
SENATE COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Senator Dr. Aisha Wahab, Chair
2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No:	AB 1720	Hearing Date:	June 22, 2026
Author:	Haney		
Version:	May 18, 2026		
Urgency:	No	Fiscal:	Yes
Consultant:	Sarah Mason		

Subject: Ticket sellers

SUMMARY: Establishes resale price restrictions for certain live entertainment tickets and imposes related requirements on ticket resellers, ticket resale marketplaces, and original sellers. Requires specified pricing disclosures, limits resale markups and fees for covered tickets, and authorizes enforcement and civil penalties for violations. Excludes numerous transactions and events, including sporting events and many large-scale entertainment events, thereby limiting the bill's application to only a subset of consumers affected by ticket scarcity and high resale prices.

NOTE: *This bill is triple-referred to the Senate Committee on Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection second and Senate Committee on Judiciary third.*

Existing law:

- 1) Defines a ticket seller as any person who for compensation, commission, or otherwise sells admission tickets to sporting, musical, theatre, or any other entertainment event. Clarifies that the following are not a ticket seller subject to various requirements:
 - a) An officially appointed agent of an air carrier, ocean carrier or motor coach carrier who purchases or sells tickets in conjunction with a tour package accomplished through the primary event promoter or his or her agent by written agreement.
 - b) Any person who sells six tickets or less to any one single event, provided the tickets are sold off the premises where the event is to take place, including, but not limited to, designated parking areas and points of entry to the event.
 - c) Any primary contractor (defines as the person or organization responsible for the event for which tickets are being sold) or seller of tickets for the primary contractor operating under a written contract with the primary contractor.
 - d) Any nonprofit charitable tax-exempt organization selling tickets to an event sponsored by the organization. (Business and Professions Code (BPC) §§ 22503.6, 225034, 22511)
- 2) Establishes various requirements for ticket sellers, a violation of which constitutes a misdemeanor, including that they:

- a) Have a permanent business address from which tickets may only be sold and that the address be included in any advertisement or solicitation, a violation of which constitutes a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment or a fine not exceeding \$2,500 or by both. Provides that a person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in a violation of this specific requirement is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed \$2,500 for each violation.
 - b) Maintain records of ticket sales, deposits, and refunds.
 - c) Prior to sale, disclose to the purchaser by means of description or a map the location of the seat or seats represented by the ticket or tickets.
 - d) Make any partial or full deposit received on a future event for which tickets are not available refundable, except for a service charge of not more than 10 percent until tickets for the event are actually available.
 - e) Disclose that a service charge is imposed by the ticket seller and is added to the actual ticket price by the seller in any advertisement or promotion for any event by the ticket seller.
 - f) Provide a refund within 30 days for the ticket price of an event which is canceled.
 - g) Provide a refund, upon request, within 30 days, for the ticket price of an event which is postponed, rescheduled, or replaced with another event at the same date and time
 - h) Provide a bond of not more \$50,000 to provide for any refunds in a local jurisdiction that requires this.
 - i) Disclose in any advertisement or promotion for any event that a service charge is imposed and added to the actual ticket price. (Business and Professions Code §§ 22500 – 22511)
- 3) Prohibits a ticket seller from contracting to sell or accepting payment for tickets unless the ticket seller has lawful possession of the ticket; has a contractual right to obtain the ticket; or informs the purchaser the seller does not have possession of the tickets, has no contract to obtain the offered ticket, and may not be able to supply the ticket at the contracted price, as specified. Authorizes a ticket seller to accept a deposit from a prospective purchaser as part of an agreement that the ticket seller will make best efforts to obtain a ticket at a specified price or price range and within a specified time, provided that the ticket seller informs the purchaser orally at the time of the contract or receipt of consideration, whichever is earlier, and in writing within two days, of the terms of the deposit agreement, and includes in the oral and written notice other required disclosures. (BPC § 22502.1)
 - 4) Prohibits a ticket seller from representing that they can deliver or cause to be delivered a ticket at a specific price or within a specific price range and fail to deliver within a reasonable time at or below or within the price and range of prices stated. Specifies that a ticket seller who violated this prohibition and violates 3) above is civilly liable to the ticket purchaser for two times the contracted price of the ticket, in

addition to any sum expended in trying to attend the event, and reasonable attorney's fees and court costs. (BPC §§ 22052.2 and 22052.3)

