

Senate Judiciary Committee

4/2/2026

1. OPPOSE

Senate Bill No. 2599

During an investigation, APRA would permit certain withholding of information. Creating a special classification outside of the APRA would not be in the interest of the public. Given the recent bridge debacle, the public's interest in knowing about safety and integrity is more paramount than ever in regard to all modes of transportation.

2. OPPOSE

Senate Bill No. 2957

As written, this does not define what a central office official is yet it also includes "all other school employees". A contractor likewise is not an employee. It is vague as to who specifically is an employee or not or what the distinctions are if all employees are covered in any event.

3. OPPOSE

Senate Bill No. 2712

RISP as a Division of the State should not be expected to be familiar with 39 different municipal ordinances that are only civil in nature and require their enforcement. In the case of Exeter, it would perhaps make sense but by and large most towns have their own departments and should fund their departments accordingly to perform such enforcement. In theory, you could have a municipality that prefers reasonable discretion in enforcing their civil municipal ordinances but empower another agency which takes a different approach creating a conflict in style and enforcement depending on the agency.

4. SUPPORT

Senate Bill No. 2154

The constitution provides protections against unreasonable searches and seizures. The search warrant process is designed to present reasonably articulable facts allowing a judge to use discretion in granting the authority to the state to execute a search.

5. SUPPORT

Senate Bill No. 2969

Time, manner, and place limitations may be placed on solicitations particularly when public safety is involved.

6. OPPOSE

Senate Bill No. 2056

This expands disqualification to non-violent offenders. The second amendment is a constitutional right just as the right not to self-incriminate, to have religious freedom, and to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. Any restrictions must be narrowly drawn and carried out in the least restrictive manner.

The right to self-defense does not stop. If someone has completed a sentence and is not charged with any violent crimes, there is a burden on the person to exercise their rights to self-defense by limiting them arbitrarily based on prior record alone. Under federal regulations, proposed rulemaking developed an apparatus to remedy to restore such rights to the nonviolent felons. In certain US circuits, the interpretation stands that nonviolent offenders cannot be dispossessed.

Respectfully submitted,

J Hirst

Cranston