

Date of Hearing: April 20, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCE

Avelino Valencia, Chair

AB 1793 (Ward) – As Amended April 7, 2026

SUBJECT: Cash payments: calculation

SUMMARY: Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Defines “merchant” to mean any person, corporations, or partnership engaged in the business of the sale of goods or services engaging in face-to-face, in-person sales.
- 2) Defines “legal tender” to mean all coins and currencies of the United States
- 3) Requires a merchant to calculate the total amount of goods and services by subtracting any discount or deductions, then adding applicable taxes.
- 4) Any sums resulting from the calculations taken from #3 ending in a mill (\$0.001), one, two, six, or seven cents, the sum shall be rounded down to the nearest amount divisible by five for payments made by legal tender.
- 5) Any sums resulting from the calculations taken from #3 ending in three, four, eight or nine cents shall be rounded up to the nearest amount divisible by five for payments made by legal tender.
- 6) Part 4 and 5 do not apply:
 - a) When the total sum of goods and services is four cents or less; or
 - b) Payments made by any demand or negotiable instrument, electronic fund transfer, money order, credit card, debit card, electronic payment, or other like instrument.
- 7) Prevents the application of tax imposed by the state or local government on gains or losses resulting from rounding.
- 8) Provides the Department of Financial Protection and Innovation (DFPI) authority to promulgate regulations to implement the bill.

EXISTING LAW:

California

- 1) AB 129 (2014) repealed Section 107 of the Corporations Code. That provision prohibited a corporation, flexible purpose corporation, association, or individual from issuing or putting in circulation, as money, anything but the lawful money of the United States.
- 2) The city of San Francisco’s *Legal Rights for Legal Tender Ordinance* number 100-19 (4/11/19) prohibits brick-and-mortar businesses from denying cash payment for any transaction involving the purchase of any tangible good and/or service where the business would accept one or more other forms of payment, and the customer is physically present in

the transaction. This ordinance prohibits the business from charging a fee or placing any other conditions on its acceptance cash.

- 3) The city of Berkeley's ordinance number 7,681-N.S. prohibits a drugstore, food products store, or retail products store operating at a fixed permanent, physical premise from denying cash payment for any transaction if offered. This ordinance prohibits the business from charging a fee or placing any other conditions on its acceptance cash.

Federal

- 1) United States coins and currency (including Federal reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal reserve banks and national banks) are legal tender for all debts, public charges, taxes, and dues. Foreign gold or silver coins are not legal tender for debts. 31 United States Code (U.S. Code) § 5103.
- 2) The Secretary of the Treasury has the authority to mint and issue coins in amounts the Secretary decides are necessary to meet the needs of the United States. 31 U.S. Code § 5111(a)(1).
- 3) The Secretary of the Treasury may mint and issue only the following coins: dollar coin, quarter, dime, nickel, penny, fifty dollar, twenty-five dollar, ten dollar, and five dollar. 31 U.S. Code § 5112(a).

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown. This bill is keyed Fiscal by Legislative Counsel.

COMMENTS:

1) Purpose

Statement from the Author

AB 1793—the California Common Cents Act—provides critical legal clarity on the rounding of cash transactions for businesses and consumers alike. By legalizing symmetrical rounding on the full cash purchase price, this bill provides clear guidelines for businesses and discourages strategic pricing against cash consumers. Credit, debit, and electronic transactions will remain unaffected, but a penny shortage will cause confusion and delays at the register for cash-paying customers. In the absence of federal law, it is up to the California State Legislature to ensure a smooth and transparent adoption of cash rounding.

Argument in Support

The California Retailers Association is happy to support AB 1793, which would provide clear and uniform rules for rounding cash transactions in California. As the United States phases out penny circulation, retailers need certainty and consistency to administer cash purchases efficiently and fairly. AB 1793 offers a practical framework that helps avoid confusion at the point of sale and promotes a smooth transition for businesses and consumers alike. This is a bill of common cents...

