

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2025-2026 Regular Session

AB 1720 (Haney)
Version: May 18, 2026
Hearing Date: June 30, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AWM

SUBJECT

Ticket sellers

DIGEST

This bill prohibits persons, including ticket resale marketplaces, from selling a ticket for more than 10 percent of the original ticket price, unless the ticket is to an event that is not held at an independent venue; or the event is at an independent venue that seats more than 3,000 individuals, or that is not a nonprofit venue that hosts agricultural fairs, exhibitions, or multiday community events; or the ticket is for an event that is a professional athletic contest, a collegiate or amateur athletic contest covered pursuant to the collegiate athletic association or national governing body, or an athletic contest or event in which athletes represent foreign nations, including the FIFA World Cup or the Olympics; or if the ticket is for an athletic contest and being sold by a season ticketholder or season ticket licenseholder.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The war on tickets has been a years-long effort, with various pieces of legislation grappling with the issues posed by both the primary and secondary markets. This bill is the latest battleground and seeks to address high ticket prices in the secondary market.

This bill seeks to curb costly resold tickets by establishing a 10 percent cap on tickets sold by ticket resellers. The bill further imposes various disclosure requirements on ticket resellers and the original market. Notably, however, this bill applies only to independent venues that have either a capacity of fewer than 3,000 people or are held at a nonprofit venue hosting live performances at agricultural fairs, exhibitions, or multiday community events, and exempts certain event types from its application, including the FIFA World Cup and the Olympics.

This bill is sponsored by the author. This bill is opposed by a number of organizations, including consumer groups, small business organizations, and equity groups. The Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development passed this bill with a vote of 6-2, and the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection passed this bill with a vote of 5-2.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing federal law:

- 1) Establishes the Better Online Ticket Sales (BOTS) Act, which prohibits the use of automated bots to circumvent ticket purchase limits set by ticket sellers. (15 U.S.C. § 45c.)
- 2) Prohibits selling or offering to sell an event ticket obtained using an automated bot if the seller participated in, had the ability to control, or should have known about the violation. (15 U.S.C. § 45c.)

Existing state law:¹

- 1) Declares it unlawful for a person to intentionally use or sell software or services to circumvent a security measure, access control system, or other control or measure (including limits on the number of tickets a person can purchase) that is used to ensure an equitable ticket-buying process for event attendees. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22502.5.)
- 2) 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. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22503.)
- 3) Clarifies that the following are not ticket sellers for purposes of existing law:
 - 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.
 - b) Any person who sells six tickets or fewer to any one single event, provided the tickets are sold off the event premises, including, but not limited to, designated parking areas and points of entry to the event.
 - c) The person or organization responsible for the event for which tickets are being sold, or a seller of tickets operating under a written contract with this person or organization.

¹ Many of these provisions would be revised by AB 1349 (Bryan, 2025), which is also pending before this Committee.

- d) Any nonprofit charitable tax-exempt organization selling tickets to an event sponsored by the organization. (Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 22503.5, 22503.6, 22504, 22511.)
- 4) Requires a ticket seller to have a permanent business address from which tickets may only be sold and that the address be included in any advertisement or solicitation. Makes a violation of this requirement a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment, a fine not exceeding \$2,500, or by both, and provides for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 for violations. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22500.)
 - 5) Requires ticket sellers to do all of the following:
 - a) Maintain records of ticket sales, deposits, and refunds. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22501.)
 - b) 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. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22502.)
 - c) Make any partial or full deposit refundable if received on a future event for which tickets are not available, except for a service charge of not more than 10 percent, until such time as tickets for the event are actually available. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22506.)
 - d) Provide a refund within 30 days for the ticket price of an event that is canceled. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22507(a).)
 - e) 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. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22507(b).)
 - f) Provide that a local jurisdiction may require a bond of not more than \$50,000 to cover required refunds. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22507(d).)
 - g) 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. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22508.)
 - 6) Prohibits a ticket seller from contracting to sell or accepting payment for tickets unless the ticket seller:
 - a) Has lawful possession of the ticket;
 - b) Has a contractual right to obtain the ticket; or
 - c) Informs the purchaser, in a specified manner, that it does not have possession of the ticket, has no contract to obtain the offered ticket, and may not be able to supply the ticket at the contracted price. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22502.1.)
 - 7) Provides that it is unlawful for a ticket seller to represent that they can deliver or cause to be delivered a ticket at a specific price or within a specific price range and to fail to deliver within a reasonable time, or by a contracted time, the tickets at or below the price stated or within the range of prices stated. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22502.2.)

