

**From:** [Marc Harris](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** City of Stamford Resolution to Stop and Question Pistol Permit Holders  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 6:28:49 PM

---

I strongly apples this measure. Having gone though the process of paying all the fees, the background checks and having to wait patiently to get an appointment to receive my permit, i think i have done enough.

Please exert your energies on fighting crime and other measures.

Thank you

**From:** [Bill Magyari](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** RESOLUTION URGING THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT TO REQUIRE GUN OWNERS WHO OPEN CARRY TO PRODUCE THEIR GUN PERMITS UPON REQUEST OF LAW ENFORCEMENT  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 7:28:54 PM

---

To whom it may concern on the board for this hearing,

I am deeply against this resolution and the slippery slope that it may cause going forward.

Regardless of how well intended this action may be, I truly believe that our civil liberties far out weight whatever benefit this resolution may offer.

Please ask yourself - how many instances have occurred to warrant action on this level.

As a permit holder I do not open carry a firearm, but I deeply believe in the right to do so for those that deem it necessary.

I urge you to not pass this resolution, so we may avoid any future abuses by authorities that may have overzealous enforcement.

I believe education of the facts and current laws would achieve the same affect that this resolution is trying to solve.

Thank You,

Bill Magyari

Stamford, CT

**From:** [Lane Lombardia](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to resolution urging the legislature to require gun owners to produce permits upon request  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 7:32:57 PM

---

To Whom it May Concern,

While I am overseas, actively supporting the representation of our great country during the ongoing Olympics in Tokyo, I have discovered that my city of residence, where I own property and pay taxes upon same, seeks to further shame and suppress peaceful bearers of arms and further tread upon equal protection under the law with a proposal to the legislature to undermine standards of evidence necessary for reasonable search and seizure, and rushing through a hearing regarding this effort at shame and suppression while I am in Tokyo.

Such a resolution will inevitably result in an increase in racial and ethnic disparity in police interactions with the public, as has been the case in our neighbor, New York, since the Sullivan Act was passed for reasons of racial and ethnic bigotry. The resolution proposes to utterly disregard the notion of probable cause and desecrating rights supposedly protected under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, particular equal protection under the law.

Stamford's proposed resolution is an egregious cousin of New York's infamous and racist "stop and frisk" program, inviting lawsuits upon police departments such as Floyd v City of New York, which the taxpayers will be saddled with paying for. It's humiliating that such an obviously racist policy resolution is being proposed by the city I call home.

The arguments laid out in the proposal are the same sort of racist filth, closeted or open, that have been used to excuse violating the rights of People of Color for over two and a half centuries. This proposal, should the legislature be so misguided as to execute it, would result in blatant disparity in arrests and prosecutions, while hiding the racism in plain sight under the guise of officer safety.

To be blunt, in addition to lodging my protest against the proposal, I would like the names of the specific individuals on the Public Safety and Health Committee who wrote this proposal. Please expose the racist bigots in office who contributed to this insult to civil liberties and equal protection under the law, so that I may draw the attention of the electorate to their misdeeds.

Respectfully,

Lane Lombardia

**From:** [Justin Chimento](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** PS30.088 RESOLUTION URGING THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT TO REQUIRE GUN OWNERS WHO OPEN CARRY TO PRODUCE THEIR GUN PERMITS UPON REQUEST OF LAW ENFORCEMENT  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 7:57:41 PM

---

Good evening everyone,

I hope this message finds you well. I know this last year has proven challenging for everyone so first I wish you all good health and continued well-being. Thank you for your hard work and continued efforts for the city!

Secondly, I'd like to address this new resolution and simply ask. How is this different than stop and frisk for lawfully owned firearm owners? Don't we want to get the bad guys with unregistered guns off the streets rather than people who own them to protect themselves and their families?

