

Date of Hearing: March 3, 2026

Counsel: Ilan Zur

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 1662 (Wilson) – As Introduced January 29, 2026

SUMMARY: Provides that if a court dismisses a defendant’s case because the defendant completes court-initiated misdemeanor diversion, and the case includes a specified violation, which, ordinarily, requires points to be added to the defendant’s driving record, then the court shall nonetheless transmit that information to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), and the DMV shall assess points on the defendant’s driving record.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Authorizes the DMV to suspend, revoke, or refuse to issue a driver’s license if a person accumulates a certain number of points on their driving record, as follows:
 - a) Provides that a person whose driving record shows a violation point count of four or more points in 12 months, six or more points in 24 months, or eight or more points in 36 months shall be prima facie presumed to be a negligent operator of a motor vehicle, except as otherwise specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subs. (a) & (b).)
 - b) Requires the DMV, in making a negligent operator determination, to give due consideration to the amount of use or mileage traveled in the operation of a vehicle if the person requests and appears at a DMV hearing. (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subd. (a).)
 - c) Authorizes the DMV to require a negligent operator whose driving privilege is suspended or revoked to submit proof of financial responsibility, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subd. (c).)
 - d) Authorizes the DMV to suspend or revoke the privilege of any person to operate a vehicle upon any grounds that authorizes the refusal to issue a license, including when a person is deemed a negligent operator. (Veh. Code, §§ 13359, 12809, subd. (e).)
 - e) Authorizes the DMV to refuse to issue or renew a driver’s license if the DMV determines the applicant is a negligent or incompetent operator of a vehicle. (Veh. Code, § 12809, subd. (e).)
 - f) Provides that whenever the DMV has discretionary authority to suspend or revoke the privilege of a person to operate a vehicle, the DMV may in lieu of suspension or revocation, place the person on probation, as specified, and issue a restricted driver’s license as a condition of probation where that person is presumed to be a negligent operator. (Veh. Code, §§ 14250, 12812.)

- g) Provides that the point count, for purposes of determining if a driver is a negligent operator, is determined as follows:
- i) Violations that receive one point:
- (1) Any traffic conviction involving the safe operation of a vehicle upon the highway, except as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (f).)
 - (2) A traffic accident in which the DMV deems the operator responsible. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (g).)
 - (3) A conviction for failing to properly secure a child under eight years old in a rear seat in an appropriate child passenger restraint system, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (h).)
 - (4) A conviction for transporting a child between eight and 16 years old, without properly securing that child in an appropriate child passenger restraint system, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (h).)
- ii) Convictions that receive two points:
- (1) A hit and run resulting in only property damage, or a hit and run resulting in injury or death to another person. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (a).)
 - (2) Driving under the influence (DUI), DUI causing bodily injury to another, or driving a vehicle with a blood alcohol content (BAC) of .05 or more, for a person under the age of 21, even where a chemical test was not made to determine that person's BAC, as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subds. (b) & (d)(2).)
 - (3) Reckless driving. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (c).)
 - (4) Intoxicated vehicular manslaughter, without gross negligence. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (5) Vehicular manslaughter, with or without gross negligence. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (6) Fleeing or attempting to elude a peace officer where the pursued vehicle is driven in willful or wanton disregard for the safety of persons or property, including where this offense causes serious bodily injury or death. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (7) Driving a vehicle upon a highway, except to the right of an intermittent barrier or dividing section which separates two or more lanes of opposing traffic. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (8) Driving a vehicle on a highway at a speed greater than 100 miles per hour. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)

