

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 2:03:34 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kainoa Kaku	Testifying for Hawaii Rifle Association	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

My name is **Kainoa Kaku**, President of the **Hawai‘i Rifle Association**, and I respectfully submit testimony **in opposition to SB 2720**.

SB 2720 proposes to establish a Hawai‘i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund, funded through mandatory licensing and contribution requirements imposed on firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. While framed as a no-fault, public health financing mechanism, this bill effectively **reassigns public health costs to a single, lawful industry regardless of fault, conduct, or causation**.

Firearm injuries arise from a wide range of circumstances, including criminal acts, suicide, accidents, and misuse by third parties. SB 2720 explicitly acknowledges that manufacturers would bear financial responsibility without any finding of wrongdoing, while simultaneously asserting that the program is not punitive. In practice, this is a cost-shifting scheme that treats lawful commerce as a proxy for liability.

The bill grants broad rulemaking authority to the Department of Health to create “risk categories” based on product characteristics and aggregated injury data. This approach relies on generalized public health data rather than individual conduct and allows administrative agencies to assign financial burdens without clear statutory limits or legislative oversight. That is not transparency or fairness. It is regulatory uncertainty.

Although the bill states that it does not regulate firearm ownership or impose civil liability, its real-world effect will be to **increase costs, restrict availability, and reduce consumer choice** for lawful firearm owners in Hawai‘i. These costs will not remain with manufacturers. They will be passed on to local retailers and law-abiding residents who already comply with one of the most heavily regulated firearm systems in the nation.

Public health costs are a shared societal responsibility. Singling out one constitutionally protected industry to subsidize broad public expenditures sets a troubling precedent. If lawful products can be financially penalized based on third-party misuse, there is no principled limiting line.

Hawai‘i already has mechanisms to compensate victims of crime and to address violence directly. SB 2720 does not target criminal behavior, improve enforcement, or enhance

prevention. Instead, it creates a new administrative structure that expands government control while offering no clear evidence of improved public safety outcomes.

For these reasons, the **Hawai'i Rifle Association respectfully urges this Committee to reject SB 2720.**

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 9:58:56 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Wayne Asam	Testifying for Mid Pacific Pistol League	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

The Mid Pacific Pistol League writes to express its strong opposition to SB 2720.

This bill would establish a Firearm Injury Restitution Fund financed by licensed firearm manufacturers as a condition of participation in the marketplace. This structure effectively assigns financial liability to manufacturers for criminal acts that are entirely outside their control.

Imposing collective financial responsibility on lawful, regulated businesses for the misuse of legal products raises serious concerns regarding fairness, legal precedent, and economic impact. Such an approach risks setting a troubling standard that could be applied broadly to other industries without regard to fault or causation.

The Mid Pacific Pistol League supports policies that hold individuals accountable for criminal behavior, not those that impose indirect punishment on compliant businesses. SB 2720 fails to address the root causes of violence and undermines principles of fairness and lawful commerce.

For these reasons, the Mid Pacific Pistol League respectfully urges you to oppose SB 2720.

Sincerely,

Mid Pacific Pistol League

Board of Directors

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 3:32:52 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Nancy D Moser	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I support SB2720.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 4:39:46 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Michael I Rice	Individual	Oppose	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

I stand in **OPPOSITION** to this law as on its face it is a Violation of the Second Amendment, as well as Federal law. The ***Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act*** prevents Firearms Manufacturers and Dealers from being held liable for crimes committed with their products as well as accidents or other misconduct.

This is an attempt to blackmail manufacturers using illegal methods, plain and simple. Either you extort money from these companies or they simply decide not to do business in Hawaii, and would be a defacto ban on the Second Amendment to make it more difficult for one to acquire arms lawfully.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 7:49:10 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Chase Cavitt	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha I am writing to explain why SB2720 is absurd and unbelievably wrong. I oppose this bill and anything that puts blame on businesses for the actions of others. Firearms themselves do not cause any harm. People using them with a bad intention or improperly can. The same goes for everyone who drives a car, swings a baseball bat or works or cooks with a knife.

This bill was clearly rushed at the 11th hour to be submitted that the description had a spelling error. As it is written:

Establishes a Hawai'i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund funded by "licenses" firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. Provides no-fault, first-payer coverage for medical and related costs arising from firearm injuries.

What are Lincenses Firearm Manufacturers? The bill will fail legal standards that have been the precedent in this nation and is a joke to be even submitted and to have passed its first reading.

The goals of this legislative body are being ignored when attempting to pass bills like this and to waste the time of so many who think we are led by people with ill intentions for our state and country. I am opposed to this bill and would hope anyone with understanding of laws would see it as unfit for a potential law. If passed, SB2720 will cost this state millions of dollars in failed lawsuits and will be a burden on the people and not the licensed firearms manufacturers that it aims to cripple.

Mahalo,

Chase Cavitt

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 8:44:53 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Bronson Teixeira	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Senators of the committee, I stand in strong opposition to this bill. This bill attempt to shift blame to firearm manufacturers instead of individual accountability. It's like saying we should hold vehicle manufacturers liable for the actions of a drunk driver that has killed someone in an accident. Nope. Mahalo

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 8:46:04 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Steven T Takekoshi	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha and thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

I oppose this proposal.

There is civil process for restitution, there is no need for the State to become involved with paying restitution. More government requires more funding to feed the ever expanding bureaucracy, which goes against the stated legislative priorities of helping with affordability and lowering the cost of living here in Hawaii. Focus on that and stop introducing Nanny State legislation supported by Special Interest lobbyists who stand to gain from the growth of government. We are aware they "donate" to your campaigns thus they get preferential treatment, for once put the people of Hawaii first. Kill this proposal.

Again, mahalo for the opportunity and your attention.

Sincerely,

Steven Takekoshi

Waipahu, HI

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 9:01:25 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Richy Chang	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I, as a citizen of the State of Hawaii, submit this testimony to OPPOSE SB 2720

SB 2720 places financial liability on manufacturers for actions outside their control, raising concerns about fairness, legal precedent in affecting other industries and businesses UNRELATED to firearms, and economic impact on lawful businesses. Manufacturers and firearms industry businesses have no responsibility for a user to the safely handling and using firearms.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/30/2026 11:34:06 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Charles-Michael victorino	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I submit this testimony in opposition to SB2720.

This bill imposes a requirement on a single, lawful industry that is not applied to any other business operating in Hawai'i. There is no precedent for the State requiring a lawful manufacturer or seller to establish or contribute to a special fund as a condition of doing business. For example, automobile manufacturers are not required to provide or finance a fund for car crashes or traffic fatalities in order to operate in Hawai'i. Singling out one industry in this manner is inequitable and sets a troubling policy precedent.

SB2720 effectively assigns collective financial liability to lawful businesses for the criminal misuse of their products by third parties. This approach undermines basic principles of fairness and responsibility, and it does nothing to directly address criminal behavior or improve public safety.

Additionally, there is significant concern that any such fund would not be preserved for its stated purpose over time. History has shown that special-purpose funds are often raided or redirected to cover unrelated budget shortfalls. This makes the proposal not only unfair, but also unreliable as a long-term policy solution.

Public safety should be addressed through enforcement of existing laws and targeted interventions, not by imposing unique financial burdens on a single lawful industry or creating funds that may ultimately be diverted from their original intent.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose SB2720.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 12:15:02 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David Ruiz	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Dumbest bill ever! Hold people accountable not companies.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 4:13:12 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Alice Abellanida	Individual	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

I strongly oppose this bill. It is illogical and places unreasonable burden on businesses. Stop this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 4:36:33 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jon Abbott	Individual	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

I strongly OPPOSE SB2720.

This bill attempts to shift the blame and financial responsibility for criminal acts onto lawful firearm manufacturers. It falsely implies that manufacturers are culpable for crimes committed by third parties who misuse their products—despite those acts already being illegal under existing law.

This reasoning is fundamentally flawed. No such liability standard is applied to manufacturers of other lawful products commonly used in crimes, such as automobiles, cell phones, or footwear. We do not hold car manufacturers responsible for vehicular crimes, phone companies liable for criminal coordination, or shoe manufacturers accountable for aiding a getaway. Firearms should not be singled out for unequal treatment simply because they are politically unpopular.

