

Discussion on Banning Gun Free Zones

[Allen Majorovic](#)

I don't understand why businesses that are no-carry zones aren't liable for injuries as a result of customers/employees being unarmed.

If the business owner prohibits customers and/or employees from being armed why hasn't the business owner taken on the responsibility of the ensuring their safety?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 25 · [1w](#)

[Gordon Markle](#)

Will the business, property owner then be liable if they do not prohibit firearms and innocent third party is harmed or killed by the use of firearms. Will the property owner be required to insure only qualified trained competent persons carry firearms on their premises. Property rights supercede rights to carry on some one other persons property. If you do not feel or believe you will be safe in a gun free zone then do not enter such an area. Rights are both hierarchial and contextual.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 4 · 1w

[Dan Harris](#)

Gordon Markle there are times we have no choice. If the left was truly looking to save people (which we know they are not) they would support this measure

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 16 · 1w

[Allen Majorovic](#)

Gordon Markle

All very good question which, along with mine, seem to devolve to the view that property owners do not have any liability/responsibility for the results of a decision they've made, i.e. insisting that customers/employees be unarmed, in the event a customer/employee is injured/killed as a result.

Perhaps that's the case but it also seems like an invitation to the plaintiff's bar to go looking for liability since injury's resulted from the property owner's decision

[Gordon Markle](#)

Allen Majorovic It can also be argued that should a person choose to enter a firearm free property, he or she has consented to theses conditions and thus no liability attaches. All rights, while absolute, are still hierarchial and contextual. I have met several gun right adovactes who truly believe they should be able to own any and all types of firearms, ammution, take them everywhere, legally use them against shoplifters, purse snatchers, tesspassers, etc. One of them (and he is not on any medications nor been diagnosed with any conditions requiring medication) believes he should be allowed to own a breech loading grenade launcher and trench mortar and be allowed to use them in self defense (via the use of spotters & walkie-talkies). their should be no liability in a gun free zone, the property owner is not

responsible for the crimes committed by 3rd parties (that is the duty of the government)

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1w

[Craig Hall](#)

Gordon Markle funny how the left doesn't view the last point of your message the same way. They feel obligated to legislate our every move. While not abiding by those same laws themselves.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 2 · 1w

[Allen Majorovic](#)

Gordon Markle

Yes, it could be argued that should a person choose to enter a firearm free property, he or she has consented to theses conditions and thus no liability attaches but it could also be argued that the property owner, in insisting that those on his property be unarmed, has taken on responsibilty to defend those on his property that would otherwise be see to their own self-defense.

I haven't heard of any law suits along those lines but I will and then we'll see how the courts and/or the legislatures decide.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 3 · 1w

[Jim Cole](#)

Patrick do you have any common sense. The law says I can open carry for my protection. You make your business a gun free zone...criminals don't obey laws. So I leave my legal gun in my car go into a gun free zone. Get shot because the business owner wouldn't allow me the rights of the constitution to defend myself and you can't figure out why the business owner should be liable for my death? Wow...there is not much common sense left in this country

H Charles Foster III

Gordon Markle no, because then the responsibility falls to each individual. Those individuals make the choice to not take safety considerations, not having it forcibly stopped from them. If you coerce or forcibly strip someone of the ability to adequately defend themselves, you are the one liable for their safety. Can't have it both ways.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

H Charles Foster III

Gordon Markle as to your argument of accepting risk by entering gun free zones, some places cannot be avoided, or people are forced under penalty of law to enter (ie. School, court, government buildings where you are requested or required by governmental agencies to enter). I would exclude private business that serve no singular life essential purpose or those that have government help. Utilities and telecoms are quasi governmental and a monopolization of services decided by government regulation so they would be included and some are fixed upon the public by law (electric and gas utilities and their equipment and access to homes), all governmental buildings and lands.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

Michael Kiley

Gordon Markle A private property owner, with no public access or invitation to do business, aka a home owner has someone break into their home and injure themselves. Case law has shown the property owner is liable for that criminals injuries incurred on his property. Why should there be any less liability on a business open to the public, with an open invitation to enter and do business via advertisement? Can I put a sign on my home to absolve myself of financial liability if someone illegally enters my property uninvited and injures themselves in the commission of a felony?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

[Trevor Dalsted](#)

So if we use a few examples. If i require everyone in my business to not wear a seatbelt, because ive seen studies that show multiple injuries and deaths caused by seatbelts, does that make me liable? The answer is yes. You might think thos to be a bad comparison but the argument comes down to the property owners liability and the property owners rights. This shows the law supersedes the right of the property owner.

We have a state wide smoking ban in any business this is where the owners rights are again stepped over. You can throw the argument back that it is making an unhealthy enviornment. But that same argument goes for being able to enter while armes as well though. So you really can not have it both ways.

