

S.C.O.P.E. Legal Update

April, 2024

SCOPE Annual Members Meeting

April 20, 2024 10:00 AM, Montour Falls Moose Lodge #426

2096 State Route 14 Montour Falls, NY 14865

The meeting is open to all SCOPE members in good standing. You must RSVP with the attached form.

Lunch will be provided

New York Lawmakers Propose shooting range restrictions

The pending bill in the Senate is called the Sporting Range Good Neighbor Act.

It would require skeet field tracts at shooting ranges to be at least 600 by 300 yards.

Also, it prohibits them from including wetlands or open water.

President of the Northern Tier Trap League John Bach says this could make it hard for those who practice the sport; some could even close.

The bill says these restrictions will prevent lead from bullets getting into the environment.

The Lewis County Board of Legislators is against it. It passed a resolution opposing the bill.

Meanwhile, some say this would also affect the next generation of clay target league athletes.

“When you look at those kids that are on school-sponsored teams, they get better grades in school, they have a lower dropout rate, they stay away from alcohol and drugs and tobacco,” said John Nelson, New York State High School Clay Target League.

(S)hooting ranges already have to meet restrictive guidelines to operate safely, costing them up to \$100,000, and that restrictions will cost thousands of dollars more.

The bill still sits in a Senate committee.

<https://www.wwnytv.com/2024/04/03/proposed-shooting-range-restrictions-come-under-fire/>

New York appeals court upholds 'red flag' law

A New York appeals court has upheld the state's "red flag" law against a legal challenge arguing that the gun confiscating process is unconstitutional.

In the decision, the Second Department of the Appellate Division said the red-flag law, which allows police to temporarily seize firearms belonging to individuals deemed a danger to themselves or others, doesn't violate the Second Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

"This regulation is consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearm regulation in keeping dangerous individuals from carrying guns and, therefore, is presumptively lawful," according to the opinion.

A lawyer for the plaintiff, Corey Monroe, told reporters his client is disappointed by the court's ruling and is discussing whether to seek further review by the state Court of Appeals.

"We strongly believe that New York's red flag law continues to lack sufficient and constitutionally-required procedural protections for people who might find themselves on the receiving end of such an order," Attorney Derek Andrews said in a statement.

https://www.oleantimesherald.com/news/new-york-appeals-court-upholds-red-flag-law/article_578d6940-e7b7-11ee-8d20-cf1ad8a33be4.html

NRA Asks SCOTUS to Hear New Concealed-Carry Case

The NRA recently filed an amicus brief asking the U.S. Supreme Court to hear a new case regarding our right to bear arms outside the home following the state of New York's reaction to the landmark decision in *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* (2022).

"In response to the NRA's victory in *Bruen*, which secured every American's right to carry arms, New York passed the 'Concealed Carry Improvement Act,' severely restricting carry throughout the state. The 2nd Circuit upheld many of those restrictions. (On March 27) NRA filed an amicus brief asking the Supreme Court to hear that case, *Antonyuk v. James*," wrote the NRA Institute for Legislative Action (ILA).

"Many NRA members wish to carry firearms for lawful purposes in the public places that the State now deems gun-free zones," reads the amicus brief.

[https://www.americas1stfreedom.org/content/nra-asks-scotus-to-hear-new-concealed-carry-case/#:~:text=The%20NRA%20recently%20filed%20an,Bruen%20\(2022\).](https://www.americas1stfreedom.org/content/nra-asks-scotus-to-hear-new-concealed-carry-case/#:~:text=The%20NRA%20recently%20filed%20an,Bruen%20(2022).)

Coalition wants New York City stun gun ban struck down

A coalition of gun rights groups are asking a judge to strike down New York City's ban on Tasers and stun guns, arguing that restrictions preventing civilians from owning electronic weapons are unconstitutional.

New York City Police began using them in 2008.

In a U.S. District Court filing, the Firearms Policy Coalition, Second Amendment say recent U.S. Supreme Court rulings striking down firearm restrictions make the city's ban illegal and ask a federal judge to block the city from enforcing the restrictions.