- 8) Provides that, in addition to other remedies, a ticket seller who violates 6) or 7) and fails to supply a ticket at or below a contracted price or price range shall be civilly liable to the ticket purchaser for two times the contracted price of the ticket, in addition to any sum expended by the purchaser in nonrefundable expenses for attending or attempting to attend the event in good faith reliance on seat or space availability, and reasonable attorney's fees and court costs. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22502.3.)
- 9) Deems a violation of the chapter of the Business and Professions Code containing the provisions related to ticket sellers to be a misdemeanor. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22505.)
- 10) Prohibits any person who does not have the written permission of the owner or operator of the property on which an entertainment event is to be held, or is being held, from selling tickets to the entertainment event, which were obtained for the purpose of resale, at any price which is in excess of the price that is printed or endorsed upon the ticket, while on the grounds of or in the stadium, arena, theater, or other place where an event for which admission tickets are sold is to be held or is being held. (Pen. Code, § 346.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes findings and declarations relating to the importance of California's cultural and creative events, independent and small venues, and artists; and to the problem of ticketing resale marketplaces.
- 2) Prohibits a ticket reseller from selling or facilitating the sale of a ticket for more than the equivalent of the original price for the ticket plus 10 percent.
- 3) Provides that, if a ticket has been resold or transferred more than once, regardless of the purchase price in the resale market, the maximum resale price shall remain no more than 10 percent above the original purchase price.
- 4) Requires an original seller to print or display on a ticket the original purchase price of that ticket.
- 5) Prohibits a ticket reseller from evading the price limitations in 2) by imposing separate charges, processing fees, delivery fees, or other charges not included in the original ticket price in excess of 10 percent.
- 6) Prohibits a ticket reseller from advertising, displaying, or offering a price for a ticket that does not include all mandatory fees or charges other than either of the following:
 - a) Taxes or fees imposed by a government on the transaction.

- b) Postage or carriage charges that will be reasonably and actually incurred to ship the ticket to the consumer.
- 7) Prohibits a ticket resale marketplace from charging more than 10 percent of the original face value of the ticket in additional fees to the reseller or buyer of the ticket.
- 8) Provides that the Attorney General, a city attorney, or a county counsel may bring an action against an original seller, a ticket reseller, or a ticket resale marketplace that violates this measure, and may recover the following:
- a) A civil penalty of up to \$1,000 per ticket sold for a first violation.
 - b) A civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per ticket sold for subsequent violations.
 - c) A civil penalty of up to \$5,000 per ticket sold for a knowing and willful pattern and practice of violations.
 - d) Injunctive relief, restitution, or disgorgement of proceeds.
- 9) Provides that the 10 percent resale cap applies only to the resale of tickets where the event is held at an independent venue and either of the following conditions is met:
- a) The seating capacity of the venue is 3,000 individuals or fewer.
 - b) The event is to be held at a nonprofit venue that hosts agricultural fairs, exhibitions, or multiday community events in addition to live performances.
- 10) Additionally provides that the 10 percent resale cap does not apply to the following ticket types:
- a) A ticket to a professional athletic contest or event.
 - b) A ticket to an athletic contest by a season ticketholder or season ticket licenseholder.
 - c) A ticket to a collegiate or amateur athletic contest or event conducted by, or under the authority of, a collegiate athletic association or a national governing body, including events hosted at large entertainment venues or arenas within the state and events involving collegiate athletic teams competing in tournaments or championship contests.
 - d) A ticket to an athletic contest or event, tournament, or series of games or matches involving athletes or teams representing foreign nations, including, but not limited to, the FIFA World Cup or Olympics.
- 11) Defines the following terms:
- a) "Collegiate or amateur championship sporting event" includes, but is not limited to, postseason tournaments or neutral-site competitions conducted by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), conference championships, bowl games, or similar nationally sanctioned collegiate athletic competitions.
 - b) "Independent venue" means an event space that derives a majority of its revenue from ticket events, is not majority-owned by a publicly traded company, and does not operate venues in more than 10 states.

