



PRESS RELEASE

Comments on Senate Bill 367
G. C. Gates, editor

Senator Cannizzaro's SB 367 is a problematic solution to increased crime rates caused by liberal policies and the bill should be concerning to gun owners. Additional charges per firearm and "per bullet" is excessive and sets poor legislative precedence.

The bill seeks to enhance penalties by allowing additional counts for certain weapons violations based on the number of weapons, or bullets, possessed, owned, or carried, etc. We brook no concern over the enhancement for possession of a firearm when engaged in certain drug activities, but feel that the other enumerated gun crimes are unnecessary.

The addition of nearly all Nevada's firearms restrictions to the bill is concerning; the bill would allow additional counts to be added for merely *owning* more than one firearm at the time of violation. Should someone who forgets to renew their concealed firearm permit (CCW) be charged with enhancements for owning more than one firearm? Should someone who is peaceably carrying a firearm while intoxicated be charged for the guns they have at home, instead of the one(s) they are carrying?

"Per bullet" enhancements are unnecessarily punitive. This smacks of creating a precedence for future amendments to allow extra counts per-bullet for defense and target ammunition. This would have a chilling effect on gun ownership especially as more anti-gun laws are proposed and passed.

Furthermore, "metal-penetrating bullets" are already illegal and extremely rare at that. Many violent criminals cannot even afford proper hollow-point defensive ammunition. The only per-firearm sentence enhancement we would not object to would be possession by a prohibited person. Why not increase the penalty for the underlying crime?

Some might say that this would only apply to criminals. Anyone is one innocent mistake away from becoming a criminal. We see no reason to trust the state with such an overly broad law. This is ripe for abuse from a biased prosecutor. Prosecutors can tell us they would never do such a thing, but gun owners are not likely to be so trusting.

SB 412 covers much of the same ground as SB 367 and is the better bill without the excessively punitive firearm language. 2019's AB 236 increased the dollar amount for many larcenous crimes to \$1,200 from \$650 having the consequence of increasing crime as more could be stolen with

less of a chance of reaching the felony threshold. SB 412 undoes this damage by lowering the threshold for felony theft prosecutions to \$750 (appropriate, given inflation) which increases the deterrence value of these laws as many “petty” criminals do not want to become felons.

SB 367 should be opposed and SB 412 supported.

Nevada Carry is a website dedicated to supporting gun rights and helping grassroots Second Amendment activism. We are not a lobbyist group and advocate on a personal basis only.