The true and predictable effect of SB2720 is to impose excessive legal and financial burdens on firearm manufacturers and lawful consumers. By inviting endless litigation and liability exposure, the bill is designed to drive manufacturers out of the state and price law-abiding citizens out of exercising their legal rights.

SB2720 does nothing to deter criminals—who by definition do not follow the law. Instead, it punishes lawful businesses and responsible citizens while ignoring the real causes of crime. For these reasons, SB2720 should be rejected in full.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 4:42:19 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Justin Muneoka-Nagy	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill because you don't hold a car, a knife, or even a hammer manufacturer liable for a persons death/ injuries. A firearm is just another tool like everything else listed and the person using said tool to do harm should be the one paying the price.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 6:24:46 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mitchell H. Weber	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I OPPOSE SB2720!

Everytown should be financially responsible for this garbage, they can just spare some of the tax money the legislature fleeces us for.

Mitchell Weber

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 7:04:28 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
steven a kumasaka	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

companies should not have to pay to enter a free market...

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 7:50:21 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marcus Tanaka	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

OPPOSE

Can you name another industry that to do this? This is nothing but another attack on the 2nd amendment.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 7:52:42 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
William Lono	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I ***oppose*** SB2720, which would create a Firearm Injury Restitution Fund by requiring firearm manufacturers to pay to participate in Hawaii's market and use that money to cover medical and related costs from firearm injuries.

While the goal of addressing costs from injuries is understandable, SB2720 sets a no-fault financing system that effectively penalizes manufacturers for third-party misuse of firearms — even when they are not at fault.

This type of cost-allocation can lead to higher costs passed on to consumers, and it may unfairly target lawful businesses without clear evidence that it will meaningfully reduce firearm injuries or improve safety. Mandating industry contributions as a market requirement also raises concerns about fairness and legal liability.

For these reasons, **I urge a NO vote on SB2720.**

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 8:39:07 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Bryson	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

To whom this may concern,

this bill is an overstep of government and goes against the second amendment. Please oppose.

Mahalo

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 9:16:51 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Reid Oya	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing to strongly oppose SB2720, which would establish the Hawai'i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund by requiring firearm manufacturers to obtain licenses and pay fees as a condition of market participation in Hawaii, with those funds covering no-fault medical and related costs for firearm injuries. While addressing the costs of firearm injuries is a valid public health concern, this approach is flawed, likely ineffective, and imposes unfair burdens. Key concerns include:

1. Impractical and ineffective funding mechanism: Hawaii has a very small firearm market compared to the mainland. Few (if any) major manufacturers sell directly here or would find it economically viable to obtain a special license and pay fees just for our tiny share of the national market. This could lead manufacturers to simply exit the Hawaii market entirely, reducing lawful access to firearms and ammunition for residents without meaningfully funding the proposed restitution fund.
2. Unfair targeting of manufacturers: Firearm injuries stem from a wide range of causes—criminal acts, accidents, suicides, lawful self-defense, etc. Shifting costs exclusively to manufacturers (who have no control over misuse after sale) is arbitrary and punitive. It resembles failed attempts elsewhere to regulate firearms through litigation or fees, many of which have been struck down or proven unworkable.
3. Constitutional and legal issues: Imposing licensing and fee requirements as a condition of "market participation" raises serious interstate commerce concerns (U.S. Constitution Article I, Section 8) and could burden Second Amendment rights (post-Bruen scrutiny for regulations that indirectly restrict access). It also risks duplicating or conflicting with federal firearms regulations.
4. Better alternatives exist: If the goal is to cover injury costs, improve enforcement against illegal firearms/trafficking, invest in mental health/suicide prevention, or promote safe storage **education**. These target root causes more directly without creating new bureaucratic funds or driving lawful commerce away.

I urge the committees to reject SB2720. It is unlikely to generate significant revenue, could harm lawful firearm owners and dealers in Hawaii, and diverts focus from evidence-based violence prevention. Mahalo for considering my testimony. I respectfully request that this bill be defeated.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 9:35:10 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Trevor	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Every year you democrats violate the constitution especially the 2nd Amendment, when are you guys gonna stop? Actually stand up for the constitution like you were sworn in to do. It's a right not a privilege.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:22:00 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jarrold Goode	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill should not be passed. You cannot impose fees to gun manufacturers for gun related death. Most of your gun related deaths are from officer involved shooting or shooting done by individuals that shouldn't be in possession of a firearm which is majorly happening due to our judicial system allowing these multiple offenders of the hook and back in our communities. Instead of wasting millions of dollar on failed projects that use federal funds start cleaning up your communities and stop allowing these individual back on our streets. This bill needs to be struck down.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:29:00 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Wayne Asam	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to SB 2720.

This bill would establish a Firearm Injury Restitution Fund financed by licensed firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. This approach effectively assigns financial liability to manufacturers for actions that are entirely outside their control.

Holding lawful businesses responsible for the criminal misuse of legally sold products raises serious concerns about fairness, legal precedent, and economic impact. Firearm manufacturers already operate within a heavily regulated framework, and imposing additional financial burdens unrelated to wrongdoing sets a troubling standard that could extend to other lawful industries.

Public safety policy should focus on those who commit criminal acts, not on assigning collective financial punishment to compliant businesses. SB 2720 risks undermining lawful commerce while doing little to address the root causes of violence.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose SB 2720.

Sincerely,
Wayne Asam

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:34:07 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Debbie Wyand	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill. It makes no sense. This type of thinking could be applied to every business in hawaii. Car manufacturers, boat manufacturers, alcohol manufacturers.

This is just another block in the way of constitutional rights for Hawaii citizens. Stop making ridiculous demands.

i myself think there should be a fund for vaccine injuries so every pharmaceutical company should pay into it for any injuries or deaths. Netra dharma companies get complete immunity Make it make sense

SB 2720 would create a Firearm Injury Restitution Fund financed by licensed firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. This approach places financial liability on manufacturers for actions outside their control, raising concerns about fairness, legal precedent, and economic impact on lawful businesses.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:41:59 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mikhael Kobayashi	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

vote no

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:44:48 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Xander Asam	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

My name is **Xander**, and I am a **16-year-old sophomore in Hawai'i**. I am writing to respectfully oppose SB 2720.

This bill would require firearm manufacturers to pay into a restitution fund, even though they are not responsible for how criminals misuse products. That doesn't seem fair to me.

In school, I'm taught that people should be responsible for their own actions. Holding businesses financially responsible for crimes they didn't commit sets a precedent that doesn't make sense.

As a young person who will live with the long-term effects of these laws, I hope policies are written in a way that is fair and logical. For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you oppose SB 2720.

Sincerely,

Xander

Age 16, Sophomore

Hawai'i

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:47:04 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kai Asam	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

My name is **Kai Asam**, and I am writing to respectfully oppose SB 2720.

This bill would require licensed firearm manufacturers to fund a restitution program as a condition of doing business, regardless of whether they have any connection to criminal misuse of their products. This approach raises serious concerns about fairness and accountability.

Holding lawful, regulated businesses financially responsible for actions beyond their control sets a troubling precedent and risks unintended economic consequences. Responsibility for criminal acts should rest with those who commit them—not with compliant manufacturers operating within the law.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you to oppose SB 2720.

Sincerely,
Kai Asam

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 11:05:20 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Cliff mello	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Chair, Vice Chair, and Members of the Committee:

I submit this testimony in strong opposition to SB2720. While the bill is presented as a public safety measure, it establishes a new **Hawaii Firearm Injury Restitution Fund** that fundamentally shifts legal responsibility for firearm injuries onto manufacturers in a manner inconsistent with constitutional and statutory law.

SB2720 would impose a requirement that firearm manufacturers obtain a license and contribute to a Firearm Injury Restitution Fund as a condition of market participation, creating a form of strict liability payment obligation for all firearm injuries regardless of causation, fault, or illegal use.

This structure departs from established principles of tort law and constitutional protections. Under U.S. Supreme Court jurisprudence, the Due Process Clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments require that liability be tied to fault or culpable conduct. In *Texaco Inc. v. Dagher*, the Court reaffirmed that statutory liability schemes must rest on clearly articulated and constitutionally permissible grounds. SB2720's approach, imposing industry charges for injuries without proof of manufacturer fault, risks classifying lawful firearm production alongside inherently dangerous products with no basis in causation.

