



GOVERNMENT WARNS SITE TO REMOVE LIST OF STATE SENATORS WHO PASSED GUN CONTROL

Printable View

copterdoctor

07-10-2016, 03:22 PM

GOVERNMENT WARNS SITE TO REMOVE LIST OF STATE SENATORS WHO PASSED GUN CONTROL

California  
Laws for thee, but not for me.....

<https://burstupdates.wordpress.com/2...nfo-on-owners/>

ivarr

07-10-2016, 03:48 PM

good, call the \*\*\*\*ers out.  
that want to publish names and addresses, let them be subject to the same scrutiny.

whalerman69

07-10-2016, 03:50 PM

Wow just another fine example of how f'ed we are...

MachineHead

07-10-2016, 03:50 PM

Fair is fair. Good!

---

Dean Crawford

07-10-2016, 03:58 PM

Damn Skippy.

Dean

---

FreeWillie

07-10-2016, 04:12 PM

Cockroaches don't won't to be seen. That's why they scurry under the fridge when the light gets turned on.

---

Kevin\_NH

07-10-2016, 04:41 PM

It'd have been no big deal if they stuck with a list of names, but [Real Write Winger](#) chose to publish the home addresses and home phone numbers.

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by SacBee

In a letter to WordPress dated July 8, the Office of Legislative Counsel demanded that the post be removed. The letter, obtained by [The Sacramento Bee](#) on Saturday, cites [a section of government code](#) barring the posting of an elected official's personal information, warning that allowing the post to remain up "presents a grave risk to the safety of these elected officials."

"The Senators and Assembly members whose home addresses are listed on this Web site fear that the public display of their addresses on the Internet will subject them to threats and acts of violence at their homes," the letter reads.

---

---

MisterHappy

07-10-2016, 04:51 PM

This is wrong. How can our rulers do their job, if little people constantly interfere?

---

**SpaceCrittter**

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Kevin\_NH >>

It'd have been no big deal if they stuck with a list of names, but [Real Write Winger](#) chose to publish the home addresses and home phone numbers.

---

Can't speak for California, but here in Connecticut, home address of an elected official is a matter of public record.

---

**ivarr**

07-10-2016, 04:54 PM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Kevin\_NH >>

It'd have been no big deal if they stuck with a list of names, but chose to publish the home addresses and home phone numbers.

---

" The **LEGAL FIREARMS OWNERS WHO WERE SIMPLY EXERCISING THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS** whose home addresses are listed on this Web site fear that the public display of their addresses on the Internet will subject them to threats and acts of violence at their homes "

---

**MarkT**

07-10-2016, 04:57 PM

I hated it when some newspaper posted the names and addresses of CCW holders in their state. I forgot where it was, but it wasn't too long ago.

I don't hate this recent news, but it does bother me in the same way. Names are ok, but home addresses should be off limits.

---

**Finalygotabeltfed**

07-10-2016, 05:04 PM

Kalifornia government wants to do their screwing in the dark.

If a bill to publish gun owner's names and addresses came up they'd be jumping in with both feet.

---

Dadstoys

07-10-2016, 05:06 PM

I'm good with it.

For those who think it's too much , keep in mind that folks on that list wouldn't lose a minutes sleep if your door got kicked in and your family taken out in the process of furthering their agenda.

Not one minute.

---

Tyke

07-10-2016, 05:17 PM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Kevin\_NH [»](#)

It'd have been no big deal if they stuck with a list of names, but [Real Write Winger](#) chose to publish the home addresses and home phone numbers.

---

Read the section of Gov't Code linked to by the Sacramento Bee -- I see 1A challenges all over the place. I nearly laughed at this part:

Quote:

---

(ii) After receiving the elected or appointed official's written demand, the person, business, or association shall not transfer the appointed or elected official's home address or telephone number to any other person, business, or association through any other medium.

---

Simply ludicrous.

---

headednorth

07-10-2016, 05:26 PM

They must realize [Case 1:16-cv-01452-LCO-SKO Document 1-2 Filed 10/31/16 Page 5 of 19](#) as it is the only one that can be copied and posted here over. Like this,

**Ben Allen**

Redacted

**James (Jim) T Beall**

Redacted

**Marty Block**

**Kevin De León**

**Steve Glazer**

Redacted

**Isadore Hall, III**

Redacted

**Loni Hancock**

**Ed Hernandez**

**Robert Hertzberg**

Redacted

**Gerald (Jerry) Hill**

**Ben Hueso**

Redacted

**Hannah-Beth Jackson**

**Ricardo Lara**

**Mark Leno** Case 1:16-cv-01152-LJO-SKO Document 12-3 Filed 10/31/16 Page 6 of 19

**Connie Leyva**

Redacted

**Carol Liu**

Redacted

**Michael (Mike) McGuire**

Redacted

**Antonio (Tony) Mendoza**

Redacted

**Holly J Mitchell**

Redacted

**Bill Monning**

**Richard Pan**

Redacted

**Fran Pavley**

Redacted

**Robert (Bob) A Wieckowski**

**Luis Alejo**

Redacted

Redacted [Case 1:16-cv-01152-LJO-SKO](#) [Document 12-3](#) [Filed 10/31/16](#) [Page 7 of 19](#)