- c) "Original seller" means a person who, for compensation, commission, or otherwise, advertises, lists, markets for sale, or sells an admission ticket to a sporting, musical, theater, or other entertainment event for original sale as instructed by an event presenter, event organizer, rights holder, or venue operator.
- d) "Professional sporting event" means a sporting event conducted by, or under contract with, a professional sports team or professional sports league in which participating athletes receive compensation for participation in the event.
- e) "Resale" means any resale of a ticket other than a sale conducted by the primary contractor or its authorized agent.
- f) "Rights holder" means an artist, performing arts organization, theater or dance company, professional athletic team, professional athletic league, author, lecturer, or any other persons who are the primary speakers or performers at an event for which tickets are sold.
- g) "Season ticketholder" or "season ticket licenseholder" means a person or entity that purchases or holds a contractual right to purchase a package of tickets directly from a professional sports team, league, or their authorized ticket agent for multiple games or events during a defined season.
- h) "Ticket resale marketplace" means an entity that, for compensation, commission, or otherwise, advertises, lists, markets for sale, or sells an admission ticket to a sporting, musical, theater, or other entertainment event other than a ticket for original sale sold by an original seller.

COMMENTS

1. Author's comment

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 on the markets for events tickets and the pending lawsuit against Live Nation/Ticketmaster

The Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee's analysis of this bill explains the state of the markets for event tickets:

Whenever someone purchases a ticket directly from a venue, event organizer, or their online ticket platform, they are buying from the primary market. These types of ticket sellers are generally referred to as original sellers. Many venues elect to use a third party to facilitate their online ticket sales. The prices of the primary market heavily impact availability and the prices on the secondary market, but generally, the primary market may sell tickets below market value. This is done to ensure a full show and to maximize venue and event expenses, such as merchandise, food, and drink.

The secondary market refers to ticket resellers. Platforms like StubHub, SeatGeek, TickPick, Vivid Seats, and others are all marketplaces that facilitate transactions between a potential consumer and a ticket reseller, who initially purchased the ticket from the primary market. Resellers, who are generally not associated with these platforms, use the secondary marketplace to secure valid, authentic transactions between themselves and consumers. They also provide consumers who, for various reasons, may no longer be able to attend the event with a way to recoup some of their money.

Further complicating this landscape is the fact that there can be overlap between the primary and secondary markets. For instance, Ticketmaster, which facilitates primary market sales, also has a resale platform.

As explained by the Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee's analysis of this bill, the state of the law may leave something to be desired:

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.

Another confounding factor in the ticketing market is the Live Nation/Ticketmaster monopoly. In 2010, concert producer Live Nation and ticketing and marketing company Ticketmaster were given authorization to merge.² The merger was approved subject to a consent decree that, among other things, was intended to prevent Live Nation from retaliating against a venue that used a ticketing company other than Ticketmaster.³ In 2019, the DOJ alleged that Live Nation/Ticketmaster violated the consent decree, and the company settled with the government.⁴

Five years later, the United States Department of Justice (USDOJ) and the attorneys general of over 30 states (including California) sued Live Nation/Ticketmaster for violating the Sherman Antitrust Act by engaging in illegal monopolization.⁵ In 2026, on the eve of trial, the USDOJ settled with Live Nation/Ticketmaster.⁶ Reports indicate that Live Nation's president and CEO spoke to President Donald Trump shortly before the USDOJ announced the settlement.⁷ Thirty-three states' attorneys general carried on with the lawsuit, however, and won a full victory at trial: the jury found that Live Nation/Ticketmaster operated as a monopoly that harmed consumers and overcharged ticket buyers.⁸

The remedies phase of the trial is expected to take place in early 2027. The states' remedies proposal, joined by Attorney General Rob Bonta, asks the court to require Live Nation to divest its ownership of Ticketmaster.⁹

As the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee's analysis notes, Live Nation/Ticketmaster is also a major ticket reseller. The 2024 complaint alleges that Ticketmaster makes up about one-third of the secondary market,

² See Joint Press Release Issued By Live Nation, Inc./Ticketmaster Entertainment, Inc., available at <https://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/1335258/000119312510012287/dex991.htm>.

³ Lorsch, *Why Live Nation and Ticketmaster dominate the live entertainment industry* (Jan. 25, 2023) CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2023/01/25/the-live-nation-and-ticketmaster-monopoly-of-live-entertainment.html>.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ See *United States, et al. v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. et al.* (S.D.N.Y.) Amended Complaint, Dkt. No. 257, available at <https://www.justice.gov/atr/media/1370191/dl>.