The bill's funding mechanism also raises serious questions under the Commerce Clause. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that state laws may not place undue burdens on interstate commerce or effectively regulate beyond state borders. In *Camps Newfound/Owatonna, Inc. v. Town of Harrison*, the Court struck down state statutes that burdened extraterritorial commerce without legitimate local benefit. SB2720 would effectively condition the market on regulatory fees that apply to all manufacturers, including out-of-state entities, without sufficient nexus to activities within Hawaii.

SB2720 conflates criminal and civil liability by imposing a no-fault financial obligation for any firearm injury, without requiring legal causation, wrongdoing, or negligence. This departs from well-established injury compensation systems in the U.S., which require proof of fault or strict product liability based on defective design or warning. In *Grimshaw v. Ford Motor Co.*, courts upheld product liability only where design defects posed unreasonable risks; SB2720 would require restitution for lawful, non-defective products used in unpredicted ways.

There is no persuasive evidence that such a fund would improve public safety. Rather than addressing the underlying causes of firearm misuse — such as criminal behavior, lack of enforcement, and failures in mental health systems — SB2720 shifts costs onto lawful producers with the expectation that funds will be used for injury compensation. This approach sets a dangerous precedent where the costs of injuries caused by unlawful conduct are socialized without accountability tied to culpable action.

From a practical standpoint, SB2720 could chill lawful commerce and discourage manufacturers from participating in the Hawaii market, effectively limiting lawful consumer access to firearms and related products. Any law that conditions market participation on punitive restitution risks legal challenge under both federal and state constitutions.

Public safety legislation must be constitutionally rooted, evidence-based, and narrowly tailored. **SB2720 fails these standards.** It imposes a broad financial scheme untethered from fault or traditional liability principles, burdens interstate commerce, and departs from established legal frameworks governing product liability and injury compensation.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Committee to oppose SB2720.

Mahalo for the opportunity to submit testimony.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 12:52:04 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Joshua Dodo	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Whom It May Concern,

I oppose SB2720 as it violates my constitutional rights for the 2nd Amendment: the right to keep and bear arms. As an Army Veteran, I swore to defend and protect the constitution of the United States and the American way of life. I rely on the 2nd Amendment to not only protect myself but my loved ones and property. Something that our forefathers have fought bravely and sacrificed themselves to protect these rights.

Mahalo for taking the time to hear my testimony.

Aloha,

Josh

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 12:53:07 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
kamakani de dely	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill!

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 12:56:28 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mallory De Dely	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill!

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 12:58:41 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Susan Dedely	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill!

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 1:01:48 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ryan Arakawa	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

There is no way that this approach which places financial liability on manufacturers for actions outside their control is constitutional and just a waste of the taxpayer money spent when this case is lost in court (AGAIN)

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 1:19:26 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Dennis Djou	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 2:11:50 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Brian Isaacson	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This is an extortional restriction of free trade of legal goods assigning practical fault to manufacturers of a legal product. When such a product is misused or used criminally, it is the sole fault and responsibility of the person whi misuses or uses the product criminally. Will other manufacturers whose products are misused in a similar fashion be required to establish such a fund? If not, then this is blatant discrimination against of class of legal manufacturers.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 2:23:49 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Kevin J. Cole	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I wish to say that I do not support this Bill. Once again members of the legislature are overreacting to events and overstepping their bounds. The law abiding people of Hawaii are not the issue when it comes to weapons for protection. If the government really wants to enhance public safety, they should focus their efforts on ensuring repeat offenders are not allowed back in public.

Concentrate on the crooks, not the citizens.

V/R

Kevin J. Cole, Mililani Col USAF Ret.

Article 1 Section 17 of the Hawaii State Constitution The “RIGHT TO BEAR ARMS”

A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms *shall not be infringed.*

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 3:04:48 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
John Terry	Individual	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

Written Testimony in Opposition to SB 2720

I respectfully submit this testimony in opposition to SB 2720.

SB 2720 proposes to create a Firearm Injury Restitution Fund financed by licensed firearm manufacturers as a condition of participating in the Hawaii market. While the goal of addressing firearm-related injuries is understandable, the mechanism proposed by this bill raises serious concerns regarding fairness, constitutional principles, and sound public policy.

The bill would impose financial liability on firearm manufacturers for actions and outcomes that are beyond their direct control. Manufacturers lawfully produce and distribute products in compliance with extensive federal and state regulations. Holding them financially responsible for the criminal misuse or negligent actions of third parties departs from long-standing legal principles that tie liability to direct wrongdoing or negligence.

From a constitutional perspective, this approach raises concerns related to due process and equal protection. Singling out a lawful industry for mandatory financial penalties without a showing of fault creates a precedent that weakens traditional standards of liability and fairness.

These concerns are particularly meaningful when viewed through Hawaii's historical and cultural lens. Traditional Hawaiian society emphasized kuleana—personal responsibility and accountability for one's own actions. Justice was grounded in balance and fairness, with responsibility placed on those who caused harm, rather than shifted to unrelated parties.

Imposing collective financial responsibility on manufacturers departs from these principles. While addressing violence and injury is an important goal, solutions should focus on those who commit harmful acts and on evidence-based prevention strategies, rather than on imposing indirect liability on lawful businesses.

Public safety is best served by policies that respect constitutional limits, uphold principles of individual responsibility, and direct resources toward proven interventions that reduce violence and support victims.

For these reasons, I respectfully oppose SB 2720 and urge lawmakers to carefully consider its constitutional implications, its alignment with Hawaii's cultural values of fairness and personal

responsibility, and the broader consequences of imposing liability disconnected from wrongdoing.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this testimony.

Respectfully submitted,

John Terry

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 3:09:48 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
GENER MACARAEG	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB2720.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 3:10:39 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
charles wei	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Gun manufacturers should not be held responsible for the use of the firearm and accessory. This would only drive the prices of legal firearms ownership and training with firearms. This also states that it doesn't matter if you're found criminally liable. Why should gun manufacturers have to 1, charge legal gun owners more. 2. Have to pay into a fund where a criminal gets hurt with a firearm now has a legal right to collect medical bills vs being held accountable for their actions.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 3:32:10 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David E Shormann	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

The life of the land is perpetuated in righteousness. Instead of bills like this, encourage others (yourself included) to repent and turn to Jesus, the only source of true righteousness. Encourage responsible gun ownership and self defense.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 3:53:58 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Elijah Tavares	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 4:18:22 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Raymond Ishii	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am strongly opposed to SB2720 as it is a bill that simply attempts to add to the bureaucracy and Cost to purchase a firearm In the state of Hawaii. If this bill is passed it will punish manufacturers of a legal product to pay an additional fee when they have done nothing wrong. The bill states the purpose is to set up another special fund Which will be used to help pay for medical expenses. However, the number one cause of death and serious injury in the state of Hawaii are automobile accidents, and knowing that the state does not require automobile manufacturers to have a special fund just in case their products cause injury or death.

This bill if passed will increase the bureaucratic burden small businesses already suffer in the state. And will needlessly Increase the cost of farms and ammunition in the state of Hawaii.

I am Opposed to this bill as written,

thank you

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 4:22:42 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Shyla Moon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 4:23:27 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Isaac Moon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 5:31:06 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marlon Calventas	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 6:58:24 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Bradford Davis	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I do not support this legislation because it erodes personal freedoms of law abiding citizens.

Respectfully,

Bradford Davis

This bill will Conflict With Existing Federal Law

by Conflictting With the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA)

The bill expressly claims compliance with **15 U.S.C. §§ 7901–7903 (PLCAA)**, but **substance matters more than labels**.

What PLCAA prohibits

PLCAA bars states from imposing liability or penalties on firearm manufacturers for:

- Harm caused by third-party misuse of firearms
- Lawful products functioning as intended

Why SB 2720 may conflict anyway

- The bill **forces manufacturers to pay for injuries caused by criminal, accidental, or self-inflicted acts** regardless of fault

SB2720_also

- Contributions are **explicitly tied to firearm injury costs**, not defective products
- This functions as a **financial penalty based solely on lawful commerce**

Federal courts have repeatedly held that **states may not do indirectly what Congress forbids directly**. Calling it “economic regulation” does not change its effect.

Key issue:

➡ The bill **recreates PLCAA-barred liability through a mandatory funding scheme**, which courts will view as preempted by federal law.

