

## Judiciary Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No.:** HB-7137

AN ACT CONCERNING A CONVICTION IN ANOTHER JURISDICTION AS A DISQUALIFIER FOR A CARRY PERMIT OR FIREARMS ELIGIBILITY OR AMMUNITION CERTIFICATE AND CONCERNING A MERCHANT CATEGORY

**Title:** CODE FOR FIREARMS OR AMMUNITION RETAILERS.

**Vote Date:** 4/10/2025

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable Substitute

**PH Date:** 3/12/2025

**File No.:**

**Disclaimer:** *The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

### SPONSORS OF BILL:

Judiciary Committee

### CO-SPONSORS:

Rep. Steven J. Stafstrom, 129th Dist.

Rep. Bob Godfrey, 110th Dist.

### REASONS FOR BILL:

Under current statute, individuals convicted of offenses outside of the state that would disqualify them from owning a firearm if they were convicted *inside* the state are allowed to possess a firearm. This bill clarifies that certain convictions in other jurisdictions are disqualifying in this state for a carry permit, or firearms eligibility or ammunition certificate, if an offense for which a person is convicted of in another state is similar to a disqualifying offense in Connecticut. This bill would also help to close a critical gap in the background check system by requiring that the merchant category code for firearms or ammunition retailers be assigned to each firearm or ammunition retailer in the state.

### SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language strikes section four and adds language regarding eligibility and specific disqualifying crimes in lines 57, 160, and 227.

## RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

**Ronnell Higgins, Commissioner, Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection:** Commissioner Higgins submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation because enforcement would likely require legal analysis to compare the elements of crimes from other jurisdictions, which could lead to increased processing and review times, which ultimately requires more resources.

## NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

**Stacey Mayer, Director of Advocacy, Policy, and Outreach, CT Against Gun Violence:** Stacey Mayer submitted testimony in support of this legislation because it is a logical extension of this state's permitting law; all criminals should be held accountable for their crimes wherever they are committed.

**Jennifer Dineen, Professor, Associate Director, UConn ARMS Center for Gun Injury Prevention:** Jennifer Dineen submitted testimony in support of this legislation because it closes the gap between state and federal gun control laws; recognizing the impact of neighboring states' firearm laws and limiting firearm migration should be part of a broader strategy to reduce firearm-related harm.

**Lawrence Edwards, PhD:** Lawrence Edwards submitted testimony in support of this legislation because gun violence is a significant danger to children and this bill will ensure criminals will not be able to obtain firearms on a technicality.

Due to the high volume of testimony, it is not possible to provide a written summary for each submission.

An additional **9** pieces of testimony were submitted in **overall support** of this legislation.

## NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

**Jake McGuigan, Managing Director, National Shooting Sports Foundation:** Jake McGuigan submitted testimony in opposition of this legislation because it seeks to target legal firearm-related commerce and constitutes an invasion of financial privacy which could lead to harassment of gun owners and a private registry of gun owners.

**William Lacey, Law Enforcement (retired):** William Lacey submitted testimony in opposition to this legislation because of the vague language surrounding jurisdiction between states. He believes that section two of this bill is discriminatory towards gun owners as their lawful purchases fall under a level of scrutiny unlike other products.

Due to the high volume of testimony, it is not possible to provide a written summary for each submission.

An additional **109** pieces of testimony were submitted in **overall opposition** of this legislation.

An additional **33** pieces of testimony were submitted citing concerns regarding the **overregulation of the firearm industry**.

An additional **31** pieces of testimony were submitted citing concerns regarding **unlawful surveillance** of gun owners.

An additional **27** pieces of testimony were submitted citing **federal law and 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment violations**.

An additional **4** pieces of testimony were submitted citing economic, self-defense and mental health concerns.

**Reported by:** Griffin Olshan

**Date:** April 24, 2025