



Krista Griffith
STATE REPRESENTATIVE
12th District

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE OF DELAWARE
411 LEGISLATIVE AVENUE
DOVER, DELAWARE 19901

COMMITTEES
Judiciary, Chair
Joint Finance
Appropriations
Economic Development/Banking/Insurance &
Commerce
Natural Resources & Energy
Revenue & Finance
Technology & Telecommunications

House Judiciary Committee Meeting Minutes

4.24.24

House Committee Recording

Chair Griffith called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

Members present:

Rep. Griffith, Chair
Rep. Romer, Vice Chair
Rep. Cooke
Rep. Lynn
Rep. Phillips
Rep. Dorsey Walker
Rep. Jones Giltner
Rep. Shupe
Rep. Spiegelman

Chair Griffith introduced **HB 311, AN ACT TO AMEND TITLE 11 OF THE DELAWARE CODE RELATING TO A SAFE SCHOOL ZONE.**

Vice Chair Romer explained that the legislation expands the Safe School Zone Act to include post-secondary colleges and universities, making it a felony to possess firearms on campus. She noted that firearms on campus heighten the risk of accidents, violence, and conflicts, especially in stressful environments where emotions run high. She said that she collaborated with universities, law enforcement, and security providers to address concerns and gather support. The legislation aimed to align with existing campus policies and enhance security measures endorsed by the Delaware State Police. Amendments were made in response to feedback from stakeholders, including the NRA and Delaware Sportsmen Association.

Rep. Spiegelman emphasized a need to address the definition of firearm, which currently encompasses anything that fires anything, in a manner more suitable for Delaware. He added that while he initially supported the parent bill with the expectation of fixes, some of those promised changes haven't materialized. Specifically, issues with concealed carry laws and the transition between areas where carrying firearms is legal and those where it's not legal. He said that until these fixes are made, he cannot support changes to the bill.

Chair Griffith expressed her intention to propose a change regarding concealed carry laws. She mentioned a bill that she introduced last year concerning safe storage of firearms, which has returned to the house with an amendment. She said she plans to request a change to strike a portion related to concealed carry.

Rep. Spiegelman pointed out that under the legislation's current provisions, individuals entering areas owned by a campus would be required to remove their firearm, secure it in a locked container, return it to their vehicle, and then repeat the process once they've left the campus area. He argued that this process is cumbersome and impractical for those with concealed carry permits.

Vice Chair Romer emphasized that carrying firearms on university campuses is already against school policy, even if it's not necessarily illegal. She mentioned an example where even a county police officer, not on duty but in uniform, would have to surrender their weapon upon entering a university event. She also noted insights from law enforcement, who highlighted the challenges of distinguishing between good and bad actors in emergency situations on large campuses. They expressed that having concealed carry holders involved in such incidents could complicate law enforcement's response. She said that she appreciated the perspective but underscored the importance of adhering to existing policies for the sake of law enforcement's effectiveness.

Rep. Spiegelman acknowledged that there is room for debate on the issue, but he focused on the practicality of criminalizing actions that might otherwise be considered routine or non-threatening.

Vice Chair Romer suggested exploring funding opportunities to establish firearm-free campuses, similar to smoke-free or alcohol-free zones seen at places like Christiana Care. She emphasized the importance of clearly communicating policies to deter individuals from bringing firearms onto college campuses, citing the University of Delaware's approach as an example. She noted the challenges posed by unclear policies, particularly at sporting events.

Rep. Spiegelman suggested a potential compromise that would allow individuals to carry firearms while traveling through campus if they are not intending to stay or conduct activities there, such as if they are en route to another destination.

Vice Chair Romer indicated openness to incorporating such provisions into the legislation.

Rep. Shupe questioned the necessity of including private colleges in the legislation, particularly when these institutions already enforce policies prohibiting firearms on their campuses.

Vice Chair Romer said that by enacting this legislation, it becomes a state law applicable to all, ensuring uniformity and clarity across institutions. She highlighted that private universities may not have the means to enforce policies effectively without the backing of state law.

Rep. Shupe raised concerns about the potential implications of the legislation, particularly regarding individuals living in housing on university campuses who may not be students. He questioned whether these non-student residents would also be prohibited from owning firearms under the proposed law.

Vice Chair Romer explained that there is a carve-out in the legislation for university-owned houses where faculty, staff, visiting professors, and others reside. These individuals would not be subject to the firearm prohibition on campus.

