

Date of Hearing: April 21, 2026  
Counsel: Kimberly Horiuchi

## ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 1930 (Zbur) – As Amended March 19, 2026

**SUMMARY:** Limits when a person or entity may provide information regarding another's legally protected health care activities in response to various types of inquiries. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Prohibits a person or entity that is located, headquartered, incorporated, or otherwise conducting business in California and receives, is served with, or is subject to a civil, criminal, or regulatory inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding legally protected health care activity from complying with the request unless all of the following conditions are met:
  - a) The inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons contains or is accompanied by an affidavit under penalty of perjury attesting any of the following:
    - i. It is not related to, and that any information obtained shall not be used in, any investigation or proceeding that seeks to impose civil or criminal liability, professional sanctions, or any other legal consequences upon a person or entity for engaging in any legally protected health care activity.
    - ii. It is related to an investigation or proceeding regarding activity that is unlawful under California civil or criminal law, and it identifies the California law under which the activity is unlawful.
    - iii. It is related to an investigation or proceeding regarding activity that is grounds for professional discipline in California, and it identifies the grounds for professional discipline.
  - b) The person or entity receiving or subject to the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons regarding legally protected health care activity has done both of the following:
    - i. Provided notice to the Department of Justice (DOJ) within seven days of receiving the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons indicating whether the person or entity intends to comply with or provide information in response to the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons. The notice shall include a copy of the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons, and any related materials.
    - ii. Made reasonable attempts to notify the individual or individuals who provided, sought, received, facilitated, or otherwise engaged in the legally protected health care activity to which the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons pertains at least 30 days prior to providing any responsive information, unless otherwise ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction.

- c) A minimum of 30 days has passed since the person or entity notified the Attorney General of the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons.
- 2) Authorizes the DOJ to commence a civil action against a person or entity that submits a false affidavit pursuant to this bill's provisions.
- 3) Provides that the submission of a false affidavit pursuant to this bill's provisions is punishable by a civil penalty up to \$15,000.
- 4) Authorizes the DOJ to commence an action to enforce the provisions of this bill, including but not limited to, an application or motion for an order enjoining ongoing or subsequent violations of this bill. Specifies that the Attorney General cannot bring such an action unless the DOJ has reason to believe the defendant intends to comply or has complied with an inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons regarding legally protected health care activity.
- 5) Requires a court of this state to assess a statutory penalty of \$10,000 for the first violation and \$15,000 for each subsequent violation against any person or entity found to have intentionally, knowingly, willingly, or recklessly complied with an inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding legally protected health care activity in violation of the bill's provisions.
- 6) Specifies that these statutory penalties can be assessed in addition to any other legal or equitable remedies at law.
- 7) Requires an action brought by the DOJ pursuant to this bill's provisions to be commenced within six years of the date on which the Attorney General received the notice of the inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons at issue.
- 8) Requires a court to award court costs and attorneys' fees to the DOJ in any civil action in which the court imposes any penalty authorized by this section.

**EXISTING LAW:**

- 1) Defines "legally protected health care activity" as any of the following:
  - a) The exercise and enjoyment, or attempted exercise and enjoyment, by a person of rights to reproductive health care services, gender-affirming health care services, or gender-affirming mental health care services secured by the Constitution or laws of California or the provision by a health care service plan contract or a policy, or a certificate of health insurance, that provides for such services.
  - b) An act or omission undertaken to aid or encourage, or attempt to aid or encourage, a person in the exercise and enjoyment or attempted exercise and enjoyment of rights to reproductive health care services, gender-affirming health care services, or gender-affirming mental health care services secured by the Constitution or laws of California.
  - c) The provision of reproductive health care services, gender-affirming health care services, or gender-affirming mental health care services by a person duly licensed under the laws of California or the coverage of, and reimbursement for, those services or care by a health care service plan or a health insurer, if the service or care is lawful under the laws of

California, regardless of the patient's location. (Pen. Code, § 1549.15, subd. (b)(1)(A)-(C).)