- 5) Prohibits a person from using, selling, offering for sale, or advertising software designed to circumvent a ticket seller's security measures, access controls, or other controls used to ensure an equitable ticket-buying process. Makes it unlawful to use software or other technological means to purchase tickets in excess of posted limits for online ticket sales. (BPC § 22505.5)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits a ticket reseller from reselling certain tickets for more than 10 percent above the original purchase price of the ticket, including specified fees.
- 2) Prohibits a ticket resale marketplace from charging fees that exceed specified limits in connection with the resale of covered tickets to the reseller or buyer.
- 3) Requires ticket resellers to disclose the original purchase price of a ticket offered for resale.
- 4) Requires ticket resale marketplaces to obtain and display specified pricing information regarding tickets offered for resale.
- 5) Requires original sellers to print or display the original purchase price on tickets subject to the bill.
- 6) Authorizes civil penalties and enforcement actions against original sellers, ticket resellers, and ticket resale marketplaces that violate the bill's provisions.
- 7) Limits the bill's application to specified live entertainment events held at independent venues with a seating capacity of 3,000 or fewer or a nonprofit venue that hosts agricultural fairs, exhibitions, or multiday community events in addition to live performances.
- 8) Excludes specified venues, events, and transactions from the bill's requirements by exempting tickets for sporting events, including professional, collegiate, amateur, Olympic, FIFA World Cup, and other specified athletic events.
- 9) Makes various definitions.
- 10) States legislative findings and declarations that California's cultural and creative events, including concerts, nonprofit productions, festivals, and community events, contribute significantly to the state's cultural life and economy and that independent venues, nonprofit stages, and community-based promoters play an important role in supporting artists and local communities. States that artists have a legitimate interest in establishing the terms and conditions under which tickets to their performances are sold, including pricing, transferability, and access. Further finds and declares that certain high-volume ticket resellers acquire tickets in bulk and resell them at significant markups, reducing ticket availability at original prices and increasing costs for consumers. Declares that resale practices may undermine ticket affordability,

limit access to events, erode public confidence in the ticket marketplace, and interfere with artists' ability to control how tickets to their performances are distributed. States that California's policy objectives include protecting the affordability of cultural and creative events, increasing the likelihood that tickets reach fans rather than industrial-scale resellers, supporting independent venues and community-based entertainment organizations, and promoting fairness, transparency, and integrity in the secondary ticket marketplace.

FISCAL EFFECT: This bill is keyed fiscal by Legislative Counsel. According to the Assembly Committee on Appropriations, the bill will result in possible costs to the DOJ of an unknown amount. By adding new requirements for ticket sellers, ticket resellers, and ticket resale marketplaces, this bill provides additional bases for enforcement by DOJ. If DOJ hires staff to handle enforcement actions authorized by this bill, the department would incur significant costs, likely in the low hundreds of thousands of dollars annually at a minimum. If DOJ does not pursue enforcement as authorized by this bill, the department would likely not incur any costs. The bill will also result in cost pressures of an unknown but potentially significant amount to the courts to adjudicate civil actions and misdemeanor charges and possible incarceration costs of an unknown but potentially significant amount.