Thirdly, I'd like to include my personal experience with the Stamford PD. Once a woman on craigslist I was going to lease an apartment from her and had given a deposit. She cashed my deposit, rented the apartment, and forged my signature on her "lease". The amount she stole was \$1,200 too much for small claims court and as I was told by Stamford PD. It didn't reach the threshold for financial crimes unit that starts at \$2,000. In short, I was out of luck with no recourse for the person who had stolen my money. I was upset because if someone steals something from the mall worth \$1,200 they are getting tackled and arrested. For some reason, this criminal was allowed to steal my money without consequence.

With all this defunding of the police, I feel they aren't properly equipped to handle this sort of operation. Often times I will see police officers at the shooting range flat out mishandling weapons putting people at the range in danger. When creating new laws we must ask ourselves, why? For what reason must we harass the legal gun-owning resident?

When there are criminals shootings openly on a nightly basis in Stamford. Are the taxes and restrictions by the state and city not enough (over \$400 every 5 years)? How about the 8 week turnaround time for issuing of legal carry permits? Stamford PD is **CONSTANTLY** on a backlog of at least 6 months when the CT state constitution says they must issue or deny within 8 weeks. Who upholds the CT Constitution the Police do, and rarely do they slap themselves on the wrist for breaking that statue.

I am confident this will cause more trouble than it's worth. This new resolution does nothing to stop criminals from obtaining weapons or committing crimes. This resolution does everything to single out and harass the already down and beaten group, legally permitted gun owners.

Respectfully,  
Justin

PS: Considering the state is being sued right now for moving the special license firearm unit database system with little warning and the system being down for 2+ weeks (it's still down today). Griding all new legal firearm sales and transfers to a stop in this state. Is this really the time to create new regulations when judges are going to be looking at the state's gun laws under a microscope? (**hint: CALI assault rifle ban, 10 round magazine ban, and 21 year**

**age restriction were all struck down in Federal court last year but are all currently being upheld and enforced in CT)**

**From:** [Jeffrey Ferraro](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition of proposed gun bill  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 10:20:56 PM

---

Profiling and targeting legal pistol permit holders is where you should spend the least amount of your time. How about encouraging law enforcement to target neighborhoods where there is known activity of ILLEGAL guns? Don't target the good guys with guns, prevent crime and save lives by getting the criminals off the street. What you are doing is infringing on my Second Amendment Rights as well as violating my Fourth Amendment Right to unlawful search and seizure. This is The Constitution State. Pass legislation that supports the Constitution, not violate it.

Regards,

Jeff Ferraro  
917-974-0248

**From:** [Timur Sakayev](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Opposition to PS30.088  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 10:35:50 PM

---

I would like to express my strong opposition to PS 30.088. Requiring gun owners who open carry to produce gun permits without reasonable suspicion of crime would be violating of 2nd and/or 4th amendment rights as well as opening door for racial profiling and selective enforcement.

The resolution states as an assumption that "enhancement to public safety" outweighs the concerns of possible infringements, however does not provide any proof of such enhancement. Are there specific cases/statistics where law enforcement observed open carry without any suspicion of crime, which later turned into crime? If not, then the action of requiring gun owners to produce permits without suspicion is infringement on their rights for the sake of "security theater".

While there may be members of public who may "become alarmed" when they observe individuals who open carry, it is important to recognize that such concern often produced out of ignorance and/or under influence of current political climate on the uneducated where gun ownership is equated to soon-to-be-criminal. The requirement to produce gun permit without reasonable suspicion of crime is another reinforcement of such misguided thinking.

In my opinion, "security theater" does not outweigh my right to be unharassed. If an officer wants to have a friendly conversation, I'm happy to participate, but requiring me to provide gun permit is a step too far.

I'll close with the oft-quoted "Those who give up essential liberty to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety", but would like to highlight that in this case the perceived safety is not real.