- 2) Provides that “gender-affirming health care” and “gender-affirming mental health care” shall have the same meaning as medically necessary health care that respects the gender identity of the patient, as experienced and defined by the patient, and may include, but is not limited to, interventions to suppress the development of endogenous secondary sex characteristics; interventions to align the patient's appearance or physical body with the patient's gender identity; and intervention to alleviate symptoms of clinically significant distress resulting from gender dysphoria, as defined in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edition. (Pen. Code, § 1549.15, subd. (a).)
- 3) States that “reproductive health care services” means and includes all services, care, or products of a medical, surgical, psychiatric, therapeutic, diagnostic, mental health, behavioral health, preventative, rehabilitative, supportive, consultative, referral, prescribing, or dispensing nature relating to the human reproductive system provided in accordance with the constitution and laws of this state, whether provided in person or by means of telehealth services which includes, but is not limited to, all services, care, and products relating to pregnancy, the termination of a pregnancy, assisted reproduction, or contraception. (Pen. Code, § 1549.15, subd. (c).)
- 4) Defines “anti-reproductive-rights crime” to mean a crime committed partly or wholly because the victim is a reproductive health services client, provider, or assistant, or a crime that is partly or wholly intended to intimidate the victim, any other person or entity, or any class of persons or entities from becoming or remaining a reproductive health services client, provider, or assistant. (Pen. Code, § 13776, subd. (a).)
- 5) Requires the DOJ to direct local law enforcement agencies to report annually to the DOJ specified information related to anti-reproductive-rights crimes. (Pen. Code, § 13777, subd. (a)(2).)
- 6) Requires the DOJ to carry out certain functions relating to anti-reproductive-rights crimes in consultation with the Governor, the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST), and other subject matter experts. (Pen. Code, § 13777, subd. (b).)
- 7) Requires POST to develop an interactive training course on anti-reproductive-rights crimes and make the telecourse available to all California law enforcement agencies through an online portal or platform. (Pen. Code, § 13778, subd. (a).)
- 8) Mandates every law enforcement agency in this state to develop, adopt, and implement written policies and standards for officers' responses to anti-reproductive-rights calls by January 1, 2023. (Pen. Code, § 13778.1.)
- 9) Prohibits a state or local law enforcement agency or officer from knowingly arresting or knowingly participating in the arrest of any person for performing, supporting, or aiding in the performance of an abortion in this state, or obtaining an abortion in this state, if the abortion is lawful under the laws of this state. (Pen. Code, § 13778.2, subd. (a).)
- 10) Prohibits a state or local public agency, or any employee thereof acting in their official capacity, from cooperating with or providing information to any individual or agency or

department from another state or, to the extent permitted by federal law, to a federal law enforcement agency regarding an abortion that is lawful under the laws of this state and that is performed in this state. (Pen. Code, § 13778.2, subd. (b).)

- 11) Provides that a law of another state that authorizes the imposition of civil or criminal penalties related to an individual performing, supporting, or aiding in the performance of an abortion in this state, or an individual obtaining an abortion in this state, if the abortion is lawful under the laws of this state, is against the public policy of this state. (Pen. Code, § 13778.2, subd. (c)(1).)
- 12) Prohibits a state court, judicial officer, or court employee or clerk, or authorized attorney from issuing a subpoena pursuant to any state law in connection with a proceeding in another state regarding an individual performing, supporting, or aiding in the performance of an abortion in this state, or an individual obtaining an abortion in this state, if the abortion is lawful under the laws of this state. (Pen. Code, § 13778.2, subd. (c)(2).)
- 13) Provides that the investigation of any criminal activity in this state that may involve the performance of an abortion is not prohibited, provided that information relating to any medical procedure performed on a specific individual is not shared with an agency or individual from another state for the purpose of enforcing another state's abortion law. (Pen. Code, § 13778.2, subd. (d).)
- 14) Prohibits a person from posting on the internet or social media, with the intent that another person imminently use that information to commit a crime involving violence or a threat of violence against a reproductive health care services patient, provider, or assistant, or other individuals residing at the same home address, the personal information or image of a reproductive health care services patient, provider, or assistant, or other individuals residing at the same home address. (Gov. Code, § 6218.01, subd. (a)(1).)
- 15) Provides that the above is punishable by a fine of up to \$10,000 per violation, imprisonment of either up to one year in a county jail or by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years, or by both that fine and imprisonment. (Gov. Code, § 6218.01, subd. (a)(2).)
- 16) Provides that a violation of the above that leads to the bodily injury of a reproductive health care services patient, provider, or assistant, or other individuals residing at the same home address, is a felony punishable by a fine of up to \$50,000, imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years, or by both that fine and imprisonment. (Gov. Code, § 6218.01, subd. (a)(2).)
- 17) Provides that the state may not deny or interfere with a person's right to choose or obtain an abortion prior to viability of the fetus or when the abortion is necessary to protect the life or health of the person. (Health & Safe. Code, § 123462, subd. (c); 123466.)
- 18) Prohibits under the Confidentiality of Medical Information Act (CMIA), providers of health care, health care service plans, or contractors, as defined, from sharing medical information without the patient's written authorization, subject to certain exceptions. (Civ. Code § 56, *et seq.*)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, “Across the country, we are seeing increasing efforts to bully and intimidate patients and providers who deliver or need reproductive health care and gender-affirming care. Out-of-state subpoenas have raised serious concerns about privacy, and threaten not only the safety of patients, but also the safety of providers and their ability to continue practicing. In the case of Children’s Hospital LA, a subpoena contributed to the closure of the hospital’s Center for Trans Youth Health and Development and Gender-Affirming Care Program, devastating families and drastically reducing access to health care for transgender patients across the region.