COMMENTS:

1. **Purpose.** This bill is sponsored by National Independent Venue Association – California, Music Artists Coalition, and National Independent Talent Organization. According to the Author, “For decades, concert tickets were sold at face value to real fans who wanted to see the artists they loved. But today, professional scalpers and bots buy up tickets in seconds and resell them at massive markups. This bill puts an end to that system and puts the concert experience back where it belongs: with fans and artists. Concert tickets aren’t stocks to be flipped for profit. They’re a chance for real fans to see the artists they love. Yet for years we’ve let out-of-state scalpers and speculators cut the line, buy up tickets in bulk, and resell them at outrageous markups, shutting out fans while taking the lion’s share of the money. They didn’t write the songs. They didn’t build the venues. They didn’t clean the bathrooms. They didn’t put on the show. But they’re the ones cashing in. That’s not fair, and it’s not inevitable. California is the heart of the music industry, and we have a duty to stand with fans, artists, and venues, not speculators and scalpers. This is about restoring common sense and making sure live music is about community and culture, not price-gouging and profiteering.”
2. **Background.** California’s ticket seller regulations were largely enacted before the widespread adoption of online ticket marketplaces, digital ticketing systems, mobile ticket transfers, and sophisticated resale platforms. Today, consumers purchase, transfer, and resell tickets through a variety of online channels that did not exist when many of the ticketing statutes were first enacted. While technological advances have increased convenience and expanded access to tickets, they have also introduced new challenges relating to speculative ticket sales, automated purchasing software, deceptive online practices, fee transparency, and restrictions on ticket transferability. Policymakers, regulators, artists, venues, ticketing companies, and consumer advocates have increasingly focused on whether existing laws adequately protect consumers in the modern ticketing marketplace.

Federal regulators have devoted significant attention to ticketing-related consumer protection concerns in recent years. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has identified hidden fees, deceptive pricing practices, and the use of automated software to circumvent ticket purchasing restrictions as practices that can harm consumers and impair fair competition. In 2024, the FTC adopted its Rule on Unfair or Deceptive Fees, commonly referred to as the “Junk Fees Rule,” which requires greater transparency in ticket pricing and seeks to ensure that consumers receive meaningful information regarding the total cost of a ticket before making purchasing decisions. The FTC has also pursued enforcement actions under the Better Online Ticket Sales (BOTS) Act against entities alleged to have used automated technologies, multiple accounts, and other means to evade ticket purchasing limits designed to provide equitable access to tickets.

At the same time, federal antitrust scrutiny of the live entertainment industry has continued to increase. In 2010, the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) approved the merger of Live Nation and Ticketmaster subject to conditions intended to address competition concerns. In 2019, the DOJ announced that Live Nation had violated portions of the consent decree governing the merger and extended the decree through 2025. Following highly publicized ticketing issues associated with major concert tours and broader concerns regarding competition in the live entertainment marketplace, the DOJ and a coalition of state attorneys general, including California, filed an antitrust lawsuit against Live Nation Entertainment and Ticketmaster in 2024. The litigation alleges conduct affecting competition in concert promotion, venue services, and ticketing, and reflects ongoing national debate regarding competition, consumer choice, and access to live entertainment events.

The Legislature has considered numerous measures over the past decade intended to address evolving issues in the ticketing marketplace. AB 329 (Pan, Chapter 325, Statutes of 2013) prohibited the use and sale of software designed to circumvent ticket purchasing controls intended to ensure an equitable ticket-buying process. AB 1556 (Friedman, Chapter 180, Statutes of 2021) strengthened consumer protections relating to cancelled, postponed, and rescheduled events by establishing refund requirements. Subsequent legislative efforts have explored a range of consumer protection issues including fee transparency, all-in pricing, resale marketplace disclosures, speculative ticket sales, deceptive practices, ticket transferability, and consumer understanding of ticket transactions. In addition, broader consumer protection measures such as SB 478 (Dodd, Chapter 740, Statutes of 2023), California's Honest Pricing Law, reflect increasing interest in ensuring transparency and fairness in transactions involving mandatory fees.

Ticket Distribution and Inventory Allocation. The United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) has observed that tickets for live entertainment events may be distributed through multiple channels before a general public on-sale occurs, including artist and fan club presales, venue and promoter allocations, sponsorship agreements, credit card partnerships, premium seating programs, season ticket holder programs, and other contractual or promotional arrangements. As a result, the number of tickets available to the general public during an initial public on-sale may represent only a portion of the total ticket inventory for an event.

