

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH  
OVERSIGHT DIVISION

**FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 5453H.011  
 Bill No.: HB 2176  
 Subject: Firearms; Weapons; Liability; Law Enforcement Officers and Agencies  
 Type: Original  
 Date: January 28, 2026

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to public safety.

**FISCAL SUMMARY**

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND**

| FUND AFFECTED                                        | FY 2027                 | FY 2028                 | FY 2029                 |
|------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| General Revenue*                                     | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        |
| <b>Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> |

\*Oversight assumes the total state fiscal impact could exceed \$250,000 due to the potential for civil action and the addition of a civil penalty of \$50,000 per occurrence for any violations of §§1.486 and 21.750.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS**

| FUND AFFECTED                                             | FY 2027                 | FY 2028                 | FY 2029                 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| State Legal Expense Fund (1692)**                         | \$0                     | \$0                     | \$0                     |
| Other State Funds*                                        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        |
| Colleges and Universities*                                | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        |
| State Highways and Transportation Department Fund (1644)* | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        |
| Water Patrol Division Fund (1400)*                        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        |
| <b>Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds</b>    | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> |

\*\*Transfers and distributions net to zero. Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS**

| FUND AFFECTED                                                 | FY 2027                 | FY 2028                 | FY 2029                 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Federal Funds*                                                | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        | \$0 or (Unknown)        |
| <b>Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or (Unknown)</b> |

\*Oversight assumes the loss of federal funds could reach the \$250,000 threshold.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)**

| FUND AFFECTED                            | FY 2027  | FY 2028  | FY 2029  |
|------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                                          |          |          |          |
| <b>Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> | <b>0</b> |

- Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.
- Estimated Net Effect (savings or increased revenues) expected to exceed \$250,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act or at full implementation of the act.

**ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS**

| FUND AFFECTED             | FY 2027                            | FY 2028                            | FY 2029                            |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
|                           |                                    |                                    |                                    |
| <b>Local Government**</b> | <b>\$0 or Unknown to (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or Unknown to (Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or Unknown to (Unknown)</b> |

\*\*Fine revenue from violations and potential litigation costs.

## FISCAL ANALYSIS

### ASSUMPTION

#### §1.486 – Anti-Red Flag Gun Seizure Act

Officials from the **Office of Administration (OA)** state this legislation this legislation creates provisions and damages relating to seizure of firearms and includes a waiver of sovereign immunity for actions brought under this section. This has the potential to increase costs to the LEF but would be subject to judicial construction; therefore, the cost is unknown.

**Oversight** does not have any information contrary to that provided by OA. Therefore, Oversight will reflect OA's potential unknown impact for fiscal note purposes to the State Legal Expense Fund. Oversight notes the Legal Expense Fund is funded by the General Revenue Fund as well as other state funds. Oversight notes this possible litigation exposure as described by OA could also apply to colleges and universities, federal funds, as well as local political subdivisions.

Officials from the **Department of Public Safety - Missouri Highway Patrol (MHP)** state Section 1.486.7(1) creates a right to sue the law enforcement agency for a minimum of \$50,000 per occurrence along with punitive damages and attorney's fees. The Patrol has no way of computing the number of allegations it may have to defend. Due to this, the impact is listed as unknown to General Revenue, the State Highways and Transportation Department Fund (1644), the Water Patrol Division Fund (1400), and Federal Funds (1152). The three impacted state funds are the primary funding sources for enforcement personnel.

Additionally, Section 1.486.2 and Section 1.486.4 could have a fiscal impact as it might eliminate federal grant money that pays for the salaries of four (4) troopers and some overtime for troopers assigned to a federal task force or are assigned to work with a specified federal law enforcement agency.

Finally, Section 1.486.7(5) appears to waive sovereign immunity, which could account for funding for the defense of future civil litigation, and would be a considerable departure from current law.

**Oversight** does not have any information contrary to that provided by MHP. Therefore, Oversight will reflect MHP's impact as \$0 or an Unknown loss to the funds listed above. Oversight assumes the amounts of federal funding received by the state related to a red flag law would reach the \$250,000 threshold.