Retailers operate thousands of registers across the state, often in high-volume environments where clarity in payment processing is essential. By establishing symmetrical rounding

standards, AB 1793 reduces the risk of inconsistent practices and helps ensure customers are treated equitably regardless of where they shop. This is especially important for a diverse retail sector that must train employees, update systems, and maintain compliance across multiple store formats and jurisdictions.--California Retailers Association

Argument in Opposition

None received.

2) Background

On November 12, 2025, the United States Mint ended production of the penny citing a significant increase in cost of production.¹ Approximately 114 billion pennies remain in circulation, and its status as legal tender will remain intact.² The U.S. Treasury recommends that merchants adapt to the dropping supply of pennies by round transactions up or down to the nearest five cents. Recent guidance from the National Conference of State Legislators (NCSL) states: “The most recommended form of rounding is symmetrical rounding whereby if the final digit of the total transaction amount (including taxes) is 1, 2, 6, or 7 cents, the amount is rounded down to the nearest multiple of five. If the final digit is 3, 4, 8, or 9 cents, the amount is rounded up. Transactions totaling exactly \$0.01 or \$0.02 might be rounded up to \$0.05. Rounding rules would not apply to payments made via electronic methods, checks, gift cards, or other non-cash instruments.”³

3) Federal Efforts

On April 29, 2025, H.R. 3074, the “Common Cents Act”, was introduced at the federal policy level. This bill would direct the secretary of the Treasury to cease production of one-cent coins for general circulation, while allowing continued production for numismatic (collector) purposes, provided sales cover production costs. When initially introduced, Section 3 of the bill contained a provision mandating rounding. However, after consideration by the House Financial Services Committee, it was amended, and Section 3 was deleted.

4) Penny Shortages

The Retail Industry Leader Association (RILA) conducted a survey in November of 2025 finding that “[o]f the 25 companies surveyed, nearly one-quarter indicated that more than 1,000 of their store locations are currently without pennies. Two-thirds of respondents said they are rounding transactions to the benefit of consumers when pennies are unavailable — a practice that, while fair to shoppers, is costing businesses millions of dollars as small amounts add up across thousands of daily cash transactions.”⁴

¹ *Penny Production Cessation FAQs* <https://home.treasury.gov/news/featured-stories/penny-production-cessation-faqs>. Last visited 2/23/26 “Over the past 10 years, the total production cost of the penny has risen from 1.3 cents to 3.69 cents per penny. These production costs include materials, facilities, and overhead.”

² *Id.*

³ *Id.* citing *Elimination of the Penny: Cents-able Considerations* (2025).

⁴ *Retailers Face Penny Shortages, Call for Federal Action* (2025).

5) Litigation Risks

The NCSL’s exploration into this topic includes in-depth consideration of potential legal risks.⁵ The three risks NCSL’s State and Local Taxation (SALT) Task Force identified are: 1) a potential violation of the federal Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA) to a certain extent; 2) “whistleblower” lawsuits state false claims acts against sellers for under-collection of sales tax from cash purchasers; and 3) class action lawsuits against sellers for over-collection of sales tax.

First, ITFA prohibits states, via the U.S. Constitution’s Supremacy Clause, from imposing “discriminatory taxes.” The prohibition on discriminatory taxes states that: “No State or political subdivision thereof may impose . . . discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce.” “Electronic commerce” means “any transaction conducted over the Internet or through internet access, comprising the sale, lease, license, offer, or delivery of property, goods, services, or information, whether or not for consideration.” While a “discriminatory tax” means a tax imposed on electronic commerce that is not generally imposed “on transactions involving similar property, goods, services, or information accomplished through other means[.]”