"The stun gun and Taser bans set forth in the Administrative Code and the Penal Law conflict directly with the Second Amendment's guarantee protecting the people's right to keep and bear arms for their protection," lawyers for the group wrote in the 22-page court filing. "A deprivation of Second Amendment rights is an injury that, by its very nature, is irreparable."

"New York City's ban on stun guns and tasers is one of the last in the country for one simple reason – nearly every court to review a challenge to such a law has struck it down," Cody J. Wisniewski, the FPC's vice president and general counsel, said in a statement. "It is clear under the Supreme Court's standard...that this sort of ban completely fails constitutional muster."

"New York City will simply be the next in a long line of governments that have been forced to cease enforcing a complete ban on electronic arms."

New York is one of a handful of states that outright ban private ownership of stun guns or Tasers. They are legal in nearby New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine and Rhode Island.

In most cases owners must be at least 18 years old and not have a felony record. In some cases a firearms permit is required, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.

<https://www.myhometowntoday.com/news/statewide/new-york/coalition-wants-new-york-city-gun-ban-struck-down>

Bill from GOP's Stefanik sets up duel on gun sales codes

A bill to be introduced by U.S. Representative Elise Stefanik and two other Republicans would bar the use of a new sales code for gun merchants, according to material seen by Reuters, setting up a clash with Democrats promoting the four-digit marker.

Visa and Mastercard have said they will comply with a California law requiring use of the code, according to letters sent to lawmakers.

The bill filed by Stefanik of New York, the fourth-ranking Republican in Congress, and by House members Andy Barr of Kentucky and Richard Hudson of North Carolina, would preempt state laws and prohibit networks from assigning codes distinguishing firearms retailers from general-merchandise or sporting-goods stores.

"The tracking of gun purchases is a violation and infringement on the Constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans," Stefanik said in a statement.

<https://www.reuters.com/world/us/bill-gops-stefanik-sets-up-duel-gun-sales-codes-2024-02-23/>

More New Yorkers are applying for gun permits. The NYPD won't say how many they granted.

The number of New Yorkers petitioning to arm themselves with guns — both at home and on the streets — more than doubled last year, according to new data on NYPD license and permit applications obtained by Gothamist.

But the NYPD will not say how many gun license and concealed carry permit applications it has approved, even as the department faces a class-action lawsuit claiming it takes too long to review applications.

John DeLoca, who owns the Seneca Sporting Range in Ridgewood...said his customers want to arm themselves because they feel unsafe when they see gruesome news stories like a subway conductor getting slashed in the neck or when they drive beside recklessly speeding cars.

<https://gothamist.com/news/more-new-yorkers-are-applying-for-gun-permits-the-nypd-wont-say-how-many-they-granted>

Congressman sounding alarm over gun buyback programs

New York City has a robust gun buyback program- perhaps the biggest in the country.

So, Congressman Dan Goldman of Lower Manhattan and Brooklyn is seeking to confirm New York City guns are being properly destroyed.

The cause for concern comes because of a growing industry where companies, including a popular one known as "Gunbusters" offer to destroy buyback guns for free. But they are not exactly destroying everything.

"What they do is they just remove the one part that is serialized and make it actually a weapon and then they'll re-package all the other parts and sell them online," Goldman said.

<https://pix11.com/news/local-news/congressman-sounding-alarm-over-gun-buyback-programs/>

US Supreme Court weighs NRA free speech fight with New York official

The U.S. Supreme Court on March 18 grappled with the National Rifle Association's claim that a New York state official violated its free speech rights by coercing banks and insurers to cut ties with it.

The NRA urged the justices to revive its 2018 lawsuit accusing Maria Vullo, a former superintendent of New York's Department of Financial Services, of unlawfully retaliating against it ..., telling the justices: "There's no question on this record that they encouraged people to punish the NRA."

Vullo in 2018 called upon banks and insurers to consider the "reputational risks" of doing business with gun rights groups following the Parkland shootings.