Rep. Shupe noted that while the University of Delaware can determine exemptions for houses it owns, there remains a question regarding properties owned by private landlords and rented out to individuals on or near campuses.

Vice Chair Romer clarified that private landlords who own properties adjacent to or near campuses are not subject to the legislation because they are not considered campus-owned property. She emphasized that even though these buildings may be associated with the university, they are not owned by the institution itself. Therefore, the legislation does not apply to privately owned properties, even if they are in close proximity to campus grounds.

Rep. Shupe pointed out the distinction between different streets near the campus, such as Cleveland Avenue, which primarily consists of private houses. He noted that individuals on Cleveland Avenue would be legally allowed to possess firearms, while those on the next street over would not be permitted to do so under the legislation.

Vice Chair Romer noted that individuals can legally possess firearms on Main Street as long as they don't enter university property or buildings. She reiterated that bringing firearms onto campus is already against school policy. She emphasized that students with concealed carry permits are allowed to have firearms but are prohibited from bringing them to class, bars, or workout areas. However, they can shop and conduct activities on Main Street without violating policy. She reaffirmed that individuals can have firearms on private properties adjacent to campus.

Rep. Shupe sought further clarification on the necessity of enacting the legislation as state law if universities already have policies prohibiting firearms on campus. He questioned why universities couldn't simply inform the community about their existing policies and work with local law enforcement without the need for state-level intervention.

Vice Chair Romer replied that it is easier for law enforcement officers to enforce a law than to enforce a school policy.

Chair Griffith requested that Rep. Shupe end his line of questioning.

Rep. Shupe asked how making an existing university policy a state law enhances the protection of students.

Vice Chair Romer explained that while universities already have policies against firearms on campus, enacting the legislation as state law would empower law enforcement agencies beyond just university police to enforce this policy. Romer emphasized that having the law in place allows various law enforcement entities, such as the county police and state police, to enforce it uniformly, potentially reducing the likelihood of gun violence on campuses.

Rep. Dorsey Walker expressed her general reluctance to support bills that could result in additional charges for individuals due to their justice situation. However, she said she would make an exception in this case, citing a recent incident at Delaware State University.

Rep. Cooke raised concerns about the absence of college administrators or directors in the room to provide input on the legislation. He emphasized the existing presence of trained constables and security guards in schools, questioning the need for additional legislation regarding armed personnel. He underscored the certification process for constables and security guards and questioned the necessity of imposing new laws when current practices are already in place.

Vice Chair Romer acknowledged accountability for not specifically inviting college administrators or directors to the meeting but stated she had emails from them expressing support for the legislation. She recognized it as a learning experience and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to improve. She invited Sgt. Michael Ripple from the Delaware State Police to respond to Rep. Cooke.

Rep. Cooke inquired about the process for constables to be involved in universities like Delaware Technical Community College (DelTech), particularly in instances where there isn't an on-site police department.

Sgt. Michael Ripple explained that there are specific groups within the Delaware State Police responsible for monitoring and certifying constables. He noted that there's a board of constables that oversees their accreditation, adding that constables undergo more extensive training compared to security guards, who have two categories: armed and unarmed. Security guard training requirements are less rigorous than those for constables but are still regulated by professional licensing at the Delaware State Police. He mentioned that the state police routinely check on individuals to ensure their licenses are valid. Ultimately, private security companies employ these individuals, and it's the responsibility of whoever hires the company to ensure proper identification or insurance for incidents on their premises.

Rep. Cooke asked about why some private universities utilize constables instead of security guards.

Sgt. Michael Ripple replied that he is unsure of the reasoning.

Rep. Cooke expressed concerns about the model of security employed by DelTech, suggesting that other colleges might not want to follow suit. He emphasized the importance of accreditation for law enforcement agencies and highlighted recent police reform legislation passed. He stressed the seriousness of the issue and the need to address it correctly, particularly in light of recent shootings. He questioned whether colleges could afford constables and asked about the distinction between constables and security guards.

Sgt. Michael Ripple reiterated that constables undergo more extensive training compared to unarmed security guards. He noted that most constables are already certified due to their law enforcement training, which is more rigorous than the training required for armed security guards.

Rep. Cooke asked Sgt. Michael Ripple to discuss the arrest powers of security guards compared to constable police officers. He highlighted the potential issues with security guards making arrests or taking physical action regarding firearms on campus.

Sgt. Michael Ripple explained the difference between detaining and arresting individuals.

