Members of the County Council

I am writing to express my opposition to Bill 21-22 as drafted.

As written, this proposed ordinance would effectively prohibit use of a Maryland wear and carry permit in any of the built up areas of Montgomery County as it would be nearly impossible to drive or walk up or down a major street (e.g., Georgia Avenue, Wisconsin Avenue, New Hampshire Avenue) without coming within 100 yards of any property attached to a place of public assembly. Moreover, any Montgomery County resident with a wear or carry permit who lived or owned a business within 100 yards of any property attached to a place of public assembly would be barred from using the Maryland wear and carry permit while entering or exiting his residence or business. Additionally, there are places in Montgomery County where the Beltway and U.S/ 29, for example, come within 100 yards of property attached to a place of public assembly. Thus, this ordinance would criminalize use of a wear and carry permit while traveling through Montgomery County on the Beltway or U.S. 29. It should not be difficult to see why the breath of this ban is inconsistent with the recent Supreme Court decision allowing legislatures to ban guns only in narrowly defined sensitive spaces.

There is also a problem with the vagueness of the definition of place of public assembly. By use of the term “including” the ordinance reads as if there are other unlisted places that may be considered a place of public assembly. With a criminal statute, the citizen is not supposed to have to guess what may or may not be included – particularly with a term that is broad enough to include, for example, any store.

There is a saying, “Bad cases make bad law.” Passing this ordinance as written will undoubtedly result in rejection by the courts and may very well result in a court decision that further restricts the right of a legislature to ban guns from sensitive spaces and thus winds up making gun control harder rather than easier. In addition, passage of this ordinance as written will unnecessarily run up County legal fees with money that could be spent on productive initiatives.

In my 31-year career (1966-1997) in criminal justice (including positions as a police officer, probation officer, and parole officer in New York State, Staff Director of the U.S. Parole Commission, and Principal Technical Advisor of the U.S. Sentencing Commission), I have seen quite a few pieces of criminal justice legislation that were not well thought out and/or not well drafted. In my opinion, this proposed ordinance, as written, falls in this category. Thus, I recommend strongly this proposed ordinance not be enacted as written. 1
Sincerely,

Peter B. Hoffman

Silver Spring, MD

1. If the “within 100 yards of” language were removed from this bill (so as to limit the prohibition to the actual property of the place of public assembly), and if the definition of place of public assembly was tightened to remove its vagueness, it might ameliorate the above noted issues. Whether the proposed legislation is needed to address a real problem is another issue on which I take no position other than to note that during my career in criminal justice, I reviewed more than 25,000 files of convicted offenders and I remember only one case involving a crime committed with a handgun carried by a person having a permit to carry a handgun (not including offenses committed by persons who were authorized to vary a handgun because they were law enforcement officers).