

*THE SAPPA GROUP*

297 Willow Drive

Little Silver, NJ

732 673 5251

To: Congressman Thomas Massie  
P.O. Box 821  
Newport, KY 41072  
RE: Congressional 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Caucus  
Date: December 9, 2016

Dear Rep. Thomas Massie,

I read with great interest an article posted on [www.ammoland.com](http://www.ammoland.com) which referenced the creation of the ***Congressional 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Caucus*** that you and several other Congressmen have formed in an effort to provide assistance to Donald J. Trump's agenda during 115<sup>th</sup> Congressional Session.

The article referenced above was vague and provided no specifics on what your new caucus has planned or what legislation it might be working on. A bit of research finds that you are not a cosponsor to HR 402 (Reciprocal Carry Bill). Do you in fact intend to join that group of legislators or is there some reason or flaw in the bill that has kept you from signing on to it? More on this Bill later in this letter.

Before I go on I want to introduce myself and inform you of what my group has been involved with during these past few years. I am cofounder of the SAPPA Group. (Second Amendment Preservation and Protection Action) Our group has for the past almost two years been battling the Federal District Court in Trenton, NJ. Mr. Nicholas E. Purpura, also cofounder, filed a lawsuit against the State of New Jersey on the basis that the legislative, executive and judicial branches of this state's government have conspired to deny its citizens their civil rights in violation of Federal Rico statutes.

This type of legal action, relating to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment, had never been undertaken before. The Brief was filed under much criticism and was given zero chance of surviving even a few weeks in the liberal District Court. We filed that Petition in March of 2015 and as of this date, all the underhanded shenanigans, collusion and failure by the court to make rulings, it is still going strong as we are now in the process of getting the 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit Court to revoke an order by the lower court which would have unfairly ended our legal action.

During this time, our Pro Se litigant has filed motions, prevented unlawful dismissals of our suit which has seen several professional groups of defense attorney's demoted or replaced and just recently, the District Court Judge (an Obama appointee) was removed and replaced. We have kept a log of all the activity of this lawsuit. That log can be seen here: <http://www.tpath.org/sappa-news-and-reports.html>

Also we have posted all the filings generated by the Petitioner (Mr. Purpura) as well as the defense attorneys and the Federal Courts. They can be seen here: <http://www.tpath.org/sappa-district-court-documents.html>

Our Petition, while it has been filed against the activities of New Jersey, the repercussions will affect all states of the Union which institute and enforce unconstitutional laws on its people.

So just in case your caucus was in need of a starting point to get your activity off the ground, we have decided to get this information to you. If you take some time to review the documents generated over this past 18 months you will see that this battle we have been waging could use some high level assistance as we move into the Appeals process. Please consider this request.

Back now to H.R. 402 of the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress. I asked if you had any problems with the Bill as written, because our SAPPA Group would like to see some changes to it. We would like for your new caucus to consider the changes we suggest here and support them.

As we all know Federalism and the liberties our founders included in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution cannot be trumped or infringed upon by any of the sovereign states. That however has failed to prevent many of them of doing just that. Many states are in competition for being the most egregious offenders but none of them top the illegal laws which have been enacted in New Jersey.

For example, New Jersey does have a program which allows citizens to acquire carry permits. They know they had to do this to comply with several federal Court rulings. But, having the permit process on the books and allowing the people to practice their 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Rights are two very different things. In New Jersey a private citizen has close to zero percent chance of being approved for a carry permit. Well over 99% of carry permit applications filed by private citizens in New Jersey, are denied.

That is why the wording of H.R. 402 and its sister bill in the Senate needs some changes made to it before it's voted on again and sent to President Trump. The wording in the heading of the bill which states - "*To amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a national standard in accordance with which **nonresidents of a State** may carry concealed firearms in the State.*" - needs to be amended. The word group - *nonresident*

*of a state- must be removed and replaced with – any person regardless of which state is his permanent residence, who has a valid carry permit issued by any other state-.*

This change will prevent states such as NJ, NY, Connecticut and a few others from thwarting the rights of its residents who may have carry permits issued in other states where they might visit or live in at certain times of the year. The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment guarantees that laws and rights are to be applied equally to every citizen of the United States. If this suggested amendment to H.R. 402 is not made, those states will be able to claim any resident of their state who has a valid permit from another state may not carry there. This would defeat the concept and intent of H.R. 402.

Also the SAPP Group would like to suggest yet another Amendment to H.R. 402. That would be the addition of some “bite” to the new legislation. That means Federal fines or penalties for any state that refuses to comply with the law as passed and enacted. Many liberal states routinely ignore the several Federal Court rulings which have been made in support of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment. They can do this because a “ruling” carries no penalty and would require a legal action which is long term and nearly impossible to win.

A Congressional bill signed into law by the President carries much more weight in that the penalties for breaking that law will (should) be swift and exacting.

As your new caucus forms up in the new session, hopefully you will consider some or all of what our SAPP Group has suggested herein.

With the warmest of regards and wishes for the success of your caucus we thank you for your time and do anticipate hearing from you concerning the important topics in this letter.

Dwight Kehoe

Editor [www.tpath.org](http://www.tpath.org)

Cofounder The SAPP Group

and

Nicholas E. Purpura

Petitioner for the Federal Brief

Purpura v Christie; et al