

**House Judiciary**

**02/18/2026 01:30 PM**

**HB26-1144 Prohibit 3D Printing Firearms & Components**

**Typed Text of Testimony Submitted**

<b>Name, Position, Representing</b>	<b>Typed Text of Testimony</b>
Melissa Kastanek  For  themselves	<p>I am writing in strong support of HB26-1144. I am a Colorado native, a resident of Douglas County, a former DCSD elementary educator, a mom of elementary aged kids in Castle Pines, a small business owner and the wife of a hunter. We are gun owners who believe thoughtful gun laws work to keep our communities safer AND uphold the integrity of responsible gun ownership.</p> <p>When firearms are regulated in ways that emphasize care, responsibility and accountability, such as HB26-1144, gun accessibility becomes increasingly difficult only for those whose ill intent gives cause to the argument they shouldn't have access to firearms in the first place.</p> <p>Please vote YES on HB26-1144.</p>
Natalie Sivak  For  themselves	<p>Hello,</p> <p>As a concerned Denverite, a parent, a physician, and an advocate for public safety, I am voicing full-throated support for HB26-1144, which will update existing legislation on ghost guns, preventing 3-D printing of firearm frames and receivers. In addition to ensuring the existing ban on 3D printed guns is fully enforced, this legislation will address the threat of 3D-printed firearms and accessories. 3D printing has grown more affordable, more accessible, and far more advanced. This technology is now readily accessible by Coloradans, and poses an immediate threat to the safety of people across Colorado. Coloradans have already been terrorized by shooters with ghost guns. Colorado should expand upon and ensure the effective enforcement of 2023's</p>

	<p>Unserialized Firearms and Components Act by taking steps to protect Coloradans from the perils of these 3D-printed, DIY firearms and illegal accessories.</p> <p>Please vote YES on HB26-1144, and protect the safety of your constituents.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Natalie Sivak</p>
<p>James McCurdy</p> <p>Against himself</p>	<p>I implore you to Vote AGAINST the proposed legislation. the bill does not increase Freedom, it restricts the freedoms of all of the unborn future Colorado citizens. Please vote against this common nonsense legislation.</p>
<p>Bryson khron</p> <p>Against himself</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to read this "trash" as Senator Sullivan calls them. I am a Colorado resident, and am a hobbyist gunsmith/ machinist and working to get an FFL for engraving. My main concerns for HB26-1144 are that it is overly broad, criminalizes my first amendment, impacts gun and safety education, impacts workforce development, and enforcement concerns. The bill defines "three-dimensional printing" to include both additive and subtractive machining, there is no other type of manufacturing so this could impact hobbyist, student, and small manufactures that are operating legally. The bill restricts possession and sharing of digital files and is regulating my free speech which is unconstitutional. They use 3D models and prototypes in gun safety education and workforce development everyday. How would you establish "intent to build" when a toy gun disassembled by a child would be passed as intent to build under current guidelines?</p>
<p>Donna LaBelle</p> <p>Against himself</p>	<p>Chair and Committee members, my name is Donna LaBelle and I am writing you in opposition of HB26-1144. This bill targets tools and technology and not any true threat. We believe it will set a dangerous precedent of the government impugning citizens'™ intent and preemptively assuming guilt. This is "1984" and Big Brother not only watching but telling you what you are thinking and what you will do. This bill will be impossible to enforce as are</p>

	<p>most of the gun restriction laws. That is “ for the criminals who will not follow this but for law abiding Colorado citizens, it will restrict them from their Second Amendment rights and therefore is unconstitutional. This bill is overbroad, overreaching and again unconstitutional. It should not be passed.</p>
<p>carol siegel friefeld For themselves</p>	<p>I am a retired pediatrician, with an MD and a Masters In Public Health, formerly employed for 25 years by Clinica Family Health Center, which serves the low income communities of both Boulder and Adams County. Prior to that, I worked for Denver Health, at the Eastside Community Health Center, which serves low income families in the Five Points area.</p> <p>I am writing to urge you to support HB26-1144. As a primary care provider in low income communities in the Colorado Front Range, I have seen the devastation of families who have lost a son, a daughter, a spouse, or other loved ones to gun violence. Furthermore, as a mother and a resident of southern Boulder County, I have experienced the fear, horror, and anxiety that leaves community members shaken for years when an event such as the King Soopers shooting occurs.</p> <p>We know that criminals are working to manufacture ghost guns using 3D printing technology. In March or 2025, law enforcement recovered hundreds of 3-D printed rapid fire devices and multiple 3-D printed firearms from an extensive operation in Colorado Springs. Two men were arrested for allegedly shipping rapid fire devices across the country. (1)</p> <p>I hope you will pass this bill through committee without hesitation.</p> <p>Respectfully yours,</p> <p>Carol Siegel Friefeld, MD, MSPH</p>

