



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

| | | | |
|--|-------------|---|------|
| BILL NUMBER: HB 3144 | | DATE: 2/25/2026 | |
| COMMITTEE: Judiciary | | | |
| 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 | | PHONE NUMBER: | |
| BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: | | TITLE: | |
| ADDRESS: | | | |
| CITY: | | STATE: | ZIP: |
| EMAIL: | ATTENDANCE: | SUBMIT DATE: 2/25/2026 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 3144 | | DATE: 2/25/2026 |
| COMMITTEE: Judiciary | | |
| 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: PETER DONOHUE | | PHONE NUMBER: |
| BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE | | TITLE: GENERAL COUNSEL |
| ADDRESS: 207 W HIGH ST. | | |
| CITY: JEFFERSON CITY | | STATE: MO |
| | | ZIP: 65101 |
| EMAIL: | ATTENDANCE: | SUBMIT DATE: 2/25/2026 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 3144 | | DATE: 2/25/2026 |
| COMMITTEE: Judiciary | | |
| 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: SAMUEL H. LEE | | PHONE NUMBER: 314-368-4242 |
| REPRESENTING: CAMPAIGN LIFE MISSOURI | | TITLE: DIRECTOR |
| ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 142585 | | |
| CITY: SAINT LOUIS | STATE: MO | ZIP: 63114 |
| EMAIL: samuelhlee@mindspring.com | ATTENDANCE: In-Person | SUBMIT DATE: 2/25/2026 11:08 AM |

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

Parties to state litigation should have the ability to appeal preliminary injunctions - just like parties in federal litigation have under 28 U.S. Code §1292:

(a) Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of this section, the courts of appeals shall have jurisdiction of appeals from:

(1) Interlocutory orders of the district courts of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, and the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or of the judges thereof, granting, continuing, modifying, refusing or dissolving injunctions, or refusing to dissolve or modify injunctions, except where a direct review may be had in the Supreme Court; ...

Appellate review of preliminary injunctions is important because it allows parties to challenge a court's decision before the final trial, which can significantly impact the outcome of the case. This helps ensure that the rights of the parties are protected and that the legal process is fair, especially in cases where immediate harm could occur if the injunction is not, on the one hand, dissolved or denied, or on the other hand, granted or upheld.

Because litigation leading to a full trial on the merits can take so long, and if the issue involves public law, then the government has a strong interest in acting without delay to protect the health and safety of its citizens. Drawn out litigation without the opportunity for an appeal of an interlocutory decision can frustrate the efforts of lawmakers and governmental authorities to protect individuals and entities at risk of harm.

On the other hand, a challenger to public law has an interest in retaining the status quo, in order that the challenger's rights are not infringed upon during the pendency of the litigation.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|
| BILL NUMBER: HB 3144 | | DATE: 2/25/2026 |
| COMMITTEE: Judiciary | | |
| 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: ABIGAIL HERNDON | | PHONE NUMBER: |
| BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: | | TITLE: |
| ADDRESS: | | |
| CITY: | | STATE: ZIP: |
| EMAIL: | ATTENDANCE: Written | SUBMIT DATE: 2/25/2026 11:33 AM |
| THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo. | | |

This was the reason SB 22 let politicians lie act was struck down because it gave the Missouri AG more power, less accountability, less oversight and weakened the judicial branch power of checks and balances. This is in retaliation of amendment 3 passing in 2025 and the success of the the People not Politicians campaign against the illegal gerrymandering by our elected officials. I'm extremely disappointed by our legislators continuing trying to change laws for their own interests and lobbyists instead of the people because they don't like how something turned out.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

| | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| BILL NUMBER: HB 3144 | | DATE: 2/25/2026 |
| COMMITTEE: Judiciary | | |
| 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: 2/24/2026 4:43 PM |

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

Members of the General Assembly should be aware that statutes reinforcing structural litigation asymmetry in constitutional cases may later be cited in judicial analysis regarding deterrent effects on rights enforcement. While HB 3144 is not facially unconstitutional, its application in specific cases could generate due process or access-to-courts arguments depending on how it is used.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge opposition or amendment.