The allocation of ticket inventory may also affect the relationship between an artist's stated ticket price and the prices consumers ultimately encounter in the marketplace. While artists, promoters, and venues generally establish the initial face value of tickets, the inventory available at that price may be affected by presales, reserved ticket allocations, premium ticketing programs, venue holds, sponsorship agreements, and other distribution practices. Consequently, consumers may encounter a range of prices for the same event depending on when tickets become available, the distribution channel through which they are offered, and the level of demand for the event. These factors have contributed to ongoing policy discussions regarding the extent to which high ticket prices are attributable to resale activity, inventory allocation decisions, event popularity, venue capacity, consumer demand, or other market dynamics.

Dynamic Ticket Pricing. In recent years, some original sellers, venues, promoters, and artists have increasingly utilized dynamic pricing models for ticket sales. Under dynamic pricing, the price of a ticket may fluctuate based on factors such as consumer demand, seat location, event popularity, timing of the sale, and overall market conditions. Similar to pricing models used in the airline, hospitality, and ride-sharing industries, dynamic pricing allows ticket prices to increase or decrease after tickets are initially offered for sale. As a result, consumers seeking tickets for the same event may encounter substantial price variation before a ticket ever enters the secondary market.

Supporters of dynamic pricing argue that it allows artists, venues, and event organizers to capture a greater share of the market value of high-demand events rather than leaving those gains to secondary-market resellers. Critics contend that dynamic pricing can make ticket costs less predictable for consumers and may result in substantially higher prices during periods of peak demand.

Ticket Prices and Secondary Market Resales. Proponents of resale price restrictions have argued that consumers are increasingly priced out of live entertainment events when tickets purchased at face value are subsequently offered for resale at substantially higher prices. Following several high-profile concert tours and other live events, policymakers, consumer advocates, and regulators have raised concerns that the use of automated purchasing technologies and large-scale resale activity may contribute to reduced ticket availability at face value and increased prices in secondary markets. Congressional hearings, FTC enforcement actions, and legislative proposals in numerous states have examined whether certain resale practices make it more difficult for consumers to purchase tickets directly from authorized sellers and increase the prices consumers ultimately pay to attend live events.

At the same time, questions remain regarding the extent to which high resale prices reflect unlawful or unfair conduct as opposed to consumer demand, limited ticket supply, artist pricing decisions, venue capacity constraints, inventory allocation decisions, or other market factors. While policymakers have identified concerns regarding ticket affordability and marketplace transparency, proposals that impose resale price caps focus on regulating the resale price of a lawfully acquired ticket, whereas California's existing ticketing laws have generally focused on deceptive conduct, ticket delivery obligations, and marketplace transparency. This bill raises

the policy question of whether restrictions on resale prices are an appropriate mechanism for addressing ticket affordability concerns in the secondary market.

Although California law already prohibits certain unfair ticketing practices, policymakers continue to examine whether existing statutes provide sufficient clarity regarding modern ticketing practices, including speculative ticket sales, deceptive online ticketing websites, and consumer understanding of whether a ticket is being offered by an authorized seller or through a resale marketplace. Policymakers have increasingly explored whether additional statutory clarification is warranted to address these practices while preserving legitimate ticketing, resale, and consumer transfer rights.

- 3. Arguments in Support.** The Music Artists Coalition writes that “The problem is clear: professional scalpers and automated bots purchase large quantities of tickets and resell them at extreme markups. These resellers extract significant economic value from live music events without contributing to their creation, production, or promotion. These practices not only price out everyday fans but also divert revenue away from the artists, venues, and staff who work tirelessly to create memorable live experiences. The data bears this out: fans now pay an average of 200% above face value, with some markups reaching 30%, pricing out everyday Californians and eroding trust in the live event marketplace... Independent venues, nonprofit stages, and community-based promoters are the backbone of California's live music economy. These small businesses and organizations serve as incubators for emerging artists and provide vital economic support to local communities. When industrial resellers siphon ticket revenue out of this ecosystem, it is the venues, crew members, and local economies that suffer. AB 1720 ensures that the economic value of live events stays with the people and places that make them possible.”