	<p>(1) Mackenzie Stafford, “Colorado Springs Men Federally Indicted for Nationwide Machine Gun Conversion Device 3D Printing Operation,” KRDO, March 27, 2025, <a href="https://krdo.com/news/2025/03/26/colorado-springs-men-federally-indicted-for-nationwide-machine-gun-conversion-device-3d-printing-operation/">https://krdo.com/news/2025/03/26/colorado-springs-men-federally-indicted-for-nationwide-machine-gun-conversion-device-3d-printing-operation/</a>.</p>
<p>Theodore Cahoon Against themselves</p>	<p>This unconstitutional bill is overbroad in scope and will expand existing laws banning 3D-printed firearms and related “ghost gun manufacturing” to include milling machines and other “subtractive” manufacturing methods, sweeping up a wide range of industrial and hobbyist equipment that has many non-firearm uses. It criminalizes knowledge and information by making it a crime to possess digital instructions in “circumstances that indicate intent,” even if the person never actually builds or sells anything, and will create a chilling effect on hobbyists, machinists, engineers, and makerspaces sharing ordinary content out of fear of being accused of “intent” because the bill leaves intent undefined. It would turn ordinary sharing of hobbyist files among friends into a criminal offense and removes the practical pathway of building a 3D-printed firearm at home and then having it serialized. To illegalize the instructions for making a firearm if there is a vague “intent” is a violation of the First Amendment, goes beyond targeting illegal gun manufacturing, and undermines Second Amendment rights.</p>
<p>KRISTEN Molsness For themselves</p>	<p>Dear Members of the House Judiciary Committee,</p> <p>Please vote YES on HB26-1144. This common sense bill will save lives. Closing loopholes like this is an important step to keep</p>

	<p>Coloradans safe. Our state still loses far too many lives to guns each year.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Kristen Molsness</p> <p>Lakewood, CO</p>
rich koeppel Against themselves	<p>this is ridiculous, it is already "against the law" to build a 3d printed firearm in this state,</p>
Paul Mandal Against themselves	<p>This bill is Luddite garbage that needlessly restricts technology. Firmly against. Violates the 1st &amp; 2nd Amendment. Legislators who support this bill have zero respect for our rights.</p>
Michael Dickson Against themselves	<p>I oppose bill HB26-1144 primarily on the grounds that the General Assembly has already outlawed the manufacture of firearm frames and receivers through SB23-279, specifically mentioned on page 4 of the final Act.</p> <p>I find it grossly negligent that the Assembly would even entertain this new bill as it provides nothing of substance to add to the law. This only wastes the time of the legislature and the citizens of the state.</p>
Josh Johnson Against themselves	<p>To the Chair and Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Josh, and I am a concerned citizen of Aurora, Colorado. I am writing to oppose this bill, which restricts private 3D printing of firearms, firearm components, and digital instructions.</p> <p>The Second Amendment guarantees the right of law-abiding citizens to keep and bear arms. This right includes the ability to</p>