B. Dormant Commerce Clause Concerns

The bill conditions **market participation** on a state-issued license and recurring payments

SB2720_

.

Problems:

- Out-of-state manufacturers must comply with Hawai‘i-specific cost schemes
- The state sets **risk categories and contribution formulas by rule**, not statute
- This can **discriminate against or burden interstate commerce**

Courts often strike down state laws that:

- Regulate national markets piecemeal
 - Create inconsistent obligations across states
-

2. How the Bill Limits the Right to Keep and Bear Arms (Second Amendment)

Even though the bill says it does not regulate possession or ownership, with **constitutional analysis looks at real-world effects**, not disclaimers.

A. Increased Firearm Costs

Manufacturers will pass mandatory contributions on to consumers through:

- Higher firearm prices
- Higher dealer costs
- Reduced availability of certain firearms

This mirrors historical “poll tax” logic:

➡ **Making the exercise of a constitutional right more expensive is still a burden.**

Under *Bruen*, courts must ask:

Is there a historical tradition of imposing special taxes or fees on exercising the right to bear arms?

There is **not**.

This bill will create Market Exit and Reduced Access

Smaller manufacturers may:

- Decline to sell into Hawai‘i
- Reduce product offerings
- Avoid “high-risk” firearm categories defined by the state the state could say any gun that holds more than 2 bullets is “high risk”

This leads to:

- Fewer lawful choices

- Artificial scarcity
- De facto bans without legislation

Courts have ruled that **laws causing widespread market withdrawal can violate the Second Amendment even without direct bans.**

The Bill Limits the Right to Purchase Firearms by

A. Licensing as a Gatekeeper because

No manufacturer may sell in Hawai'i without a **Firearm Injury Cost Recovery License**

SB2720

Key concerns:

- License denial or revocation **halts lawful commerce**
- Contributions are adjustable at agency discretion
- Manufacturers must comply **before any firearm ever reaches consumers**

This will create an **administrative choke point** between citizens and constitutionally protected goods.

Also It allows for . Unbounded Agency Power

The Department of Health will

- Defines “risk categories”
- Sets contribution rates
- Adjusts payments via actuarial reviews
- Enforces compliance administratively

SB2720_

This allows for

- Policy shifts without legislative votes
- Escalating costs over time
- Political pressure disguised as “public health”

Courts are very skeptical when **core rights depend on agency discretion rather than clear statutory limits.**

So to summarize (Plain-Language)

- **Yes**, this bill likely conflicts with federal law despite claiming compliance.
- It also will show to the courts Hawaii appears to **circumvent PLCAA** by imposing i liability without calling it liability.
- It **raises the cost of exercising a constitutional right**, which courts have repeatedly rejected.
- It **limits access and availability** of firearms through indirect economic pressure.
- It creates an **administrative gatekeeper** between citizens and protected arms.
- Under *Bruen*, there is **no historical tradition** supporting this kind of burden.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 7:23:59 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Brandon Santiago	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB 2720. When a crime is committed, all liability should be put on the criminal. This bill does nothing to protect the law abiding or reduce crime.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 8:43:14 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Victor Muh	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose SB2720. SB2720 is unfairly biased against firearms. There are much more dangerous products on the market that should be first in line, if Hawai'i were to institute such a fund. Alcohol comes to mind. How about motor vehicles? Start there and then we can have a debate about applying this to firearms.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 8:48:13 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Michael A. Cobb Jr	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill. The manufacturers of products are not responsible for the use of their products.

Husky is not responsible if I smash my finger with a hammer.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 9:06:20 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Seth Proctor	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 9:21:31 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
William Buttler	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

TO: The Honorable Chair Carol Fukunaga, Vice Chair Chris Lee, and Members of the Committee on Public Safety and Military Affairs

FROM: William Buttler

DATE: January 31, 2026

RE: STRONGEST OPPOSITION to SB 2720 (Relating to Firearms)

Honorable Chair Fukunaga, Vice Chair Lee, and Committee Members,

I am writing to express my firm opposition to SB 2720. While this bill is framed as a restitution fund, its practical effect is to create an unconstitutional financial barrier that targets law-abiding citizens while doing nothing to deter criminal activity.

I oppose this measure based on the following:

Artificial Price Hikes: By requiring manufacturers to pay for expensive licensing fees as a condition of selling in Hawaii, this bill forces companies to pass those costs directly to the consumer. These significant price hikes make it harder for the average Hawaii resident to exercise their Second Amendment rights. A constitutional right should not be restricted only to those who can afford a "pay-to-play" system.

Criminals Do Not Follow Laws: Criminals do not buy their firearms through licensed manufacturers or pay restitution fees. This fund will be built entirely on the backs of law-abiding citizens who follow every safety regulation and legal requirement. This bill punishes the peaceful for the actions of the violent.

Targeted Financial Burden: In *NYSRPA v. Bruen* (2022), the Supreme Court emphasized that the Second Amendment is not a "second-class right." Creating unique, targeted financial hurdles that do not apply to other goods and services creates an unconstitutional "chilling effect" on a fundamental right.

Violation of Precedent: The Supreme Court has historically viewed taxes or fees that specifically target the exercise of a constitutional right as inherently suspect (e.g., *Minneapolis Star &*

Tribune Co. v. Minnesota Commissioner of Revenue). SB 2720 singles out the Second Amendment for a financial burden that is not shared by other industries.

The State should not be in the business of pricing its citizens out of their constitutional protections. This bill will only ensure that self-defense becomes a luxury for the wealthy while doing nothing to stop gun violence.

Sincerely,

William Buttler

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 9:28:18 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Alison T Wolford	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Alison Wolford, and I respectfully submit testimony **in opposition** to this measure establishing a Hawai'i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund funded through licensing firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation.

This proposal **imposes financial liability on lawful manufacturers and consumers for actions they did not commit**, regardless of fault. Firearm manufacturers already operate within one of the most heavily regulated industries in the country. Holding them financially responsible for criminal misuse or accidents—without any showing of negligence—sets a troubling precedent that undermines basic concepts of fairness and personal responsibility. I can only see this measure being proposed so that manufacturers will choose to limit Hawaii's market, either taking their product out of our state and/or increasing costs which again will only be passed on to the consumers who are lawfully exercising their constitutional rights.

This bill **fails to address root causes** of firearm-related injuries, such as mental health crises, substance abuse, domestic violence, and repeat acknowledgment of criminal behavior. Redirecting focus toward prevention, education, enforcement of existing laws, and community-based interventions would be far more effective and fiscally responsible.

Policies like this risk **normalizing the erosion of constitutional protections through indirect financial pressure**, rather than transparent regulation. Using restitution funds to discourage lawful activity should concern all residents, regardless of where they stand on firearms policy.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Committee to **oppose this measure** and instead focus on solutions that enhance public safety without unfairly penalizing lawful businesses and responsible citizens.

Respectfully,
Alison Wolford

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 10:58:57 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lee Uchiyama	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 1/31/2026 11:59:53 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Robert Doi	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Good Evening,

I am submitting testimony in opposition to this bill. Simply put, you're targeting gun makers to make them fiscally liable for any damages incurred by use of a firearm. That is just preposterous. Do you have one for automobile makers for victims for Drunk Driving, Hit and Run and so on? And let's be honest here, cars have killed more way more people here in Hawaii last year than firearms. If you believe this bill will solve anything it's disingenous and facetious at best.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 5:28:07 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Andrew J. Vioria	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill, SB2720, would create a “Firearm Injury Restitution Fund” financed by licensed firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. Giving manufacturers financial liability for actions outside of their control will raise concerns about fairness, legal precedent, and economic impact on lawful businesses while doing nothing to address the root causes of violent firearm-related crime. Instead of punishing firearms manufacturers, address the root issues of crime by going after criminals and repeat offenders in our state and implementing harsher penalties for them.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 7:44:14 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Samuel Webb	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill, because it is only to punish company's that sell their products in this state.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 7:46:26 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ryan Bell	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I do not support SB2720

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 8:24:08 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jennifer Cabjuan	Individual	Oppose	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

Oppose this bill. Why would we use our Hawaii taxpayer money on this cause? Stop wasting our \$\$ and focus on fixing real problems in our Hawaii. Oppose this wasteful bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 8:32:34 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Gabriel Kekauoha	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

You can't place blame on manufacturers for a criminals actions.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 8:44:10 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Winfrey Pablo	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I am opposed to SB2720,

The creation of Firearm Injury Restitution Fund financed by licensed firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. This approach places financial liability on manufacturers for actions outside their control, raising concerns about fairness, legal precedent, and economic impact on lawful businesses.