**Joaquin Arambula**

**Toni Atkins**

Redacted

**Catharine Baker**

Redacted

**Richard Bloom**

**Susan Bonilla**

Redacted

**Rob Bonta**

Redacted

**Cheryl Brown**

Redacted

**Autumn Burke**

**Ian Calderon**

**Nora Campos**

Redacted

**Ling-Ling Chang**

Redacted

**Edwin Chau** Case 1:16-cv-01152-LJO-SKO Document 12-3 Filed 10/31/16 Page 8 of 19

Redacted

**David Chiu**

**Kansen Chu**

Redacted

**Ken Cooley**

Redacted

**James Cooper**

Redacted

**Matt Dababneh**

Redacted

**Tom Daly**

**Bill Dodd**

Redacted

**Susan Eggman**

Redacted

**Cristina Garcia**

**Eduardo Garcia**



**Michael Gatto**

**Mike Gipson**

Redacted

**Jimmy Gomez**

Redacted

**Lorena Gonzalez**

**Rich Gordon**

**Roger Hernández**

**Chris Holden**

**Jacqui Irwin**

Redacted

**Reginald (Reggie) Jones-Sawyer**

**Marc Levine**

Redacted

**Patty Lopez**

Redacted

**Kevin McCarty**

Redacted

**Kevin Mullin**

Redacted

Redacted

Case 1:16-cv-01152-LJO-SKO Document 12-3 Filed 10/31/16 Page 10 of 19

**Adrin Nazarian**

**Patrick O'Donnell**

Redacted

**William Quirk**

Redacted

**Sebastian Ridley-Thomas**

Redacted

**Miguel Santiago**

**Mark Stone**

**Tony Thurmond**

**Phil Ting**

**Shirley Weber**

Redacted

**Das Williams**

**Jim Wood**

**Anthony Rendon**

Then it just becomes an endless game of whack-a-mole.

[QUOTE=coptrd Case 5:16-cv-01152-JO-SKO Document 12-3 Filed 10/31/16 Page 11 of 19  
Laws for thee, but not for me.....

In the Kommiewealth too. I tried too look up my neighbors' tax bills on the town website. Two neighbors were not listed. One was a cop and the other a lawyer. Rules for thee but not for me!!!!

Steve

---

wahsben

07-10-2016, 07:16 PM

So many treasonous scum.

---

CTpatriot

07-10-2016, 07:19 PM

Wonder how many are gun owners.

---

Lank

07-10-2016, 07:21 PM

7.62 FMJ

Is my favorite cartridge

---

**SpaceCrittter**

---

As I have said - many, MANY times here and elsewhere - a lot of horseshit will go away when it is required that ANYONE - elected, appointed, hired or contracted\* - on the public dime has his/hers/its personal contact information made public. The taxpayers deserve to know for whom/what they are paying. Don't want to disclose? Find work elsewhere.

\* In the case of contractors, that means the corporation's principal officers and major shareholders. And yes, that includes home addresses. My business has, from time to time, had contracts with government entities - still does with one, as a matter of fact - and as part of the disclosure required for that, my personal contact information has been part of the public record.

---

**EC1**

---

07-10-2016, 07:34 PM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Mark T [»](#)

I hated it when some newspaper posted the names and addresses of CCW holders in their state. I forgot where it was, but it wasn't too long ago.

I don't hate this recent news, but it does bother me in the same way. Names are ok, but home addresses should be off limits.

---

One major difference, the CCW holders were not elected to PUBLIC OFFICE.

---

**soloman02**

---

07-11-2016, 12:34 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Kevin\_NH [»](#)

It'd have been no big deal if they stuck with a list of names, but [Real Write Winger](#) chose to publish the home addresses and home phone numbers.

---

"When a man assumes a public trust, he should expect to have his private life made public." - Thomas Jefferson

Elected officials are not supposed to be above the citizenry. As such, they should have their home addresses published. That is the price one should accept to serve as an elected official. One willingly gives up a certain amount of privacy by running for office and being elected.

Also, this is the 21st century. Good luck to anyone who thinks they can enforce such a retarded law. All it takes is to buy a domain and server from a company in a foreign country (like one of the Eastern bloc countries) and there is no way the government of CA is ever taking down that list.

---

Bfatz

07-11-2016, 09:04 AM

Most local towns cities what have you have online GIS programs lol finding one place of residence is very accessible oh and the you have Zillow, the list goes on ... No secrets

---

Kevin\_NH

07-11-2016, 09:23 AM

If the purpose was not to make a threat, then why include home addresses?

Making a "true threat" is not protected speech, but anything short of that is (see NAACP v. Claiborne Hardware and Elonis v. United States)

The first amendment likely protects publishing a hit list of the names and addresses of "Tyrants" and saying their name will be removed "upon the tyrant's death". Speech that only makes it more likely that some person will be harmed in the future by an unknown party is not actionable, but is creepy.