- (9) Engaging in a motor vehicle speed contest or exhibition of speed or aiding and abetting a motor vehicle exhibition of speed. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (10) Engaging in a motor vehicle speed contest that proximately causes specified injuries to another person. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (11) Driving on a highway for the purpose of transporting explosives, except as specified. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).)
 - (12) Driving on a suspended or revoked license, driving on a license that was suspended or revoked due to a DUI, DUI causing bodily injury, reckless driving, or refusal or failure to complete a chemical test or alcohol screening test, or accumulating a driving record that results from driving when a person has a suspended or revoked license. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (e).)
- iii) Provides that a conviction for only one violation arising from one occasion of arrest or citation shall be counted in determining the violation point count. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (j).)
- 2) Establishes Court-Initiated Misdemeanor Diversion, as follows:
- a) Authorizes a judge in the superior court in which a misdemeanor is being prosecuted to, at the judge's discretion, and over the objection of a prosecuting attorney, offer diversion to a defendant. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (a).)
 - b) Authorizes a judge to continue a diverted case for a period not to exceed 24 months and to order the defendant to comply with terms, conditions, or programs that the judge deems appropriate based on the defendant's specific situation. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (b).)
 - c) Requires the judge, if the defendant has complied with the imposed terms and conditions, to dismiss the action against the defendant at the end of the period of diversion. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (c).)
 - d) Requires the court, if it appears to the court that the defendant is not complying with the terms and conditions of diversion, after notice to the defendant, to hold a hearing to determine whether the criminal proceedings should be reinstated. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).)
 - e) Authorizes the court, if it finds that the defendant has not complied with the terms and conditions of diversion, to end the diversion and order resumption of the criminal proceedings. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).)
 - f) Provides that a defendant may not be offered diversion for any of the following current charged offenses:
 - i) Any offense for which a person, if convicted, would be required to register as a sex offender;

- ii) Any offense involving domestic violence, as specified; and,
 - iii) Stalking. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (e).)
- g) Requires a defendant who is diverted under court-initiated diversion to complete all of the following to have their action dismissed:
- i) Complete all conditions ordered by the court.
 - ii) Make full restitution, although a defendant's inability to pay restitution due to indigence shall not be grounds for denial of diversion or a finding that the defendant has failed to comply with the terms of diversion.
 - iii) Comply with a court-ordered protective order, stay-away order, or order prohibiting firearm possession, if applicable. (Pen. Code, § 1001.96.)
- h) Provides that upon successful completion of the terms, conditions, or programs ordered by the court pursuant to court-initiated misdemeanor diversion, the arrest upon which diversion was imposed shall be deemed to have never occurred, and the defendant may indicate, in response to any question concerning their prior criminal record, that they were not arrested. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subds. (a).)
- i) Prohibits a record pertaining to an arrest resulting in successful completion of the terms, conditions, or programs ordered by the court from, without the defendant's consent, being used in any way that could result in the denial of any employment, benefit, license, or certificate. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subd. (a).)
- j) Requires the defendant to be advised that, regardless of their successful completion of diversion, the arrest upon which the diversion was based may be disclosed by the Department of Justice in response to a peace officer application request and that completion of diversion does not relieve them of the obligation to disclose the arrest in response to a direct question contained in a questionnaire or application for a position as a peace officer. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subd. (b).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, "When serious driving offenses disappear from the record, the public pays the price. AB 1662 closes a loophole that previously let individuals avoid points on their driving record if their case was dismissed through diversion. This bill ensures dangerous conduct is counted, not covered up."
- 2) **Court-Initiated Diversion:** Existing law authorizes a judge to divert a misdemeanor defendant, over the objection of the prosecution, except in cases of stalking, domestic violence, and any offense requiring sex offender registration. (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.95, subds. (a) & (e).) Unlike other existing pre-plea diversion programs, court-initiated diversion contains no statutory requirements for the defendant to satisfy in order to be eligible, except that the defendant cannot have committed one of the crimes that are specifically excluded.

(Pen. Code, §§ 1001.95; 1001.96; 1001.97.) The judge has broad authority to order the defendant to comply with terms, conditions, or programs that the judge deems appropriate based on the specific situation; however, the case may not be diverted for a period exceeding 24 months. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (b).) Similar to other diversion programs, if the defendant has complied with the imposed terms and conditions, the judge is required to dismiss the action against the defendant at the end of the period of diversion. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (c).) If it appears to the court that the defendant is not complying with the terms and conditions of diversion, after notice to the defendant, the court must hold a hearing to determine whether the criminal proceedings should be reinstated. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).) If the court finds that the defendant has not complied with the applicable terms and conditions, it may end the diversion and order resumption of the criminal proceedings. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (d).)