I am a firm believer in the second amendment as well as the property owners rights. So what is constitutionally just is the property owner is allowed to ban guns from his property aswell as to allow smoking. It is his property amd right. But when it comes to being forced upon an individual to enter an area of anykind the individual has the right to carry.

Ken Hartin

If you come to my property and get injured while there, can you sue my homeowners insurance?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1 · 5d

[Clifton Palmer McLendon](#)

Gordon Markle: Supersede

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 4d

[Steven Foldy](#)

Gordon Markle You have valid questions and in our litigious society it is difficult to know whether a person would also be held liable if they permitted people to be armed on a premisis. Laws differ in every state and municipality but I am not

aware of any laws that prohibit a person to be armed under the 'open carry' premise. WalMart and a few other entities have recently implemented policy that prohibits open carry but not concealed carry. The question of open versus concealed carry is a question and practice that needs to be clearly defined and decided by 'we, the people' and hopefully it's sooner rather than later. However, to suggest that if I don't feel safe or believe me or someone I love will not be safe in a 'gun free zone' that I should not go is telling me to be a hermit or if you oppose permitting people to be armed that I must adhere to your belief and not attend. Now I do agree that private citizens have the right to decide who is allowed on their property concerning if a friend or person is armed or not armed and definitely should NOT be held accountable or responsible if they say guests are not permitted to bring a weapon and then are harmed by some nut who does. My opinion is it should be prohibited for a person to carry a weapon in the 'open carry' method, period. However, I also believe that people should be permitted to 'carry concealed' and must have a license. License laws in every state need to be standardized so that EVERYONE can get a license who is 1-allowed by law to possess a weapon, 2-have attended a course of instruction and passed demonstrating they have the rudimentary knowledge and skills to use a weapon under the laws and responsibly, and 3-have passed a background check that validates the person in question is not a convicted felon or mentally unstable at the time of the background check. I firmly believe that if the would-be shooter knows beyond a reasonable doubt that there are several people armed and trained to return fire at a location, they would think twice before deciding to enter a place to conduct a mass shooting

[Tom Stillings](#)

Gordon Markle the bills align with our state constitution. That alone, it would seem offers protection to those who respect constitutionally protected rights.

Conversely, if a business decides to ban the exercise of a right on their property, it would seem appropriate that they assume responsibility for the outcome of that decision. Even SCOTUS has ruled that "self defense is the responsibility of the individual" (Castle Rock V Gonzales). When that function, actually more than a "right" but also a "legal responsibility" is removed, the entity prohibiting such should be held responsible for the outcome of that action.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 3d

Greg Joseph Sr.

Gordon Markle wouldn't the innocent injured party be covered by the liability of the shooter???

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 21h

[Patrick Hall](#)

Article 1 sec 6 State constitution guarantees every citizen the Right of Self Defense and defense of others why dont we just stick to that? Michigan was not instituted to take our Rights away but rather protect our Rights preordained before Michigan was ever created.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 19 · [1w](#)

[Mark Purkey](#)

When you start telling individuals and business owners that they can not set rules for their own property you run into problems . First you are violating their rights as property owners . There has been way to much of this. Then there is the problem of making someone else liable for what some criminal or sick individual does . NO ONE should ever be held accountable for what someone else does . We have lost the concept of being responsible for ourselves . This bill just reinforces the idea that government has the right to tell business and individuals what they can and can not do with their own property. If you do not like the policy that Walmart has regarding guns let them know it and tell them you will not shop there . There is one Walmart store in Flint that I will not be going to. But I do not want the government getting into it .

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5 · [1w](#)

[Craig Hall](#)

Yet right now, the government is saying that because some jerk off uses a gun to kill someone else. That it's the guns fault and not the person using it. Hence their screams for "gun control". More commonly known as gun confiscation. Look if you own a car and by your own actions kill someone while using it. YOU should be held responsible for that action, not the car. So in my opinion, if a business owner makes the decision to have a "gun free zone". Then by his action HE should be held accountable for what occurs in his business. The person committing the crime is held accountable for the crime, but the business owner by his actions. Created the environment for the event to happen. I believe it is one reason we don't see many gun store crimes. Because the employees are carrying guns and know how to use them.

