

## Ariana Costa

---

**From:** Eric Claros <eric.claros969@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 8, 2026 12:55 PM  
**To:** House Judiciary Committee  
**Subject:** written testimony in opposition of H8075

Dear Representative,

I am writing in opposition to H8075, which is under consideration in the judiciary. There are already multiple Supreme Court decisions and a Federal Circuit of Appeals case ruling against similar laws that set a price on exercising one's constitutional rights.

The Supreme Court's decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022) made clear that the Second Amendment is not a second-class right and that states may not impose burdens that are inconsistent with the Nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation.

In *Ezell v. City of Chicago* (7th Cir. 2011), the Seventh Circuit struck down a regulatory scheme that effectively prevented lawful firearm training, emphasizing that the right to keep and bear arms must remain practically accessible.

In addition, conditioning the exercise of a constitutional right on the purchase of an expensive (\$1,000,000) Liability insurance policy raises concerns similar to those addressed in *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections* (1966), where the Supreme Court held that the government may not impose financial barriers (such as poll taxes) on the exercise of fundamental rights.

The Court has also made clear in *Murdock v. Pennsylvania* (1943) that a state may not require the payment of a fee as a condition for exercising a constitutional right.

Forcing a citizen to pay a high price to exercise a constitutionally protected right, such as voting, has already been found unconstitutional and prejudicial. Then it is clear that imposing a high price on a constitutionally protected right, in both the Rhode Island and United States Constitutions, would be equally unconstitutional and prejudicial. This would open the State up to litigation over the law and, potentially, a DOJ investigation into Civil Rights Violations.

As this law shares so many similarities to the Poll Tax schemes, multiple precede court cases that show it is already unconstitutional come from the legal battle against the Poll Taxes from the Jim Crow Era of America that was designed to prevent minorities and the impoverished from enjoying the same rights as the wealthy whites; most arguments made for this bill would also be used in favor for these prejudicial archaic laws that America should have already left in the past.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose H8075.

Sincerely,

Eric Claros

Warwick, Rhode Island 02886

### References

1. *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1 (2022).  
[https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/20-843\\_7j80.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/20-843_7j80.pdf)
2. *Ezell v. City of Chicago*, 651 F.3d 684 (7th Cir. 2011).  
<https://caselaw.findlaw.com/us-7th-circuit/1575941.html>
3. *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663 (1966).  
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/383/663/>
4. *Murdock v. Pennsylvania*, 319 U.S. 105 (1943).  
<https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/319/105/>