⁶ See *United States, et al. v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. et al.* (S.D.N.Y.) Notice of Settlement, Dkt. No. 1171, available at <https://www.justice.gov/atr/media/1443801/dl>.

⁷ Atkins, *Trump spoke with Live Nation's Head before DOJ reached surprise antitrust settlement* (June 25, 2026) NBC News, <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/trump-spoke-live-nation-ceo-doj-antitrust-settlement-rcna351766>.

⁸ Sarmiento, *Jury finds that Live Nation acted as a monopoly and overcharged ticket buyers* (Apr. 15, 2026) NPR, <https://www.npr.org/2026/04/15/nx-s1-5786715/live-nation-ticketmaster-antitrust-verdict-monopoly>.

⁹ California Department of Justice, Press Release: Attorney General Bonta Asks Court to Break Up Live Nation/Ticketmaster (May 21, 2026) <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-asks-court-break-live-nationticketmaster>.

and that Live Nation/Ticketmaster employs technology that makes it harder for fans to resell their tickets on rival secondary ticketing platforms.¹⁰

3. This bill imposes a 10 percent resale price cap on event tickets in a limited number of venues and event types

This bill prohibits any person reselling a ticket – including individuals and professional resellers – from charging more than 10 percent above the price they paid for the original ticket in select circumstances. Specifically, this resale cap applies when all of the following circumstances are met:

- The event is held in an independent venue, i.e., a venue that derives a majority of its revenues from ticket events, is not held by a publicly traded corporation, and is not owned by an entity with venues in more than 10 states.
- The independent venue either (1) has a seating capacity of 3,000 or fewer, or (2) is held at a nonprofit venue that also hosts agricultural fairs, exhibitions, or multiday community events.
- The event is not a professional athletic contest or event.
- The event is not an athletic contest for which the ticket is being sold by a season ticketholder or season ticket licenseholder.
- The event is not a college or amateur contest event conducted by a collegiate athletic association, e.g., the NCAA.
- The event is not an athletic contest or event, tournament, or series of games or matches involving athletes or teams representing foreign nations, expressly including the FIFA World Cup or the Olympics.

It further prohibits a ticket resale marketplace from charging fees over 10 percent and requires ticket resale marketplaces to obtain and display pricing information about the resale ticket. The bill also requires original sellers to print or display the original purchase price on tickets.

This bill can be enforced only by the Attorney General, a city attorney, or a county counsel. In the event of a violation, a violating original seller, ticket reseller, or ticket resale marketplace can be liable for civil penalties as follows:

- A civil penalty of up to \$1,000 per ticket sold for a first violation.
- A civil penalty of up to \$2,500 per ticket sold for subsequent violations.
- A civil penalty of up to \$5,000 per ticket sold for a knowing and willful pattern and practice of violations.
- Injunctive relief, restitution, or disgorgement of proceeds.

¹⁰ *United States, et al. v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc. et al.* (S.D.N.Y.) Amended Complaint, *supra*, at p. 17.

4. Stakeholder concerns related to this bill's relationship to the ongoing Live Nation/Ticketmaster lawsuit

Although the bill expressly carves out tickets sold at venues owned by Live Nation/Ticketmaster, through its carve-out for venues "not majority owned by a publicly traded company" and which do "not operate venues in more than 10 states," some of the bill's opponents are still concerned that this bill will serve to cement Live Nation/Ticketmaster's monopoly. For example, the Consumer Federation of California writes:

What does all this have to do with AB 1720? Quite a lot, as it turns out. The Live Nation/Ticketmaster monopoly is a massive vertically integrated monopoly. It directly represents hundreds of the largest artists in entertainment. It owns a dominant number of outdoor amphitheaters important to the live music infrastructure. It has a dominant position in terms of promoting and putting together artist tours. It forces venues of many sizes, particularly mid-sized and smaller venues, to sign long-term exclusive ticketing agreements with the monopoly, and greases these transactions with additional payments (sometimes called kickbacks by critics of the monopoly). It dominates the primary ticketing market, with a roughly 80% market share - clearly monopoly sized. It also is the largest player in the secondary ticketing market - a market which also includes some of the few competitors to the Live Nation/Ticketmaster monopoly, such as Stub Hub, Vivid, SeatGeek, Gametime and a few others.