	<p>acquire and possess firearms for lawful purposes, such as self-defense, hunting, and sport. Courts have recognized that the Second Amendment extends beyond commercial firearms and includes privately made guns, provided they are not otherwise illegal (United States v. Miller).</p> <p>This bill would make it a criminal offense for private citizens to manufacture firearms or firearm components using 3D printers or CNC machines, unless they are federally licensed manufacturers. By criminalizing lawful private manufacture, the bill directly burdens a fundamental constitutional right.</p> <p>Additionally, the prohibition on possessing or distributing digital instructions that could be used to make firearms raises First Amendment concerns. These digital files constitute knowledge and instructions “ a form of speech protected under the Constitution (Bernstein v. United States). Restricting access to this information effectively limits citizens’ ability to exercise their Second Amendment rights.</p> <p>The law also creates a troubling distinction: it favors licensed commercial manufacturers while criminalizing private citizens acting for lawful purposes. This is not merely a regulation of dangerous activity; it curtails the personal right to self-defense and the private exercise of a fundamental constitutional liberty.</p> <p>While I strongly support measures to prevent firearms from falling into the hands of criminals, this bill overreaches by criminalizing law-abiding citizens and restricting access to lawful means of self-protection. Custody of firearms, including private manufacture, is a right that predates the state and is protected by the U.S. Constitution.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to vote no on this bill and preserve the constitutional rights of Colorado citizens.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Josh Johnson</p> <p>Aurora, Colorado</p>
<p>Ed Gunsch</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I'm just going to touch on one aspect of this bill of the many that I find out right appalling. This bill criminalizes distribution of "digital instructions", including "distribution over the internet," and defines "distribute" broadly (including out-of-state distributors sending into Colorado). That's a content/information restriction that is likely to invite costly constitutional litigation. I ask you how this not a violation of free speech? How is a digital file any different than purchasing a book. There are many books out there that teach things that are illegal to do. I can imagine what someone with a simple high school or college chemistry book could do. I mean look at what the Tsarnaev brothers were able to do with common house hold items. How do you plan on restricting these files. Force internet providers to filter out content? Setup a system similar to China's Great Wall on the internet.</p> <p>Please VOTE NO.</p>
<p>Ingrid Moore</p> <p>For themselves</p>	<p>This bill addresses a public safety concern by preventing the unregulated production of untraceable firearms and firearm components that could bypass existing gun control measures and background check requirements. The bill maintains reasonable exceptions for legitimate, licensed manufacturers while closing a potential loophole in firearm regulation.</p> <p>About enforcement, this law will allow enforcement when this class of firearms are discovered. If there is no law then a huge gap in regulations will continue that will endanger the public safety.</p>

<p>Brad S</p> <p>For themselves</p>	<p>I live in Arvada. Please vote YES on HB 26-1144. I am concerned that the existing law does not go far enough to prohibit the 3D printing of unfinished frames and receivers, which can then be used to build fully functional firearms that can't be traced. 3D-printed firearms that like could easily end up in the wrong hands. Only licensed manufacturers and licensed dealers should be able to manufacture firearms, not anyone with access to a 3D printer. This bill would address that. It would also would expand the ban to include 3D-printing high-capacity magazines and rapid-fire devices. I think of the Club Q shooter who murdered 5 people and wounded 19 others with guns built using untraceable 3D-printed parts. I want to live in a world where I don't have to look over my shoulder whenever I go out, thinking that someone there could harm me or my community. I want to be safe and feel safe. I want that for my friends, for you, and for our communities. Please vote yes on this bill for our safety.</p>
<p>Joseph Pero</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I strongly urge you to vote AGAINST HB26-1144. This oppressive bill criminalizes information instead of criminal behavior, and that is a dangerous shift.</p> <p>The bill punishes possession or sharing of digital files based on inferred intent, even when no illegal act has occurred. That crosses a clear line and creates serious constitutional exposure for the state.</p> <p>Enforcement will be subjective and inconsistent. Digital files can exist for lawful reasons such as education, engineering, or research. Yet this bill asks law enforcement to guess intent. That invites uneven enforcement and legal challenges.</p> <p>The bill also fails the basic question: will it reduce violence? No evidence shows that restricting digital files will stop criminals or improve safety. Symbolic regulation is not public safety.</p> <p>Colorado already has laws covering firearm manufacturing, prohibited persons, and un-serialized weapons. HB26-1144 does not close a gap, it duplicates existing law while adding legal risk.</p> <p>Worst of all, it risks targeting low-risk people (students, engineers, and small innovators, etc.) while diverting resources away from real criminals.</p>

	<p>Even supporters of gun control should reject this bill. It is overbroad, unenforceable, legally vulnerable, and unlikely to deliver results.</p>
<p>Brian Christie</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>Dear Esteemed Legislators:</p> <p>The proposed bill is highly personal to some but is very problematic when it comes to the US Constitution.</p> <p>First, you have the 2nd Amendment which prohibits infringement of The Peoples' right to bear arms. With the advent of modern technology such as 3D printers and CNC machining tools, it is definitely easier for individuals to create and implement firearm parts, spare parts for a car, or even toys. These tools are extremely useful. The machines, for their part, simply ingest code that moves them around to instantiate the model. The machine has no intelligence to determine what that end result might look like.</p> <p>Second, we have the 1st Amendment which grants The People freedom of speech and expression. Several judges have determined that computer code is subject to this right because a person created that code or created that model which was turned into code. By prohibiting possession of code which *can* be used to create a firearm part, you are infringing upon The Peoples' 1st amendment protected right, as well as the 2nd amendment protected right.</p> <p>Innovation has almost always had its roots in personal/home development within that technology. This bill will outlaw such innovation within the firearm industry.</p> <p>I sincerely hope our lawmakers can find better things to do with their time than continuing to infringe The Peoples' rights or taking more power and control away from The People they purport to represent.</p>
<p>Marissa Hickmon</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>This is a poorly written bill with consequences for "intent" that go beyond targeting illegal arms by turning hobbyists and small businesses into criminals for manufacturing while not doing anything to actually deter violent crime. This bill is too broad and too subjective, not to mention unenforceable, with the definitions for 3D printing pulling into it, CNC machines, that are modern day</p>