Whether or not to divert a misdemeanor defendant is in the trial court's discretion. However, judicial discretion is not without limits. "[A]ll exercises of legal discretion must be grounded in reasoned judgment and guided by legal principles and policies appropriate to the particular matter at issue." (*People v. Russel* (1968) 69 Cal.2d 187, 195 (superseded by statute on other grounds).) A court abuses its discretion when it "exceeds the bounds of reason, all of the circumstances before it being considered." (*Id.* at p. 194) (quoting *State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court of San Francisco* (1956) 47 Cal.2d 428, 432.)

- 3) Driving Record Points and Related Sanctions:** If a driver accumulates four or more points in 12 months, six or more points in 24 months, or eight or more points in 36 months, they shall be prima facie presumed to be a negligent operator of a vehicle (Veh. Code, § 12810.5, subds. (a) & (b).) This authorizes the DMV to suspend or revoke the negligent operator's driving privilege or refuse to issue or renew their driver's license. (Veh. Code, §§ 12809, subd. (e), 13359). The DMV may, instead of suspension or revocation, place the person on probation, as specified, and issue a restricted driver's license as a condition of probation. (Veh. Code, §§ 14250, 12812.) Whether a negligent operator's license will be suspended, and for how long, is primarily determined by the DMV, not by statute. In practice, a driver who accumulates the point levels described above will typically be subject to a one-year probationary period that includes a six-month suspension.¹

According to the DMV, if a person is deemed a negligent operator, there are four levels of Negligent Operator Treatment System (NOTS) actions.² Level I – if a person receives two points within 12 months, four within 24 months, or six within 36 months, they will receive a warning letter.³ Level II – if a person receives three or more points within 12 months, five or more within 24 months, or seven or more within 36 months, they will receive a notice of intent to suspend their license.⁴ Level III is the point total that establishes a person as a prima facie negligent operator pursuant to Vehicle Code 12810.5. Here, if a person receives four points within 12 months, six within 24 months, or eight within 36 months, that person will receive a one-year probation that includes a six-month license suspension.⁵ The action is

¹ DMV, *Negligent Operator Actions* <<https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/dmv-safety-guidelines-actions/negligence/negligent-operator-actions/>> [as of Feb. 19, 2026].

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

effective 34 days from the date the order is mailed.⁶ Additionally, under Level IV, if a person who is on NOTS probation receives a violation while operating a vehicle or is involved in a collision, regardless of fault, then an additional six-month suspension shall be imposed, and the probation will be extended for one year from the violation of probation.⁷

Certain traffic violations and crimes add points to a person's driving record, which can lead to that person being deemed a negligent operator. More minor offenses, such as a traffic conviction involving the safe operation of a vehicle, a traffic accident in which the DMV deems that person responsible, or failing to properly secure a child in a child passenger restraint system, receive one point. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subs. (f), (g) & (h).) More serious traffic offenses, such as convictions for a hit and run, DUI, DUI causing bodily injury, reckless driving, intoxicated vehicular manslaughter without gross negligence, vehicular manslaughter, engaging in a speed contest, and driving in excess of 100 miles per hour, among others, result in two points. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subs. (a)-(d).)

Negligent operator-based suspensions are administrative in nature, are imposed at the discretion of the DMV, and are distinct from the criminal license suspensions or revocations that can result from a vehicle-related conviction. Certain criminal license revocations require the DMV to revoke a person's driver's license for one year or three years, depending on the nature of the conviction. (Veh. Code, §§ 13350, 13351.) Other convictions, such as those for a DUI or a DUI causing bodily injury, result in progressively longer license suspensions or revocations depending on the person's number of prior DUIs. (Veh. Code, § 13352.) Notably, many of the offenses that add points to a person's driving record carry separate, and lengthier, criminal license revocation mandates. For example, gross vehicular manslaughter adds two points to a person's driving record. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (d)(1).) It also results in a three-year criminal license revocation, irrespective of the number of points on the defendant's record. (Veh. Code, § 13351, subd. (a).)

