

To whom it may concern:

I am opposed to the broadening of the definition of protected "family or household members" under the constitutionally suspect "extreme risk protection order". The definition of household member includes individuals who have been involved in a sexually intimate relationship. So if a person was sexually involved with an individual 40 years ago, they are a member of that individual's household? I do not buy that.

Absent scrapping the entire bill, the law needs work to narrow the definition of household member to current, or at least recent members, of someone's household. A six month limitation seems at least reasonable.

In addition, there needs to be a penalty assessed on anyone who requests an extreme risk protection order without a reasonable basis for doing so. Current law does not require even a reasonable belief that the order is needed before allowing a filing for an extreme risk protection order. The cost and aggravation to someone falsely accused of being a threat to himself, herself, or others is extreme. The individuals who can request an extreme risk protection order include untrained individuals and vindictive former partners. There are NO controls on these individuals that would prevent spurious filings for an extreme risk protection order.

Thank you for considering my views.

John MacDonald
8893 NW Savoy Lane
Portland, Oregon 97229
971-219-1750
macdcpa@comcast.net
Sent from my iPad