

**2009 DRAFTING REQUEST**

**Assembly Amendment (AA-AB193)**

Received: **06/01/2009**

Received By: **phurley**

Wanted: **As time permits**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Mark Gundrum (608) 267-5158**

By/Representing:

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **phurley**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Criminal Law - guns and weapons**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Rep.Gundrum@legis.wisconsin.gov**

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

---

**Pre Topic:**

No specific pre topic given

---

**Topic:**

Castle doctrine

---

**Instructions:**

Where the term "reason to believe" is used, delete that term and use "reasonably believes" instead.

---

**Drafting History:**

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?							
/1	phurley 06/17/2009	csicilia 06/17/2009	mduchek 06/17/2009	_____	mbarman 06/17/2009	mbarman 06/17/2009	

FE Sent For:

<END>

**2009 DRAFTING REQUEST**

**Assembly Amendment (AA-AB193)**

Received: 06/01/2009

Received By: phurley

Wanted: As time permits

Identical to LRB:

For: Mark Gundrum (608) 267-5158

By/Representing:

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: phurley

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Criminal Law - guns and weapons

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: YES

Requester's email: Rep.Gundrum@legis.wisconsin.gov

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

---

**Pre Topic:**

No specific pre topic given

---

**Topic:**

Castle doctrine


---

**Instructions:**

Where the term "reason to believe" is used, delete that term and use "reasonably believes" instead.

---

**Drafting History:**

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	phurley	1 gjs 6/17 09					

FE Sent For:

<END>



## 2009 ASSEMBLY BILL 193

April 2, 2009 – Introduced by Representatives HRAYCHUCK, DANOU, VRUWINK, MURSAU, FRISKE, VAN ROY, BALLWEG, SUDER, STRACHOTA, PETROWSKI, VUKMIR, ZIPPERER, DAVIS, BIES, KLEEFISCH, GUNDERSON, VOS, SPANBAUER, KERKMAN, NERISON, LEMAHIEU, KESTELL, HONADEL, RHOADES, ZIGMUNT, RIPP, JORGENSEN, TAUCHEN, ROTH, KAUFERT and HUEBSCH, cosponsored by Senators HOLPERIN, VINEHOUT, DECKER, PLALE, SCHULTZ, LAZICH, LEIBHAM, GROTHMAN, A. LASEE, KANAVAS, DARLING, KAPANKE, HARSDDORF and HOPPER. Referred to Committee on Personal Privacy.

- 1     **AN ACT to create** 939.48 (1m) of the statutes; **relating to:** the privilege of  
2     self-defense.

---

### *Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau*

In general, a person who uses force in self-defense or in the defense of another person may not be convicted of a crime stemming from that use of force. This law applies only when: 1) the amount of force used is reasonable; and 2) the person uses that force to prevent or stop what he or she reasonably believes is an unlawful interference with himself or herself or another person, such as the crime of battery. Current law specifies that a person may use force that is intended or likely to cause the death of or great bodily harm to another individual only if the person reasonably believes that using such force is necessary to prevent the imminent death of or great bodily harm to himself or herself or another person.

Under this bill, if a person used defensive force that was intended or likely to cause death or great bodily harm, the court must presume that the person reasonably believed that the force was necessary to prevent death or great bodily harm if: 1) the individual against whom the force was used was in the process of unlawfully and forcibly entering, or had already unlawfully and forcefully entered, the residence of the person who used the force; 2) the person was present in that residence; and 3) the person knew or had reason to believe that an unlawful and forcible entry was occurring or had occurred. This presumption, however, does not apply if: 1) the person who used the force was engaged in an unlawful activity or was using his or her residence to further an unlawful activity; or 2) the individual against whom the force was used had identified himself or herself as a peace officer (or was or should

**ASSEMBLY BILL 193**

have been known to be a peace officer) and was entering the residence in the performance of his or her official duties.

---

*The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:*

1           **SECTION 1.** 939.48 (1m) of the statutes is created to read:

2           939.48 (1m) (a) If an actor intentionally used force that was intended or likely  
3 to cause death or great bodily harm, the court shall presume that the actor  
4 reasonably believed that the force was necessary to prevent imminent death or great  
5 bodily harm to himself or herself if the actor makes such a claim under sub. (1) and  
6 any of the following applies:

7           1. The person against whom the force was used was in the process of unlawfully  
8 and forcibly entering the actor's residence, the actor was present in the residence,  
9 and the actor knew or (had reason to believe) that an unlawful and forcible entry was  
10 occurring.

11           2. The person against whom the force was used was in the actor's residence  
12 after unlawfully and forcibly entering it, the actor was present in the residence, and  
13 the actor knew or (had reason to believe) that the person had unlawfully and forcibly  
14 entered the residence.

15           (b) The presumption described in par. (a) does not apply if any of the following  
16 applies:

17           1. The actor was engaged in an unlawful activity or was using his or her  
18 residence to further an unlawful activity at the time.


19           2. The person against whom the force was used was a peace officer who entered  
20 or attempted to enter the actor's residence in the performance of his or her official  
21 duties. This subdivision applies only if at least one of the following applies:

**ASSEMBLY BILL 193**

1 a. The officer identified himself or herself to the actor before the force described  
2 in par. (a) was used by the actor.

3 b. The actor knew or reasonably should have known that the person entering  
4 or attempting to enter his or her residence was a peace officer.

5 (END)



State of Wisconsin  
2009 - 2010 LEGISLATURE

LRBa0504/1

PJH:.....

*cjs*

ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ,  
TO 2009 ASSEMBLY BILL 193

*fillment*  
*6-17-09*

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 **1.** Page 2, line 9: delete "had reason to believe" and substitute "reasonably  
3 believed".

4 **2.** Page 2, line 13: delete "had reason to believe" and substitute "reasonably  
5 believed".

6 (END)