She later fined Lloyd's of London and two other insurers more than \$13 million for offering an NRA-endorsed product called "Carry Guard" that Vullo's office found was in violation of New York insurance law.

<https://www.reuters.com/legal/us-supreme-court-weigh-nra-free-speech-fight-with-new-york-official-2024-03-18/>

ACLU on NRA v. Vullo

More than 60 years ago the Supreme Court ruled that the First Amendment bars the government from coercing private entities to punish speech that the government disfavors. Just as the government can't directly punish or censor speech it disagrees with, it cannot do so indirectly by coercing private parties to do the same.

History underscores the importance of this free speech protection. Government officials have all too often enlisted private parties—from the White Citizens' Councils of the Jim Crow South to the blacklists of Communists in the McCarthy era—to punish those with whom they disagree. New York's efforts to punish the National Rifle Association, at issue before the Supreme Court in *National Rifle Association v. Vullo*, follow in the footsteps of those earlier censorship efforts.

The ACLU disagrees sharply with the NRA on many issues, yet we are representing the group in this case because of the First Amendment principles at stake. We argue that Maria Vullo, a New York state regulator, threatened to use her regulatory power over banks and insurance companies to coerce them into denying basic financial services to the NRA and, in Vullo's own words, "other gun promotion" groups. Vullo's threats were expressly based on her disagreement with the NRA's advocacy. And they worked. Several insurance companies and banks refused to work with the NRA out of fear of reprisals from New York regulators. The ACLU urges the Supreme Court to hold that coercing third parties to break ties with the NRA because of its advocacy violates the First Amendment...

<https://reason.com/volokh/2024/03/05/aclu-on-nra-v-vullo/>

Judge rules that lawsuits against social media can move forward in Buffalo massacre case

The families of those murdered in the racist mass shooting in Buffalo in 2022 can continue with their lawsuits against social media companies that they contend helped fuel the killer's racist hate.

A judge this week refused to dismiss the lawsuits against the social media companies, including Meta (Facebook), 4Chan, Reddit and YouTube. The social media companies had sought the dismissal.

Payton Gendron, who fatally shot 10 Black people at a Buffalo Tops supermarket in May 2022, was partly driven by his belief in what is known as the "white replacement theory," Erie County-based state Supreme Court Justice Paula Feroleto noted in her decision.

The families of the victims maintain that Gendron discovered the concept on postings in the social media universe, found like-minded racists, then set out on his murderous mission. The social media networks have done nothing to monitor and address content of the sort, the lawsuits contend.

The lawsuits allege that "Gendron became aware of this (replacement) concept from information and posts on defendants' platforms," Feroletto wrote. The social media companies, meanwhile, said that they were simple "third-party" hosts to the content and, under the law, would be immune from liability.

As the judge noted in her decision, the lawsuits [allege] that the social media platforms "are sophisticated products designed to be addictive to young users..."

<https://www.democratandchronicle.com/story/news/2024/03/21/lawsuits-against-social-media-in-buffalo-tops-shooting-allowed-to-move-on/73050663007/>

Federal Judge Rules Millions of NRA Members Exempt From ATF Pistol Brace Rule

A federal judge has blocked the ATF from enforcing its pistol brace rule for millions of members of the National Rifle Association (NRA) as the appeals process plays out.

It came after the NRA filed a lawsuit against the ATF, or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, arguing that the agency's rule to reclassify the brace-equipped pistols as short-barreled rifles is unconstitutional.

U.S. District Judge Sam Lindsay sided with the gun rights group, arguing that the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals already concluded that the ATF pistol-brace rule "fails the logical outgrowth test and violates" the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) and is "unlawful" under the act.

"The court, therefore, sees no reason why it should not consider this argument and APA claim in ruling on Plaintiff's Motion," the judge added. "To not do so would be exalt form over substance, particularly since the Fifth Circuit has already determined that this claim has a substantial likelihood of succeeding on the merits."