Respectfully,

Tim Sakayev  
North Stamford

**From:** [J. Marciano](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** PS30.088  
**Date:** Wednesday, July 28, 2021 10:40:32 PM

---

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing to express my dismay that my home city is contemplating a racist resolution that advances white supremacy. The earliest examples of gun control which predated the founding of our nation were enacted to forbid weapons to Black Americans. The antebellum and Jim Crow South explicitly banned Black Americans from owning and carrying firearms.

Now, Black Americans are disproportionately burdened by the financial and administrative burdens imposed by the state of Connecticut; prejudicing their ability to lawfully own and carry firearms. To make matters worse, Stamford is proposing and supporting what is effectively a "stop and frisk" law that will do nothing to stop actual criminals. Instead, Black citizens of Connecticut will be subjected to police harassment without probable cause or even reasonable suspicion. Wealthy Whites in Darien and Greenwich will never be stopped by the police, but I bet money Black residents of Norwalk, Bridgeport, and Hartford will.

This law, should it pass with Stamford's support, will fall most heavily on Black and Brown residents of Connecticut. Some cops will see "open carry" where it doesn't exist and use this law to harass and search Black citizens without probable cause or even reasonable suspicion.

I regret I won't be able to express my dismay at Stamford's lurch toward white supremacy in person and I sincerely hope that Stamford will respect the rights of ALL Americans and not pass this resolution.

Yours most faithfully and respectfully,

John Marciano  
60 Lawn Ave., Stamford  
M: 908-477-7747



**From:** [jerry milew](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Bill proposed by State Legislators regarding pistol permit holders.  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 8:35:40 AM

---

To whom it may concern.

Good afternoon my name is Jaroslaw A. Milewski, long Stamford resident. The newly proposed bill which would allows police officers to stop, hold, and identify pistol permit holders is an unconstitutional and would impose harassment of many hard working Stamford residents. I strongly urge you not to pass such bill. Thank you.

[Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone](#)

**From:** [Ernie Tartaglione](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** New Stamford Law  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 9:55:14 AM

---

I think this law is unconstitutional and an invasion of people rights. What is the purpose of this law? You should focus your attention on criminals, people with permits don't commit crimes. Please tell me what good this will do? How can you enact a law where you target law abiding citizens with NO SUSPICION OF A CRIME? Tell me is Connecticut part of the United States of America?

**From:** [James Ritchie](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Oppose PS30.088 Requiring Gun Owners to Produce Their Licenses When Asked by Law Enforcement Officers  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 10:07:30 AM

---

Your proposal to force gun owners to "Show your Papers" when confronted by police is unconstitutional. This is in direct opposition to SCOTUS ruling in Terry v Ohio, and supported by 2 other cases which upheld Terry v Ohio in the last 5 years:

Thomas Pinner v. State  
<https://law.justia.com/cases/indiana/supreme-court/2017/49s02-1611-cr-610.html>

Allentown v. Hicks  
<https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/spotting-a-concealed-gun-is-not-reason-enough-for-police-to-stop-and-investigate-top-state-court-rules>

In all 3 of these cases, the courts determined that this was a violation of the 4th Amendment unless there was Reasonable Articulate Suspicion that a crime was occurring. Just the mere issue that a person carrying a gun is not enough reason to suggest that a crime is occurring.

In Pinner v. State the summary: The Supreme Court held that evidence obtained after a search and seizure was obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment and that the trial court erred in denying Defendant's motion to suppress the evidence obtained as a result of the search and seizure. The trial court denied the motion to suppress, concluding that law enforcement officers had reasonable suspicion to approach and question Defendant after they received a call that someone of Defendant's description had a handgun on him. The Supreme Court reversed, holding that the intrusion by the police was not reasonable in this case.