This last point is why AB 1720 should be voted down by the California Legislature. Monopolies never admit they are monopolies, and monopolies will do anything to enhance their monopoly and market power. 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.

To be clear, CFC is repelled by some of the prices that we see in the secondary market. That sentence, by the way, applies not just to the secondary ticketing market companies mentioned above but also to the monopoly itself, as the largest player in the secondary market. But CFC is also repelled by the monopolistic behavior of Live Nation/Ticketmaster detailed in the original federal DOJ complaint with regards to

all other aspects of their business, of which secondary is only a part of it (and a relatively recent part at that, created largely to stymie the forces of competition that monopolies have always hated).

If you're going to do some sort of price cap or limit on resale value it must be combined with a number of discreet and specific actions against the monopoly, none of which are in AB 1720. None. In fact, AB 1720 goes out of its way to create even more loopholes in its own pricing regime by conveniently exempting all professional sports from the bill! That's a massive giveaway for one of the worst offenders of ticketing excess and anti-consumer behavior.

5. Arguments in opposition

According to a coalition of consumer, small business, community, and equity groups:

The fundamental issue in today's ticketing market is the entrenched monopoly power of Live Nation/Ticketmaster. This vertically integrated conglomerate controls ticketing, promotions, and venues. Roughly 80% of all primary ticketing sales occur on Ticketmaster. Its dominance has produced excessive fees, opaque pricing, and widespread consumer harm. Recently revealed internal company communications describe fans as "so stupid" and boast about "robbing them blind" - the predictable result of unchecked market power.

Yet just weeks ago, the Trump Administration's Department of Justice entered into a deeply flawed settlement with Live Nation/Ticketmaster, which was widely criticized as a concession that failed to restrain the company's behavior. The vast majority of states, including California, have rejected that deal and are continuing their case. When federal enforcement falls short, it is even more vital that California act to rein in monopoly practices – not shift the burden onto consumers.

Instead, AB 1720 is myopically focused on limiting the price at which consumers can resell their tickets, even though resale accounts for only a small fraction – roughly 9 percent – of total ticket sales. Meanwhile, Ticketmaster's monopoly retains full control over how much they can charge on primary sales. They can continue to engage in anti-consumer tactics like dynamic pricing, exclusive pre-sales, and inventory holdbacks, all of which drive up costs and reduce 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.

AB 1720 regulates consumers instead of monopolies, hurts competition, and deepens inequities in access to live events. Californians deserve real reforms that directly confront Ticketmaster’s monopoly power, increase transparency, and restore fairness in the ticketing marketplace.

SUPPORT

None received

OPPOSITION

California Black Chamber of Commerce
California League of United Latin American Citizens
California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce
California Live Events Equity Alliance
California Multicultural Business Alliance
Central Valley Latino Mayors and Elected Officials Coalition
Central Valley Yemen Society
Coalition for Ticket Fairness
Consumer Federation of California
Gametime
Hispanic 100
Hispanic Chambers of Commerce San Francisco
Latin American & Caribbean Business Chamber of Commerce
Latin Business Association
National Action Network Sacramento
North Valley Yemen Society
Pantone 294
SeatGeek
Si Se Puede Fresno, Kings, Kern, Tulare
TickPick

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending legislation: AB 1349 (Bryan, 2025) revises and expands existing laws prohibiting speculative ticketing and misleading resale ticketing practices. AB 1349 is pending before this Committee and is set to be heard on the same date as this bill.

Prior legislation:

AB 1291 (Lee, 2025) would have required a ticket seller to immediately provide proof of purchase to a consumer and required a venue operator to honor that proof of purchase

in lieu of a ticket, as specified. AB 1291 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

SB 785 (Caballero, 2024) would have prohibited the advertisement, sale, or contract for a ticket if a ticket seller did not own, possess, have constructive possession, or have the contractual right to sell a ticket and prohibited ticket sellers or ticket resale marketplaces from using an internet website with the intent to mislead. SB 785 died on the Assembly Inactive File.

PRIOR VOTES

Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee (Ayes 5,
Noes 2)

Senate Business, Professions and Economic Development Committee (Ayes 6, Noes 2)
Assembly Floor (Ayes 49, Noes 16)

Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 3)

Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 4)

Assembly Arts, Entertainment, Sports, and Tourism Committee (Ayes 6, Noes 1)