	manufacturing tools and criminalizing possession of digital files that are used in small businesses daily activity. This bill must not pass.
Sandra Knowles Against themselves	This bill is un-American and must be killed. To criminalize the possession and distribution of information in the form of code and instructions violates our 1st Amendment rights. It is completely unacceptable. In addition, to criminalize the manufacture of a part of a gun is ridiculous. What makes it part of a gun? The fact that it could be part of a gun? I do not accept your attempt to control what items I may create in my home or what information I may possess or share.
erik knowles Against themselves	You are attempting to criminalize possession of computer code, despite the fact that code has already been determined to be a form of free speech (see <i>Bernstein v. United States</i> ). As such, this bill is nothing more than a base attempt to circumvent both the first and second amendments to the US Constitution. It is bound to be ruled unconstitutional (something the sponsors undoubtedly know, but apparently their virtue-signaling is worth the litigation expense to the state).  Stop wasting money Colorado doesn't have on frivolous, obviously unconstitutional legislation.
Brent Hickmon Against themselves	This is an infringement of 1st and 2nd, 4th Amendment Rights and creates significant burdens for replacement parts manufacturers that make parts NOT classified as firearms. Vote no on this bill.
Weston Thompson Against themselves	Against
Kevin Wells Against	Chair, members of the committee,

<p>Standard Line Company LLC</p>	<p>My name is Kevin Alan Wells, and I am speaking today on behalf of Standard Line Company LLC, a Colorado-based fabrication and engineering business. Our company uses additive manufacturing commonly known as 3D printing as a normal and necessary part of daily operations.</p> <p>I am here in opposition to the proposed restrictions on 3D printing and related fabrication technologies.</p> <p>For our business, 3D printing is not theoretical. It is not political. It is a general-purpose manufacturing tool. We use it to prototype parts, repair equipment, create custom tooling, fabricate adapters, and support mechanical systems that cannot be purchased off-the-shelf. It saves time, lowers costs, reduces waste, and allows small companies to compete in the modern manufacturing economy.</p> <p>Because of that, legislation targeting 3D printers based on potential firearm applications does not regulate a product “ it regulates a category of machines used across countless lawful industries.</p> <p>A 3D printer is closer to a drill press, a lathe, or CAD software than it is to any regulated item. Restricting it due to one possible application creates legal uncertainty for businesses like ours and risks criminalizing normal industrial activity performed every day by engineers, tradesmen, educators, and repair professionals.</p> <p>There is also a constitutional concern.</p> <p>The right protected by the Second Amendment has historically included the ability of individuals to acquire and make arms. Regardless of one’s policy views, regulating a general</p>
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>manufacturing tool rather than unlawful conduct moves the law away from behavior and toward restricting capability itself.</p> <p>Beyond the constitutional question, the practical effect would be economic. Colorado businesses rely on additive manufacturing for innovation, prototyping, accessibility devices, automotive repair, agricultural equipment maintenance, and small-batch production. A restriction broad enough to address digital firearm files inevitably burdens these legitimate uses.</p> <p>Public safety matters. But legislation should target criminal misuse, not multi-purpose industrial equipment used daily by lawful businesses and citizens.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the committee to reconsider this approach and craft policy that addresses illegal acts without placing lawful manufacturing and technological development at risk.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Defenders of the free.</p>
<p>Russell Dare Against themselves</p>	<p>I respectfully oppose HB26-1144. This bill raises serious First Amendment issues by criminalizing the possession and distribution of digital files and instructions.</p> <p>Courts have long recognized that computer code and digital files can constitute protected speech. In <i>Bernstein v. U.S. Department of State</i> and <i>Junger v. Daley</i>, federal courts held that source code is speech entitled to First Amendment protection. CAD files and similar digital designs communicate ideas, technical knowledge, and engineering concepts. Restricting their possession or dissemination based on content is a content-based regulation of speech that must satisfy strict scrutiny under Supreme Court precedent such as <i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i>.</p>