Supporters state “The need is clear. Professional ticket flippers and bots routinely buy up large quantities of tickets within seconds, shutting out real fans and immediately relisting at extreme markups. Across 65 shows studied nationwide, secondary-market prices averaged roughly twice face value. Here in California, general-admission tickets priced at \$32 have been resold for \$56, \$61, \$200, and in some cases more than \$4,000 for the exact same seat. This is not a competitive market working as intended; it is industrial-scale extraction that pulls revenue away from the artists, crews, venues, and local economies that actually create live events. It is important to be clear about what AB 1720 does and does not do. The bill targets the brokers and resellers who dominate the resale market and aggregate inventory across multiple platforms. It does not target legitimate, consumer-to-consumer resale by fans whose plans change. By removing the financial incentive for bulk speculation, AB 1720 helps ensure more tickets reach real fans at prices closer to what artists intended.”

- 4. Arguments in Opposition.** Opponents note that by restricting resale pricing, this bill may have the unintended effect of advantaging certain market participants while disadvantaging independent platforms. Limiting the ability of competitive marketplaces to operate effectively can reduce consumer choice and reinforce reliance on a smaller number of dominant channels. Opponents note that transparent and competitive ticket marketplace, supported by multiple platforms,

provides the strongest options for consumers, promotes innovation, and ensures broader access to tickets.

According to opponents, this bill does nothing to address the single greatest contributor to the live event affordability crisis: Live Nation/Ticketmaster's monopoly control over the live event and ticketing ecosystem. Opponents note that Live Nation/Ticketmaster defended its own anti-competitive conduct, which includes overcharging consumers for live event tickets, and instead tried to place the blame elsewhere, citing Live Nation/Ticketmaster's claim that "The real problem is the secondary market where resellers drive up prices and siphon billions out of the industry, hurting both artists and fans." Opponents say the company has used this same "it's the secondary market's fault" rhetoric as justification to introduce over a dozen Live Nation-supported resale price cap bills across the country this year, including this bill.

According to the Consumer Federation of California, "Were AB 1720 to become law the main beneficiary of the bill would actually be the monopoly itself. How? The bill caps prices and profits for the precious few competitors to the monopoly but does nothing to limit the monopoly's predatory behavior against consumers and others. But what about the talking point that the monopoly itself will be trimmed under this bill? This is essentially known as a loss-leader strategy - the monopoly pretends to be making a big sacrifice for consumers, but their real objective is to harm the economics of the secondary ticketing industry such that this limited competition would be diminished and ultimately eliminated. Does anybody actually think that if the monopoly gained more control over the secondary ticketing market this would be good for consumers in the long run? Only a monopolist would defend such an action."

Numerous chambers of commerce and community groups write that "AB 1720 effectively exempts Ticketmaster from accountability while placing the burden of regulation on consumers. This bill unfairly targets consumers by restricting how they may resell tickets they legally own while leaving Live Nation/Ticketmaster's monopoly and its control over ticket prices, fees, and supply untouched. AB 1720 punishes consumers rather than confronting the real source of the problem: unchecked power by a single player that keeps prices high and limits access... AB 1720's approach also raises serious equity and consumer protection concerns. Many consumers, particularly low-income Californians, depend on resale as a financial safety valve when plans change. Tying resale limits to the 'original price' is unworkable in a primary marketplace defined by secrecy, where consumers often have no clear way to determine what the original price was. As a result, individuals could be forced to sell at a loss or risk violating the law, while Ticketmaster continues to 'rob fans blind' and perpetuate the same anti-consumer practices that were the focus of President Biden's antitrust lawsuit."