In Allentown v. Hicks JUSTICE BAER DECIDED: May 31, 2019 "This Court granted allowance of appeal in this matter to address the narrow question of "[w]hether the Superior Court's bright line rule holding that possession of a concealed firearm in public is sufficient to create reasonable suspicion[.]" Commonwealth v. Hicks, 172 A.3d 583 (Pa. 2017). I agree with the Majority that this bright line rule cannot withstand constitutional scrutiny; accordingly, I join Parts I., II.A., B., and C.(i.-v.) of the Majority Opinion. Most importantly, I join the Majority's ultimate conclusion that "the Superior Court patently has erred in concluding that the possession of a concealed firearm by an individual in public is sufficient to create a reasonable suspicion that the individual may be dangerous, such that an officer can approach the individual and briefly detain him in order to investigate whether the person is properly licensed."

Therefore the town proposed ordinance is in violation of the 4th Amendment, which is a constitutional right granted to the citizens through the 14th Amendment which requires all states and municipalities to abide too.

--

James Ritchie CISA, CISSP, NRA Instructor Cell 860-681-1336  
27 Matilda Drive  
Bristol CT 06010

**From:** [Tim Davis](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Police Verification of Valid Gun Carry Permits  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 10:15:20 AM

---

Dear Sir / Madam,

I was asked by my gun club to speak out against this. In fact, I am **100% FOR this proposition**. I believe that it is truly important for public safety that police enforce that all guns (and particularly guns in public on a person) out there are legal. As a permit holder, I would rather be asked to produce my permit - under any conditions - than for the public to bear the risks of illegal carries on the street. If this is 'profiling', I am happy to be profiled as a law abiding good guy; and I see this as no impingement on my rights.

Tim  
C: 203-536-8726

**From:** [loren.morrissey](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** OPPOSE resolution to allow law enforcement officers to require law abiding citizens to produce gun permits without cause  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 11:15:20 AM

---

I strongly oppose the resolution to allow law enforcement officers to request law abiding citizens to produce their gun permit without reasonable suspicion of a crime. They should direct their efforts towards catching the criminals and stopping crime. Stop wasting our taxpayer money by harassing citizens who have followed the law and have permits to protect themselves. Stop infringing on our personal liberties and use our taxpayer money to go after the criminals.

This is the terrible resolution I oppose:

PS30.088 RESOLUTION URGING THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT TO REQUIRE GUN OWNERS WHO OPEN CARRY TO PRODUCE THEIR GUN PERMITS UPON REQUEST OF LAW ENFORCEMENT WHEREAS, it is legal in the State of Connecticut for the owner of a gun to carry it in open fashion, in such a way that it is observable by others (“open carry”); and WHEREAS, although state statute in Connecticut requires gun owners who open carry to have their gun permits on their person, law enforcement officers may not ask them to produce their permits to verify the existence or validity of the permit unless said officers have reasonable suspicion of a crime; and WHEREAS, individuals who open carry sometimes cause alarm among members of the public who observe them with a gun that is not concealed, and such situations have the potential to escalate into dangerous confrontations; and WHEREAS, it is detrimental to public safety for law enforcement officers to be unable to verify the existence and validity of a gun permit unless they have reasonable suspicion of a crime, given the significant amount of violence that occurs in the community involving the use of guns; and WHEREAS, most of the gun violence is being committed by persons who are legally unable to possess a gun permit; and WHEREAS, public safety would be enhanced if state statute were amended to allow law enforcement officers to request that a person who is open carrying a gun produce their gun permit even if the officer does not have reasonable suspicion of a crime; and WHEREAS, it is acknowledged that some people have concerns with allowing law enforcement to request a gun owner to produce their permit even when there is no reasonable suspicion of crime, such as selective enforcement and racial profiling, possible infringement of Second Amendment rights, and possible infringement of Fourth Amendment rights; and WHEREAS, the above-referenced concerns are outweighed by the enhancement to public safety that would result from an amendment to state statute to allow law enforcement to request a gun owner to produce their permit even when there is no reasonable suspicion of crime, since the intrusion suffered by a permit holder having to produce their gun permit is a very brief and limited intrusion. NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board of Representatives of the City of Stamford hereby urges the Connecticut State Legislature to amend state statute to allow law enforcement officers to request that a person who is open carrying a gun produce their gun permit even if the officer does not have reasonable suspicion of a crime.

