



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

| | | |
|--|-------------|---|
| BILL NUMBER: HB 3111 | | DATE: 2/11/2026 |
| COMMITTEE: Professional Registration and Licensing | | |
| 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: JEREMY NICHOLAS | | PHONE NUMBER: |
| BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI ALLIANCE OF PROFESSIONAL BAIL BOND AGENTS | | TITLE: |
| ADDRESS: 26 COURT SQUARE | | |
| CITY: WEST PLAINS | | STATE: MO |
| | | ZIP: 65175 |
| EMAIL: | ATTENDANCE: | SUBMIT DATE: 2/11/2026 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 3111 | | DATE: 2/11/2026 |
| COMMITTEE: Professional Registration and Licensing | | |
| 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: ARNIE "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCATE | | PHONE NUMBER: |
| BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: | | TITLE: |
| ADDRESS: | | |
| CITY: | | STATE: ZIP: |
| EMAIL: | ATTENDANCE: In-Person | SUBMIT DATE: 2/11/2026 11:34 PM |
| THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. | | |

I am Opposed to Creating yet another Division and Commission.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|------|
| BILL NUMBER: HB 3111 | | DATE: 2/11/2026 | |
| COMMITTEE: Professional Registration and Licensing | | | |
| 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: 2/6/2026 2:24 PM | |

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

HB 3111 should be rejected. It is an overbuilt, industry-friendly licensing rewrite that expands quasi-law enforcement authority for “surety recovery” actors, creates a new board structure prone to capture, and hardwires due-process and civil-rights risk into Missouri statute. This bill manufactures a “licensed enforcement class” with unsafe powers

HB 3111 authorizes a bail bond or surety recovery agent—who is explicitly not a sworn peace officer—to detain and transport people and to enter property “in a lawful manner” based on “probable grounds,” including detention periods that can stretch up to 72 hours when travel from another state is involved. That is not “consumer protection.” That is a recipe for wrongful detention, mistaken identity, escalation, injury, and lawsuits.

Missouri does not need a statute that normalizes bounty-style apprehensions while pretending a laminated ID badge and a short training course makes this safe.

It invites regulatory capture by design

The bill creates a new “Board of Professional Surety Bail Bond Agents” as a corporate body that can sue and be sued, funded by industry fees, then staffed in part by the very industry it regulates. When you build a board with industry seats and dedicated fee revenue, you don’t get clean oversight—you get self-regulation with a state seal on it.

This is government outsourcing accountability to the regulated parties.

It expands punitive enforcement while weakening fairness

HB 3111 stacks criminal penalties (including escalations to felony offenses) onto licensing problems and paperwork violations, while also broadening investigative and subpoena-style powers inside the administrative scheme. It also contains language about rulemaking “nonseverable” effects tied to legislative review mechanics—meaning the whole regulatory program can be thrown into chaos if any piece is later struck. That is instability baked into the statute.

It increases due-process exposure for the state

Licensing systems must be precise, fair, and reviewable. This bill leans on vague and historically abused standards (“good moral character,” “moral turpitude”), broad discretion, and extensive access to criminal-history information, while creating high-stakes consequences (loss of livelihood, criminal

penalties, public harm events). That combination is exactly how states end up sued—especially when a private actor is empowered to restrain a person’s liberty in the field.

Even if the bill’s intent is “order,” its actual effect is predictable: more civil-rights claims, more liability for counties and cities responding to incidents, more courtroom fights over authority, and more human harm.

Bottom line

HB 3111 is not a modernization. It’s a dangerous expansion of private apprehension power and a regulatory structure that is practically engineered to protect the industry first and the public last.

Vote NO on HB 3111.

Footnotes / Authorities

Missouri HB 3111 (103rd GA), “Professional Bail Bondsman and Surety Recovery Agent Licensure Act” (LegiScan listing).

† Missouri Constitution, Article I, Section 10 (state due process).

‡ Mathews v. Eldridge, 424 U.S. 319 (1976) (procedural due-process balancing framework).

§ U.S. Constitution, Amendments IV and XIV (search/seizure and due process principles implicated when liberty is restrained by state-enabled actors). (General constitutional authority.)

? Schwabe v. Board of Bar Examiners, 353 U.S. 232 (1957) (limits on vague “character” standards in licensing; due process concerns). (General case authority.)

¶ Dent v. West Virginia, 129 U.S. 114 (1889) (states can regulate professions, but licensing must comport with due process). (General case authority.)