The judge agreed with the NRA's arguments that its members would be substantially harmed by the ATF rule, which was finalized in January 2023.

https://www.ntd.com/federal-judge-rules-millions-of-nra-members-exempt-from-atf-pistol-brace-rule_983596.html

Justice Department Launches the National Extreme Risk Protection Order Resource Center

The Justice Department launched the National Extreme Risk Protection Order (ERPO) Resource Center (the Center) which will provide training and technical assistance to law enforcement officials, prosecutors, attorneys, judges, clinicians, victim service and social service providers, community organizations, and behavioral health professionals responsible for implementing laws designed to keep guns out of the hands of people who pose a threat to themselves or others.

ERPO laws, which are modeled off domestic violence protection orders, create a civil process allowing law enforcement, family members (in most states), and medical professionals or other groups (in some states) to petition a court to temporarily prohibit someone at risk of harming themselves or others from purchasing and possessing firearms for the duration of the order.

Through the Center and its newly launched website, states, local governments, law enforcement, prosecutors, attorneys, judges, clinicians, victim service providers, and behavioral health and other social service providers will have direct access to critical information that will enhance their ability to reduce firearm homicides and suicides. The website will be maintained and updated to include newly developed resources for the field created through the Center, in partnership with BJA. The website also provides a platform for the Center to highlight emerging and promising practices in successful ERPO implementation and connect states and localities to innovative strategies to reduce gun violence and save lives.

<https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-launches-national-extreme-risk-protection-order-resource-center>

Kamala Harris Visits Parkland and Urges States to Adopt Red-Flag Gun Laws

At the site of the 2018 school shooting in Florida, the vice president announced federal help for states to limit weapon access

<https://www.nytimes.com/2024/03/23/us/politics/kamala-harris-parkland-guns.html>

Biden Decries Criminalization of Cannabis Consumers Even As He Insists They Have No Second Amendment Rights

In his State of the Union address this month, President Joe Biden declared that "no one should be jailed for simply using" marijuana or "have it on their record." He amplified that message on X (formerly Twitter) that night, saying, "No one should be jailed just for using or possessing marijuana." Biden said those things on the same day that federal prosecutors in North Carolina filed a brief defending the federal ban on gun possession by cannabis consumers, whom they likened to "lunatics" and violent felons.

Biden, who during his 2020 campaign promised to "decriminalize the use of cannabis," thinks marijuana users are not doing anything that justifies arresting them. Yet his Justice Department simultaneously insists marijuana users are so dangerous that they cannot be trusted with guns even when they are completely sober—so dangerous, in fact, that they are altogether excluded from "the people" whose "right to keep and bear arms" is guaranteed by the Second Amendment.

<https://reason.com/2024/03/20/biden-decries-criminalization-of-cannabis-consumers-even-as-he-insists-they-have-no-second-amendment-rights/>

Over 140 House Democrats Demand Ability to Block Veterans from Purchasing Guns

More than 140 House Democrats are demanding that the ability to bar veterans from gun purchases/ownership under certain circumstances be added back to the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

For decades, the VA has been reporting veterans to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS) for mental issues, and such issues include using a fiduciary to manage one's VA benefits. But this year, the Clinton-era gun ban was rolled back in the Senate by an amendment put forward by Sen. John Kennedy (R-LA).

Following the adoption of his amendment, Kennedy said, "Unelected bureaucrats shouldn't be able to strip veterans of their Second Amendment rights unilaterally. The Senate did the right thing for veterans and all freedom-loving Americans by passing my amendment today."

Democrats in the House are crying foul and demanding the gun ban be added back into the appropriations bill.

<https://www.breitbart.com/2nd-amendment/2024/03/15/over-140-house-democrats-demand-ability-block-veterans-purchasing-guns/>

Undocumented Immigrants Have Right to Own Guns, Judge Rules

U.S. District Court Judge Sharon Coleman of the Northern District of Illinois referenced lower court rulings in dismissing firearm possession charges against Heriberto Carbajal-Flores, who was illegally or unlawfully in the United States when he possessed a handgun in the Little Village neighborhood of Chicago on June 1, 2020.