	<p>HB26-1144 functions as a prior restraint by punishing the mere possession or sharing of information that “may be used” to manufacture an item. Prior restraints are among the most disfavored forms of regulation under the First Amendment. The bill’s broad language also risks unconstitutional overbreadth and vagueness, chilling lawful research, education, and innovation. As the Supreme Court emphasized in <i>Reno v. ACLU</i>, overly broad restrictions on digital expression are constitutionally suspect.</p> <p>Beyond constitutional concerns, this bill presents significant fiscal and practical risks. Laws restricting digital information related to firearms have repeatedly triggered complex and expensive litigation. Colorado taxpayers will bear the cost of defending challenges that the state may ultimately lose. At a time of budget pressures and competing priorities, inviting a wave of constitutional lawsuits is fiscally imprudent.</p> <p>Policy debates about firearms should focus on clearly defined conduct, not the suppression of information or expression. Criminalizing digital files sets a dangerous precedent that extends far beyond this specific context.</p> <p>For these reasons, I respectfully urge a NO vote on HB26-1144.</p>
<p>Stan Gelb For themselves</p>	<p>HB26-1144 can limit the number of unlicensed and unregistered guns, thereby potentially saving many lives. Please vote YES on this bill.</p>
<p>Lyn Lowry For</p>	<p>Please vote yes on this important bill; it will save many lives. Thank you.</p>

themselves	
<p>Joshua Franklin</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I'm writing in strong opposition to HB26-1144. This bill is presented as a public safety measure, but it's largely redundant, overly broad, and risks creating new penalties that sweep up ordinary Coloradans who aren't committing violent crimes.</p> <p>This bill goes beyond punishing criminal misuse and targets tools and information that can be shared for lawful educational, engineering, and hobby purposes. That creates a dangerous precedent. When the government starts criminalizing the sharing of digital files or code, we're no longer just debating firearms; we're debating speech, publication, and the free exchange of technical information. Even if the intent is to address "ghost guns," Colorado already has laws on prohibited items and illegal conduct, making this bill seem more about optics than outcomes.</p> <p>It saddens me to see my home state continuously disregard our constitution with it's attacks on our second amendment and this bill begins the attack on our first amendment. I respectfully ask that you strongly reconsider and oppose HB26-1144.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service.</p> <p>Josh Parker, Colorado</p>
<p>Mark Franklin</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I'm writing in strong opposition to HB26-1144. This bill is presented as a public safety measure, but it's largely redundant, overly broad, and risks creating new penalties that sweep up ordinary Coloradans who aren't committing violent crimes.</p> <p>This bill goes beyond punishing criminal misuse and targets tools and information that can be shared for lawful educational, engineering, and hobby purposes. That creates a dangerous precedent. When the government starts criminalizing the sharing of digital files or code, we're no longer just debating firearms; we're debating speech, publication, and the free exchange of technical information. Even if the intent is to address "ghost guns," Colorado already has laws on prohibited items and illegal</p>

	<p>conduct, making this bill seem more about optics than outcomes.</p> <p>It saddens me to see my home state continuously disregard our constitution with it's attacks on our second amendment and this bill begins the attack on our first amendment. I respectfully ask that you strongly reconsider and oppose HB26-1144.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service.</p> <p>Mark</p> <p>Wellington, Colorado</p>
<p>Valarie Harriman</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I'm writing in strong opposition to HB26-1144. This bill is presented as a public safety measure, but it's largely redundant, overly broad, and risks creating new penalties that sweep up ordinary Coloradans who aren't committing violent crimes.</p> <p>This bill goes beyond punishing criminal misuse and targets tools and information that can be shared for lawful educational, engineering, and hobby purposes. That creates a dangerous precedent. When the government starts criminalizing the sharing of digital files or code, we're no longer just debating firearms; we're debating speech, publication, and the free exchange of technical information. Even if the intent is to address "ghost guns," Colorado already has laws on prohibited items and illegal conduct, making this bill seem more about optics than outcomes.</p> <p>It saddens me to see my home state continuously disregard our constitution with it's attacks on our second amendment and this bill begins the attack on our first amendment. I respectfully ask that you strongly reconsider and oppose HB26-1144.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service.</p> <p>Valarie</p> <p>Parker, Colorado</p>
<p>James Williams</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>This has already been determined to be considered free speech. Your bill is unconditionally unconstitutional. All you are doing is violating rights, wasting taxpayer money, and showing you are unfit for office.</p>