- 4) **Effect of this Bill:** Most of the offenses that add points to a person's record require a criminal conviction. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subs. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), & (h).) Accordingly, a person who is arrested and charged for an offense that would ordinarily add points to their driving record, if convicted, but who avoids a conviction for the offense by completing court-initiated diversion, typically will not receive those points on their driving record. Accordingly, this bill states that if a court dismisses a defendant's case because the defendant completed court-initiated misdemeanor diversion, and the case included a specified violation, which, ordinarily, would add points to the defendant's driving record, then the court shall nonetheless transmit that information to the DMV, and the DMV shall assess points on the defendant's driving record.

For example, if a person is arrested and charged for misdemeanor reckless driving, and completes diversion 12 months later, this bill would require the DMV to add two points to that person's driving record in the same manner as if they had been convicted of reckless driving. (Veh. Code, § 12810, subd. (c).) This would apply even if the person was not adjudicated guilty before being granted diversion; court-initiated diversion does not require that the defendant enter a guilty plea. (Pen. Code, §§ 1001.95; 1001.96; 1001.97.)

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Ibid.*

The impact of this bill may be limited. First, some of the point-adding convictions listed in Vehicle Code section 12810 may not be eligible for court-initiated diversion if prosecuted as a felony. Court-initiated diversion is confined to misdemeanors. (Pen. Code, § 1001.95, subd. (a).) The list of convictions that add points to a driver's record includes many offenses that are alternate-felony misdemeanors. These include: 1) a hit and run resulting in injury or death; 2) a fourth or subsequent DUI; 3) a DUI causing bodily injury; 4) intoxicated vehicular manslaughter, without gross negligence; 5) gross vehicular manslaughter; 6) fleeing or attempting to elude a peace officer, as specified; 7) fleeing or attempting to elude a peace officer which causes serious bodily injury or death; 8) driving a vehicle upon a highway, except to the right of an intermittent barrier or dividing section which separates two or more lanes of opposing traffic, resulting in injury or death; and 9) engaging in a motor vehicle speed contest that proximately causes specified injuries to another person. To the extent that these offenses are charged as felonies and are not reduced to misdemeanors, they are not eligible for diversion and therefore will not be affected by this bill.

Further, DUIs have been found ineligible for court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. After the creation of court-initiated diversion in 2021, it was initially unclear if DUIs were eligible for judicial diversion. A longstanding statute prohibits a court, if a person is charged with a DUI offense, from suspending or dismissing the criminal proceedings for the purposes of allowing the accused to participate in specified education, training, or treatment programs. (Veh. Code, § 23640, subd. (a).) On the other hand, DUIs were not explicitly excluded from court-initiated misdemeanor diversion, as they had been from prosecutor-initiated diversion. (Pen. Code, § 1001.51, subd. (b).) This led a California superior court to find that misdemeanor DUIs were eligible for court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. (*People v. Superior Court (Diaz-Armstrong)* (2021) 67 Cal.App.5th Supp. 10, 20.)

However, in recent years, courts of appeals have largely brought clarity to this matter, consistently finding that DUIs are not eligible for court-initiated diversion. (See *Grassi v. Superior Court* (2021) 73 Cal.App.5th 283, 308 [finding that court-initiated diversion “authorizes diversion for all misdemeanor defendants except those listed in subdivision (e) and misdemeanor DUI defendants pursuant to Vehicle Code section 23640”]. See also *Tan v. Appellate Division of Superior Court* (2022) 76 Cal.App.5th 130, 148; *Islas v. Appellate Division of Superior Court* (2022) 78 Cal.App.5th 1104, 1110.) Accordingly, the changes made by this bill generally will not apply to persons arrested for DUIs.