“AB 1930 will help the Attorney General defend health care access and enforce California’s protected health activities laws for all who provide and receive care in California. Specifically, this bill will protect transgender patients and all patients receiving gender-affirming care, patients who receive reproductive health care services, and their health care providers by requiring business entities in California to notify the Attorney General before they respond to a subpoena or inquiry regarding legally protected health care activity. This bill will also authorize the Attorney General to intervene. Together, this will allow the Attorney General to know when protected healthcare is under attack and protect all those who seek and provide this kind of care in California.”

- 2) **Attacks on Gender-Affirming Care and Reproductive Rights:** In the past few years, numerous states have introduced legislation targeting transgender individuals in an attempt to prohibit or limit their ability to obtain gender-affirming care and reproductive care. More recently, on the first day of President Trump’s second term, he issued an executive order titled “Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government” which states that “the United States recognizes two sexes, male and female.”<sup>1</sup>

In 2025, the federal DOJ announced that it had sent more than 20 subpoenas to doctors and clinics providing gender-affirming health care to minors.<sup>2</sup> Along with other states, California’s DOJ has worked to prevent the federal government and out-of-state officials from obtaining these kinds of records.<sup>3</sup> However, DOJ’s ability to successfully prevent

---

<sup>1</sup> Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 8615 (Jan. 20, 2025), available at <<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/01/30/2025-02090/defending-women-from-gender-ideology-extremism-and-restoring-biological-truth-to-the-federal>.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Justice, Department of Justice Subpoenas Doctors and Clinics Involved in Performing Transgender Medical Procedures on Children, (Jul. 9, 2025) available at: <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/departments-justice-subpoenas-doctors-and-clinics-involved-performing-transgender-medical>.

<sup>3</sup> See California Department of Justice, Attorney General Bonta Joins Multistate Opposition to U.S. DOJ’s Attempt to Subpoena Gender-Affirming Care Records, (Oct. 22, 2025) available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-joins-multistate-opposition-us-doj%E2%80%99s-attempt-subpoena>.

disclosure is directly tied to it having the authority to intervene in disputes regarding the provision of this information, and having notice of an inquiry in the first instance.

Since then, the President has issued an executive order banning transgender girls and women from participating in women's sports, and another one banning the use of federal funding for youth gender-affirming care, including funding for research on gender-affirming care.<sup>4</sup> Although some of these orders are currently being challenged in court, the outcome of those cases is uncertain. In response to these executive orders, the Trump Administration has taken several actions, including rescinding all existing federal policies protecting transgender people from sex and disability discrimination; revoking the ability to obtain passports and federal documents reflecting their gender identity; denying transition-related healthcare to federal employees; and directing federal prisons to deny medical treatment and house transgender people according to sex assigned at birth.<sup>5</sup>

Some California healthcare providers are beginning to scale back care for transgender youth, following efforts by the Trump administration to restrict access to such care. Stanford is the second provider in this state that has begun restricting gender-affirming health care because of the recent actions of the Trump administration. Stanford recently issued the following statement on the matter:

After careful review of the latest actions and directives from the federal government and following consultations with clinical leadership, including our multidisciplinary LGBTQ+ program and its providers, Stanford Medicine paused providing gender-related surgical procedures as part of our comprehensive range of medical services for LGBTQ+ patients under the age of 19, effective June 2, 2025.<sup>6</sup>

In 2022, the U.S. Supreme Court published its opinion in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* ((2022) 597 U.S. 215), overturning 50 years of precedent and revoking, for the first time, a constitutional right. Prior to *Dobbs*, the Supreme Court had continuously upheld the holding of *Roe v. Wade*, that found the implied constitutional right to privacy extended to a person's decision whether to terminate a pregnancy, while allowing some state regulation of abortion access as permissible. (*Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113.) In the wake of *Dobbs*, numerous states now have laws prohibiting or severely limiting abortion and have enacted laws attempting to punish those who seek safe and reliable reproductive healthcare in states where it is still legal to seek abortion care. According to the Guttmacher Institute, 16 states have effectively banned abortion and another 10 have become very restrictive or restrictive.