Consequences that SB2720

-Financial Liability for Manufacturers: Licensed firearm manufacturers would be required to contribute to a new state fund as a condition of participating in the Hawai'i market.

-Funding for Medical Costs: The fund is designed to provide "no-fault, first-payer coverage" for medical and related costs arising from injuries caused by firearms.

- Administrative Oversight: The bill authorizes administrative review for manufacturers to contest their assigned risk category, the calculation of their contributions, or compliance determinations.

-Administrative Proceedings: Proceedings under this bill are structured to be Administrative in nature and do not directly constitute adjudication of civil or criminal liability.

-Market Impact: By making contributions a condition of "market participation," the bill may lead to changes in which manufacturers choose to sell firearms in Hawai'i.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 9:17:33 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Katherine Muhs	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

I'm writing in support of SB2720. A Firearm Injury Restitution Fund is a great idea! If gun manufacturers and gun owners want to profit/benefit from firearms, it's only fair that the public has a pathway for restitution when firearm offenses are committed against them. If the people of Hawaii have rights without responsibility and accountability, everything runs amok.

Please pass this bill.

Sincerely,

Katherine Muhs, Keaau, HI

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 9:22:37 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Marko Mijuskovic	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

1. Creates a De-Facto Tax on the Exercise of a Constitutional Right

SB2720 forces firearm manufacturers to pay into a state-controlled “injury restitution fund” as a condition of selling firearms in Hawai‘i.

Even though the bill insists it is “not a penalty,” the effect is unmistakable:

- Manufacturers must pay the State **for injuries they did not cause**
- The cost will be passed directly to consumers
- This becomes a **financial barrier to acquiring firearms**

The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the government **cannot impose special taxes, fees, or financial burdens on the exercise of a constitutional right.**

This bill does exactly that.

2. Violates the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA)

The bill tries to avoid PLCAA by claiming:

“This is not civil liability.”

But the structure is functionally identical to the types of liability PLCAA prohibits:

- It assigns financial responsibility for **third-party criminal misuse**
- It forces manufacturers to pay for injuries **they did not cause**
- It conditions market access on accepting this financial burden

PLCAA forbids states from doing indirectly what they cannot do directly.

SB2720 is an attempt to **circumvent federal law** through a licensing scheme.

3. Creates a State-Controlled Pricing System for Firearms

The Department of Health is empowered to:

- Create “risk categories”
- Assign contribution rates
- Adjust those rates at any time
- Cap contributions based on “in-state revenue”
- Conduct audits
- Reclassify products

This gives the State the power to **financially manipulate the firearm market**, raising prices at will.

This is unprecedented economic control over a constitutionally protected product.

4. Establishes a Financial Punishment for Lawful Commerce

The bill claims to be “economic regulation,” but the structure is punitive:

- Manufacturers must pay for **accidental, self-inflicted, criminal, and unintended** injuries
- No other industry is treated this way
- The fund is a **first payer**, meaning it pays before insurance
- Manufacturers are forced to subsidize the entire cost of firearm-related injuries statewide

This is not neutral regulation — it is a **targeted financial burden** on a single lawful industry.

5. Creates a Dangerous Precedent for Regulating Other Rights

If the State can impose a financial restitution fund on firearms, it could theoretically do the same for:

- Free speech (e.g., “misinformation harm fund”)
- Vehicles (“traffic injury restitution fund”)
- Alcohol (“alcohol injury restitution fund”)

This bill opens the door to **rights-based taxation**, which is constitutionally unacceptable.

6. The “Risk Category” System Is Vague and Abusable

The Department of Health can classify firearms into “risk categories” based on:

- “Objective product characteristics”
- “Aggregated public-health cost data”

This is dangerously broad.

It allows the State to:

- Label certain firearms as “high risk”
- Assign them higher contribution rates
- Financially pressure manufacturers to stop selling certain models

This is a **backdoor method of banning disfavored firearms** without passing a ban.

7. The Bill Forces Manufacturers to Fund Injuries Caused by Criminals

The fund covers:

- Criminal shootings
- Accidental shootings
- Suicides
- Any discharge of a firearm

Manufacturers are being forced to pay for:

- Crimes they did not commit
- Misuse they did not cause
- Injuries unrelated to product defects

This is the exact type of liability PLCAA was designed to prevent.

8. Creates a State-Run Insurance Scheme Without Calling It Insurance

The bill describes the fund as:

- “No-fault”
- “First payer”
- Covering medical care, mental health, rehab, lost wages, funeral costs

This is **insurance**, but:

- It is mandatory
- It is imposed only on one industry
- It is not regulated as insurance
- It bypasses insurance law entirely

This is a **shadow insurance mandate** disguised as a licensing requirement.

9. Violates Due Process Through Mandatory Participation

Manufacturers must:

- Participate in the fund
- Pay whatever the State demands
- Accept reclassification
- Accept actuarial adjustments
- Accept audits

Failure results in:

- License denial
- License suspension
- License revocation

This is coercive economic regulation that deprives manufacturers of due process protections.

10. Will Dramatically Increase Firearm Prices for Hawai'i Residents

Manufacturers will pass the cost to:

- Distributors
- Retailers
- Consumers

This means:

- Higher firearm prices
- Higher ammunition prices
- Reduced access for low-income residents
- A disproportionate burden on lawful owners

This is a **financial barrier to exercising a constitutional right**

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 9:29:25 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Barbara Gomes	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

As a long time resident of Hawaii, I support this bill to help our Hawaii residents who have been or will be affected by gun violence. This is an important step to hold gun manufacturers accountable. Thank you for your consideration.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 10:02:18 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Craig Woodward	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha,

The [Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act](#) (PLCAA), enacted in 2005, is a U.S. federal law that shields gun manufacturers, distributors, and dealers from most civil liability lawsuits when their products are used in crimes. It prohibits lawsuits against the firearm industry for criminal misuse of their products, aiming to prevent "frivolous" litigation.

This "Restitution Fund" would be illegal to enforce and only raise the cost of firearms and ammo for the people of Hawaii, I know personally people who want to own firearms but can't because of and have to save up in order to buy a firearm for defense. This tax would further increase the cost because the manufacture would pass on the cost to the consumer.

Thank you,

Craig

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 10:17:54 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Judith White	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

As a mental health professional for 30+ years, I have witnessed first hand the lived trauma of gun violence survivors. This is only made worse when these individuals cannot access the care they need to recover, due to financial barriers. This bill is a good step toward rectifying that. Please pass!

Judith C. White, Psy.D.

Kapaa Clinical Psychologist

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 10:24:55 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Domenick Taylan	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Members of the Committee, I am respectfully submmiting this testimony in opposition Senate Bill 2720.

Though the intent of this Senate Bill is to cater public costs relating to firearm injuries, does not neccassarily stop the root causes of violence in the state of Hawaii.

SB 2720 does not appear to reduce gun violence nor improve public safety. I believe that firearms manufactureres does not have any part of it. Instead we should blame improper use of firearms such as criminals misuse endangering innocent lives. This bill only prioratizes reallocating cost after harm has taken place as opposed to investing in proven prevention strategies such as mental health services, violent prevention as a community, and enforcement against criminal activies such as illegal firearm trafficking.

Second, this bill can potentially affect local firearm businesses and manufacturers which they do not have to control of firearm misuse. Manufacturers operate under extensive federtal and state regulation. Requiring them to contribute to a restitution fund regardless of who is at fault, it creates a system in which bussinesses are charged for the action of third parties. It raises concerns about fairness and due process.

SB 2720 creates vague and potentially arbitrary financial requirements that introduce uncertainty for businesses, discourage lawful commerce, reduce competition, and raise costs for consumers particularly impacting small businesses and individuals who lawfully use firearms without clear evidence of a public safety benefit.

For these reasons, I repectfully urge the Committee to reject Senate Bill 2720 and pursue policies that meaningfully improve general public safety while respecting fairness, accountability, and the rights of law-abiding citizens.