TickPick, SeatGeek, and Gametime state that "Numerous analyses of resale price caps have found they are bad policy, harm consumers, and undermine antitrust efforts against LiveNation/Ticketmaster. They cite the Progressive Policy Institute which stated "Proposed state laws capping ticket resale prices and fees could decimate the resale ticket market and undermine federal antitrust enforcement against Live Nation/Ticketmaster. State legislation to cap resale ticket

prices and fees targets the only market with competition, leaving the monopolized and broken primary ticket market to operate unfettered.” According to the companies, “it is increasingly common for primary ticket prices to fluctuate in the weeks and months before an event, and because AB 1720 does not mandate pro-consumer pro-competitive interoperable systems as did Assemblymember Wicks’ 2024 bill, AB 2808, secondary ticket marketplaces have no way of knowing or verifying the original ticket price.”

StubHub writes that “A resale price cap does not eliminate a consumer’s willingness to pay above the capped price for a ticket. It merely prevents those transactions from occurring on regulated platforms. When that happens, fans leave regulated marketplaces and both buyers and sellers turn to informal channels such as social media, private messaging platforms, and cash transactions. These channels lack refund protections, customer support, and fraud monitoring. Resale does not disappear under a cap, consumer protection does. More importantly, the same platforms, infrastructure, and actors operate across both exempt and non-exempt events. Introducing a resale cap for concerts adds complexity to systems that also support exempt events, creating confusion for consumers and inconsistent regulatory outcomes. Critically, when safe, regulated resale options are restricted in one part of the market, consumers may turn to unregulated channels and carry that behavior into exempt events where losses are even higher.”

5. **Proposed Author’s Amendments.** The Author is proposing amendments to make conforming changes to reference to the Olympics currently contained in the bill, replacing “Olympics” with “2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games” and to also exempt a ticket to a movie theater for a motion picture or screening from being limited to a 10 percent cap on the resale price. The Author’s amendments would also update the definition of “Ticket resale marketplace” currently contained in the bill.

6. **Policy Concerns and Comments.**

Arbitrary nature of a price cap. This bill would prohibit the resale of certain tickets at a price exceeding 10 percent above the original purchase price. The bill, however, does not identify why a 10 percent threshold was selected as opposed to another percentage, nor does it establish a methodology for determining that 10 percent represents the appropriate balance between consumer protection and lawful resale activity. As a result, questions may arise regarding whether the proposed cap is based on empirical evidence, market analysis, consumer harm data, or another policy rationale.

The bill also raises broader questions regarding whether a resale price cap addresses the underlying causes of high ticket prices. As discussed above, ticket prices may be influenced by a variety of factors, including event popularity, venue capacity, inventory allocation decisions, presales, dynamic pricing practices, consumer demand, and secondary-market activity. While a resale cap may limit the price at which certain tickets can be resold, it may not affect the number of tickets initially available to consumers at face value or address other factors contributing to ticket affordability concerns. Is this proposed price restriction appropriately tailored to the problem the bill seeks to address or are there alternative approaches like a

focus on transparency, disclosure, competition, or marketplace practices that would more directly address consumer concerns?

Uneven consumer protections. A fundamental policy question raised by this bill is why consumers purchasing tickets for certain events would receive the bill's protections while consumers purchasing tickets for many major sporting events would not. The bill exempts sporting events, including professional, collegiate, amateur, Olympic, FIFA, and other specified athletic competitions, from its resale price restrictions. As a result, consumers attending some of the most sought-after and expensive events in the world would remain subject to unrestricted resale prices, while consumers attending consumers attending covered events at qualifying independent venues would receive the benefit of the bill's price controls.