<p>Elizabeth Cerise</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I am urging you to please VOTE NO on HB26-1144. This is a continued attack on the right of Coloradans to keep and bear arms. The right to keep and bear arms is a Constitutional right, listed in the second amendment, and this bill is an overreaching act to restrict that right. Please VOTE NO to ensure Coloradans retain their Constitutional right.</p> <p>Thank you!</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Elizabeth Cerise</p>
<p>Phil Rupprecht</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I am a Colorado Native expressing my strong opposition to HB26-1144.</p> <p>While this bill is being presented as a public safety measure, it feels more like a solution in search of a problem. We already have laws on the books in Colorado to address prohibited items and illegal conduct. Instead of focusing on those, this bill creates a massive, overly broad net that risks sweeping up ordinary Coloradans who aren't committing any violent crimes.</p> <p>My biggest concern is the dangerous precedent this sets for our First Amendment. By criminalizing the sharing of digital files, code, and technical information, we are moving the goalposts. We aren't just debating firearms anymore—we are debating whether the government can ban the exchange of speech, publication, and engineering data.</p> <p>It's honestly disheartening to see my home state continue to push legislation that disregards our constitutional rights. This bill doesn't just feel like another hit to the Second Amendment; it's a direct attack on the First.</p>

	Iâ€™m asking you today to look past the optics and consider the actual outcomes of this bill. Please protect the rights of your constituents and vote "No" on HB26-1144.
Jordan Rutherford Against themselves	HB26-1144 is entirely anti American. It infringes on the 2nd Amendment. As a voting Colorado citizen, I urge you to vote against this and all infringements on freedom and on the 2nd Amendment, which are frequently called 'gun control'. Thank you for your time.
Matthew Koziolk Against themselves	This law is an overreaching violation of our rights, on multiple levels as you will soon hear from my fellow peers, please shut this down and vote no.
Justin Beard Against themselves	Vote NO on HB-1144.  Banning digital files or plans?? Sounds like a 1st Amendment issue that is going to cause you legal issues... This bill will do nothing to stem crime. You know, from those criminals who are buying expensive printers or CNC machines to make parts for their nefarious deeds. lol
Kate Davis For themselves	As I sit in my living room working from home I can see several 3D printed toys. My children are all in elementary school and it seems many of their friends received 3D printers for Christmas. In an age when online predatory behavior seems to lurk around every digital corner we must pass this bill. While there are obvious reasons regarding logistics of gun tracing and unlawful sale of guns, I am for this bill primarily for section 3A A PERSON SHALL NOT OFFER TO SELL AND SHALL NOT DISTRIBUTE BY ANY MEANS, INCLUDING DISTRIBUTION OVER THE INTERNET, TO A PERSON IN COLORADO WHO IS NOT A FEDERALLY LICENSED FIREARM MANUFACTURER, DIGITAL INSTRUCTIONS THAT MAY BE USED TO PROGRAM A THREE-DIMENSIONAL PRINTER OR A CNC MILLING MACHINE TO MANUFACTURE OR PRODUCE A FIREARM OR FIREARM COMPONENT.  As children have access and abilities to use 3D printers and are vulnerable to online influence, it is essential that we do all that we

	<p>can to prevent access to dangerous instructions and prosecute any that would attempt to distribute those instructions.</p> <p>Already over one-third of adolescents can access a household firearm in less than 5 minutes. Colorado consistently ranks in the top 10-15 states for suicide rates. Roughly 1 person dies by gun suicide in Colorado every 15 hours. If we do not attempt to restrict the 3d printing of guns we are inviting that number to increase particularly in an age group not old enough to purchase a gun.</p> <p>Please pass this bill.</p>
<p>Bob Frank Against themselves</p>	<p>I'm opposed to this proposal which clearly infringing is on my first amendment rights my second amendment rights. It's amazing that the representatives and senators are so egregious against the constitution of the US and Colorado. Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>Brandon Hill Against themselves</p>	<p>Chair and Members of the Committee,</p> <p>My name is Brandon Hill. I am a Colorado resident, a veteran, and a software engineer. I respectfully oppose HB26-1144.</p> <p>This bill moves beyond regulating physical firearms and into regulating digital information and inferred intent. That is a significant expansion of state authority.</p> <p>HB26-1144 prohibits manufacturing certain firearm components via 3-dimensional printing or CNC unless federally licensed. It also criminalizes possessing or distributing digital instructions if "circumstances indicate intent" to manufacture or distribute unlawfully.</p>