Rep. Cooke reiterated the seriousness of the issue, emphasizing the distinction between police detaining individuals and other security personnel taking action. He highlighted that security guards do not have the authority to detain individuals in the same way as police officers. He pointed out that security guards at places like the Christiana Mall can approach individuals differently than law enforcement officers can.

Vice Chair Romer expressed appreciation for the input regarding armed security guards and acknowledged the need to address any challenges. She stated her openness to working on the issue to prioritize safety, indicating a willingness to collaborate on finding solutions.

Chair Griffith opened the floor for public comment.

Kristen Bruce, Moms Demand Action, Liddy Ballard, Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, and Traci Murphy, Delaware Coalition Against Gun Violence, provided testimony in support of the bill.

Eric Romero, Paul Johnston, Jeff Hague, Delaware State Sportsmen's Association, Rick Armitage, National Rifle Association, Denise Clendening, and Kenneth Jones provided testimony in opposition of the bill.

Vice Chair Romer thanked everyone for their participation and comments, expressing a willingness to engage in further discussions regarding constables and security guards. She emphasized that concealed carry is already prohibited on campuses, and the legislation aims to reinforce this policy. She reiterated her commitment to addressing potential unintended consequences, particularly regarding the transition phase, to ensure the safety of all involved.

A motion was made by Rep. Phillips and seconded by Rep. Dorsey Walker to release HB 311 from committee; motion carried. Yes = 6 (Cooke, Dorsey Walker, Lynn, Phillips, Romer, Griffith); No = 2 (Shupe, Spiegelman); Absent = 3 (Dukes, Jones Giltner, Schwartzkopf). The bill was released from committee with a F=3, M=3, U=0 vote.

Chair Griffith introduced **HB 357, AN ACT TO AMEND TITLE 6, TITLE 10, TITLE 11, AND TITLE 24 OF THE DELAWARE CODE RELATING TO WEAPONS.**

Rep. Spiegelman explained that the bill would amend Delaware's firearm definition to align with the federal definition, following a previous bill that simplified the definition but may have been too basic. The legislation aims to clarify confusion surrounding what constitutes a firearm, distinguishing it from other implements like bows and crossbows. Additionally, it creates a new category called projectile weapons, akin to deadly weapons, to encompass items not covered by the firearm definition. The bill seeks to empower law enforcement by providing clearer legal frameworks and addressing concerns raised by various agencies. He said that this comprehensive approach aims to resolve long-standing issues and ensure consistency in enforcement across Delaware.

Chair Griffith expressed gratitude for the work done on the task force but raised concerns about opposition from the Department of Justice. She highlighted the Department's worry about splitting the concept of firearm into firearm and projectile weapon, potentially affecting settled case law and statutory interpretation, leading to uncertainty in case handling.

Rep. Spiegelman responded by emphasizing the conceptual aspect of the bill, highlighting that to a victim, there's no practical difference between being threatened with a firearm or a crossbow; both are perceived as dangerous weapons. He noted that aligning Delaware's definition with that of 29 other states and the federal government would eliminate confusion in the legal code. He stressed that penalties for crimes committed with firearms and projectile weapons would remain consistent under the proposed bill, ensuring continuity in law enforcement practices and legal proceedings. Additionally, he mentioned that the bill extends prohibitions on firearm ownership to include projectile weapons for individuals deemed prohibited from owning firearms, thus maintaining consistency in enforcement.

Chair Griffith asked expert Mark Cutrona, Director of the Division of Research, to answer questions about the bill.

Rep. Spiegelman asked Mark Cutrona to discuss the legal aspects of crafting the bill to ensure that it empowers the Department of Justice to pursue suitable penalties for crimes involving firearms versus projectile weapons

Mark Cutrona acknowledged Rep. Spiegelman's explanation of the concept behind House Bill 357, noting that the original bill, House Bill 224, simply changed the definition of firearms. He highlighted that House Bill 357 takes a more nuanced approach by creating a new classification for what was intended to be criminalized under the firearm definition, namely projectile weapons. He emphasized that this bill ensures consistency throughout Delaware's legal code in regard to firearms and projectile weapons, empowering legislators, partners, and the Department of Justice to enforce necessary laws for the protection of Delawareans.

Rep. Spiegelman provided Chair Griffith with an example from the bill, specifically highlighting changes made to a section of Title 11 regarding possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony. He explained that the amendment extends the law to include possession of a projectile weapon during the commission of a felony. Spiegelman emphasized that this amendment is consistent throughout the bill, ensuring that committing a felony with either a firearm or a projectile weapon carries the same legal consequences.

