2021BCDCC-GOV-12_2021

1 2

KYLE RITTENHOUSE CASE IS A MISCARRIAGE OF JUSTICE

WHEREAS Kyle Rittenhouse traveled to Kenosha, Wisconsin from his home in Antioch,
Illinois, on August 21, 2020 during a period of sometimes violent racial unrest, and without
authority of any kind, took it upon himself to patrol the streets and attempt to "protect property"
and quell the violence^{1,2};

8

9 WHEREAS Rittenhouse, age 17 at the time, armed himself with an AR-15-style rifle which but
10 for a flaw in Wisconsin law, he should not have been not permitted to own, given that Wisconsin
11 law concerning underage possession of a dangerous weapon (948.60) is written in a way that

- restricts underage gun possession only when the person is carrying a short-barreled (less than 12inches) firearm;
- 14

15 WHEREAS protecting property of another without express (preferably written) permission is not

16 a justification for using deadly force³, yet Rittenhouse shot to death two people, seriously

17 wounded a third, and "recklessly endangered" the life of two others, showing an "utter disregard

- 18 for human life;
- 19

20 WHEREAS Wisconsin's law of self-defense (939.48) and its jury instruction on provocation do

- 21 not clearly indicate that an individual who provokes or instigates a conflict forfeits the right of
- self-defense, and an individual who shoots and kills another person should not have to commit
- ²³ "unlawful" provocative conduct (939.48(2)(a)) to qualify as a provocateur or initial aggressor;⁴
- 24

First, make it clear that protecting property of another without their written permission is not a justification for using or threatening to use deadly force. In other words, write the statute to explicitly say if you use a deadly weapon to threaten and/or harm anyone in defense of the property of another without their written permission to defend their property, that behavior constitutes assault with a deadly weapon, and that behavior exposes you to both civil and criminal liability. Further, if you kill anyone while defending the property of another without their written permission to do so, that constitutes capital murder.

Second, if you give someone written permission to defend your property, you have civil and criminal liability for anything they do while on your property.

Third, if you are armed with a weapon and you kill a person you cannot claim that you were exercising self defense because you feared they would take the weapon away from you. You must have a reasonable fear of being harmed by them independently of their gaining control of your weapon. In other words, make it so Rittenhouse could not claim self defense for the first person he shot."

³ Ibid.

WHEREAS Rittenhouse was acquitted of all charges on November 19, 2021 as a result of vague
 laws and jury instructions based on those vague laws, and this verdict has already inflamed the

¹ Wisconsin Armed Security Guard requirements (SPS-31) are: be at least 21 years old, be a U.S. citizen or legal alien, pass a drug test, have no felony convictions, submit to a criminal background check, submit to electronic fingerprinting, present two forms of photo ID, partake in state-required security guard training.

² Comments off-the-record from an attorney: "... So, three points.

⁴ https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2021/11/17/wisconsin-self-defense-law-rittenhouse-522814.

2021BCDCC-GOV-12_2021

- passions of U.S. far-right groups, militias, and white supremacists, and is likely to inevitably
 encourage further vigilante violence and murder;
- 29
- 30 THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we, the Benton County Democrats, condemn the
- 31 perpetration of violence by all participants at the Kenosha demonstration, and we call upon the
- 32 Washington State Attorney General to review the Kyle Rittenhouse case, to ensure that
- 33 Washington State laws on underage gun possession, unlawful assembly, and vigilantism would
- 34 prevent an outcome like the Rittenhouse verdict, even while preserving protections for
- 35 individuals who commit alleged crimes as a result of chronic domestic abuse⁵;
- 36
- 37 THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we, the Benton County Democrats, consider
- 38 the verdict in the Kyle Rittenhouse case to be a miscarriage of justice which sets a dangerous
- 39 precedent and sends a message that vigilantism will likely be condoned by the authorities;
- 40
- 41 THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that we, the Benton County Democrats, call upon
- 42 the Washington State Attorney General, and the Governor of Washington, citing Washington
- 43 laws, to speak out in the strongest terms against law enforcement undertaken without legal
- 44 authority by self-appointed groups of vigilantes or "militia," and make clear the penalties
- 45 associated with such actions.
- 46
- 47 Submitted to the Benton County Democratic Platform and Resolutions Committee by Richard
- 48 Badalamente November 21, 2021.
- 49
- 50 Submitted to the Benton County Democratic Executive Board December 6, 2021.
- 51
- 52 Submitted to the Benton County democratic central Committee December 9, 2021.

⁵ Comments off-the-record from another attorney: "I also noted that the pro-self defense laws out of Washington arise mainly out of case law, not statute. And that the cases were where the defense was "battered woman syndrome" so any suggestions as to review of self defense laws in Washington might be seen as undercutting consideration for women who may have committed an alleged crime as a result of abuse."