Mahalo for the the opportunity and your time to read my testimony and for your consideration.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 10:36:40 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Terriann Mohideen	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha Chair Fukunaga, Vice Chair Lee and members of the committee: I live on O‘ahu and I urge you to support this bill. If you watch the local news, you see an uptick in gun violence in our state. We see it perpetrated against the people who live here, our keiki, and our brave law enforcement officers as well. Every other type of company in the US can be sued if something bad happens with its product or if they market it irresponsibly- a car, a medication, a vaccine, even a toy. But gun manufacturers, thanks to a gun lobby sponsored federal law, are the only ones in the US that get protection from being sued and free reign to make however dangerous a weapon they want and for marketing it in however irresponsible way they want. For example, they make Glock handguns that can be easily be converted to machine guns and they also market in a really irresponsible way, even to keiki nowadays - if your young child wants an AR 15 with pink accessories, they sell it and they market it to those keiki! We tax payers end up picking up the pieces for the money spent in medical care (on the day and long-term), increased law enforcement costs to deal with investigating and prosecuting, increased costs in our court system, "hardening" our schools and buildings, hiring school security offers, not to mention the broken lives and families. Please pass this law. We taxpayers are tired of paying for gun companies who make billions in this country, off our backs. Mahalo for your consideration.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 10:38:04 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Andrew Namiki Roberts	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Testimony in Opposition to SB2720

Hawai‘i Firearms Coalition respectfully submits testimony in opposition to SB2720.

While this bill is framed as a public health financing measure rather than a restriction on firearms, its structure and effect raise serious legal, policy, and constitutional concerns. SB2720 seeks to impose a mandatory cost-recovery scheme on firearm manufacturers for injuries caused by third-party misuse, accidents, or self-harm, regardless of fault, negligence, or unlawful conduct by the manufacturer.

Although the bill expressly disclaims civil liability and punishment, it functionally operates as a liability substitute. Conditioning market participation on mandatory payments tied to aggregate injury data shifts public costs onto a lawful industry for conduct it does not control. This approach conflicts with long-established principles that responsibility for criminal or negligent misuse rests with the individual actor, not the manufacturer of a lawful product.

The bill also raises serious concerns under federal law. Congress enacted the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act to prevent states from imposing liability, directly or indirectly, on firearm manufacturers for harms caused by third parties. Recharacterizing liability as a licensing fee or restitution fund does not change its substance. Courts look to practical effect, not labels, and SB2720 risks being viewed as an impermissible end-run around federal protections.

From a policy standpoint, SB2720 sets a troubling precedent. If manufacturers of constitutionally protected products may be required to subsidize injuries arising from misuse or criminal acts, there is no principled limiting rule. This logic could be extended to automobiles, alcohol, pharmaceuticals, or other lawful products, transforming public health costs into industry-specific taxes untethered from fault.

Additionally, the bill grants broad discretion to the Department of Health to classify firearms into “risk categories” and assign contribution rates through rulemaking. These determinations would be made without direct legislative standards and could result in arbitrary or politically driven classifications that affect market access, consumer choice, and pricing in Hawai‘i.

Finally, SB2720 risks significant unintended consequences. Increased compliance costs will be passed on to consumers, reduce lawful market participation, and further isolate Hawai‘i from

national supply chains, all without evidence that the proposed fund will reduce violence or improve public safety outcomes.

Hawai‘i already has mechanisms to compensate crime victims and address public health needs. SB2720 does not address misuse, criminal behavior, or enforcement gaps. Instead, it reallocates costs in a manner that undermines legal accountability principles and invites extensive litigation.

For these reasons, Hawai‘i Firearms Coalition respectfully urges the Legislature to reject SB2720.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 10:47:58 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Tyler Ubias	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:15:16 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Theo-Den Boncales	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

SB2720 imposes an unconstitutional financial burden on the exercise of Second Amendment rights by forcing firearm manufacturers to pay into a statecontrolled restitution fund as a condition of selling firearms in Hawai‘i. Although the bill claims not to impose liability, it effectively assigns manufacturers financial responsibility for accidental, selfinflicted, and criminal firearm injuries they did not cause. This structure conflicts with the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act and creates a defacto tax on a constitutionally protected product. The bill grants the Department of Health sweeping authority to classify firearms into “risk categories,” set contribution rates, and adjust those rates at will, enabling the State to manipulate firearm pricing and indirectly restrict access. This unprecedented economic regulation will raise firearm prices for Hawai‘i residents, disproportionately burden lawful owners, and establish a dangerous precedent for taxing constitutional rights. SB2720 is not a publichealth measure — it is a targeted financial penalty on lawful commerce and should not advance.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:24:05 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Shannon	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

It is my prediction, based on past related actions, that this bill will actually result in costing the state's tax payers more money, since gun manufacturers have the funding and support to fight these impositions in court. Additionally, I would like to see a break down of these supposed "direct and indirect costs" and a conversation which analyses how they have become so expensive. Perhaps there is a need for more oversight, not more funding.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:28:23 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Erica Yamauchi	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Testimony in Support of SB 2720

Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the committee:

My name is Erica Yamauchi, and as a mother, small business owner, state employee and gun violence survivor, I am writing to express my strong support for Senate Bill 2720.

Firearm injuries impose massive costs on Hawaii's taxpayers, public hospitals, and families. SB 2720 addresses this crisis through a commonsense, no-fault public health financing mechanism to create the Hawai'i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund, which would operate as a first payer for medical care, mental health treatment, rehabilitation, lost wages, and funeral expenses for firearm injury victims. Unlike existing programs that act as payers of last resort, this fund would provide immediate support when families need it most.

SB 2720 requires firearm manufacturers to obtain a license and contribute to the fund based on risk categories tied to public health data. This isn't about blame or punishment; it's economic regulation that allocates a portion of public costs to the industry profiting from firearm sales in our state.

This bill would ensure no future victim faces the impossible choice between medical care and financial ruin.

Hawai'i's geographic isolation and limited trauma capacity make us especially vulnerable to these costs. SB 2720 protects taxpayers while ensuring survivors get the care they need and deserve.

I urge you to support this bill. For those who bear the physical and financial scars of gun violence. For our overstretched public health system. And for a more just allocation of the true costs of more and more firearms in our community.

Mahalo for your consideration and the opportunity to testify.

erica yamauchi

Kaimukī/Wilhelmina Rise

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:31:20 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jerry Yuen	Individual	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

I oppose SB2720 on the grounds that is another pay to play scheme that forces manufactures to pay to to business in Hawaii on top of the other taxes and fees they pay to the State. Manufacturers already supply warning literature and instructions for each firearm produced. They should not be held liable or forced to pay for misuse of their products.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:33:02 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
ryan hopf	Individual	Oppose	In Person

Comments:

I OPPOSE SB2720. This is a blatant violation of multiple State and US Supreme Court rulings that prohibit maufacturers from being sued as a result of the misuse of thei products. This is a clear attempt to blame the guns for crime, instead of the person committing the crime. This bill would affect me in other ways as well.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:42:23 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Chester Holt	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

If we are unable and unwilling to hold car manufacturers liable for vehicle collisions than the same should be for gun manufacturers.

This would immediately be challenged in court and ultimately be struck down by the federal "Protection of lawful commerce and arms act" 15 U.S CODE CHAPTER 15

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:47:03 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Justin Arnold	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This is ABSURD! Are we going to hold car manufactureres responsible for drunk driver fatalities? How about Pharmaceutical companies accountable for misuse of their products? The clear and astonishing agenda of the Anti-gun groups is evident. The whole "punish the law abiding citizens and price them out of participation" is clearly the plan here and it will not be stood for.

OPPOSE! and a message to the politicians who continually push legislation like this, keep it up, your career in politics here will come to an end. The voters will have their say.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 12:16:15 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lily Villarin	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 12:18:18 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Michael Villarin	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 12:39:13 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
davin asato	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

My name is Davin Asato and I am a resident of Kahului, Maui. I am writing to express my **strong opposition to SB2720**, which seeks to impose a "cost recovery" fee on firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation in Hawaii.