Mark Cutrona highlighted the benefit of the bill in clarifying the laws surrounding firearms and projectile weapons. He noted that the current broad definition of firearm in practice criminalizes conduct beyond what people commonly perceive as a firearm, leading to confusion among legislators and the public. He explained that the bill's distinction between firearms and projectile weapons helps people better understand the scope of prohibited conduct. Additionally, he mentioned that the bill corrects inconsistencies in other parts of the legal code, ensuring that firearms and other weapons are treated appropriately under the law and can be seized by police when necessary.

Rep. Spiegelman highlighted that Delaware's current definition of a firearm makes it an outlier among other states and stressed the importance of matching it with federal standards.

Vice Chair Romer indicated a preference for the current broad definition, particularly due to its inclusion of items like airsoft guns. She highlighted the challenge of garnering consensus on firearm-related legislation, especially regarding the banning of guns from certain school settings. She expressed concern that the proposed bill would add complexity to future legislative efforts,

including her Safe Schools bill, as it would require separate considerations for firearms and projectile weapons.

Mark Cutrona emphasized that the bill maintains the criminalization of prohibited firearms and projectile weapons in safe school zones.

Vice Chair Romer said that she is still hesitant to support the bill.

Rep. Spiegelman questioned the implication that a 15-year-old possessing an airsoft gun should be charged with a firearms violation.

Vice Chair Romer asserted that in situations where individuals are on a college campus attempting to use airsoft guns to intimidate others, she supports charging them accordingly.

Rep. Spiegelman responded by highlighting that the current law, prior to House Bill 357, would indeed lead to a 15-year-old on a college campus being charged with a felony violation for possessing an airsoft gun. He emphasized that this issue stems from the overly broad definition of firearms.

Vice Chair Romer pointed out that Rep. Spiegelman did not vote for her Safe Schools bill.

Rep. Spiegelman explained that while universities can establish policies regarding items like airsoft guns, the issue arises when a 17-year-old on a college campus could receive a firearms violation for possessing such items. He noted that many places have zero-tolerance policies, which could disproportionately impact individuals for possessing items that are not firearms but may be considered as such under Delaware law. He emphasized that the overly broad definition of firearms limits flexibility in distinguishing actual threats from harmless items like airsoft guns.

Rep. Lynn expressed difficulty in following the linear flow of the argument regarding the objections raised by the Department of Justice. He noted that while Representative Spiegelman may be familiar with the objections due to his involvement in the task force, other legislators may not be. He highlighted the challenge of defending against arguments that have not been presented, especially for those who have not participated in the task force discussions.

Chair Griffith noted that a physical copy of the feedback from the Department of Justice was in the folder provided to the legislators prior to the start of the meeting.

Rep. Lynn suggested that it might be more logical to first hear the Department of Justice's arguments against the bill before discussing its defense. He proposed that a representative of the DOJ explain their objections, allowing all legislators to understand the argument's logical flow before considering the defense.

Chair Griffith invited expert witness Deputy Attorney General J.S. Taylor to explain the position of the Department of Justice on the legislation.

J.S. Taylor explained the Department's objections to the bill, stating that changing the definition in the Criminal Code, upon which decades of case law rests, requires thorough review due to potential litigation costs and confusion. Specifically, he highlighted that the new definition of projectile weapon differs from the current definition and removes exemptions based on broad categories rather than specific types of weapons. He expressed concern that new types of

weapons not covered under the current definition of projectile weapon could emerge, creating a need for frequent legislative amendments. He warned of potential gaps in protecting Delaware citizens if legislation is not promptly updated to address emerging threats.

Rep. Lynn expressed skepticism regarding J.S. Taylor's concern about potential litigation resulting from changing the definition in the Criminal Code. He referred to past instances, such as the proposal of a new criminal code by a former Chief Justice, where similar arguments were raised against introduction. He questioned whether there would be genuine grounds for litigation, as he found the definition to be comprehensive and lacking in ambiguity. He expressed uncertainty about this argument being brought in good faith, as he does not see any basis for potential litigation.

J.S. Taylor responded by first addressing the issue of good faith. He asserted that, as Deputy Attorney General, he presents testimony truthfully and to the best of his knowledge, and he denied acting in bad faith. Regarding potential litigation, he admitted uncertainty about specific arguments that criminal defense attorneys might raise concerning ambiguities in the new definitions. However, he expressed confidence that such arguments would likely arise and be litigated, as is common with any legislative change.

