalf of my employer or any other person. My statements here are my own.

It will take very few words to describe my issues with three of the four bills here. HF14 will only inconvenience and infringe on the constitutional rights of law abiding Minnesotan gun owners. *Federal* background checks are already performed for all firearms purchases in this state in compliance with ATF regulations. Obviously, no criminal is going to file a report of transfer to their area's chief law enforcement officer or do their crime at a gun store, and state prosecutors already fail to regularly charge criminals with straw purchasing, that is, knowingly buying firearms for others that are ineligible. And members of this Legislature have blocked legislation that would enhance penalties for this crime. The bill is about universal registration of lawful gun owners, they want them on a list and want to deprive them of privacy. HF396 and HF 601 don't even warrant their own paragraph-- it's already unlawful to unsafely store a firearm in an abode with minors present. It also apparently makes it a crime to not own the same number of locking devices as firearms you possess. I genuinely wonder; do the authors realize there are safes that can store multiple firearms in them? Finally, I want to ask; why are we criminalizing victims of theft and violence?

My biggest concern is HF15, the Extreme Risk Protection Order bill that keeps getting introduced every session. I'm a Registered Nurse with five years of experience, and almost a decade of time working in medicine, in EMS, emergency room, medical floor, and ICU settings. I see patients that are altered or at risk of themselves or others every day at work. If they are deemed a threat to themselves or others they are placed on an emergency medical hold for up to 72 working hours, they can be placed on a peace officer hold, or they can find themselves held on commitment through the legal process. This is so we can keep them safe until they are in their right mind. What continues to strike me about every time this legislation is introduced is it has *never* been amended to actually focus on the person: the imminent threat to themselves or others that is potentially going to use firearms in a violent act.

We have seen these Extreme Risk Protection Orders served around the nation, often they are actually performed by area SWAT or armored personnel, usually in the dead of night in the form of a raid. There have been documented instances of these gun owners being shot and

killed by law enforcement in these raids. Where is the protection in this protection order? Police arrive, kick in someone's door, after sitting them on the floor and cuffing them at gunpoint they painstakingly search the entire residence, potentially for hours, for firearms as they must, because there is no way to determine how many firearms the person owns. Then the police can leave with potentially thousands of dollars of this person's property, and this *imminent threat to themselves or others* is left alone in their home. They still have knives, chemicals, cars, a ladder with access to high places, rope and any number of other means to kill themselves or plenty of others, except now they're also likely agitated, angry, in fear for their lives, confused, and may be dealing with severe damage to their homes (that law enforcement is completely immune to liability for.) How is anyone safer after this? Why is there not a requirement for a medical professional to evaluate this person at any point in the process to actually see if they meet the requirements for a hold or suicidal ideation? Furthermore, family members with genuine concerns for the safety of their loved ones may be *less likely* to report their concerns with this bill in place, as they could fear them being injured or killed, or fear them acting out as a result of an order being enacted.

Where are the protections for potentially innocent victims in this, targeted by vengeful parties who just want to make their lives miserable? Why are police completely immune from liability in these matters? Minnesota law enforcement has, quite frankly, a terrible recent history of police brutality, especially in serving warrants and searching homes- Amir Locke comes to mind. One would think in the execution of a protection order, we would want *more* scrutiny to decrease the chances of injury or death when someone is suffering a mental health crisis.

In conclusion, in conclusion, all of the above legislation will do nothing to solve the violent crime in our state, and in the case of HF15, it will actually put more people at risk. Extreme Risk Protection Orders do not work, and studies have demonstrated as such. I strongly urge this committee not to support any of them.