

Angel's Testimony in Opposition to House Bill 7208 Electronic Information and Data Privacy Act

February 29, 2026

To House Committee on Judiciary Chair and Members,

My name is Angel Lopez, and I am writing to you today as a resident of Providence. I am writing to you today in opposition to House Bill 7208. All the views expressed are entirely my own.

My main reason to oppose this bill is the term “dishonesty” which appears three times in this bill. dishonesty is not a crime or a reason to investigate for probable cause, thus the use of the term “dishonesty” within the language of this legislation allows for the term to be subjective to perspective and imposes implicit bias. The term dishonesty is not a reason to issue a warrant, thus should not be included as an exception to bypass the judicial processes of a warrant.

The bill as is will allow a remote computing service to voluntarily disclose electronic data to law enforcement triggering unnecessary surveillance or seizure of electronic data because of dishonesty. H7208 is aiming to supersede a Federal Law which has remained the same. I included a link to [Title 18 of the US Code Section 2702. Voluntary disclosure of customer communications or records](https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title:18%20section:2702%20edition:prelim%29%20OR%20%28granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2702%29&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true) for your reference below:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title:18%20section:2702%20edition:prelim%29%20OR%20%28granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2702%29&f=treesort&edition=prelim&num=0&jumpTo=true>

The referenced Federal Law includes prohibitions for Electronic Communications Providers or “a remote computing service” against the voluntary disclosure of customer records and Exceptions for Disclosure of customer records. Dishonesty is not listed or alluded to as an exception.

Angel's Testimony in Opposition to House Bill 7208 Electronic Information and Data Privacy Act

The term dishonesty is used three times in this legislation: on page 3 line 32, page 4 line 14, and page 7 line 19.

My second reason to oppose H7208 is the existence of two indemnification clauses that appear on Page 4 sub-section (h), lines 28 to 32 and on Page 7 sub-section(e) lines 22-25. Both indemnification clauses free the "remote computing service" and its officers, agents, or specified person free of any liability. This within itself is dishonest to the RI Constitution and the budget of every municipality fooled to move funding towards this false solution.

My third and final reason to oppose H7208 is that the legislation will enable the device in the photo below along with any other surveillance devices operating under the self-regulated privileges of RI Gen. Laws §39-32 to continue operating as is. Why is this device allowed to operate near our homes without any consideration for the health of residents? Why do the exact operations of this device remain concealed to the public, when the device is fixed on a sidewalk? What benefit does this device contribute to my community that outweighs home insurance spikes, elevated property taxes, and increasing energy costs, while contributing to adverse health effects and deteriorating visual community aesthetics.



Angel's Testimony in Opposition to House Bill 7208 Electronic Information and Data Privacy Act

In conclusion, my community is not a prison. Creating distress and barriers to opportunity increases crime. Allocating more funds to policing and unwarranted surveillance is taking funding away from schools, our food supply, and from solutions that solve the problems we confront today. Please hold House Bill 7208.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Sincerely,

Angel Lopez
Resident of Providence