Rep. Lynn questioned the basis for the argument regarding potential litigation, asking for specific details about what aspects of the bill might lead to litigation.

J.S. Taylor stated that whenever there is a change in the Criminal Code, it typically leads to litigation as the new laws are utilized. He emphasized that past changes in firearm definitions have resulted in years of case law and litigation surrounding what constitutes a firearm. He concluded that there is no reason to believe that a change in the definition of a firearm would not lead to similar new litigation, as it has occurred before and would likely happen again.

Rep. Lynn asked J.S. Taylor if he could provide a specific example of something in the legislation that he believed could be subject to litigation.

J.S. Taylor replied that he could not provide a specific example at this point in time.

Rep. Lynn said that he wanted to address J.S. Taylor's earlier point about good faith, suggesting that the Department of Justice also has a political agenda.

Rep. Spiegelman addressed concerns regarding the projectile weapons statute, emphasizing that the bill aims to reduce ambiguity by providing a clear and specific definition of firearms. He noted that there have been no examples brought forth of new implements that would fall under the projectile weapon category. He highlighted a specific line in the bill that was added to address the Department of Justice's concerns, which specifies certain weapons like arrows and crossbows. He acknowledged the potential for new technologies but argued that addressing such issues now would prevent future ambiguity. He also pointed out that changes in technology often necessitate changes in the law and vice versa, highlighting the need for ongoing legislative review. He concluded that by updating the definition of firearms, the bill aims to eliminate ambiguity and ensure clarity in the law, addressing concerns raised by both the Department of Justice and potential technological advancements.

Rep. Lynn asked Mark Cutrona if he saw anything in the legislation that would invite potential for re-litigation.

Mark Cutrona said that while he did not see anything specific in the bill that would warrant litigation, any law passed can be subject to litigation. He emphasized that the General Assembly regularly passes laws that result in litigation, including those that change settled case law. He suggested that if lawmakers wanted to avoid relitigating issues, they would need to refrain from passing legislation altogether.

Chair Griffith opened the floor for public comment.

Jeff Hague, Delaware State Sportsmen's Association, Eric Romero, Scott Kidner, National Shooting Sports Foundation, Erin Chronister, Denise Clendening, and Rick Armitage, National Rifle Association, provided testimony in support of the bill.

Traci Murphy, Delaware Coalition Against Gun Violence, provided testimony in opposition of the bill.

Rep. Spiegelman highlighted the importance of having a consistent definition of firearms, especially in times of changing technology. He emphasized that without a clear definition, there would be a continual need for new bills to address different interpretations and classifications of weapons. He underscored the benefits of aligning Delaware's definition with those of other states, ensuring consistency and clarity in the law.

A motion was made by Rep. Jones Giltner and seconded by Chair Griffith to release HB 357 from committee; motion carried. Yes = 6 (Jones Giltner, Lynn, Phillips, Dorsey Walker, Griffith, Cooke); No = 0; Absent = 5 (Dukes, Schwartzkopf, Spiegelman, Romer, Shupe). The bill was released from committee with a F=2, M=5, U=0 vote.

Chair Griffith introduced **HB 342, AN ACT TO AMEND TITLES 11 AND 24 OF THE DELAWARE CODE RELATING TO THE VOLUNTARY FIREARMS DO-NOT-SELL REGISTRY ACT.**

Rep. Morrison introduced the Delaware Voluntary Firearms Do Not Sell Act, which aims to reduce firearm-related suicides in the state. The bill proposes a voluntary list where individuals can place themselves to prevent firearm purchases. The legislation requires a 30-day waiting period before removal from the list and mandates background checks for firearm transactions. Information on the list will only be accessible to law enforcement, ensuring privacy. He emphasized the bill as a preventive measure for suicide, especially among vulnerable groups like veterans and those struggling with mental health issues. He added that the proposal has garnered support from various organizations and is modeled after similar laws in other states.

Rep. Lynn asked if an individual who had voluntarily placed themselves on the proposed registry would face repercussions if they were stopped by law enforcement while possessing a firearm.

Rep. Morrison asked House Majority Caucus Attorney Mary Sherlock to respond.

Mary Sherlock replied that her instinct is to say that yes, those individuals would face repercussions since they are considered prohibited persons.

