Replying to the three comments (from the State Bar, from the chair of the CIDVC and from the Maricopa County Attorney) opposing my petition to Repeal Rule 6(E)(4)(e)(2) regarding weapon possession in Injunctions: I trust the court will take notice of the SCOTUS's June 28 ruling in *McDonald v. Chicago*, affirming our 2nd Amendment right? This renders all commentators' arguments and reliance on *Heller* in opposition invalid.

While I expect my opponents might quote from the new ruling itself that the ruling "does not imperil every law regulating firearms," I remind the court of the fundamental point of my petition, overlooked by all commentators: There is no law to support Rule 6(E)(4)(e)(2).

Instead, all try to spin an unspecific general law in their favor aiming at only the constitutional right to bear arms. I showed the illogic of that "reasoning" in my earlier reply to the State Bar, so will not rehearse it here.

Next, I wish to thank the Maricopa County Attorney for making one of my points. In his conclusion, he says the Rule "is an important component for ensuring the safety of individuals seeking an Order of Protection." His error, referring to an OOP, is exactly what began my petition.

We are not talking about OOP's here. We are talking about Injunctions Against Harassment. Like sharks and dolphins, they are two different animals. They may look similar, they may perform similar functions, but one is a lot meaner than the other.

An OOP is a Title 13 criminal matter, very serious, complete with NCIC reporting. An Injunction Against Harassment is a lot friendlier, merely a Title 12 procedural (i.e., civil) matter.

Unfortunately and frustratingly, the fallacy of equating the two has thoroughly permeated the judicial system. As with dolphins with their dorsal fin, judicial staff views Injunctions as sharks.

I suspect part of this comes from the fact that the paperwork form used for both is the same, the only difference being which box on the form gets checked. Perhaps, then, the court should instruct the CIDVC to modify the ARPOP to make it clear that an Injunction Against Harassment is not an OOP and that staff is not to call Injunctions OOP's. Further, as a learning aid so as to separate the two animals in the minds of judicial staff, the court should mandate there be two distinct paperwork forms. One for an OOP and a distinctly looking different one for an Injunction to make it clear which is which.

Next, please notice that all three commentators argue using a very one sided, heavily weighted view of the so-called victim in an Injunction and her right to safety. But what about the right of the accused to safety? None of the commentators consider the right of a father to protect his loved ones. This is a double hit, for, as the court knows, and as the even the chair of the CIDVC stated in his comment, the threshold is set very low for a so-called victim to get an Injunction. It is so low that it can be ex parte, without any due process! To suspend an individual's constitution right without due process is wrong.

Which brings me to my last point. I thank the chair of the CIDVC for the history lesson on Arizona's pertinent A.R.S.'s and how they relate or do not relate to Brady. I stand corrected. But now, in light of the recent SCOTUS ruling, given what the chair tells us, that in Arizona an individual can be deprived of his 2nd Amendment right without due process, I submit that A.R.S. § 13-3602(G)(4) is now unconstitutional. (If it hadn't been before.) Given the reality that it will take some time before anyone challenges that law (and even if they challenged today, it would take time to work through the court system), I call for the court to be proactive. **I now amend my Petition to additionally call for the amending of Rule (6)(c)(5)(d) to make it conform with the federal law which, quite correctly, requires due process before suspending a constitutional right.** Specifically, to parallel 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(8) requiring a hearing before a citizen's right to bear arms is suspended.

The existing Rule here is clearly a tradition in the court. It has no basis in law and thus, constitutes a violation of both the US and Arizona Constitution. The purpose of the Rules forum it to ferret out such Rules and I submit that Rule 6(E)(4)(e)(2) be repealed.

Mike Palmer
PO Box 5564
Glendale, AZ 85312
Phone: private
e-mail: mikepalmer_arizona@fastmail.fm