In 1969, the California Supreme Court held that the state constitution's implied right to privacy extends to an individual's decision about whether or not to have an abortion. (*People*

---

<sup>4</sup> See Exec. Order No. 14201, 90 Fed. Reg. 9279 (Feb. 5, 2025), available at <<http://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/11/2025-02513/keeping-men-out-of-womens-sports>>; Exec. Order No. 14187, 90 Fed. Reg. 8771 (Jan. 28, 2025), available at <<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2025/02/03/2025-02194/protecting-children-from-chemical-and-surgical-mutilation>>.

<sup>5</sup> Jennifer Levi, GLAD Law, *From the Front Lines: The Fight for Transgender Rights Is a Fight for Democracy*, (Feb. 10, 2025), available at <<https://www.glad.org/the-fight-for-transgender-rights-is-a-fight-for-democracy/>>.

<sup>6</sup> See <<https://www.ktvu.com/news/stanford-no-longer-providing-gender-affirming-surgeries-children>>, June 26, 2025.

*v. Belous* (1969) 71 Cal.2d 954.) This was the first time an individual's right to abortion was upheld in a court. In 1972 the California voters passed a constitutional amendment that explicitly provided for the right to privacy in the state constitution. (Prop. 11, Nov. 7, 1972 gen. elec.)

The Reproductive Privacy Act includes findings and declarations that every individual possesses a fundamental right of privacy with respect to personal reproductive decisions, which entails the right to make and effectuate decisions about all matters relating to pregnancy; therefore, it is the public policy of the State of California that every individual has the fundamental right to choose or refuse birth control, and every individual has the fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion. (Health & Saf. Code, § 123462.)

In 2019, Governor Newsom issued a proclamation reaffirming California's commitment to making reproductive freedom a fundamental right in response to the numerous attacks on reproductive rights across the nation. In September 2021, more than 40 organizations came together to form the California Future Abortion Council (CA FAB) to identify barriers to accessing abortion services and to recommend policy proposals to support equitable and affordable access for not only Californians but all who seek care in the state.

In response to the *Dobbs* decision, California enacted a comprehensive package of legislation expanding, protecting, and strengthening access to reproductive health care, including abortions, for all Californians and people seeking such care in our state. One such law, SB 345 (Skinner, Ch. 260, Stats. 2023) provided safeguards for professional licenses of California healthcare providers from out-of-state statutes attempting to punish these professionals for providing care legal in the state.

Additionally, the voters overwhelmingly approved Proposition 1 (Nov. 8, 2022 gen. elec.), and enacted an express constitutional right in the state constitution that prohibits the state from interfering with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions.

3) **Full Faith and Credit Clause:** The Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution states:

Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof. (U.S. Const. art. IV, sec. 1.)

Because this bill prohibits government actors from cooperating with another state for the purpose of enforcing another state's laws on what we characterize as "legally protected healthcare activity," it potentially implicates the Full Faith and Credit Clause.

Generally, the laws of the state regulate conduct that occurs within that state. However, situations may arise where more than one state's laws may apply such as collection of income taxes or child support obligations from another state. The purpose of the Full Faith and Credit Clause:

“[I]s to alter the status of the several states as independent foreign sovereignties, each free to ignore obligations created under the laws or by the judicial proceedings of the others, and to make them integral parts of a single nation throughout which a remedy upon a just obligation might be demanded as of right, irrespective of the state of its origin.” (*Baker v. General Motors Co.* (1998) 522 U.S. 222, 232 citing *Milwaukee County v. M. E. White Co.* (1935) 296 U.S. 268, 277.)