	<p>That shift raises serious concerns.</p> <p>First, this bill reaches into digital files — code, CAD models, and machine instructions. These are forms of information. Once the state begins criminalizing possession or distribution of digital instructions based on what they could be used for, the line between regulating objects and regulating knowledge becomes thin.</p> <p>Second, the bill hinges on inferred intent. What constitutes “circumstances that indicate intent”? Does owning a printer and possessing a file create suspicion? Laws built around ambiguous intent standards invite uneven enforcement and uncertainty, particularly in technical communities where tools are often dual-use.</p> <p>As an engineer, I can tell you that CNC machines and CAD files are widely used in aerospace, automotive, medical, and small-business manufacturing. Expanding criminal liability into file possession risks chilling legitimate innovation.</p> <p>Third, the bill creates a two-tiered system where federally licensed manufacturers may possess and use the same digital information that ordinary citizens may not. If the concern is safety, the physics of a manufactured object do not change based on who produced it. If the concern is control of information, that is a different and much broader policy decision.</p> <p>Public safety matters. Criminal misuse of firearms should be punished. But this bill does not narrowly target violent misuse. It extends into digital information, inferred intent, and broadly used manufacturing tools.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>I urge the committee to consider the second- and third-order effects: legal ambiguity, selective enforcement risk, and collateral damage to Colorado's strong maker and advanced manufacturing culture.</p> <p>For these reasons, I respectfully oppose HB26-1144.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
<p>Jason Franklin</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I'm writing in strong opposition to HB26-1144. This bill is presented as a public safety measure, but it's largely redundant, overly broad, and risks creating new penalties that sweep up ordinary Coloradans who aren't committing violent crimes.</p> <p>This bill goes beyond punishing criminal misuse and targets tools and information that can be shared for lawful educational, engineering, and hobby purposes. That creates a dangerous precedent. When the government starts criminalizing the sharing of digital files or code, we're no longer just debating firearms; we're debating speech, publication, and the free exchange of technical information. Even if the intent is to address "ghost guns," Colorado already has laws on prohibited items and illegal conduct, making this bill seem more about optics than outcomes.</p> <p>It saddens me to see my home state continuously disregard our constitution with its attacks on our Second Amendment, and this bill begins the attack on our First Amendment. I respectfully ask that you strongly reconsider and oppose HB26-1144.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service.</p>
<p>Jeany Rush</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>TO: HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE</p> <p>RE: HB26-1144 D-PRINTED GUN BAN</p> <p>SPONSORS: GLICHRIST, BOESNECKER, SULLIVAN, WALLACE</p>

FROM: JEANY RUSH, COLORADO CONSTITUENT 2-18-26

VOTE: NO "NO THANK YOU" "SHALL NOT

INFRINGE!"

Well, doesn't this one take the prize at the State Fair for most Insane, Invasive, and Intrusive Bills of the day! Well, except the child mutilating bills!

First, and worst, you are now legislating, punishing, "INTENT" as if you are playing Judge and Jury! This will attack hobby folks, private folks, as well as all weapons shops. Even Components, Milling machines will be stomped out in the wake of this Tsunami Bill. Having printed plans now constitutes a crime, even if no crime is there! Now we take out the 1st and 2nd Amendment in one trick!

You force Centralized manufacture, and further penalize small operators, individuals.

Will the next bill you make be to inspect our toilets, and see what type of toilet paper we are using? One Ply or Two?

You are now legislating out of state activities in this regard as if you have now Crowned Yourself dictators of the 2nd amendment for the rest of the country as well? WHAT EXACTLY WILL BE LEFT OVER; WHAT WILL BE THE "REMAINS OF THE DAY" WHEN YOU GET THROUGH RIPPING OUR RIGHTS TO SHREDS?

People won't even be able to have plans if they want to submit them to a licensed dealer, because if someone snitches on them, they may get charged with possession of plans, and a digital crime?