"The Court finds that Carbajal-Flores' criminal record, containing no improper use of a weapon, as well as the non-violent circumstances of his arrest do not support a finding that he poses a risk to public safety such that he cannot be trusted to use a weapon responsibly and should be deprived of his Second Amendment right to bear arms in self-defense," Coleman, who was appointed under President Barack Obama, wrote in her eight-page ruling filed March 8.

Carbajal-Flores was charged under Title 18 of U.S. Criminal Code, which legally disallows undocumented individuals to possess firearms and ammunition "or to receive any firearm or ammunition which has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce."

<https://www.newsweek.com/undocumented-immigrants-have-right-own-guns-judge-rules-1880806>

US appeals court upholds gun bans as bail condition

A federal appeals court on (March 18) ruled that barring defendants out on bail from possessing firearms while they are awaiting trial was constitutional even after a landmark U.S. Supreme Court ruling in 2022 that expanded gun rights.

A three-judge panel of the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals rejected arguments by two defendants in California that the pretrial firearm restrictions violated their right to keep and bear arms under the U.S. Constitution's 2nd Amendment.

U.S. Circuit Judge Gabriel Sanchez, an appointee of Democratic President Joe Biden, said the disarmament of defendants awaiting trial was consistent with a tradition of subjecting criminal defendants to temporary restrictions on their liberty to protect the public's safety.

<https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/us-appeals-court-upholds-gun-bans-bail-condition-2024-03-18/>

Delaware's "Assault Weapon" Ban Argued in 3rd Circuit

The Third Circuit heard oral argument on March 11 in a challenge to Delaware's ban on so-called "assault weapons" and ammunition magazines that hold over 17 rounds. Three overlapping cases were consolidated for argument on appeal from the denial of a preliminary injunction. Before the Court got into the meat of the Second Amendment dispute, Judge Stephanos Bibas raised a question about the preliminary injunction standard as it applies in Second Amendment cases: do the plaintiffs need to show that every preliminary injunction factor weighs in their favor, or is it enough to show they are likely to succeed on the merits?

The Supreme Court refers to the preliminary injunction as "an extraordinary remedy" that requires plaintiffs to make a "clear showing" on four factors before being granted: (1) likelihood of success on the merits, (2) that they face irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction, (3) that the balance of the equities favor them, and (4) that the public interest would be served by the injunction. The plaintiffs in Delaware focused on the first point—that they were likely to show the laws they challenged violate their Second Amendment rights. Judge Bibas questioned whether that was enough.

<https://reason.com/volokh/2024/03/14/second-amendment-roundup-delawares-assault-weapon-ban-argued-in-3rd-circuit/>

Federal judge upholds Washington state gun industry accountability law

A federal judge has dismissed a challenge to a Washington state law that would hold gun makers and sellers accountable for preventing their products from getting into the wrong hands.

U.S. District Court Judge Mary Dimke on Friday dismissed the National Shooting Sports Foundation's complaint against Senate Bill 5078 in which it argued the bill is unconstitutional on First and Second Amendment grounds.

Washington Gov. Jay Inslee signed the act in April 2023, which holds firearms manufacturers and retailers accountable for putting "reasonable controls" -- such as screenings -- on the manufacture, sale, marketing and distribution of firearms.

Dimke said the Second Amendment does not "independently protect a proprietor's right to sell firearms."

https://www.upi.com/Top_News/US/2024/03/09/judge-dismiss-challenge-washington-gun-law/2041710007305/

Michigan shooting survivor files lawsuit against company that sells ghost guns

Guy Boyd's friend bought and assembled a ghost gun kit when the boys were 17 years old, created a firearm, and accidentally shot Boyd in the face. This week Boyd filed a lawsuit against the company that sold the kit.

https://www.cbsnews.com/detroit/news/michigan-shooting-survivor-files-lawsuit-against-company-that-sells-ghost-guns/?utm_campaign=nys-academy-of-trial-lawyers-eclips&utm_source=membercentralpublications&utm_medium=email&utm_content=march-13-2024

Federal appeals court upholds Rhode Island ban on high capacity magazines

A federal appeals court has upheld Rhode Island's 2022 law banning gun magazines that hold more than 10 rounds of ammunition, rejecting arguments by a group of gun owners that the legislation violated the Second Amendment.