In response to similar legislation, HB 1683 (2026), officials from the **Office of Administration - Budget and Planning (B&P)** stated Article IX, Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution requires that penalties, forfeitures, and fines collected for violations of state law be distributed to the schools. To the extent any additional such revenues are deposited into the state treasury, TSR may increase.

**Oversight** notes that violations of section 1.486.7(1) could result in fines or penalties. Oversight also notes per Article IX Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution fines and penalties collected by counties are distributed to school districts. Fines vary widely from year to year and are distributed to the school district where the violation occurred. Oversight will reflect a positive fiscal impact of \$0 or Unknown to local school districts. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the possibility that fine revenue paid to school districts may act as a subtraction in the foundation formula.

#### §21.750 – Civil Suits involving Firearms and Amendment II of the Constitution

Officials from the **OA** state this legislation creates provisions and damages relating to firearm deprivation and includes a waiver of sovereign immunity for actions brought under this section. This has the potential to increase costs to the LEF but would be subject to judicial construction; therefore, the cost is unknown.

**Oversight** does not have any information contrary to that provided by OA. Therefore, Oversight will reflect OA's potential unknown impact for fiscal note purposes to the State Legal Expense Fund. Oversight notes the Legal Expense Fund is funded by the General Revenue Fund as well as other state funds and federal funds. Oversight notes this possible litigation exposure as described by OA could also apply to colleges and universities and local political subdivisions.

Oversight notes that violations of section 21.750.7 could result in fines or penalties. Oversight also notes per Article IX Section 7 of the Missouri Constitution fines and penalties collected by counties are distributed to school districts. Fines vary widely from year to year and are distributed to the school district where the violation occurred. Oversight will reflect a positive fiscal impact of \$0 or Unknown to local school districts. For simplicity, Oversight will not reflect the possibility that fine revenue paid to school districts may act as a subtraction in the foundation formula.

#### §§571.101, 571.104, 571.117, 571.205, and 571.225 – Concealed Carry Permits

**Oversight** notes this bill lowers the age requirement from nineteen to eighteen for a concealed carry permit, which may increase the number of CCW applications submitted to county sheriffs. Oversight assumes any increase in revenue to sheriff's departments will be offset by an increase in cost to process the applications for CCW permits. Therefore, the impact to local governments-sheriff's departments will be presented as netting to \$0.

#### Responses regarding the proposed legislation as a whole

Officials from the **Office of State Courts Administrator (OSCA)** state there may be some impact but there is no way to quantify that currently. Any significant changes will be reflected in future budget requests.

**Oversight** notes OSCA assumes this proposal may have some impact on their organization although it can't be quantified at this time. As OSCA is unable to provide additional information regarding the potential impact, Oversight assumes the proposed legislation will have a \$0 or (Unknown) cost to the General Revenue Fund. For fiscal note purposes, Oversight also assumes the impact will be under \$250,000 annually. If this assumption is incorrect, this would alter the fiscal impact as presented in this fiscal note. If additional information is received, Oversight will review it to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek approval to publish a new fiscal note.

Officials from the **City of Kansas City** state the proposed legislation has a negative fiscal impact of an indeterminate amount as it increases the city's potential liability.

Officials from the **City of O'Fallon** assume this bill could potentially cost the City \$50,000 per event if a violation were to occur.

Officials from the **Office of Attorney General (AGO)** assume any potential litigation costs arising from this proposal can be absorbed with existing resources. The AGO may seek additional appropriations if the proposal results in a significant increase in litigation or investigation costs.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight assumes the AGO will be able to perform any additional duties required by this proposal with current staff and resources and will reflect no fiscal impact to the AGO for fiscal note purposes.

Officials from the **City of Osceola** and **St. Louis County Police Department** assume the proposal will have a fiscal impact on their organization but did not provide any additional information.

Officials from the **Department of Natural Resources, Department of Corrections, Department of Revenue, Department of Public Safety – (Capitol Police and Office of the Director), Department of Social Services, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri National Guard, Office of the State Public Defender, Phelps County Sheriff's Department, Branson Police Department, and Kansas City Police Department** each assume the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their respective organizations.

In response to similar legislation, SB 142 (2025), officials from the **Missouri Office of Prosecution Services** assumed the proposal will have no fiscal impact on their organization.