- 5) **Inconsistency With the Benefits of Diversion:** This bill may be inconsistent with the function and purpose of completing court-initiated diversion; that “the arrest...shall be deemed to have never occurred.” (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subds. (a) (emphasis added).) Upon successful completion of court-initiated diversion, the arrest upon which diversion was imposed shall be deemed to have never occurred, and the defendant may indicate, in response to any question concerning their prior criminal record, that they were not arrested. (*Ibid.*) Further, existing law prohibits a record pertaining to an arrest resulting in successful completion of court-initiated misdemeanor diversion from, without the defendant’s consent, being used in any way that could result in the denial of any employment, benefit, license, or certificate (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subd. (a).) The only exemption to this prohibition is for peace officer applications. (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subds. (a) & (b).) Requiring points to be added to a person’s driving record, even after completing diversion, creates another exemption to the strict record-clearing benefits associated with court-initiated diversion.

Further, this bill may conflict with the existing law’s prohibition against an arrest record being used in “any way that could result in the denial of any employment, benefit, *license*, or certificate.” (Pen. Code, § 1001.97, subd. (a) (emphasis added).) The term “license” as used in Penal Code section 1001.97 is not defined. This was likely intended to extend the record-clearing benefits of diversion to employment-related licenses, such as professional licenses.⁸ However, a plain reading of the statute broadly prohibits, where a person successfully completes diversion, the underlying arrest from being used in *any way* that could result in the denial of a license. Adding points to a person’s driving record after they complete diversion, which could contribute to that person receiving a DMV-imposed license suspension, could reasonably be interpreted to be using that underlying arrest in a way that results in a denial of a license. Accordingly, this bill may create an inconsistency in the law.

- 6) **Argument in Support:** According to the *California Police Chiefs Association*, “AB 1662 would ensure that traffic safety accountability is preserved when a misdemeanor diversion results in dismissal of a case involving a point-assessable driving offense.

“Under current law, drivers who successfully complete diversion under Penal Code Section 1001.95 may avoid a criminal conviction; however, dismissal of these cases can also result in the DMV not assessing violation points that are otherwise critical to maintaining accurate driver safety records. AB 1662 clarifies that when a court dismisses a qualifying misdemeanor following diversion, the DMV must still assess the applicable violation points.

“This measure strengthens California’s traffic safety framework by ensuring that serious driving conduct remains reflected in a driver’s official record for purposes of negligent operator determinations and license suspension. Without this clarification, diversion may unintentionally undermine the integrity of the state’s point system and weaken deterrence for repeat or dangerous drivers. Maintaining accurate driving histories is essential to protecting the public and preventing recidivism on California roadways.”

- 7) **Argument in Opposition:** According to *Western Center on Law and Poverty*, “If AB 1662 is passed, people who are charged with driving-related offenses and complete a diversion program would, nonetheless, be assessed points on their license, as though they were convicted. Western Center opposes AB 1662 because it punishes legally innocent people for a crime they were never convicted of.

“Diversion is an “exit ramp” to the criminal legal system – which “minimize[s] people’s exposure to the criminal legal system.” Pretrial diversion programs allow people charged with crimes to complete a rehabilitation program in lieu of prosecution. Upon successful completion of the program, the judge dismisses their case. Under California Penal Code section 1001.95, judges have the discretion to offer diversion to people charged with most misdemeanors. Diversion is a crucial criminal justice tool: it can clear court calendars and reduce jail and prison overcrowding. Diversion also advances public safety – research shows that diversion programs cut recidivism by half. Policies that weaken or remove these incentives to complete diversion programs undermine these benefits, harming people charged

⁸ The author’s statement of the enacting statute emphasizes that diversion “allow[s] a person to avoid the lifelong collateral consequences associated with a criminal record when they are seeking employment or housing.” See AB 3234 (Ting), Senate Floor Analysis (accessed Feb. 19, 2025), available at: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billAnalysisClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200AB3234#

with crimes, straining an already overburdened criminal legal system, and diminishing public safety.