Did you all re-write the Constitution? Did you forget WHO you work for? This is truly beyond reasonable, and you saved the

	<p>worst for last in this bill? You are not punishing the lawless shooters, you are still attacking your very own constituents!</p> <p>AND YOU ONCE AGAIN ABUSED THE SAFETY CLAUSE, DICTATING WHAT THE VOTERS GET TO HAVE A VOICE ON, AND WHAT YOU WILL JUST SLAM DOWN THEIR THROATS! The misuse of the Safety is like your very own Loaded WEAPON in which citizens are IGNORED!</p>
<p>Shirley Bauer</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>I have lived in Colorado my entire life and am a 3rd generation resident, with my family being homesteaders in 1918. We were brought up with guns and it never was an issue. The area I live in is a hunting region and key to much of the money this state earns. This bill HB26-1144 is just another attack on ordinary law abiding citizens and WILL DO NOTHING to stop those that are hell bent on killing someone. I think the extreme amount of anti 2nd amendment laws (36 to be exact) with an outrageous 22 passed in just the last 2 years is over the top. It indicates more of a mental illness and fixation on laws that can't be enforced. There isn't enough man power to do it and the cost to the tax payers to implement such a law, is just another NON FUNDED Mandate. It must stop! Senator Sullivan and co sponsors, please re consider and pull this bill. Thank you.</p>
<p>Craig Bauer</p> <p>Against themselves</p>	<p>Tom Sullivan and communist insurrection agents are attempting to continue their UNCONSTITUTIONAL terrorist agenda against usa nationals in an obvious communist coup attempt. Blatantly unconstitutional, this bill is Mao Zedong in action as these traitors attempt to disarm the Colorado and American public so people of money and international leverage can Continue to kidnap, rape, murder and consume infants with Jeffery Epstein's associates of Israel and other groups linked via evidence supplied recently by the doj, being protected from righteous punishment by this UNCONSTITUTIONAL bill and others . Tom Sullivan especially needs removed from office as he uses his office to take revenge on society for the death of his child, IRONICALLY protecting the very persons responsible for the mental conditions of James Holmes and the communist insurrection attempted through school board hijacking by members of terrorists organizations such as THE WEATHER UNDERGROUND whos member was pardoned by democrat Bill Clinton. No American has the duty to</p>

	<p>comply with these or the other Title 18 ss 241 conspiracy bills introduced by these people acting outside their constitutional capacity and the persons of merit reading this should take criminal actions against Tom Sullivan and the rest of these actors in crimes against the people of the state of Colorado and united States at large. There is no qualified immunity against title 18 crimes especially against these people acting outside their constitutional restraints and their law bears no merit and those enforcing it are in collusion with know agents of a domestic communist coup attempt. Violation of the 1st, 5th , 6th and 14th ammendments. Accountability.</p>
<p>Sam Johnson Against themselves</p>	<p>HB26-1144 raises serious constitutional, technological, and practical concerns, making it advisable to vote against the bill.</p> <p>Constitutional Concerns:</p> <p>HB26-1144 may violate the First Amendment by criminalizing digital firearm files, recognized as protected speech.</p> <p>It potentially infringes on the Second Amendment, restricting lawful private firearm manufacturing.</p> <p>Vague language around “intent to manufacture” risks arbitrary enforcement and due process issues.</p> <p>Technological and Practical Issues:</p> <p>The bill misunderstands 3D printing and CNC machining, conflating legitimate additive and subtractive manufacturing uses.</p> <p>Enforcing the law would be difficult and privacy-invasive, potentially targeting innocent individuals.</p> <p>Criminalizing CAD files may be ineffective at preventing illicit firearm production and could stifle education, innovation, and research.</p> <p>Economic and Industry Impacts:</p>

	<p>Could harm Colorado’s manufacturing, technology, and educational sectors.</p> <p>May discourage innovation, entrepreneurship, and skilled workforce development.</p> <p>Legal Precedent and Risk:</p> <p>Similar laws in other states have faced legal challenges, exposing the state to lawsuits and costly legal defenses.</p> <p>Policy Alternatives:</p> <p>Strengthen background checks and licensing for firearms.</p> <p>Regulate production of physical firearm components instead of digital files.</p> <p>Promote education on safe handling and appropriate security measures.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>HB26-1144 creates constitutional vulnerabilities, enforcement challenges, technological misunderstandings, and negative economic impacts. A focus on regulating physical firearms rather than digital instructions is a safer and more effective approach for public policy.</p> <p>This condensed format highlights the core arguments for written testimony advocating a vote against HB26-1144 while keeping the content clear and persuasive.</p>
<p>Wes Anderson Against himself</p>	<p>This proposal is not just targeting hardware. It is targeting code. Information. Ideas.</p> <p>This bill does not only infringe on the Second Amendment, it is also a First Amendment infringement.</p> <p>HB26-1144 says the state may decide when possessing a file is evidence of criminal intent. That is a dangerous precedent.</p> <p>This bill further centralizes firearm manufacturing in the hands of government-approved corporations, while shutting ordinary law abiding citizens out entirely.</p>