**Oversight** does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact in the fiscal note for these agencies.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other cities, counties, circuit clerks, and local law enforcement were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. Upon the receipt of additional

responses, Oversight will review to determine if an updated fiscal note should be prepared and seek the necessary approval to publish a new fiscal note. A general listing of political subdivisions included in our database is available upon request.

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>                                                                                                                 | FY 2027<br>(10 Mo.)            | FY 2028                        | FY 2029                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>GENERAL REVENUE</b>                                                                                                                                  |                                |                                |                                |
| <u>Cost</u> – MHP (§1.486) Potential loss of funding p.3                                                                                                | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            |
| <u>Cost</u> – OSCA (§§1.486 & 21.750) Potential cost relating to “Anti-Red Flag Gun Seizure Act” p.4                                                    | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            |
| <u>Transfer Out</u> – OA (§§1.486 & 21.750) To the State Legal Expense Fund for Potential increase in litigation p.3-4                                  | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE</b>                                                                                                          | <b><u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u></b> | <b><u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u></b> | <b><u>\$0 or (Unknown)</u></b> |
| <b>STATE LEGAL EXPENSE FUND (1692)</b>                                                                                                                  |                                |                                |                                |
| <u>Transfer In</u> – from General Revenue and other State and Federal funds p.3-4                                                                       | \$0 or<br>Unknown              | \$0 or<br>Unknown              | \$0 or<br>Unknown              |
| <u>Cost</u> – OA (§§1.486 & 21.750) Potential increase in litigation p.3-4                                                                              | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON THE STATE LEGAL EXPENSE FUND</b>                                                                                             | <b><u>\$0</u></b>              | <b><u>\$0</u></b>              | <b><u>\$0</u></b>              |
| <b>OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>                                                                                                                                |                                |                                |                                |
| <u>Transfer Out</u> – OA (§§1.486 & 21.750) To the State Legal Expense Fund for potential increase in litigation potential increase in litigation p.3-4 | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)            |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>                                           | FY 2027<br>(10 Mo.)         | FY 2028                     | FY 2029                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT<br/>OTHER STATE FUNDS</b>                                 | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <b>COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES</b>                                                  |                             |                             |                             |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <u>Cost</u> – (§§1.486 & 21.750) Potential<br>increase in litigation p.3-4        | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON<br/>COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES</b>                      | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <b>STATE HIGHWAYS AND<br/>TRANSPORTATION<br/>DEPARTMENT FUND (1644)</b>           |                             |                             |                             |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <u>Cost</u> – MHP (§1.486) Potential loss of<br>funding p.3                       | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON<br/>THE STATE HIGHWAYS AND<br/>TRANSPORTATION FUND</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <b>WATER PATROL DIVISION<br/>FUND (1400)</b>                                      |                             |                             |                             |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <u>Cost</u> – MHP (§1.486) Potential loss of<br>funding p.3                       | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON<br/>THE WATER PATROL DIVISION<br/>FUND</b>             | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>(Unknown)</b> |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <b>FEDERAL FUNDS</b>                                                              |                             |                             |                             |
|                                                                                   |                             |                             |                             |
| <u>Cost</u> – MHP (§1.486) Potential loss of<br>funding p.3                       | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         | \$0 or<br>(Unknown)         |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – State Government</u>                                                                                                                    | FY 2027<br>(10 Mo.)                | FY 2028                            | FY 2029                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <u>Transfer Out – OA to the State Legal Expense Fund (§§1.486 &amp; 21.750) To the State Legal Expense Fund for potential increase in litigation p.3-4</u> | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>         | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>         | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>         |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO FEDERAL FUNDS</b>                                                                                                               | <b>\$0 or<br/><u>(Unknown)</u></b> | <b>\$0 or<br/><u>(Unknown)</u></b> | <b>\$0 or<br/><u>(Unknown)</u></b> |