The three-member panel of the Boston-based 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals on March 8 ruled that Rhode Island's ban was "consistent with our relevant tradition of gun regulation" in rejecting a challenge filed by a group of gun-rights advocates.

<https://rhodeislandcurrent.com/2024/03/08/federal-appeals-court-upholds-rhode-island-ban-on-high-capacity-magazines/>

California Violated the Second Amendment by Disarming People Based on Nullified Convictions

The state of California employed Kendall Jones as a correctional officer for 29 years and as a firearms and use-of-force trainer for 19 years. But in 2018, when Jones sought to renew the certificate of eligibility required for firearms instructors, the California Department of Justice (DOJ) informed him that he was not allowed to possess guns under state law because of a 1980 Texas conviction for credit card abuse. Jones committed that third-degree felony in Houston when he was 19, and his conviction was set aside after he completed a probation sentence.

According to the DOJ, that did not matter: Because of his youthful offense, which Jones said involved a credit card he had obtained from someone who falsely claimed he was authorized to use it, the longtime peace officer was permanently barred from owning or possessing firearms in California. That application of California law violated the Second Amendment, a federal judge ruled this week in *Linton v. Bonta*, which also involves two other similarly situated plaintiffs.

Like most jurisdictions, California prohibits people with felony records from buying, owning, receiving, or possessing firearms. That ban encompasses offenses that did not involve weapons or violence, and it applies regardless of how long ago the crime was committed. Federal law imposes a similar disqualification, which applies to people convicted of crimes punishable by more than a year of incarceration (or more than two years for state offenses classified as misdemeanors). But the federal law makes an exception for "any conviction which has been expunged, or set aside or for which a person has been pardoned or has had civil rights restored."

<https://reason.com/2024/03/01/california-violated-the-second-amendment-by-disarming-people-based-on-nullified-convictions/>

Florida House Passes Bill to Lower Legal Gun Purchase Age to 18

The Florida House passed legislation on Friday to lower the legal firearm purchase age from 21 to 18 years.

It was legal to buy a long gun in Florida at age 18 until shortly after the February 14, 2018, Parkland high school shooting. The legislature raised the minimum purchase age to 21 following that attack.

The NRA filed suit against Florida's increased legal purchase age, arguing that it violated the rights of 18-20 year-olds.

HB 1223 is designed to return the legal purchase age to 18.

<https://www.breitbart.com/2nd-amendment/2024/03/02/florida-house-passes-bill-lower-legal-gun-purchase-age-18/>

As the NRA struggles, the gun lobby has a new leader in D.C.

The NSSF, founded more than 60 years ago to promote hunting and recreational shooting, has grown into the country's largest firearms trade association. The organization spent more than \$5.4 million on federal lobbying last year, more than in any other year in its history and more than twice as much as the NRA, according to federal records.

The NRA — long seen as synonymous with the gun-rights movement — has struggled with declining membership and revenue, as well as internal scandals. The latest blow came when its longtime leader, Wayne LaPierre, was found liable for corruption in a New York court last month.

As the NRA cuts back on federal lobbying, its troubles have created an opportunity for other gun-rights advocates to expand — especially the NSSF.

The NSSF resists comparisons to the NRA, stressing that its trade association is just that — a group that represents gun manufacturers, retailers and other business interests, not gun owners themselves, as the NRA does.

But the two groups share many core positions, opposing universal background checks, “red flag” laws passed in more than 20 states and efforts to mandate safe storage of firearms.

Unlike trade groups representing other industries, the NSSF isn't just advocating for businesses; it is also protecting “the exercise of a constitutional right,” said Larry Keane, the NSSF's general counsel and chief lobbyist.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/nra-struggles-gun-lobby-new-leader-nssf-rcna140547>

America's first biometric 'smart gun' is finally here. Will it work?

