

## ASSEMBLY THIRD READING

AB 1568 (Alanis)

As Amended May 18, 2026

Majority vote

**SUMMARY**

Makes various changes to the petition process for termination from the sex offender registry. **Major Provisions**

- 1) Clarifies that a petition to be terminated from the sex offender registry applies to persons who currently resides in California.
- 2) Specifies that a court may order a petitioner to appear, either personally or by video, at a hearing requested by the prosecutor to determine whether to order continued registration.
- 3) Requires the hearing to be heard in the county in which the person is registered.
- 4) Adds as a factor for the court to consider when determining whether continued registration would significantly enhance community safety that the offender was in a position of trust or authority in relation to any victim.
- 5) Provides that the court shall verify, in a manner subject to its discretion, including an inquiry of the petitioner, the petitioner's participation in or completion of sex-offender specific treatment or successful completion of a Sex Offender Management Board (CASOMB)-certified sex offender treatment program.

**COMMENTS****According to the Author**

"Assembly Bill 1568 strengthens California's sex offender registration laws to better protect communities by requiring tier one and tier two sex offenders to provide proof of completing a state-approved sex offender treatment program before they can petition a court to be removed from the registry. The current system lacks verification by which the court and the prosecution can confirm that an offender has completed a sex offender treatment program, placing an undue burden on prosecutors to prove ongoing risk—often impossible in older cases due to lost records. AB 1568 addresses deficiencies by requiring proof of completion of a CASOMB-certified program, ensuring offenders have undergone evidence-based rehabilitation to reduce reoffending risks. This will make Californians safer by preventing these individuals from being removed from the registry without demonstrating behavioral change, while making the criminal justice system more equitable by applying uniform rehabilitation standards and enhancing community protections for vulnerable families and neighborhoods."

**Arguments in Support**

According to the *Riverside Sheriffs' Association*, "AB 1568 is a common sense bill that incentivizes these offenders to participate in and successfully complete certified treatment program to better protect our communities and prepare them to re-integrate into society without continuing on the registry."

**Arguments in Opposition**

According to *California Public Defenders Association*, who has an oppose unless amended position, "By requiring the petitioner to be present, AB 1568 would impose significant hardship and expense on some indigent and/or elderly individuals who might not have transportation to get to court in rural counties or in large urban counties where the petitions are heard in courthouses all over the county. For example, in Los Angeles County, the petitions are filed and heard at the courthouse where the original case was filed so if someone lived in Lancaster and the petition was filed in the Pomona courthouse, they might not be able to attend without access to a car. Some elderly individuals may be quite infirm and unable to drive or navigate public transportation. Not every county has robust public transportation.

"Moreover, instead of one size fits all, the court should retain discretion to decide if it is helpful to their decision making to have the individual present. If the court decides that the individual should be present, then they should be allowed to appear remotely if they waive their right to be personally present. By their very nature, proceedings pursuant to Penal Code section 290.5 are postconviction proceedings and in most, if not all, postconviction proceedings individuals are allowed to appear remotely if they waive their right to be personally present. (Penal Code Sections 977(c)(1)(A), 1473(f).)

"AB 1568 would make it impossible for nondangerous indigent individuals ordered to obtain risk assessments to be removed from the registry. The cost of obtaining risk assessments conducted by psychologists or psychiatrists would be prohibitive. Risk assessments are usually conducted as part of court ordered probation or parole ordered sex offender treatment programs."

**FISCAL COMMENTS**

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, "The bill also requires courts verify treatment completion and consider whether the offender held a position of trust or authority (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund). The bill allows courts to order petitioners to appear in person or by video. These provisions would likely add modest incremental workload to existing hearings."

**VOTES****ASM PUBLIC SAFETY: 9-0-0**

**YES:** Schultz, Alanis, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Lackey, Nguyen, Ramos, Wilson

**ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 15-0-0**

**YES:** Wicks, Hoover, Aguiar-Curry, Calderon, Caloza, Dixon, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

**UPDATED**

VERSION: May 18, 2026

CONSULTANT: Stella Choe / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744

FN: 0002895