| <u>FISCAL IMPACT – Local Government</u>                                                                      | FY 2027<br>(10 Mo.)                               | FY 2028                                           | FY 2029                                           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <b>LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>                                                                          |                                                   |                                                   |                                                   |
| <u>Revenue Gain – School districts (§§1.486 &amp; 21.750) Fines from violations p.4</u>                      | \$0 or<br>Unknown                                 | \$0 or<br>Unknown                                 | \$0 or<br>Unknown                                 |
| <u>Revenue Gain – Sheriff’s Departments (§§571.101 to 571.225) Increase in CCW applications p.5</u>          | \$0 or<br>Unknown                                 | \$0 or<br>Unknown                                 | \$0 or<br>Unknown                                 |
| <u>Cost - (§§1.486 &amp; 21.750) Potential increase in litigation and/or civil penalty costs p.3-4</u>       | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>                        | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>                        | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>                        |
| <u>Cost – Sheriff’s Departments (§§571.101 to 571.225) Increase in costs to process CCW applications p.5</u> | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>                        | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>                        | \$0 or<br><u>(Unknown)</u>                        |
| <b>ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS</b>                                                  | <b>\$0 or<br/>Unknown to<br/><u>(Unknown)</u></b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>Unknown to<br/><u>(Unknown)</u></b> | <b>\$0 or<br/>Unknown to<br/><u>(Unknown)</u></b> |

FISCAL IMPACT – Small Business

No direct fiscal impact on small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

## FISCAL DESCRIPTION

### PUBLIC SAFETY (Sections

This bill establishes the "Anti-Red Flag Gun Seizure Act".

For purposes of the bill, "red flag law" is defined as any gun control law, order, or measure that directs the seizure of any firearm, accessory, or ammunition of an individual, except persons lawfully in custody or persons who have been released after the execution of a bail bond after having been charged with a dangerous felony, or any Federal or state rule, statute, or judicial order that prohibits a Missouri citizen from owning or receiving any firearm, accessory, or ammunition or any order of removal for the surrender of any firearm, accessory, or ammunition of an individual, except persons lawfully in custody or persons who have been released after the execution of a bail bond after having been charged with a dangerous felony.

Any red flag law that directs the confiscation of any firearm, accessory, or ammunition from any law-abiding citizen, within the borders of Missouri, will not be enforced within Missouri.

No state agency, political subdivision, or state or local law enforcement agency can receive any Federal funds for the purpose of enforcing any Federal law, order, or judicial finding for the purpose of enforcing any state statute, rule, order, or judicial finding that would have the effect of enforcing a red flag law against a Missouri citizen.

No entity or person, including a state entity or employee thereof, or political subdivision or employee thereof, will have the authority to enforce or attempt to enforce a red flag law regardless of the red flag law's origin or the authority of the issuing entity, except that this prohibition will not apply to any agent of the Federal government enforcing a Federal law or Federal order.

A political subdivision or state or local law enforcement agency that employs a law enforcement officer that knowingly violates the provisions of this bill will be liable to the party against whom the red flag law was enforced and additionally will be subject to a civil penalty of \$50,000 per occurrence.

In any action brought under the provisions of this bill, a court can order injunctive or other equitable relief, recovery of damages, other legal remedies, and payment of reasonable attorney's fees, costs, and expenses of the party. Such relief will not be exclusive and additional relief or remedies can be awarded as otherwise permitted by law (Section 1.486).

Currently, the Missouri General Assembly occupies and preempts the entire field of legislation on firearms, components, and ammunition and supplies of firearms. An exception is granted allowing local political subdivisions to regulate the open carrying of firearms by ordinance.

This bill repeals this exception for local political subdivisions. This bill also creates a civil cause of action against a political subdivision that enacts an ordinance that regulates firearms. Any

person who believes that a jurisdiction has taken action that would violate these provisions will have standing to pursue a cause of action or to seek injunctive relief, and the injured party will receive a civil penalty of \$50,000. The court can also award the injured party reasonable attorney fees and costs. Sovereign immunity will not be considered an affirmative defense (Section 21.750).

Currently, a person can use physical force upon another person to defend himself or herself or a third person from what he or she reasonably believes to be the imminent use of unlawful force by such other person. However, a person must not use deadly force upon another person unless such force is used against a person who unlawfully enters a dwelling, residence, or vehicle. If the person asserts that his or her use of deadly force was for this purpose, the burden is on the State to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the defendant did not reasonably believe that the use of such force was necessary.