**From:** [Andrew Koehm](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Show your gun permit ordinance.  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 11:20:55 AM

---

Dear Board of Representatives,

I am opposed to this ordinance and ask you to vote NO. As someone who travels frequently to Stamford it will negatively impact my civil rights. It will also give police yet another opportunity to harass people of color or any individual the police do not like.

The Town of Stamford Public Safety and Health committee proposal to force gun owners to "Show Your Papers" when confronted by police is clearly unconstitutional. This issue has been decided by a SCOTUS ruling in Terry v Ohio, and supported by 2 other cases which upheld Terry v Ohio in the last 5 years:

Thomas Pinner v. State <https://law.justia.com/cases/indiana/supreme-court/2017/49s02-1611-cr-610.html>

Allentown v. Hicks <https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/spotting-a-concealed-gun-is-not-reason-enough-for-police-to-stop-and-investigate-top-state-court-rules>

In all 3 of these cases, the courts determined that this was a violation of the 4th Amendment unless there was Reasonable Articulate Suspicion that a crime was occurring. Just the mere issue that a person carrying a gun is not enough reason to suggest that a crime is occurring.

In Pinner v. State the summary: The Supreme Court held that evidence obtained after a search and seizure was obtained in violation of the Fourth Amendment and that the trial court erred in denying Defendant's motion to suppress the evidence obtained as a result of the search and seizure. The trial court denied the motion to suppress, concluding that law enforcement officers had reasonable suspicion to approach and question Defendant after they received a call that someone of Defendant's description had a handgun on him. The Supreme Court reversed, holding that the intrusion by the police was not reasonable in this case.

In Allentown v. Hicks JUSTICE BAER DECIDED: May 31, 2019 This Court granted allowance of appeal in this matter to address the narrow question of "[w]hether the Superior Court's bright line rule holding that possession of a concealed firearm in public is sufficient to create reasonable suspicion[.]" Commonwealth v. Hicks, 172 A.3d 583 (Pa. 2017). I agree with the Majority that this bright line rule cannot withstand constitutional scrutiny; accordingly, I join Parts I., II.A., B., and C.(i.-v.) of the Majority Opinion. Most importantly, I join the Majority's ultimate conclusion that "the Superior Court patently has erred in concluding that the possession of a concealed firearm by an individual in public is sufficient to create a reasonable suspicion that the individual may be dangerous, such that an officer can approach the individual and briefly detain him in order to investigate whether the person is properly licensed."

Therefore the town proposed ordinance is in violation of the 4th Amendment, which is a constitutional right grant to the citizens through the 14th Amendments which requires all states and municipalities to abide too. The ordinance is obviously designed to harass gun owners and is a violation of individual civil rights.

Thank you,

Andrew Koehm

Brookfield, CT



**From:** [Larry Tedesco](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** pistol permit meeting July 29  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 11:29:48 AM

---

Gentlemen: I oppose the legislation to stop pistol permit holders to identify and detain them

Larry Tedesco  
1 Harbor Point Rd  
Apt 1505  
Stamford, Ct 06902  
914-403-4550

**From:** [salem12ga@gmail.com](mailto:salem12ga@gmail.com)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Cc:** [<salem12ga@gmail.com>](mailto:salem12ga@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** Opposition to "Stop and Identify pistol permit holder" proposed Resolution  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 11:35:35 AM

---

Strongly against.

This is intrusive, unconstitutional and a waste of the hard earned tax dollars I send to Stamford. Please stop.

**From:** [Albert Einstein](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** CORRECTED COPY: Stamford Board Wants Ordinance That Was Ruled Unconstitutional By SCOTUS.  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 12:37:33 PM

---

From: Thomas M. Dutkiewicz, 24 Atkins Avenue, Bristol, CT  
06010, 860-833-4127

RE: PS30.088

WHAT THE STAMFORD BOARD WANTS TO DO IS  
ILLEGAL. THEY WILL BE CHALLENGED.