Rep. Lynn acknowledged the potential benefit of the bill for individuals recognizing their own struggles and voluntarily choosing not to possess firearms during difficult times. However, he raised concerns about the consequences if someone on the registry is arrested for firearm possession during that period, wondering if it would lead to them being labeled as a prohibited person and exacerbating their situation. Additionally, he questioned the process for removal from the registry, comparing it to similar registries for involuntarily committed individuals and inquiring whether there would be a review process, objections, or any formal procedure for being removed from the list.

Rep. Morrison expressed appreciation for the comments and questions raised by Rep. Lynn. Regarding the process for removal from the registry, he clarified that there is no formal procedure involving medical or mental health professionals. He highlighted the potential barriers individuals might face in seeking such assistance, such as lack of insurance or affordability. He emphasized a trust-based approach, believing that people are capable of self-assessment and should have the opportunity to voluntarily place themselves on the registry without facing consequences if they are found in possession of a firearm. He expressed a willingness to amend the bill to ensure that individuals on the registry do not become prohibited persons or face charges for possession of a firearm. He also shared personal experiences to underscore the importance of providing individuals with this option for self-evaluation and protection.

Mary Sherlock revoked her earlier statement, clarifying that individuals who voluntarily place themselves on a do-not-sell list would be held to a different standard than typical prohibited persons.

Rep. Lynn questioned the reasoning behind making it a criminal offense to provide false information on the application to be removed from the registry. Given that participation in the registry is voluntary, he wondered about the policy rationale for imposing criminal penalties in such cases.

Rep. Morrison explained the necessity of penalizing false statements on the application for removal from the registry, mentioning a possible scenario where someone could impersonate another individual, leading to fraudulent actions such as firearm purchases. This highlights the importance of ensuring the integrity of the process by deterring false representations.

Rep. Lynn clarified their understanding of the situation, realizing that the criminal offense pertained specifically to false statements regarding identity when requesting removal from the registry.

Rep. Spiegelman questioned whether individuals might see placing themselves on the registry as a sufficient measure rather than seeking professional help, potentially creating unintended consequences. He also pondered the fate of firearms currently possessed by individuals on the registry and how it relates to existing red flag laws. He sought clarification on the process of returning firearms to individuals once they decide to remove themselves from the registry, citing past difficulties faced by constituents in regaining their rights and property. Despite these concerns, he acknowledged the intriguing nature of the bill and its potential significance in suicide prevention efforts.

Rep. Morrison explained that the original bill included a relinquishment component but faced challenges due to liability issues. He mentioned plans to introduce legislation to update this aspect. He emphasized that the bill does not discourage individuals from seeking professional help, sharing his own experience of seeking help despite facing suicidal ideation. He asserted that the bill provides an additional option for those not yet ready for professional help but still willing to take steps toward safety. Regarding red flag laws, he expressed skepticism about the likelihood of individuals being prompted by others to place themselves on the registry.

Chair Griffith commended Rep. Morrison for the legislation, acknowledging its potential to reduce the impulse time for individuals contemplating harmful actions and expressing gratitude for its introduction.

Chair Griffith opened the floor for public comment.

Traci Murphy, Delaware Coalition Against Gun Violence, Detta Burcal, Moms Demand Action, Liddy Ballard, Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence, Katrina Brees, and Fred Vars provided testimony in support of the bill.

Paul Johnston, Jeff Hague, Delaware State Sportsmen's Association, Rick Armitage, National Rifle Association, and Denise Clendening provided testimony in opposition of the bill.

A motion was made by Rep. Dorsey Walker and seconded by Rep. Cooke to release HB 342 from committee; motion carried. Yes = 8 (Cooke, Dorsey Walker, Jones Giltner, Lynn, Phillips, Spiegelman, Romer, Griffith); No = 0; Absent = 3 (Schwartzkopf, Shupe, Dukes). The bill was released from committee with a F=4, M=3, U=1 vote.

Chair Griffith adjourned the meeting at 1:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Wyatt Patterson

Attendance List

- Kristen Bruce, Moms Demand Action
- Liddy Ballard, Brady Campaign to Prevent Gun Violence
- Traci Murphy, Delaware Coalition Against Gun Violence
- Eric Romero
- Paul Johnston
- Jeff Hague, Delaware State Sportsmen's Association
- Rick Armitage, National Rifle Association
- Denise Clendening
- Kenneth Jones
- Scott Kidner, National Shooting Sports Foundation
- Detta Burcal, Moms Demand Action
- Katrina Bees
- Fred Vars