“Receiving points on a driving record can have devastating consequences to low-income Californians and their families, including increased costs of insurance and even the loss of a driver’s license. The loss of a driver's license is a major threat to economic security, particularly for low-income Californians and their families:

“Numerous studies have found a direct correlation between driving and employment. A task force report to the Governor of New Jersey cited a survey of suspended drivers conducted by Rutgers University researchers, which found that following a license suspension, 42% of people lost their jobs as a result of the suspension. Of those who lost their jobs, 45% could not find another job, and this effect was most pronounced for seniors and low income people. Of those who were able to find new employment, 88% reported decreased wages.

“People who successfully complete diversion programs are legally innocent. They have not been convicted of any crime. Punishing people who complete diversion cuts against the presumption of innocence that lies at the core of the U.S. criminal legal system.

“Finally, this legislative session there are numerous efforts to reform and update DUI laws in California. We strongly believe that a broader discussion on existing DUI statutes should take place among key legislators and a wide array of stakeholders in order to possibly identify a more comprehensive and balanced approach to the larger policy issue. We encourage this author and others to help bring us together for this convening.”

8) **Related Legislation:**

- a) AB 1685 (Lackey) would increase the number of points that must be added to a person’s driving record for the crimes of intoxicated vehicular manslaughter without gross negligence and vehicular manslaughter. AB 1685 is pending a hearing in this Committee.
- b) SB 953 (Niello) would require a violation for vehicular manslaughter to be given a value of two driving record points, even if the defendant’s case is dismissed because they completed court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. SB 953 is pending a hearing in Senate Transportation.

9) **Prior Legislation:**

- a) AB 2519 (Maienschein), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have prohibited individuals diverted for a misdemeanor, for which there would be a 10-year prohibition on possessing a firearm if convicted, from possessing a firearm until they successfully complete diversion. AB 2519 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.
- b) SB 1282 (Smallwood-Cuevas), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have authorized a county that opts to create a diversion or deferred entry of judgment program for theft offenses to have their program conducted by a county department providing pretrial or health care services or a nonprofit contract agency, and expanded the court-initiated misdemeanor diversion program to felonies, except those specified. SB 1282 failed passage on the Senate Floor.

- c) AB 74 (Muratsuchi), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have added the proposed crime of knowingly attending, participating, or aiding and abetting the commission of a vehicle sideshow or street takeover to the list of convictions that require two points to be added to the defendant's driving record. AB 74 was never heard.
- d) AB 282 (Lackey), of the 2021-2022 Legislative Session, would have DUI and other offenses relating to reckless operation of a vehicle excluded from court-initiated misdemeanor diversion. AB 282 failed passage in the Senate Public Safety Committee.
- e) SB 421 (Bradford), of the 2021-2022 Legislative Session, would have established a pretrial diversion scheme with specific conditions for misdemeanor DUI violations. SB 421 was held in the Senate Appropriations Committee.
- f) AB 3234 (Ting), Chapter 334, Statutes of 2020, created a court-initiated misdemeanor diversion program.
- g) AB 47 (Daly), Chapter 603, Statutes of 2019, removed the prohibition on the DMV assessing a point on a driver's license if they are convicted of a violation of operating a handheld wireless or communication device while driving and required DMV to assess a point for a second violation in three years occurring after January 1, 2021.
- h) SB 725 (Jackson), Chapter 179, Statutes of 2017, specified that a trial court can grant military pretrial diversion on a misdemeanor DUI.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah
Automobile Club of Southern California
California Police Chiefs Association
Safety and Advocacy for Empowerment (SAFE)

Opposition

ACLU California Action
Debt Free Justice California
Initiate Justice
Justice2jobs Coalition
LA Defensa
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children / All of US or None
Local 148 LA County Public Defenders Union
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.

Analysis Prepared by: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744