The Full Faith and Credit Clause may be implicated when there is a conflict between the laws of the different states. At least one court has held that any effort by a state to apply its criminal laws beyond state borders to criminalize activity that is otherwise lawful in the other state. (*Bigelow v. Virginia* (1975) 421 U.S. 809.) *Bigelow* involved a Virginia newspaper editor who was convicted in Virginia for printing an advertisement for an abortion referral service in New York. The Supreme Court overturned the conviction stating:

“The Virginia Legislature could not have regulated the advertiser’s activity in New York, and obviously could not have proscribed the activity in that State. Neither could Virginia prevent its residents from traveling to New York to obtain those services, or as the state conceded, prosecute them for going there. Virginia possessed no authority to regulate the services provided in New York . . .” (*Id.* at p. 822-824.)

However, other cases do not follow a strict prohibition on the application of one state’s laws on another state. The Supreme Court has also held that even when criminal conduct takes place outside of the state, extraterritorial jurisdiction may be proper when the conduct was intended to produce or did produce harmful effects within the state. (*Strassheim v. Daily* (1911) 221 U.S. 280.)

The Supreme Court has also made a distinction between the strength of the Full Faith and Credit Clause’s applications to judgments versus state law.

“The Full Faith and Credit Clause does not compel "a state to substitute the statutes of other states for its own statutes dealing with a subject matter concerning which it is competent to legislate. Regarding judgments, however, the full faith and credit obligation is exacting. A final judgment in one State, if rendered by a court with adjudicatory authority over the subject matter and persons governed by the judgment, qualifies for recognition throughout the land.” (*Baker v. General Motors Co.*, *supra*, 522 U.S. at 232-233.)

This concept is often referred to as the “public policy exception” meaning statutes in one state is given effect only if they do not contravene the public policy of the other state. If this bill were challenged based on the Full Faith and Credit Clause, California would argue that enforcing the anti-reproductive criminal statutes of other states is contrary to the public policy of the State which is supported by case law.

- 4) **Argument in Support:** According to *Equality California*, a co-sponsor, “California has long served as a safe haven for individuals seeking comprehensive health care, including reproductive health care and gender-affirming care. However, recent actions by the federal government and coordinated efforts in other states threaten access to these legally protected health care services. Without strong safeguards, subpoenas, investigations, and other legal demands may be used to circumvent California law and undermine the rights of patients and their providers.

“In 2025, the U.S. Department of Justice issued a subpoena to Children’s Hospital Los Angeles seeking information that could identify more than 3,000 transgender youth receiving gender-affirming care. The subpoena demanded documents that would identify patients by name, as well as medical records containing highly sensitive personal information. This request raised serious concerns about patient privacy and ultimately contributed to the closure of one of the state’s largest gender-affirming care programs, significantly reducing access to care for transgender patients in Southern California.

“California law protects the right to access reproductive health care and gender-affirming care and includes safeguards for patients, their families, and health professionals against retaliation by hostile out-of-state actors. AB 1930 strengthens California’s existing protections by establishing clear safeguards when a business entity receives a subpoena or inquiry seeking information related to legally protected health care activity.

“If a California entity plans to respond to such a request, AB 1930 would require them to: (1) notify the Attorney General within seven days of receiving the inquiry; (2) make reasonable attempts to notify any individuals to whom the inquiry pertains within 30 days; and (3) delay responding until at least 30 days after notifying the Attorney General. Additionally, AB 1930 explicitly authorizes the Attorney General to intervene and enforce the provisions of the bill, including through civil action and civil penalties.

“By establishing these critical safeguards, AB 1930 helps ensure that patients and providers in California are not exposed to harassment or legal threats from out-of-state actors seeking to undermine access to lawful health care.”

- 5) **Argument in Opposition:** According to the *California Family Council*, “AB 1930 would prohibit California individuals and entities from complying with out-of-state or federal legal requests, including subpoenas, court orders, and regulatory process, related to abortion and gender transition interventions for minors, unless strict conditions are met. It empowers the Attorney General to penalize those who cooperate with such requests. While framed as a patient privacy measure, AB 1930 erects unprecedented legal barriers that obstruct accountability, conflict with federal law, and shield providers from legitimate oversight when children are harmed.

