



# Press Release

Connecticut Bar Association's Support of 2013 Gun Ban is Deplorable

Connecticut Carry Calls for Public Denouncements of Proposal

**New Britain CT, July 18, 2014:** Connecticut Carry has been made aware that the [Connecticut Bar Association](#) (CBA) has proposed to its members that the CBA wishes to file an Amicus, or 'friend of the court', Brief in the case of [Shew v Malloy](#) in support of the defendant, the State of Connecticut. Ironically, the section of the CBA which has brought this topic for this called "Human Rights and Responsibility", with their mission being:

*"This section focuses on the enforcement, protection, and development of legal protections, which safeguard the rights of individuals"*

By proposing to support the [2013 Gun Ban](#) in Connecticut, they have chosen to attack 'the rights of individuals' instead of safeguarding those rights. By choosing this stance, they also imply that the 2013 Gun Ban somehow supports 'Human rights', even though there is no more of a basic or important human right than the right to self-defense, which they advocate opposing with their proposal. They also inversely imply that the amici on the other side of the issue, including the International Law Enforcement Education and Trainers Association (ILEETA), Law Enforcement Legal Defense Fund (LELDF), Law Enforcement Action Network (LEAN), current and retired state and local law enforcement officers, and the Attorney Generals of **23 states** are somehow against human rights by opposing the 2013 Gun Ban, a de-facto infringement on individual rights.

In response to this proposal, [Attorney Rachel M. Baird](#) of Torrington, CT wrote a [scathing letter](#) to the Connecticut Bar Association, which she is a member of. [Attorney Scott D. Camassar](#) of the law firm [Stephen M. Reck, LLC](#) and Attorney Martha Dean have joined in Attorney Baird's criticism of the Connecticut Bar Association, bringing up very valid and critical points about the goals of the CBA and their understandings of what the CBA was supposed to stand for.

But, as Connecticut Carry is pointing out, this is not the Connecticut Bar Association's first foray into advocating against the right to self-defense. In a [letter dated 03/12/2013](#), the Connecticut Bar Association recommended that the legislature pass edicts that later became the basis for SB 1160, otherwise known as the [2013 Gun Ban](#). In their letter, they advocated on behalf of:

**For Release 11:00 AM EST 7/18/2014**

- Universal background checks (registration)
- The banning of 'assault/military style weapons' to civilians.
- The banning of the sale of 'high capacity magazines' to civilians.

In the letter, they also support Governor Malloy's gun ban proposals of that time and call them 'common sense' which is a sardonic term used by other anti-rights groups to imply that individual rights are somehow not 'common sense'. They go on to say that they 'strongly endorse' the Governor's proposals, which became SB 1160 that we now live under.

The Connecticut Bar Association joined the world's bulwark of human rights, China in [their declaration](#) about gun bans. By taking the same stance as the communist Chinese government took in "Human Rights Record of the United States in 2011", which was released by the State Council Information Office of the People's Republic of China in May of 2012, the Connecticut Bar Association has made their stance against individual rights and for collectivism clear.

Interestingly, Judge Covello, the Federal District Court judge that dismissed the [Shew v Malloy](#) case on summary judgment is a proud member of the Connecticut Bar Association, as declared in his [judicial biography](#). Connecticut Carry must ask whether Judge Covello's association with the Connecticut Bar Association tainted his decision-making in this case and whether this behavior on the part of an organization that he is a proud member of should mean that he recuse himself from all subsequent firearms-related cases.

The brief that is being proposed by the Connecticut Bar association is against the appeal of Judge Covello's [decision](#). This kind of conflict of interests is both unbecoming of a 'professional organization' like the bar association and it is unbecoming of a sitting Federal judge.

Connecticut Carry has [posted a list](#) of the members of the CBA's "Human Rights and Responsibility" on our [website](#). We urge our members and other concerned members of the public to review [the list](#) and strongly reconsider doing any business with anyone on the list. In addition, any member of the Connecticut Bar Association should not be considered a friend of individuals rights unless and until they make a *public* declaration against this proposal by the Connecticut Bar Association. If you are doing business with an attorney that has not *publicly* come out against this proposal, please make sure you let them know *why* you will no longer be able to do business with them.