U.S. SUPREME COURT ALREADY RULED GUN OWNERS  
DON'T HAVE TO PRODUCE IDENTIFICATION PAPERS

Act now and let them know you are against the proposed  
ordinance. - James Ritchie

Your proposal to force gun owners to "Show your Papers"  
when confronted by police is unconstitutional. This is in  
direct opposition to SCOTUS ruling in Terry v Ohio, and  
supported by 2 other cases which upheld Terry v Ohio in the  
last 5 years:

Thomas Pinner v.  
State [https://law.justia.com/cases/indiana/supreme-  
court/2017/49s02-1611-cr-610.html](https://law.justia.com/cases/indiana/supreme-court/2017/49s02-1611-cr-610.html)

Allentown v.  
Hicks [https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/spotting-a-  
concealed-gun-is-not-reason-enough-for-police-to-stop-and-  
investigate-top-state-court-rules](https://www.abajournal.com/news/article/spotting-a-concealed-gun-is-not-reason-enough-for-police-to-stop-and-investigate-top-state-court-rules)

In all 3 of these cases, the courts determined that this was a  
violation of the 4th Amendment unless there was Reasonable  
Articulate Suspicion that a crime was occurring. Just the  
mere issue that a person carrying a gun is not enough reason  
to suggest that a crime is occurring.

In Pinner v. State the summary: The Supreme Court held that  
evidence obtained after a search and seizure was obtained in  
violation of the Fourth Amendment and that the trial court  
erred in denying Defendant's motion to suppress the  
evidence obtained as a result of the search and seizure. The  
trial court denied the motion to suppress, concluding that law  
enforcement officers had reasonable suspicion to approach  
and question Defendant after they received a call that  
someone of Defendant's description had a handgun on him.  
The Supreme Court reversed, holding that the intrusion by  
the police was not reasonable in this case.

In Allentown v. Hicks JUSTICE BAER DECIDED: May 31,  
2019 This Court granted allowance of appeal in this matter to  
address the narrow question of "[w]hether the Superior

Court's bright-line rule holding that possession of a concealed firearm in public is sufficient to create reasonable suspicion[.]” Commonwealth v. Hicks, 172 A.3d 583 (Pa. 2017). I agree with the Majority that this bright-line rule cannot withstand constitutional scrutiny; accordingly, I join Parts I., II.A., B., and C.(i.-v.) of the Majority Opinion. Most importantly, I join the Majority’s ultimate conclusion that “the Superior Court patently has erred in concluding that the possession of a concealed firearm by an individual in public is sufficient to create a reasonable suspicion that the individual may be dangerous, such that an officer can approach the individual and briefly detain him in order to investigate whether the person is properly licensed.”

Therefore the town proposed ordinance is in violation of the 4th Amendment, which is a constitutional right grant to the citizens through the 14th Amendments which requires all states and municipalities to abide too.

---

NEW PROPOSED LAW VIOLATES THE STATE'S  
CONSTITUTION AS WELL AS THE FEDERAL  
CONSTITUTION.

By: Thomas M. Dutkiewicz

They are also creating new laws inwhich they lack the authority to do. There's an Equal Protection Violation when one city creates this law and others don't. Laws flow down from the state. What's the fine and what's the Due Process for appeal. If the judge can't point to a state law, the court "Lacks Subject Matter Jurisdiction".

What the Stamford Board is doing is illegal.

**From:** [AOL](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Resolution to target and stop gun owners  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 12:46:41 PM

---

I am against this resolution. It is an infringement on law abiding citizens and goes against the second amendment.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [chetsy\\_saurmail.com](mailto:chetsy_saurmail.com)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** NO TO RESOLUTION to ask State Leg. to consider PRODUCTION OF GUN PERMITS  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 12:54:36 PM

---

Stop and frisk, really? Have things deteriorated so much in this country that law-abiding citizens are now the object of these searches?

