



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1993		DATE: 2/10/2026	
COMMITTEE: Veterans and Armed Forces			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/10/2026 11:27 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

I am in Support of the intension of this Bill. I feel that this may be a duplication of State Revised Statue and Federal Codified Code.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1993		DATE: 2/10/2026
COMMITTEE: Veterans and Armed Forces		
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:		
WITNESS NAME: JEWELL PATEK		PHONE NUMBER: 573-690-3573
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION		TITLE:
ADDRESS: PO BOX 1933		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: jewell@patekandassociates.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/10/2026 10:53 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		
Support both bills		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1993		DATE: 2/10/2026	
COMMITTEE: Veterans and Armed Forces			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: MAJOR GENERAL (RET) WILL BLAYLOCK		PHONE NUMBER: 314-799-1137	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI NATIONAL GUARD ASSOC		TITLE: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: 2302 MILITIA DRIVE			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/10/2026 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1993		DATE: 2/10/2026
COMMITTEE: Veterans and Armed Forces		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:		
WITNESS NAME: SARAH BERRY		PHONE NUMBER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:
ADDRESS:		
CITY:		STATE: ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 2/5/2026 5:08 PM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

HB 1993 pretends to grant rights the state does not have constitutional authority to bestow in this way.

**This bill isn't just "protective."
 It's jurisdictionally sloppy and structurally deceptive.**

**Missouri cannot selectively federalize SCRA
 The Servicemembers Civil Relief Act is a federal statute grounded in federal war powers.**

**SCRA protections are triggered by:
 federal active duty status
 federal authority over courts, contracts, and creditors**

**What Missouri is doing here is saying:
 "We'll just borrow the federal protections and slap them onto state active duty."**

That's not incorporation — that's constitutional cosplay.

Why that matters

SCRA is not a menu

**States cannot unilaterally extend federal procedural protections that alter:
 court proceedings
 creditor remedies
 interest caps
 default judgments**

Those are interstate and federal commerce domains.

**Missouri can protect Guard members within its own employment law, sure —
 but this bill reaches far beyond that, into:
 private contracts
 courts of general jurisdiction
 creditors operating across state lines**

That's where the problem lives.

2. This bill creates a false equivalence between state and federal service

The Constitution draws a bright line between:
state militia authority (Article I, §8, cl. 16)
federal armed forces authority

SCRA exists because:
federal service removes a servicemember from civilian life under national command
federal supremacy justifies overriding private legal relationships
State active duty does not carry that same constitutional weight.

Missouri is trying to say:
"Trust us, it's basically the same."

It's not.

And courts notice that.

3. The AG enforcement provision is a quiet power grab

This line is not harmless:
"The attorney general may also bring suit against an employer who violates the provisions of this section."

Why that's dangerous:

The AG is enforcing federal-style protections created by state statute

There's no rulemaking clarity
No standards for investigation
No safe harbor for employers acting in good faith

This sets up:
selective enforcement
political targeting
uneven application

Which I've already clocked as a Missouri pattern, not a hypothetical.

4. The "30 consecutive days" threshold proves the bill knows it's shaky

If this were truly about rights, the threshold would track:
status
function
vulnerability

Instead, it tracks time — arbitrarily.
That's a tell.

It's there to:
limit exposure
reduce fiscal and legal blowback
keep the bill alive in committee

Not to actually protect service members consistently.

5. This bill invites litigation — and Missouri will lose control of it

By creating:
a private right of action

**AG enforcement authority
ambiguous incorporation of federal law**

**Missouri is begging courts to decide:
“Can a state replicate federal military protections without federal service?”**

That’s not a friendly question for the state.

Footnotes

¹ U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cls. 11–16.

(Granting Congress exclusive authority over war powers, federal armed forces, and governance of federal military service; reserving only limited militia authority to the states.)

² *Perpich v. Department of Defense*, 496 U.S. 334, 353–54 (1990).

(Holding that National Guard members operate under distinct state and federal authorities, and that federal military status is constitutionally separate from state service.)

³ 50 U.S.C. § 3901 et seq. (Servicemembers Civil Relief Act).

(Explicitly tying statutory protections to federal military service and federal authority, not state-ordered duty absent federal activation.)

⁴ *Tarble’s Case*, 80 U.S. (13 Wall.) 397, 408–09 (1872).

(Confirming that states may not exercise authority in matters constitutionally committed to the federal government, including federal military status and protections.)

⁵ *McCulloch v. Maryland*, 17 U.S. (4 Wheat.) 316, 436 (1819).

(Establishing that states may not extend, burden, or reinterpret federal authority through state law.)

⁶ *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 935 (1997).

(Reaffirming limits on state enforcement of federal regulatory schemes absent clear constitutional delegation.)

⁷ *State ex rel. Missouri Highway & Transp. Comm’n v. Dierker*, 961 S.W.2d 58, 60 (Mo. banc 1998).

(Recognizing that Missouri statutes must operate within clear constitutional boundaries and may not assume authority not expressly granted.)

⁸ *Grayned v. City of Rockford*, 408 U.S. 104, 108–09 (1972).

(Holding that laws must provide clear standards to prevent arbitrary or discriminatory enforcement.)

See *Free Enter. Fund v. Pub. Co. Accounting Oversight Bd.*, 561 U.S. 477, 499 (2010).

(Warning against statutory structures that blur accountability and dilute constitutional separation of authority.)



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 1993		DATE: 2/10/2026
COMMITTEE: Veterans and Armed Forces		
TESTIFYING: <input type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES		
WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:		
WITNESS NAME: NICK HUMPHREY		PHONE NUMBER: 573-638-9574
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI NATIONAL GUARD		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 2302 MILITIA DR		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65101
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/10/2026 12:00 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		