---

robjax

07-11-2016, 09:46 AM

what do you mean it warns the site to remove the list? Cite the law that says what they did is illegal otherwise STFU.

---

Kevin\_NH

07-11-2016, 10:08 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by robjax 

what do you mean it warns the site to remove the list? Cite the law that says what they did is illegal otherwise STFU.

---

You're late to the game. See [reply #7](#). California gov't code 6254.21

---

bigblue

07-11-2016, 10:10 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Kevin\_NH 

You're late to the game. See [reply #7](#). California gov't code 6254.21

---

So the US Gummit can't even get to Wikileaks but you think Kommifornia can take down a list of names from the internet? Good luck with that.

---

Len-2A Training

07-11-2016, 10:11 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by robjax 

what do you mean it warns the site to remove the list? Cite the law that says what they did is illegal otherwise STFU.

---

It's CA, they will make up a law if they have to! [shocked]

---

robjax

07-11-2016, 10:14 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by robjax [»](#)

what do you mean it warns the site to remove the list? Cite the law that says what they did is illegal otherwise STFU.

---

I stand corrected...

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Kevin\_NH [»](#)

You're late to the game. See [reply #7](#). California gov't code 6254.21

---

yup, I missed that. I guess they'll have to take that down then.

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Len-2A Training [»](#)

It's CA, they will make up a law if they have to! [shocked]

---

Seems they thought of this one in advance....lol

---

mikem317

07-11-2016, 10:15 AM

Thread reminded me of this:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G6ICoHUFgkA>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G6ICoHUFgkA>

---

Len-2A Training

07-11-2016, 10:19 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by robjax 

I stand corrected...

yup, I missed that. I guess they'll have to take that down then.

Seems they thought of this one in advance....lol

---

Why am I not surprised.

I know that my state rep/sen have purposely published their home phone numbers so that constituents can reach them at home in the past.

---

Kevin\_NH

07-11-2016, 10:36 AM

---

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by bigblue 

So the US Gummit can't even get to Wikileaks but you think Kommifornia can take down a list of names from the internet? Good luck with that.

---

I don't think they can (or should) be successful in taking down the list, but the law does give California more ways to harass Real Write Winger, including empowering each legislator to go after RWW for +\$4,000.

As mentioned above, the blog post may not rise to the level of a "true threat", so is protected by the first amendment, just as newspapers publishing a list and map of CCW holder's homes is protected by the first amendment. Doesn't make it morally right.

---

robjax

07-11-2016, 10:42 AM

---

Quote:

---



Originally Posted by [Case 1:16-cv-01152-LJO-SKO Document 12-3 Filed 10/31/16 Page 17 of 19](#)

Why am I not surprised.

I know that my state rep/sen have purposely published their home phone numbers so that constituents can reach them at home in the past.

---

I'd be interested to know when that passed. Probably recently as they and other states have been toying with the idea of publishing LTC holder's info. Seems the slipped that one by buried in another bill.

---

drumenigma

07-11-2016, 10:49 AM

I'm not seeing anything wrong with it. Those people just legislated more of CA's rights and property away. Passing bad laws should have consequences.

---

Noreaster78

07-11-2016, 11:10 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by BfatZ [»](#)

Most local towns cities what have you have online GIS programs lol finding one place of residence is very accessible oh and the you have Zillow, the list goes on ... No secrets

---

Interesting tidbit. When i first moved into that neighborhood, i only knew the first name of a local LEO that lived down the street. I pulled up the GIS site for my town to get his last name. The address was listed, but names or any other identifying information was blocked. It seems the town hides information for at least LEOs.

---

MarkT

07-11-2016, 11:12 AM

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by MarkT [»](#)

I hated it when some newspaper posted the names and addresses of CCW holders in their state. I forgot where it was, but it wasn't too long ago.

I don't hate this recent news, but it does bother me in the same way. Names are ok, but home addresses should be off limits.

---

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by EC1 [»](#)

One major difference, the CCW holders were not elected to PUBLIC OFFICE.

---

Fair enough.

---

## Len-2A Training

07-11-2016, 11:14 AM

---

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by robjax [»](#)

I'd be interested to know when that passed. Probably recently as they and other states have been toying with the idea of publishing LTC holder's info. Seems the slipped that one by buried in another bill.

---

I just glanced at the cited law and it appears that it might be 1998 when it was passed.

Quote:

---

Originally Posted by Noreaster78 [»](#)

Interesting tidbit. When i first moved into that neighborhood, i only knew the first name of a local LEO that lived down the street. I pulled up the GIS site for my town to get his last name. The address was listed, but names or any other identifying information was blocked. It seems the town hides information for at least LEOs.

---

MGL protects privacy of LEOs and families from being listed in the public street lists. Either assessors don't know/care about this or perhaps that isn't illegal but from what I've seen the info is available there. Same wrt county deed records.

All times are GMT -4. The time now is 01:42 PM.

Powered by vBulletin® Version 4.2.2  
Copyright © 2016 vBulletin Solutions, Inc. All rights reserved.

Digital Point modules: Sphinx-based search