And don't the police have better things to do, like catch criminals?

The whole object, after all, of having a pistol carry license is to get all this information in the first place.

Please deny this intrusive initiative.

Mercedes Saur  
Darien, CT

**From:** [ccpuma@mindspring.com](mailto:ccpuma@mindspring.com)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Law enforcement to demand a gun owner to produce their permit  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 1:06:12 PM

---

Law enforcement to demand a gun owner to produce their permit.

As a upstanding citizen of the United States of America and legally trained Carry Permit holder I find it very upsetting that I can be approached for no good reason to produce my Carry Permit.

I feel that I'm being treated as criminal and that's not right.

I and SRONGLY AGAINST making this any kind of law or action.

Respectfully,  
Carmine Puma

**From:** [Brian Rivers](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** Pending Board Resolution on Open Carry  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 1:31:59 PM

---

To the Board,  
I live locally and am in Stamford on almost a daily basis.

While I understand your concern about open carry, I don't recall reading or hearing of many instances involving the problem that the resolution tries to address. Does this problem really exist ?

The way your resolution is worded automatically presupposes that anyone who open carries has bad intentions. I don't know if this is correct, or fair. Unless you have data or facts to support your position, please consider me opposed.

I look forward to hearing any legitimate facts you have to support your resolution.

Respectfully,  
Brian Rivers  
Old Greenwich

Sent from my iPad



**From:** [Kristen Niemynski \(ICON\)](#)  
**To:** [Board of Representatives](#)  
**Subject:** PS30.095 - Vote NO  
**Date:** Thursday, July 29, 2021 1:36:01 PM

---

Requiring gun owners to produce their licenses when asked by law enforcement officers, even if the officer does not have reasonable suspicion of a crime is an infringement of Second and Fourth Amendment rights and will only lead to greater infringements. This infringement outweighs the concerns it addresses because I doubt you can even name one incident in Stamford where someone was "open carrying" and then committed a crime with the gun they were carrying...so there is no concern for alarm. You cannot just start infringing upon people's rights because some other people don't like the way those rights look. You are creating a problem where there is none. This is completely unnecessary and just opening a door to more erosion of our Second and Fourth Amendment Rights. Legal gun owners carrying their guns with them only helps to protect our communities. This resolution could deter legal gun owners from carrying their gun for fear of being profiled/singled out/embarrassed or being made into a spectacle and drawn attention to. Therefore, this resolution could make our communities LESS SAFE because it could deter legal gun owners from carrying their guns. I am the daughter and sister of law enforcement officers and I believe you should vote NO on this resolution.

Thank you

*Kristy*

Kristen Niemynski  
5 Smith Street  
Greenwich, CT 06830

[kniemynski@icon-intl.com](mailto:kniemynski@icon-intl.com)

This email is intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise protected from disclosure. Dissemination, distribution, or copying of this email or the information herein by anyone other than the intended recipient, or an employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately.

From: [Gregg Oehler](#)  
To: [Board of Representatives](#)  
Date: Thursday, July 29, 2021 2:20:29 PM

---

**I oppose the resolution to allow law enforcement officers to request law abiding citizens to produce their gun permit without reasonable suspicion of a crime. ( PS30.088)**

**They should spend their time stopping crime. Stop wasting our taxpayer money. Stop infringing on personal liberties and use taxpayer money to go after the criminals.**

Gregg R. Oehler,  
Chairman, NY Pet Fashion Show  
Partner, Oehler Media Inc  
EVP, Global Media Hub US  
[www.NYPetFashionShow.com](http://www.NYPetFashionShow.com)  
[www.globalmediahubus.com](http://www.globalmediahubus.com)  
ph: 203-595-5452 c:646-202-3807