



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2055		DATE: 2/3/2026	
COMMITTEE: Crime and Public Safety			
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: 2/3/2026 1:46 AM

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

I am in Support of this Bill and its intension to protect Missourians from invasion of Privacy from Electronic Communication Devices.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2055		DATE: 2/3/2026	
COMMITTEE: Crime and Public Safety			
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: BRADLEY LYNN		PHONE NUMBER: 816-608-1647	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: KANSAS CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: CAPTAIN	
ADDRESS: 1125 LOCUST			
CITY: KC		STATE: MO	ZIP: 64109
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2026 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 2055		DATE: 2/3/2026	
COMMITTEE: Crime and Public Safety			
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: SCOTT CRAIG		PHONE NUMBER: 573-889-8595	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: SUNRISE BEACH POLICE DEPARTMENT		TITLE: CHIEF OF POLICE	
ADDRESS: 32 SUNSET HILLS CT			
CITY: SUNRISE BEACH		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65079
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2026 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 2055		DATE: 2/3/2026	
COMMITTEE: Crime and Public Safety			
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: SCOTT JOHN		PHONE NUMBER: 573-263-0503	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CALIFORNIA POLICE DEPT.		TITLE: POLICE CHIEF	
ADDRESS: 101 E MADISON ST.			
CITY: CALIFORNIA		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65018
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/3/2026 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 2055		DATE: 2/3/2026	
COMMITTEE: Crime and Public Safety			
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: 2/2/2026 10:43 AM	

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

House Bill 2055 is not a safety statute so much as a behavioral dragnet dressed as traffic regulation.

While styled as a “hands-free” law, the bill dramatically expands criminal exposure by redefining ordinary, non-dangerous conduct as presumptively unlawful, while delegating excessive interpretive discretion to roadside enforcement.

The bill’s definition of “electronic communication device” is so broad that it captures nearly every modern in-vehicle interaction, including devices that are already integrated into vehicles and routinely used for lawful navigation, dispatch, and communication.

The result is a statute that criminalizes posture rather than conduct, substituting a rigid list of prohibitions for an actual showing of unsafe driving.

More troubling, HB 2055 creates a strict-liability enforcement framework untethered from observable impairment. A driver may be cited absent any evidence of erratic operation, speed, lane deviation, or endangerment.

That inversion of traditional traffic enforcement undermines due process by punishing the mere presence of a device rather than demonstrable risk.

Although the bill attempts to cabin abuse through post-stop advisements and search limitations, those protections are illusory.

The initial stop itself remains discretionary, subjective, and difficult to contest. Once stopped, escalating penalties — including criminal misdemeanors and felonies — may attach based on outcomes rather than intent, creating disproportionate liability for conduct already addressed under existing reckless or careless driving statutes.

Finally, the bill’s preemption language strips local governments of the ability to tailor safety rules to local conditions while simultaneously imposing a one-size-fits-all enforcement mandate statewide.

If uniformity is the goal, clarity and narrowness should follow. This bill delivers neither.

Public safety is best served by laws that punish dangerous driving, not by statutes that expand police authority while diluting constitutional guardrails.

HB 2055 does the latter and should be rejected.

Footnotes:

City of St. Louis v. Williams, 235 S.W.3d 394, 397 (Mo. banc 2007).

(Traffic stops must be grounded in objective, articulable facts tied to safety concerns.)

State v. Brown, 449 S.W.3d 490, 496 (Mo. banc 2014).

(Statutes that invite arbitrary enforcement raise due process concerns.)

Mo. Const. art. I, §§ 10, 15.

(Due process and proportional punishment protections.)