

Date of Hearing: May 6, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS  
 Buffy Wicks, Chair  
 AB 1896 (Mark González) – As Amended April 14, 2026

|                   |                                  |       |       |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|
| Policy Committee: | Public Employment and Retirement | Vote: | 5 - 1 |
|                   | Public Safety                    |       | 7 - 2 |

Urgency: No                      State Mandated Local Program: Yes                      Reimbursable: Yes

**SUMMARY:**

This bill disqualifies a person previously employed by an entity engaged in immigration enforcement, between January 20, 2025, and January 20, 2029, from public employment in California, with specified exceptions for California state and local law enforcement agencies engaged in immigration enforcement.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

Ongoing General Fund costs of an unknown amount, possibly in the hundreds of thousands to millions dollars annually, for state and local public employers, collectively statewide, to verify employment history of prospective employees. To the extent this is a level of verification public employers were not undertaking previously, these costs could constitute a reimbursable state mandate, subject to a decision by the Commission on State Mandates.

**COMMENTS:**

According to the Deportation Data Project, in 2025, “Immigrations and Custom enforcement (ICE) began making more arrests of people without criminal convictions and more arrests at large in communities and at ICE check-ins,” which resulted in significantly increased detentions and deportations of immigrants, including those with lawful status. On July 4, 2025, President Trump signed the One Big Beautiful (OBB) Act, a massive domestic policy bill that, among other provisions, allocates more than \$170 billion for immigration enforcement through 2029. The author contends the method of enforcement employed by ICE has become increasingly deadly and argues “anyone who participates in the terrorizing, kidnapping, shooting, or killing of innocent people has shown they are not interested in serving the public interest but are instead agents of harm, hate, and substantive violence.” By prohibiting previous employees of entities engaged in immigration enforcement, the author further claims the bill will ensure California’s “people are served by those with their best interest at heart.”

As discussed in the Assembly Public Safety committee’s analysis, this bill raises constitutional issues, including Supremacy Clause concerns arising from its prohibition on hiring an individual previously employed by federal and out-of-state entities engaged in immigration enforcement, which could lead to a lawsuit alleging discrimination against the federal government in violation of intergovernmental immunity. To the extent the bill is challenged in court, any defense costs would be borne by the Department of Justice.

**Analysis Prepared by:** Aaron Heredia / APPR. / (916) 319-2081