



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2099		DATE: 1/27/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
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 C. AC "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVO		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: In-Person		SUBMIT DATE: 1/27/2026 11:53 PM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2099		DATE: 1/27/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
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: DAVID KENT		PHONE NUMBER:	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI BANKERS ASSOCIATION		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 207 CAPITOL AVE			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL: dkent@mobankers.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 1/27/2026 1:07 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. The Missouri Bankers Association supports HB 2099.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2099		DATE: 1/27/2026
COMMITTEE: Commerce		
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: MICHAEL HENDERSON		PHONE NUMBER: 573-520-7240
REPRESENTING: MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF MISSOURI		TITLE:
ADDRESS: 235 E HIGH ST, STE. 301		
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO
		ZIP: 65101
EMAIL: mike@cnmissouri.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 1/27/2026 11:22 AM
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.		
The Mortgage Bankers Association of Missouri supports HB 2099.		



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2099		DATE: 1/27/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
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: 1/25/2026 5:24 PM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

While framed as a property-rights bill, HB 2099 goes far beyond addressing unlawful trespass.

It creates a fast-track eviction and arrest system that strips individuals of basic due-process protections, expands ex parte judicial power, and exposes both citizens and law enforcement to serious constitutional risk.

1. Ex parte removal without meaningful due process

HB 2099 authorizes immediate ex parte orders removing individuals from property based solely on a verified petition by a property owner — before notice, before a hearing, and before the respondent has any opportunity to be heard.

This directly conflicts with:

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which guarantees that no person shall be deprived of liberty or property without due process of law; and

Article I, Section 10 of the Missouri Constitution, which provides even stronger due-process protections.

Removing a person from their living space — and authorizing arrest — is a severe deprivation of liberty.

Due process cannot be satisfied by a promise of a hearing after the harm has already occurred.

2. Vague standards invite error and abuse

The bill allows removal based on assertions that a person is an “unlawful occupant,” a term that:

Depends entirely on the petitioner’s narrative,

Can be difficult to distinguish from tenancy disputes, domestic conflicts, or informal living arrangements, and

Places judges in the position of making life-altering decisions on incomplete information.

When laws rely on vague definitions and unilateral allegations, mistakes are not hypothetical — they are inevitable.

3. Criminal penalties tied to civil allegations

HB 2099 converts alleged occupancy disputes into criminal exposure by:

Making presence on property a Class A misdemeanor once an ex parte order issues; and

Mandating arrest for alleged violations of such orders, even when service has not occurred.

This blurs the line between civil and criminal law in a way that undermines fundamental fairness and increases the risk of wrongful arrest.

4. Immunity provisions erode accountability

The bill grants broad civil immunity to law enforcement officers and their employing entities for arrests made under ex parte orders.

While officers deserve protection when acting in good faith, blanket immunity paired with truncated due process removes meaningful accountability and shifts the cost of mistakes onto innocent individuals.

5. Disproportionate harm to vulnerable populations

HB 2099 will fall hardest on:

Low-income individuals,

People experiencing housing instability,

Survivors of domestic or family conflict,

Individuals living in informal or transitional housing arrangements.

These are precisely the populations most dependent on clear legal process and judicial restraint.

6. Existing law already provides remedies

Missouri law already allows:

Trespass enforcement,

Unlawful detainer actions,

Eviction proceedings with notice and hearings,

Criminal prosecution for vandalism, theft, or damage.

HB 2099 does not fill a legal gap — it short-circuits existing safeguards.

Property rights matter. So do constitutional rights.

HB 2099 attempts to solve a real concern by discarding the very legal protections that prevent abuse, trading careful adjudication for speed and certainty for convenience.

The Constitution does not allow liberty to be taken first and explained later.

For these reasons, I urge the Committee to oppose House Bill 2099.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2099		DATE: 1/27/2026	
COMMITTEE: Commerce			
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: WILL R KRUEGER		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 1/27/2026 8:11 PM	

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

I am an attorney, and I am confident passing this law will waste the taxpayers' money, violate the Constitution, and do nothing to "protect" the rights of homeowners.

An ex parte hearing against an unnamed party is patently unconstitutional. It doesn't give the accused any chance to have their day in court or present their side of the story. A good lawyer will waste a lot of time getting this law overturned, and the taxpayers will foot the bill for the time the AG spends defending it and the courts spend hearing the arguments. Since this law will certainly be invalidated, it won't do anything to help anyone. It's simply a waste of everyone's time and money to pass this bill.

If fidelity to the Constitution doesn't convince to vote no on this bill, perhaps fiscal responsibility and consideration of the taxpayer will.