



Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

## Fwd: Vote NO CF#13-0068 Ammunition Magazine Ban

1 message

**Sharon Dickinson** <sharon.dickinson@lacity.org>  
To: Etta Armstrong <etta.armstrong@lacity.org>

Tue, Aug 4, 2015 at 7:39 AM

Please upload to file. Thanks.

--

Sharon Dickinson  
Legislative Assistant  
Office of the City Clerk  
Council and Public Services  
Ph. (213) 978-1080  
Fax (213) 978-1040  
sharon.dickinson@lacity.org



Try the mobile version of LACityClerk Connect - Search Council Files, Ordinances and Contracts



With MyLA311, City of Los Angeles information and services are just a few taps away. Available for download from Google Play and App Store.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Matthew Weintraub** <mdw3006@aol.com>  
Date: Mon, Aug 3, 2015 at 3:48 PM  
Subject: Vote NO CF#13-0068 Ammunition Magazine Ban  
To: Clerk.AppFeedBack@lacity.org

I urge the Mayor to VOTE NO, and the Council to AMEND the bill CF#13-0068 regarding State-Regulated firearm magazines to allow CCW holders and law-abiding competitive shooters (if not all law abiding citizens) to continue to possess "high capacity" magazines, as provided by State Law.

The State of California has regulated the possession and sale of "high-capacity" firearm magazines since 2000, and has allowed legal possession of these items provided they were possessed prior to the year 2000. Criminal use of these items is already illegal, and is extremely rare in California, as they have not been available for purchase for 15 years. This new proposed statute will make criminals out of previously law-abiding citizens who have virtually no criminal history. The goal is to stop crime, not to create a new brand of criminal. Additionally, this bill will create criminals out of every resident of an "island city" in Los Angeles (Beverly Hills, San Fernando, West Los Angeles, Culver City, Inglewood, Santa Monica, etc) who drive through Los Angeles on their way to a shooting range or to another state to participate in a competition. Also, you will have created criminals out of everyone who drives on any interstate that transits through Los Angeles. This means anyone on I-5, I-405, I-10, I-110, I-210, CA-170 who are enroute to a training exercise, shooting competition or sporting event will become instant criminals. Is this what you intend?

Police officers are permitted to possess these magazines, but police officers are NOT first responders. We, the citizens who are victims of crimes are first responders. Officers only respond to reports of crime, and are hence, "second" responders. Why would you hamper us, your citizens who are victims of crimes with this legislation, but not hamper your own police officers. We need protection just as much as the police do, and

perhaps more. We don't have radios to call in "back-up", and we don't show up after a crime is committed and the criminal has left the scene. The crime is committed upon us.

This legislation is making a previously-legal item banned as a "nuisance". This constitutes a "taking" of property, without compensation. If this piece of legislation becomes law, the Council should set up a fund to reimburse residents who lose the use of a previously legal item.

I don't believe that these consequences are the intent of this "feel good", but misguided legislation. This type of legislation does not stop criminals from committing their crimes. Criminals, by definition, do not follow the laws on the books. They don't stop for police officers, they don't stop for traffic lights or stop signs, they steal cars and assault people. It is not fair to law abiding citizens to become enveloped in legal entanglements with this proposed law.

Please reconsider, amend or vote NO.

Recommendation:

However, if the goal of the Council is to reduce crime and focus on "high capacity", I suggest the council focus on criminal use of cars and gasoline.

Of much more criminal use are vehicles with "high capacity" gas tanks, that are used virtually with EVERY CRIME COMMITTED. Criminals don't take the bus to their crimes, neither do they take an UBER or a Taxi. They use cars. So, why not make the use of a car in the commission of a crime...a crime? And if you want to focus on "high capacity", think of the criminals who run from the police, endangering and threatening to kill virtually everyone they pass in traffic. These violent criminals run for miles with the use of many gallons of gas, but their criminal use of the vehicle would be reduced if gas tanks in Los Angeles were smaller. Perhaps a law reducing the capacity of vehicular gas tanks in the City of Los Angeles would reduce the radius of crimes, and would reduce the distance criminals run from the police. Wouldn't we all be safer then?

If this suggestion sounds absurd, compare it to the use of the controlled and already highly-regulated firearm magazine. I think you'll find a correlation that is hard to refute.

Please Vote NO, or reconsider and amend this misguided legislation.

Matt Weintraub

Chatsworth Neighborhood Councilmember but

NOT REPRESENTING the Neighborhood Council on this issue.