[Mark Purkey](#)

Craig Hall You and I probably think a lot a like on guns and the 2nd amendment. But you want to blame a business owner for what someone else does. You would not want government telling you what to do with your gun, which is property. But you want the government to tell a business or individual what to do with their property. Remember businesses are private property. If you carry in a store and drop your gun, it goes off , hits someone they will sue the store. If you are in the store and someone goes nuts and injures you , you want to sue the store. Both sides use the same argument that the store created an unsafe area. Lets let business decide what they want to do and keep government out of it.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 6d

Kevin Shull

Mark Purkey while it is the right for the business to set their own rules on this subject, it is not their right to take our right away, the ability to protect ourselves. I get what you are saying. There's an argument to both sides. But if the establishment allows firearms on their property, they are no longer liable for injuries related to firearms. As for not going to those types of places, they're not just talking about local box stores. They're also talking about schools and government buildings.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 2 · 6d

[Show 9 more replies in this thread](#)

Scott Balderrama

The incipient drolling about safety from both business's and government entities added with popular and arbitrary dismissal of an individual right to protect oneself is nothing more than an attempt to keep their pocketbook safe at the effort and sometimes mortally detrimental expense of the individual.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1 · 1w

James Hoffman

I'm a CCW permit holder, but am not allowed to carry at work. If I EVER get injured by a shooter because I am not allowed to defend myself at work, if I survive, I will sue my employer

[Vance Cole](#)

Unless you signed a waiver with your employment papers waiving your right to sue them in such a case :/

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

[Allen Majorovic](#)

Vance Cole

Waivers aren't magic, get-out-of-jail-free cards. Get hurt because of faulty equipment and even if you've signed a waiver that absolves the employer of responsibility for injury resulting from their faulty equipment the employer will find themselves on the wrong end of a suit with a good chance of losing.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 2 · 4d

Greg Joseph Sr.

The employer would have to have some responsibility, yet to be proved for a lawsuit...

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 19h

John Keur

Ok then why are government Have a immunity? courthouse, school, Gun free zones are all death traps why should government have Immunity from lawsuit their also a violation of our 2nd amendment

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5 · 1w

Marc Wymer

This bill seems to fix that issue.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 3 · 6d

[Nathaniel Robert Hunt](#)

Then those of us that have churches/temples simply go back to the ancient way of baring everyone but priests from the altar room, worshipers can worship in a plain room if they want their guns, they don't have a right to defile our religious traditions

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 6d

S Allen Woodstuff

Nathaniel Robert Hunt: Exactly what religious tradition do you adhere, Shaker, Quaker, Mennonite, Amish, JW, Mormon, Judaism, Islam, etc.? There are only a few smallish traditions that would view a firearm as “defiling” a Holy Place.

[Nathaniel Robert Hunt](#)

S Allen Woodstuff Celto-Roman Paganism

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 6d

[Tatianna Graywing](#)

Nathaniel Robert Hunt what are you talking about? Are you talking about pre Roman Celtic Paganism or are you talking about modern Celtic Paganism?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 6d

[Nathaniel Robert Hunt](#)

Tatianna Graywing modern Paganism that is based on the Celto-Roman mix of religion that happened after the invasion of Celtic lands

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 6d

[Tatianna Graywing](#)

Nathaniel Robert Hunt I see, I hadn't seen it put as Celto before, thus my confusion. I follow a pagan path myself just not that particular one. Honestly I can understand the wish to not have weapons in a place of worship. Though I would like to point out almost anything can be used as a weapon. Though from what I read of this it's to help prevent more issues in business or governmental owned gun free zones. I'm not sure how it would possibly affect a religious location.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1 · 6d

[Nathaniel Robert Hunt](#)

Tatianna Graywing We are for having armed guards that stand guard away from the altar area, its just we had a few crazies mus understand us who wanted to show up and place guns on the altar just to show they could.....

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 6d

[Tatianna Graywing](#)

Nathaniel Robert Hunt now i understand. Thank you for explaining the reason for your comment. If they want to place them on the alter you could always purify it with salt water ☹️ just teasing about the purifying.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 2 · 6d

[Trevor Dalsted](#)

Nathaniel Robert Hunt The seperation of state and chruch. This would be protected.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1 · 5d

[Nathaniel Robert Hunt](#)

Trevor Dalsted Some of these bills have tried to go around that, and a few churches in Texas that said no were punished when the sign requirements were made to be almost impossable to do , but think the state backed down

[Trevor Dalsted](#)

Nathaniel Robert Hunt agree and thats gov. For ya. Their only goal nowdays is to get ride of more of the citizens rights and grant themselves more power and a raise to boot. Honeslty the property owner should have the right to say no guns. This be said that should also have the right to say yes to other things aswell like smoking.