This distinction is particularly notable given that concerns regarding ticket affordability and resale prices have been widely reported in connection with major sporting events. Recent reporting regarding the 2026 FIFA World Cup documented consumer difficulty obtaining tickets at face value. Consumer concerns regarding Olympic ticket availability and pricing have similarly generated significant public attention in recent years. These examples raise the question of why consumers purchasing tickets for exempted sporting events would not receive the same protections afforded to consumers attending covered events, particularly when many of the concerns cited in support of the bill, ticket affordability, resale markups, and consumer access, are not unique to concerts or live entertainment events. If resale price restrictions are necessary to protect consumers from excessive resale prices, it is unclear why those would not apply consistently across similarly situated consumers. If a 10% cap is necessary to protect consumers, why are the consumers attending the World Cup, Olympics, Super Bowl, NBA Finals, NCAA tournaments, and other major sporting events excluded?

Limited application to smaller venues. AB 1720's consumer protections only apply to a limited subset of live entertainment events and venues. As drafted, the bill generally applies to specified events held at venues with a seating capacity of fewer than 3,000 individuals and nonprofit venues that host agricultural fairs, exhibitions, or multiday community events in addition to live performances. This raises the policy question of whether the bill is targeting the events where consumers are most likely to encounter the affordability concerns cited by proponents.

Many of the highest-profile examples of ticket scarcity, substantial resale markups, and consumer frustration occur at large-scale events held in arenas, stadiums, and major entertainment venues with capacities well exceeding 3,000 people. By limiting the bill's application to smaller venues, the measure excludes many of the events that generate the greatest public attention regarding ticket availability and secondary-market pricing. As a result, consumers purchasing tickets for major concerts, arena tours, and stadium events could remain subject to unrestricted resale prices even though those events are frequently cited in discussions regarding ticket affordability.

The bill's venue limitation may also create inconsistent outcomes for consumers seeking tickets to different events. For example, a consumer seeking to purchase a resale ticket for a Broadway touring production at the SAFE Credit Union

Performing Arts Center in Sacramento, which has a seating capacity below the bill's threshold, could receive the benefit of the bill's resale price restrictions. In contrast, a consumer attempting to purchase a resale ticket for a high-demand concert at a large venue such as Oracle Park or SoFi Stadium could receive no comparable protection because those venues exceed the bill's capacity limitation. Illustratively, consumers seeking tickets to major stadium and arena performances by artists such as Noah Kahan, Olivia Rodrigo, Beyoncé, Taylor Swift, or other touring acts performing at large-capacity venues, could remain subject to unrestricted resale prices even though those events frequently generate some of the highest levels of consumer demand, resale activity, and public concern regarding ticket affordability.

These distinctions raise questions about whether venue capacity serves as an appropriate proxy for consumer harm. If the bill is intended to address excessive resale prices and improve ticket affordability, it is unclear why the bill excludes many of the events where fans and consumers are most likely to encounter the very practices the bill seeks to address.

Reconciliation of definitions. This bill and AB 1349 both include changes to the existing ticket sellers regulatory framework. Definitions will need to be updated in order for the bills' intent to be clear and for there to be cohesion in the law.

SUPPORT AND OPPOSITION:

Support:

American Association of Independent Music
American Federation of Musicians
Artist Rights Alliance
Black Music Action Coalition
Bright Light Strategies
California Arts Advocates
Fan Alliance
Future of Music Coalition
Music Artists Coalition
Music Artists Coalition
Music Managers Forum - US
National Independent Talent Organization
National Independent Venue Association of California
Recording Academy
Recording Industry Association of America
SAG-AFTRA
Songwriters of North America
Venue Pilot

Opposition:

California Black Chamber of Commerce
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California League of United Latin American Citizens
California Live Events Equity Alliance

California Multicultural Business Alliance
Central Valley Latino Mayors and Elected Officials Coalition
Coalition for Ticket Fairness
Consumer Federation of California
Gametime
Hispanic 100
Hispanic Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco
Internet.works
Latin American and Caribbean Business Chamber of Commerce
Latin Business Association
National Action Network Sacramento
National Baptist Convention Usa, INC
North Valley Yemen Society
Pantone 294
Seatgeek, INC.
Si Se Puede Fresno, Tulare, Kings & Kern
Stubhub, INC.
Technet
Ticket Policy Forum
Tickpick, LLC

-- END --