After decades of failed attempts by other manufacturers to bring a reliable smart gun to market, Biofire, a Colorado-based startup, says it's shipping its first batch of 9 mm handguns equipped with fingerprint and facial-recognition technology by the end of the month. The company's smart gun is designed to serve a very specific purpose: a weapon that can be quickly accessed to defend against a home intruder, but that can't be used by anyone unauthorized, particularly children.

Gun control advocates have long seen biometric technology as a game changer for reducing gun violence, and Biofire has drawn their praise by emphasizing safety and the need to prevent children from accessing guns. At the same time, the company has built ties with the gun industry and opposes any government mandates to require biometric features in guns, trying to head off fears that the technology is a Trojan horse for gun control.

Leading gun-rights advocates ...have stressed that they do not oppose smart gun technology itself, but rather any government plan to use it as a means to control which types of guns can be sold.

Some have also raised the concern that smart guns could be disabled remotely, including by the government. Biofire says remote access to its gun is not possible.

<https://www.yahoo.com/news/america-first-biometric-smart-gun-193852870.html>

Gun Control Activists Admit They Overreacted to This Concealed Carry Case

Gun control advocates have spent the past two years losing their minds over the Supreme Court ruling in *New York State Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen*, a case that affirmed citizens' right to publicly carry a firearm for self-defense.

One of the commonly repeated criticisms of Bruen has been that the high court's ruling is dangerous because allowing ordinary peaceable citizens to carry concealed handguns in public would increase rates of gun violence.

In a strange twist of events, some of those same gun control advocates now admit—unintentionally and with no sense of irony—that violent crime rates are actually on the decline in those restrictive gun control states forced by Bruen to recognize the right to bear arms in public.

Giffords, a prominent gun control advocacy organization, previously condemned the Bruen decision as “extremist,” arguing that it would “drastically affect the safety of a large swath of the U.S. population” by “escalating gun violence, leading ever more people to feel unsafe in their own communities.”

Two years later, while retweeting an article that criticizes conservatives for asserting that President Joe Biden's failed border policies are partially responsible for an increase in crime rates (even though significant evidence suggests that this claim is false), Giffords now highlights a claim that crime rates are actually falling.

Gun control advocates can't seem to get their story straight. Crime rates often appear to increase or decrease depending on whichever is most useful to the gun control narrative.

The truth is that lawful gun owners—and concealed carry permit holders, in particular—have never been the driving force behind criminal gun violence. At the same time, the right to keep and bear arms in self-defense offers ordinary Americans significant protection against threats to life, liberty, and property.

Almost every major study has found that Americans use their firearms in self-defense between 500,000 and 3 million times annually, according to a 2013 report by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. In 2021, the most comprehensive study ever conducted on the issue concluded that roughly 1.6 million defensive gun uses occur in the United States every year.

<https://www.dailysignal.com/2024/03/12/gun-control-activists-admit-they-overreacted-to-this-concealed-carry-case/>

SCOPE Annual Members Meeting

April 20, 2024

10:00 AM



Montour Falls Moose Lodge #426

2096 State Route 14
Montour Falls, NY 14865

The meeting is open to all SCOPE members in good standing.
You must RSVP with the attached form.

Lunch will be provided

*Speakers to be announced
Bergara Timber Raffle drawing
Ruger Raffle Tickets*



Yes I will be attending the 2024 SCOPE Annual Members Meeting

No, I cannot attend, however I am committed to S.C.O.P.E.'s mission to Protect and Restore 2nd Amendment Rights here in New York State.

Please accept my donation of

\$50 _____ \$25 _____ \$10 _____ Other _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____ Phone _____

Email _____

RSVP is Required
And must be post marked
No later than
April 10th, 2024

Please return this form to:

SCOPE Member Meeting

PO Box 165
East Aurora, NY 14052

www.SCOPEny2a.org