SB2720 attempts to hold manufacturers financially responsible for the criminal misuse of their products by third parties. This is fundamentally inconsistent with American commerce:

- **The "Ford" Comparison:** We do not require automobile manufacturers to pay into a restitution fund for injuries caused by drunk drivers, nor do we tax cutlery manufacturers to pay for knife-related crimes.
- **Targeting Lawful Industry:** This bill penalizes a legal, highly regulated industry for the actions of individuals who break existing laws. It shifts the financial burden from the perpetrator of a crime onto the manufacturer of a lawful product.

The **Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA)** was specifically designed to prevent these types of predatory "cost-shifting" lawsuits and administrative schemes. By making market participation conditional on paying into a restitution fund, SB2720 is an attempt to circumvent federal protections. This will inevitably lead to costly litigation for the State of Hawaii at the taxpayers' expense.

Firearm manufacturers will not simply absorb these costs; they will be passed on to Hawaii consumers.

- **Impact on Self-Defense:** By artificially inflating the price of firearms, SB2720 makes the exercise of a Second Amendment right more difficult for low-income residents who seek a firearm for self-defense.
- **Impact on Professionals:** This "fee" acts as a hidden tax on the equipment used by our local law enforcement officers and security professionals.

The focus of our legislature should remain on holding criminals accountable for their actions rather than creating a novel tax on a lawful industry. SB2720 is an overreach that penalizes law-abiding citizens and businesses for the acts of criminals. I respectfully request that you **VOTE NO on SB2720**.

Thank you for your time and for considering my testimony.

Sincerely,

Davin Asato

136 West Hawaii Street

Kahului, HI 96732

808-205-4616

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 12:46:03 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
James Revells	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly oppose this bill !

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:02:08 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Albertbraceros	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:04:14 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Richard Domingo	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB2720.

If you need money, Hawaii Government should stop asking for more funding and start looking at places that could be thinned. i surely dont get raises for NOT doing a good job. STOP creating things that make Hawaii residents harder to live. Big fat NO!

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:21:54 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Timothy Miyao	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Honorable Members of the Public Safety and Military Affairs Committee,

I urge you to oppose SB2720: Relating to Firearms.

SB2720 would hold a manufacturer liable for an individual's misuse of their product. By the thought process behind this bill: a car manufacturer would be liable for damages caused by a drunk driver. A spoon manufacturer would be liable for health issues resulting from an individual's poor dietary choices.

Mahalo for your all that you do for the people of Hawaii!

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:26:26 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Rustin Magliba	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:37:26 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Margaret ST Vesnefski	Testifying for For Liberty and Justice Hawaii	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose this bill. Why should our Hawaii taxpayers' money be used for this? This approach unfairly puts financial liability on manufacturers for events beyond their control, raising concerns about fairness, legal precedents, and the economic impact on legitimate businesses. Stop wasting our money and focus on fixing real issues in Hawaii. We oppose unnecessary liability without cause.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:43:58 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Robert Pitman	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:45:09 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Daniel Covert	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha I respectfully submit testimony in opposition to this bill establishing a Hawai‘i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund funded by firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation.

While providing assistance to victims of firearm-related injuries is a worthy goal, this proposal is legally unsound and unlikely to withstand judicial scrutiny. Similar efforts in other jurisdictions have already faced serious legal challenges, and recent court decisions make clear that this approach conflicts with federal law and constitutional principles.

In a recent unanimous decision, the United States Supreme Court reaffirmed the broad protections provided to firearm manufacturers under the federal Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act. In *Smith & Wesson Brands, Inc. v. Estados Unidos Mexicanos*, the Court rejected an attempt to hold firearm manufacturers financially responsible for harms caused by third parties who criminally misuse lawfully sold firearms. The Court made clear that liability cannot be imposed without specific allegations of wrongdoing by the manufacturer itself. This decision underscores that states may not impose no-fault financial responsibility on firearm manufacturers simply because their products were misused by others.

Similarly, California’s Firearm Industry Responsibility Act, which attempted to impose sweeping liability and regulatory burdens on firearm manufacturers, has been blocked by a federal court. The court found the law likely unconstitutional and in conflict with federal protections governing lawful firearm commerce. This demonstrates that state efforts to single out firearm manufacturers for special financial penalties are vulnerable to being struck down.

This bill raises the same fundamental problems. It requires firearm manufacturers to fund a restitution program regardless of fault, negligence, or unlawful conduct, effectively punishing a lawful and heavily regulated industry for the actions of third parties. Such an approach raises serious concerns under federal law, the Commerce Clause, and due process protections, and would almost certainly result in costly litigation borne by Hawai‘i taxpayers.

Rather than risking years of litigation and uncertainty, the Legislature should pursue constitutionally sound, evidence-based approaches to victim support that do not rely on legally questionable funding mechanisms.

For these reasons, I urge the committee to oppose this measure.

Mahalo

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 1:49:20 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Martin Humpert	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:03:33 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Bunnie Harrington	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:08:07 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
David K. Jones	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Aloha representatives! I am writing in OPPOSITION to SB2720. Placing the liability on manufacturers will not deter criminals, and will only serve to drive up the cost of firearms to law-abiding citizens. Had such measures been effective in the past, we would have seen car manufactureres subject to the same. We need to go back to holding the correct parties responsible for their actions, and this is not the way to do it.

Sincerely,
David Jones.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:09:15 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mike Harrington	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I strongly disagree and oppose this bill.

Thank you,

Michael

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:14:14 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jacob Rathje	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Sb2720: opposed

Aloha I am writing to explain why SB2720 is absurd and unbelievably wrong. I oppose this bill and anything that puts blame on businesses for the actions of others. Firearms themselves do not cause any harm. People using them with a bad intention or improperly can. The same goes for everyone who drives a car, swings a baseball bat or works or cooks with a knife.

This bill was clearly rushed at the 11th hour to be submitted that the description had a spelling error. As it is written:

Establishes a Hawai'i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund funded by "licenses" firearm manufacturers as a condition of market participation. Provides no-fault, first-payer coverage for medical and related costs arising from firearm injuries.

What are Lincenses Firearm Manufacturers? The bill will fail legal standards that have been the precedent in this nation and is a joke to be even submitted and to have passed its first reading.

The goals of this legislative body are being ignored when attempting to pass bills like this and to waste the time of so many who think we are led by people with ill intentions for our state and country. I am opposed to this bill and would hope anyone with understanding of laws would see it as unfit for a potential law. If passed, SB2720 will cost this state millions of dollars in failed lawsuits and will be a burden on the people and not the licensed firearms manufacturers that it aims to cripple.

Mahalo,

Jacob Rathje

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:19:20 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Lanette Bourg	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Why burden a legitimate business with this burden? Work on measures to put responsibility squarely on lawbreakers.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:35:36 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jordan Au	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

To whom it may concern,

I strongly oppose SB 2720 because it singles out the firearm industry for how people use their products. No industry is required to pay when someone harms another person with their products. The person using the item is at fault not the manufacturer. For example, almost every day on the news we hear about someone getting injured or killed in a car accident. Telling Toyota, Honda, etc to pay people's medical bills because someone hurt or injured someone with their product is ridiculous. Or will the State go after fast food chains such as Burger King and McDonald's for people's heart disease related medical bills? I think not. For these reasons and many others I will not list for the sake of time I strongly oppose SB 2720.

Thank you

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:40:13 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Gregory Fogarty	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this bill

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:40:53 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Stephen Yuen	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill forcing firearm manufacturers to participate in the firearm injury resitution fund places financial liability on manufacturers for actions outside their control, raising concerns about fairness, legal precedent and economic impact on lawful businesses.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:41:05 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jacob Holcomb	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Oppose

There's a reason why startups avoid Hawaii, and it has to do with exactly this sort of hostile legislative attitude from people who have worked for the government so long that they have no idea how companies in the real world actually turn a profit.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:45:46 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Matthew Connelly	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Manufacturers of items intended for lawful purposes are not responsible for the actions of those who chose to use those items for unlawful or malicious purposes. This is as true for firearms as it is for alcohol, vehicles, baseball bats, scissors, or anything else that has valid uses but can be used to harm another.

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:47:49 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
John Miyagi	Individual	Comments	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

To be short, sweet and to the point. I oppose this "Bill", due to the fact that that it is bias towards the firearms manufacturer for no reason. If this "Bill" is passed. Please create the same "Bill" for auto manufacturers in cases of "DUI's". There's more of them than there is of firearms incidents. Mahalo

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 2:54:43 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Todd Yukutake	Individual	Oppose	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

I oppose SB2720

This law would burden law abiding firearm companies and owners with extra costs. This will penalize those who follow the law and does nothing to those that break the law.