In this regard, the ITFA is potentially implicated when a state institutes a rounding rule—irrespective of the specific methodology—for cash payments that diverges from the rounding protocols applicable to electronic commerce. The SALT study estimates the likelihood that an ITFA challenge would succeed is unlikely:

1. “Cash payments are not “similar” to electronic payments as the payment methods differ in terms of security, recordkeeping, acceptance and, importantly, the need to provide “change” to the purchaser.”
2. “The rounding rule that applies to non-cash payments is the same, whether “online” point-of-sale systems (which are processed via access the public Internet) or “offline” or “one-premise” point-of-sale systems (which are processed via access to private networks or without the need for constant Internet connectivity). These point-of-sale systems are “similar” for ITFA purposes because they offer comparable security, recordkeeping and acceptance of such payments, as well as the lack of any requirement to provide change to a purchaser. “
3. “Should rounding be mandated by federal law, such a statute would have to be read in harmony with ITFA. Consequently, enactment of federal rounding legislation makes a successful ITFA claim almost non-existent.”⁶

Second, litigation risks for under-collection of the sales tax in certain states, like California, that permit *qui tam* suits in tax matters. In a *qui tam* action for state tax under-collection, a private party (a “relator”) brings a lawsuit on the state government’s behalf to assist in recovering funds that have not been properly paid to the government. “Said private party may assert that a company’s tax collection practices or failure to collect the correct amount of tax has resulted in the state being defrauded. “Such a suit likely would be dismissed if the seller correctly applies

⁵ Livingston, J. (2025) “Elimination of the Penny: Cents-able Considerations” A policy brief from the NCSL State and Local Taxation (SALT) Task Force. <https://www.ncsl.org/fiscal/elimination-of-the-penny-cents-able-considerations>. Last visited 3/2/2026.

⁶ Livingston, J. (2025) at 10.

the statutory or regulatory rounding rule because that action would not meet the “falsity” requirement under a typical false claims act. That is, *compliance* with duly enacted state law is a defense to improper under-collection of taxes because there would be no legally “false” action by the seller.”⁷

Finally, similar to the second, in a class action, which is brought by consumers on behalf of a group for over-collection of tax, if a company correctly applies a state’s rounding rule, a class action suit against the seller would likely fail. “In such cases where a class action plaintiff, i.e., a representative purchaser, files suit for over-collected tax, sellers have a number of defenses to class actions, including but not limited to: (i) “certification” of the class, where the plaintiffs must generally meet numerosity, commonality, typicality, representation, and predominance (all legal terms of art beyond the scope of this summary); (ii) lack of a private cause of action that underlies the suit; (iii) requirement to arbitrate under the seller’s terms and conditions or contract, acknowledged or executed by the purchaser; and (iv) the voluntary payment doctrine.”⁸

6. Concerns for cash-required cities

Inclusion and accessibility were the primary motivators for cash inclusion ordinances. “For many City residents, such as those unable to obtain bank accounts, the ability to engage in consumer transactions, including goods and services vital to health and safety, depends on the ability to pay with legal cash tender established by the federal government of [the] United States.”⁹ Some retailers have raised concerns that rounding up may be considered a fee or penalty for the use of cash in cash-required cities because the use of credit card or other payments would result in exact payment. In both cities, the ordinances prohibit the businesses from charging a fee or penalty for the use of cash, or other placing other conditions for the acceptance of cash. These provisions are intended to prevent businesses from steering customers to using one payment method over another. However, no business has imposed any fee, penalty or condition for the use of a different payment method when it is simply complying with the law, particularly where the law contemplates a balancing by rounding up and down based on a specific ending amount.

6. Consideration for Point of Sale System Implementation

The cessation of penny production necessitates significant technical modifications to existing Point of Sale (POS) infrastructure. Implementation of the proposed rounding mandate requires comprehensive adjustments to cash acceptance and reporting systems to facilitate the requisite protocols for transactions involving legal tender. Such efforts include the design of systems capable of differentiating between cash-based and electronic demand instruments, while mitigating operational risks and ensuring seamless integration with statutory tax reporting and payroll accounting systems

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ The city of Berkeley’s ordinance number 7,681-N.S. (a)

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Last verified 4/15/26

California Grocers Association

California Retailers Association

Cameo - California Association for Micro Enterprise Opportunity

Opposition

4/15/26

None received.

Analysis Prepared by: Desiree NguyenOrth / B. & F. / (916) 319-3081