This being said i am a big supporter of the 2A and the constitution as a whole. But i also believe the individuals rights supersede over the property owner if the individual is forced to enter.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 2 · 5d

Phillip Armstrong

If gun nuts are scared of gun free zones don't go to them.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1 · 5d

[Trevor Dalsted](#)

So what about the people that are forced to go to gun free zones. Commy?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

Ken Hartin

They don't. That's why so many die. Sheesh

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

Phillip Armstrong

Trevor Dalsted if you were intelligent you'd know economic systems like capitalism and communism have nothing to do with this topic.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

Trevor Dalsted

Phillip Armstrong say why dont you try to rebuttal instead of trying to discredit the character? Constantly insulting does not show an intelligence. My cummy question would relate to your gun nut comment. If someone supporting our 2A right is a nut, then that would make you more of a communist.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 5d

Patrick Key

It's called the 2nd Amendment my friend.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 4d

Phillip Armstrong

Trevor Dalsted you should take your own advice dumbass

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 4d

Phillip Armstrong

Trevor Dalsted and no dumbass the 2nd Amendment has nothing to do with economic systems.

Trevor Dalsted

Phillip Armstrong still waiting on you to rebuttal my point. Ive rebuttal yours with a direct question. If you can force citizens to enter gun free zones without the right to self defense you could force that citizen to do anything. Like boarbing a cattle car. My argument has nothing to do with economic systems. I agree that a private business has the right to say no to guns, and i believe that you feel the same. This would also mean that you thing the business has the right to say yes to smoking aswell. However if you are forced to enter then the individuals rights would supersede the property owners rights do to the fact the individual can not opt out. So are you going to insult me again instead of trying to come up with a compelling argument?

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 4d

Stu Chisholm

Such zones often cannot be avoided. If you have business with any government agency, for instance, you're not allowed to carry on the premises in most instances. (I've always found it odd that carry is permitted in the Capitol building and in the legislative offices across the street, but if I go to DHS, a sign is posted prohibiting my firearm.) Also, if you presume to substitute your judgment for mine, then you should also be accountable for your judgment. Simple.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 1h

Wtxohn Thao

Government, schools, public and business should be liable for the death and injury of people by guns in "gun free zones". When a person who has paid for all the training, licenses and tools to protect themselves, but obey the "gun free zone" laws and they get killed then what's the point of making someone go through it all just to die in a "gun free zone"? The purpose for "gun free zone" is to prohibit guns. But a criminal don't care about rules and laws. That's why they are criminals. I'm a concealed carry holder and if I follow the law and either me or my family member get shot by a criminal who didn't follow the law. The government, schools, public and business should be 100% liable. Because we followed the law to make your business or place happy and feel safe, but we disarm ourselves in that very process. So government, schools, public and business are 100% liable just like how the Left and all gun control activist says guns are responsible for mass shootings and not the insane criminals.

So if a business, school, public and government buildings don't have our life as their priority, then why should we follow "gun free zones"? Because my life and my families life is worth more than a stupid law that wants to make us open targets for a criminal that "gun free zones" never stops. Your schools, business, public and government buildings are not safer with "gun free zones", you just maje mass shooting easier.

Lee Heinz

Spot on the government gave us the 2nd Amend. God gave me the right to defend my self and my family and he commands us to do so.

As far as I am concerned I have no need for any of the gun free zones let the gun free people go there so the criminals will have a hay day on the snowflakes who have on clue about this or how great this country is they would cash the whole thing in for a stupid video game millinials are brain less when it comes to what made this counrty Great. It was God and the people who belive in right and wrong.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 4d

Bob Blackthorne

YES! YES! Hold business owners LIABLE when those "certain" religious FREAKS decide to kill, behead, rape, and destroy what's left of our, repeat OUR civilized country! Oh, then why not hold SCHOOL BOARD members, Privncipals, and all Superintendents of school districts LIABLE when a mentally defective IGNORES that wonderfully effective sign solidly stating "GUN-FREE-ZONE?" Yeah, JAIL THEM for FAILING to ensure OUR CHILDREN are SAFE! In FACT, GFACTUALLY, 99% of ALL mass killings in the last 25 years have happened in those idiotic, stupid Liberal declared "GUN-FREE-ZONES!" Guess what? Criminals a...[See More](#)

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 3d

Walt Kay

I assumed that this was already the case, or least I as a CPL holder have a better case as I should be able to claim that person or identity that disarmed me automatically took additional responsibility for my safety. Only makes sense. Sad to hear that the government grants immunity to people for taking away your rights.

Hope this bill passes.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 3d

Matthew Moss

Makes sense, if a place is going to insist you be disarmed they should not only be liable but be required to prove their individual venue has adequate security upon request (mall/plaza security shouldn't count). If they fail to provide a bare minimum (armed personnel & surveillance), it should defer to the carrier of the weapon as to whether they disarm or not. It'd be their call anywhere else, I see no reason that shouldn't be so. Would you willingly make yourself less secure in a place that isn't? Can't say I would.

[Like](#) · [Reply](#) · 3d

Richard Reaves

Finally someone with some common sense.

Pray the bill will pass.