Everyone knows that people struggle to make a living in Hawaii and this fee will make it even harder for gun stores, recreational shooters, hunters, competition shooters, and people buying guns for self-defense.

The main purpose of this law is to create a backdoor way to restrict the lawful sale and possession of firearms.

Todd Yukutake
toddyukutake@gmail.com

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 6:21:28 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jeffrey King	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Just another disgusting attempt by a blatantly anti gun and anti second amendment state legislature to further villify and overregulate firearms. Car manufacturers are not held responsible for accidents caused by people. Why should it be any different for firearm manufacturers? There are already more than enough unconstitutional restrictions and plenty of legal channels for "victims" without adding additional needless cost for law abiding citizens to purchase firearms, Any legislator who votes in favor of this garbage should be considered unfit for office. We demand constitutional carry without restrictions!

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 7:05:48 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Chris Millen	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I oppose this proposed bill.

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 8:07:36 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Ilima DeCosta	Individual	Support	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

Aloha and mahalo to the committee for allowing me to provide my testimony in full support of SB2720.

Having experienced gun violence after my daughter was found dead due to a single bullet to the back of her head, I am grateful to its introducers - Senators Rhoads and Chang - for considering the needs of survivors, well beyond the thoughts and prayers.

This type of no fault, no shame fund would have helped me tremendously to avoid having to expend my modest savings, just to survive the first eight months.

Though not quite ready to return to work, the lack of resources and the inability of other non profits to really meet our needs meant that I had to return to work sooner than I should have.

It also led to me living at a half dozen locations over the ten years since my daughter died and my own brush with domestic violence, recently.

The impacts are no less devastating for my grandson, Ikaika, who is now 14 years old and will never know a peaceful nights sleep.

If my daughter had died from cancer, a car accident or some other incident, there would likely be more community support, but those of us who have lost loved ones to gun violence are forced to shoulder these burdens on our own.

Survivors of gun violence must navigate a completely uncharted path and - beyond the flowers and well wishes, the availability of financial resources is amongst the best ways to help us to ease our burdens while we recover from our tremendous loss.

Please vote to pass SB2720 and provide no fault, no shame support to assist those who have been impacted by gun violence. Mahalo piha, Lizzie's mom

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:42:41 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

LATE

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Jason Young	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

SB2720 imposes an unconstitutional financial burden on the exercise of Second Amendment rights by forcing firearm manufacturers to pay into a state-controlled restitution fund as a condition of selling firearms in Hawai‘i. Although the bill claims not to impose liability, it effectively assigns manufacturers financial responsibility for accidental, self-inflicted, and criminal firearm injuries they did not cause. This structure conflicts with the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act and creates a de-facto tax on a constitutionally protected product. The bill grants the Department of Health sweeping authority to classify firearms into “risk categories,” set contribution rates, and adjust those rates at will, enabling the State to manipulate firearm pricing and indirectly restrict access. This unprecedented economic regulation will raise firearm prices for Hawai‘i residents, disproportionately burden lawful owners, and establish a dangerous precedent for taxing constitutional rights. SB2720 is not a public-health measure — it is a targeted financial penalty on lawful commerce and should not advance.

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/1/2026 11:48:57 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
james smith	Individual	Oppose	Remotely Via Zoom

Comments:

Aloha Chair and Members of the Committee,

My name is Mr James H Smith from and I submit this testimony in strong opposition to S.B. 2720.

S.B. 2720 creates a Hawai‘i Firearm Injury Restitution Fund and requires firearm manufacturers to obtain a “Firearm Injury Cost Recovery License” and pay state-set contributions as a condition of selling lawful products in Hawai‘i. Although the bill repeatedly states this is “not civil liability,” “not punishment,” and “not regulation of ownership,” the practical effect is the same: it forces manufacturers, as a class, to pay for harms caused by third-party misuse of a lawful product.

Congress enacted the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act (PLCAA), 15 U.S.C. §§ 7901–7903, to prevent exactly this type of cost-shifting for criminal misuse by third parties. Courts have applied PLCAA broadly. In *City of New York v. Beretta U.S.A. Corp.*, 524 F.3d 384 (2d Cir. 2008), and *Ileto v. Glock, Inc.*, 565 F.3d 1126 (9th Cir. 2009), federal courts rejected efforts to impose industry-wide responsibility for third-party misuse. While S.B. 2720 is structured as an administrative “license and contribution” system rather than a lawsuit, courts look at substance over labels. If the payments function as a damages proxy tied to injury costs from downstream misuse, PLCAA and federal preemption arguments will be unavoidable.

Beyond PLCAA, the bill invites additional constitutional challenges. The rate-setting, risk categorization, audits, and penalties delegated to an agency raise Due Process concerns if standards are vague or arbitrary. Conditioning market access on payments tied to statewide injury data implicates Commerce Clause issues, especially when it pressures out-of-state manufacturers. If the contribution operates like a punitive exaction untethered to any

individualized wrongdoing, Excessive Fines or Takings-style arguments will also arise. This means costly litigation for the State, funded by taxpayers, with uncertain outcomes.

There is also a serious practical concern for Hawai‘i’s local small businesses. Even if the contribution is imposed on manufacturers, costs will be passed down the supply chain to distributors, retailers, and ultimately consumers. Reduced manufacturer participation could mean less inventory, fewer lawful models available, higher prices, and longer wait times. Small, compliant local FFL dealers and ranges will be squeezed hardest. This does not target criminals; it burdens lawful commerce and local jobs.

Finally, S.B. 2720 does not clearly state what happens to surplus funds at the end of a fiscal year if claims are lower than projected. If contributions exceed payouts, do funds return to manufacturers? Are they rolled forward into the next year? Are they used for unrelated programs? The bill is silent on this. That raises important fairness, transparency, and constitutional questions. If the payments are truly a cost-recovery mechanism tied to actual injuries, there should be clear statutory direction on how excess funds are handled. Without that clarity, the contributions begin to look less like reimbursement and more like an open-ended revenue mechanism, which further weakens the State’s claim that this is not punitive or liability-based in nature.

If the goal is reducing firearm injury, Hawai‘i has better options that do not attempt to work around federal law, such as focused enforcement against straw purchasing, improved prosecution of prohibited possessors, mental health intervention, and community-based violence prevention programs.

For these reasons—federal conflict with PLCAA, constitutional concerns, likely litigation costs to taxpayers, economic harm to local lawful businesses, and lack of clarity regarding surplus funds—I respectfully ask the Committee to HOLD S.B. 2720.

Mahalo for the opportunity to testify.

Respectfully,

James H Smith

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/2/2026 7:51:07 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Victor K. Ramos	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

OPPOSE this bill. Instead of starting the bill with, "The Legislature finds..." begin these "kinds" of bill with "Two members of the Legislature, Com. RHOADS and Com. CHANG believe..."

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/2/2026 9:40:24 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Maverick Quatero	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

Another ridiculous Bill. Are we going to charge McDonald's, Jack in the Box, and Taco Bell for diabetes and cardiovascular diseases? Or Honda, Toyota, Ford, Dodge, and Nissan for fender benders and drink driving. This generation no longer believes in personal responsibility, always trying to place blame everywhere except the individual. No, it is not the gun company's fault of someone breaks the law or behave irresponsibly. They sold a product legally to exercise their constitutional right. This is just another attempt to harm law abiding citizens by destroying the gun industry.

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/2/2026 11:35:54 AM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Mary Ellen Williams	Individual	Support	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I support this bill to support victims of gun violence and their families who deal with the devastating aftermath. This bill will also support the healthcare system, which is overtaxed by the cost of trauma care. This bill will help to address the true cost of guns in our society.

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/2/2026 12:40:15 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
James Mueller	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

I STRONGLY OPPOSE SB 2720

LATE

SB-2720

Submitted on: 2/2/2026 12:45:31 PM

Testimony for PSM on 2/2/2026 3:00:00 PM

Submitted By	Organization	Testifier Position	Testify
Atom Kasprzycki	Individual	Oppose	Written Testimony Only

Comments:

This bill violates the US Constitution and the Second Amendment.