

Roberta DiMezza

From: R.J. Petrillo <rjpetrillo@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 7, 2026 10:30 AM
To: House Judiciary Committee
Subject: Please OPPOSE H7035 - one gun a month

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear members of the House Judiciary Committee,

I am a member of the r/rifguns community on reddit, and a concerned law-abiding gun owner in the state of Rhode Island.

I am writing regarding the proposed “one-gun-per-month” firearm purchase limitation currently under consideration in **H7035**.

I respectfully urge you to carefully consider the significant constitutional risks associated with this type of legislation. Courts have recently found similar laws unconstitutional under the Supreme Court’s decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n v. Bruen*, which requires modern firearm regulations to be consistent with the Nation’s historical tradition of firearm regulation.¹

Most notably, in *Nguyen v. Bonta*, a panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit struck down California’s one-gun-per-month law. The court held that limiting lawful purchasers to one firearm every thirty days meaningfully constrains conduct protected by the plain text of the Second Amendment and that the state failed to demonstrate a historical analogue supporting such a restriction.²

Under the framework established in *Bruen*, if a regulation burdens conduct covered by the Second Amendment, the government must affirmatively demonstrate that it is consistent with historical firearm regulations from the Founding era. Courts applying this test have found that broad purchase caps, such as one-gun-per-month restrictions, do not have clear historical precedent.³

Enacting legislation that mirrors laws **already invalidated by federal courts** invites expensive and protracted litigation. Taxpayers should not have to shoulder the expense of defending a statute that courts have already found constitutionally suspect.

Before advancing this proposal, I respectfully ask that you consider:

- The Ninth Circuit’s ruling striking down California’s one-gun-per-month law
- The Supreme Court’s binding Bruen framework requiring historical consistency
- The significant litigation exposure such a law would create for Rhode Island
- Whether limiting the quantity of lawful purchases meaningfully advances public safety goals in any constitutionally sustainable manner, or is merely partisan politics.

Public policy should be crafted with clear awareness of constitutional limits and recent federal court rulings, and when even California finds a bill so abhorrent to the 2nd Amendment that they strike it down, it must be so.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Richard Petrillo
Cranston, RI

Footnotes

1. *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, (2022) – Supreme Court framework requiring historical consistency for firearm regulations.
2. *Nguyen v. Bonta*, (2025) – California one-gun-per-month law struck down.
 - a. Full court opinion: <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2025/06/20/24-2036.pdf>
 - b. Summary/analysis: <https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/2025/07/litigation-highlight-ninth-circuit-strikes-down-californias-one-gun-per-month-rule>
3. *National Ass'n for Gun Rights v. City of San Jose* (2023) – Example of federal challenge to local purchase limits under Bruen.
 - a. <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66605663/national-association-for-gun-rights-v-city-of-san-jose/>