

Please Vote YES on CCW Resolution

Ken Greenwood

to:

Ron Briggs, Ray Nutting, Jack Sweeney, John Knight, Norma Santiago, Cindy Johnson, Suzanne Allen de Sanchez

08/25/2009 02:04 AM

Show Details

Dear Supervisors,

I have spoken to your Board on this issue previously. Now you have the opportunity to send a clear message to Sheriff Neves and future Sheriffs that our right to self defense is not to be rationed or conditioned beyond what is required by current statute. Please support the Resolution to affirm the rights of the citizens of El Dorado County to defend themselves when and where the Sheriff cannot.

Currently the Sheriff is requiring the following in excess of the arduous procedure outlined by Section 12050 of the Penal Code and the statewide application form:

- Three letters from non relatives attesting to your good moral character and acknowledging the recommendation is for a CCW License.
  - Sounds good on the surface, but will these people be liable if you are ever called to civil court?
  - Do they run background checks on the writers? (NO!)
  - The Sheriff tells us we should NEVER tell anyone we have a CCW!
- Banning you from having your gun in possession on school grounds.
  - Statute is clear you are allowed on campus with a valid CCW. Additionally, you can lawfully pick your kids up from school while returning from a hunting trip with a truckload of guns! What is the problem here?
- Banning you from having your gun in possession in a place that serves alcohol.
  - Again sounds good on the surface, but my Niece was brutally robbed in a Pizza Parlor that served beer, and she wasn't drinking. The statewide application you sign under perjury says you cannot consume alcohol when you are in possession of your gun in public. Problem solved.
- Guns on the license must be registered to the individual (cannot be shared between husband and wife who each have a License).
  - There is no law that requires this. Simply a non binding advisory notice from DOJ.
- Forcing Renewal applicants to fill out an "Application for Renewal" that asks invasive questions and requires them to "Rejustify" their reason for the license.
  - Who cares if I am exercising my right to recover damages in a civil case.
  - What if I no longer have that job or let my Restraining Order against the person who threatened my life expire?
  - Is my life any less valuable than someone who delivers gold?

The Sheriff says in yesterday's paper he is following the law. No he isn't, he is exceeding the law, as well as making up a few of his own. He is also using an extremely narrow definition of what is "Good Cause" as required by Statute. He is applying it to both new and renewal applicants far in excess of the requirements of previous Sheriffs who basically allowed "self defense" as Good Cause.

Currently, Sheriffs in Yuba, Mendocino, Tehama and other California Counties allow anyone who otherwise qualifies under statute to obtain a CCW License simply for "Personal Self Defense." This is the "Shall Issue Policy" as suggested by the Resolution. Such policy means if you want it, the Sheriff

shall issue it if you meet the Statutory standards for training, residency, no criminal history and submit to an FBI and State background check. By allowing good citizens to be armed in public, they have low crime rates and enjoy the added revenue generated by license fees.

On the other hand, El Dorado County has a new casino that will raise crime 10-20% (Sheriff's Office quote), a growing gang problem and not enough Deputies to adequately cover the county. Yet we are reducing the number of armed citizens. Additionally, by denying renewals and new applicants that would otherwise qualify, our Sheriff is losing revenue by spending countless hours of staff time reviewing applications they will never approve. Thus no revenue is generated and critical staff time is diverted from actually fighting crime. This is bordering on the absurd. You can help the situation by approving the Resolution.

I am a Sheriff's Office Approved CCW Instructor. I see the face of this issue daily. I have seen my business drop about 20% since these new "rules" have gone into effect. I have a woman who was nearly beaten to death by her former fiance in 2003. She was denied renewal of her license in 2007 despite his release in 2006 and his parole ending next month. She is here today, but as she lives in constant fear for her life, she will find it difficult, if not impossible to speak about her concerns. I will speak for her: "Please approve this Resolution!"

I have several other clients who can "qualify" to defend themselves under current policy, yet many others who cannot and are therefore not given the "privilege" to exercise their right of self defense as they don't own a business, have documented threats against them or are somehow "associated with law enforcement" (the only THREE reasons the Sheriff issues licenses).

I have two brothers as clients, one owns a business and was approved immediately. The other wants to protect his family wherever they are in California, especially on hikes in the woods, but he cannot get a license to carry. Where is the equity here? Both are fine citizens, but the Sheriff has arbitrarily determined that one's life is somehow more "valuable" because he conducts business in "out of the way places" and is often paid in cash. Yet the other must take his chances on his outings where there is no chance that law enforcement could ever come to his rescue. Given the realities that have always existed, but are worse now with budget cuts, neither can expect to be protected by the Sheriff's Deputies. In fact, it is physically impossible, and the Supreme Court correctly ruled in the 1860's that law enforcement nor the government has any obligation to protect the individual from criminal attack (presumably because they were allowed by the Second Amendment to bear arms in their personal self defense).

This doesn't make sense. The current system is unfair and inconsistent with the opportunities afforded by Statute. You can help fix this by sending the clear message contained in this Resolution.

Thank you for your support of this Resolution.

Sincerely,

Ken R. Greenwood  
Straight Shot Consulting  
Firearms Training Division