This bill repeals those provisions related to deadly force used against another who unlawfully enters a dwelling, residence, or vehicle. This bill further states that there must be a presumption of reasonableness that the defendant believed such force was necessary to defend himself or herself or a third party from what he or she believed to be the use or imminent use of unlawful force by another person (Section 563.031).

Currently, an armed nuclear security guard, employer of an armed nuclear security guard, or owner of a nuclear power plant will not be subject to civil liability for the physical or deadly force used by an armed nuclear security guard. However, even if the use of physical or deadly force was justified, that fact does not abolish or impair any remedy for such conduct in a separate civil action.

This bill repeals the provision allowing for a remedy for such conduct in a separate civil action (Section 563.041).

Currently, a person who uses physical or deadly force under certain conditions, as described in the bill, is justified in using such force and will be an absolute defense to criminal prosecution or civil liability. However, even if the use of physical or deadly force was justified, that fact does not abolish or impair any remedy for such conduct in a separate civil action.

This bill repeals the provision allowing for a remedy for such conduct in a separate civil action (Section 563.074).

This bill provides immunity to a person from criminal prosecution and civil action for the use or threatened use of physical or deadly force, unless:

- (1) The person against whom such force was used or threatened is a law enforcement officer acting in his or her official duties and the officer identified himself or herself as such; and
- (2) The force used or threatened occurred in a location readily accessible to the public.

A law enforcement agency can investigate the use or threatened use of force, but the agency must not arrest the person for using or threatening force unless the agency determines that there is probable cause that the force used or threatened was unlawful.

Once a prima facie claim of self-defense immunity is raised by the defendant in a criminal prosecution or civil action, the party seeking to overcome the immunity claim will have to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the claim is improper (Section 563.085).

Currently, a county or city sheriff can issue a concealed carry permit to someone at least 19 years of age, or who is at least 18 years of age and a member of the U.S. Armed Services. This bill repeals these provisions, and reduces the minimum age to 18 (Section 571.101).

Currently, a concealed carry endorsement issued prior to August 28, 2013, must be suspended or revoked if the holder of the endorsement becomes ineligible due to certain state actions taken against the holder. This bill extends such a suspension or revocation to a holder who is at least 18 years of age (Section 571.104).

Currently, any individual who has knowledge that a person with a concealed carry permit or endorsement is ineligible to hold such a permit or endorsement can file a petition to revoke that person's permit or endorsement. The individual filing the revocation petition can check any boxes that apply to the defendant. This bill updates the revocation petition form by:

- (1) Repealing the requirement that the named defendant must be at least 19 years of age; and
- (2) Altering the number of years of imprisonment for crimes that the defendant has pled guilty to or been convicted of (Section 571.117).

Currently, a Missouri lifetime or extended concealed carry permit must be issued by a county or city sheriff if the applicant is at least 19 years of age, or is at least 18 years of age and a member of the U.S. Armed Services. This bill repeals these provisions, and reduces the minimum age to 18 (Section 571.205).

Currently, any individual who has knowledge that a person with a Missouri lifetime or extended concealed carry permit is ineligible to hold such a permit can file a petition to revoke that person's permit. The individual filing the revocation petition can check any boxes that apply to the defendant. This bill updates the revocation petition form by:

- (1) Repealing the requirement that the named defendant must be at least 19 years of age; and
- (2) Altering the number of years of imprisonment for crimes that the defendant has pled guilty to or been convicted of (Section 571.225).

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Attorney General's Office  
Department of Natural Resources  
Department of Corrections  
Department of Revenue  
Department of Public Safety –  
    Capitol Police  
    Office of the Director  
    Missouri Highway Patrol  
Department of Social Services  
Missouri Department of Conservation  
Missouri National Guard  
Office of Administration  
Office of Administration - Budget and Planning  
Office of the State Courts Administrator  
Office of the State Public Defender  
Missouri Office of Prosecution Services  
City of Kansas City  
City of Osceola  
Phelps County Sheriff's Department  
Branson Police Department  
Kansas City Police Department  
St. Louis County Police Department



Julie Morff  
Director  
January 28, 2026



Jessica Harris  
Assistant Director  
January 28, 2026