“The Bill Conflicts with Federal Supremacy. AB 1930 imposes civil penalties on parties who comply with lawful federal legal process. This creates a direct conflict with federal authority and implicates the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution (Article VI, Clause 2). States cannot nullify federal investigative and judicial process by statute. Courts have consistently held that state laws obstructing the enforcement of federal legal obligations are preempted. Article IV, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution requires each state to give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. By penalizing

compliance with lawful sister-state subpoenas and court orders, AB 1930 places California in direct conflict with this constitutional mandate and with 28 U.S.C. § 1738, which implements it. No state may unilaterally immunize its residents from the judicial authority of other states. Shields Providers from Accountability for Harm to Minors. Among the "legally protected health care activities" covered by this bill are sterilizing, hormone therapies, and sex change surgeries performed on minors. A landmark peer-reviewed report released by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found that evidence for the benefits of these interventions in pediatric patients is of "very low certainty," while documented harms, including infertility, cardiovascular risk, and long-term psychological harm, are significant<sup>1</sup>. By insulating California providers from out-of-state and federal legal process, AB 1930 functionally eliminates a key avenue of accountability when these interventions cause serious injury to children.

“Multiple European nations, including Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and the United Kingdom, have recently restricted or halted pediatric gender transition interventions after systematic reviews found insufficient evidence of benefit and meaningful evidence of harm<sup>2</sup>. Rather than following this international trajectory toward greater caution, AB 1930 would entrench California as a destination jurisdiction where providers face no external scrutiny. The Legislature should not be erecting legal walls to protect a medical practice that leading health systems worldwide are now questioning.

“The Bill Undermines Parental Authority. Parents in other states who believe their minor child was harmed by a California provider, or whose child traveled to California for these interventions without parental consent, may have no practical legal recourse if AB 1930 becomes law. The bill's barriers to subpoenas and information sharing would prevent parents and courts from obtaining records necessary to pursue claims on behalf of injured children. Parental authority to protect children from medical harm is a fundamental right recognized under federal constitutional doctrine, and AB 1930 erodes that authority.

“The Bill Raises Serious First Amendment Concerns. Penalizing individuals and entities for responding truthfully to lawful legal process compels silence and raises significant First Amendment free speech concerns. Statutes that punish cooperation with judicial or governmental proceedings, particularly where they reach federally-initiated processes, face heightened constitutional scrutiny.”

## 6) **Related Legislation:**

- a) AB 1854 (Krell) requires, among other things, any person or entity headquartered, located, or incorporated in California and who receives, is served with, or is subject to a civil, criminal, or regulatory inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons, as specified, for information regarding legally protected health care activity not comply with or provide information in response to that inquiry. AB 1854 is pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
- b) AB 2164 (Bauer-Kahan) applies California Shield Laws related to protected healthcare activity to any person who has previously undertaken one or more protected healthcare activities, as specified, in another state to aid or encourage any other person in the exercise and enjoyment of their rights to reproductive health care services or gender affirming health care services that would have been protected by this state if they had

been undertaken in this state, if the activity was permissible under the laws of the state where the person providing aid was located. AB 2164 is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

**7) Prior Legislation:**

- a) SB 497 (Weiner), Chapter 764, Statutes of 2025 enacted various safeguards against the enforcement of other states' laws that purport to penalize individuals from obtaining gender-affirming care that is legal in California.
- b) AB 82 (Ward), Chapter 679, Statutes of 2025, expanded safe haven protections against adverse action for aiding and assisting the access of legally protected health care activities in California, prohibits the reporting of testosterone and mifepristone to California's Prescription Drug Monitoring Program (PDMP), and required bail to be set at zero dollars for an individual who has been arrested in connection with a proceeding in another state regarding the individual performing, supporting, or aiding in the performance of "a legally protected health care activity."
- c) SB 107 (Wiener), Chapter 810, Statutes of 2022, enacted various safeguards against the enforcement of other states' laws that purport to penalize individuals from obtaining gender-affirming care that is legal in California.
- d) AB 2091 (Bonta), Chapter 628, statutes of 2022, prohibited providers, health care service plans, contractors, employers from releasing medical information related to abortion services or information related to a person allowing a minor to receive gender-affirming health care and gender-affirming mental health care in response to a subpoena/investigation-related request seeking to impose liability under another state's law for an abortion lawful in CA or for allowing minor to receive gender-affirming health care and gender-affirming mental health care, among other provisions.
- e) AB 1666 (Bauer-Kahan), Chapter 42, Statutes of 2022, prohibited California courts from applying another state's laws authorizing civil action for receiving, seeking, providing, and/or aiding abortion in deciding the cases before them or from enforcing civil judgments under those laws, and designating those laws as contrary to California public policy, among other provisions.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

California Legislative Lgbtq Caucus (Sponsor)  
Office of the Attorney General Rob Bonta (Sponsor)  
Equality California (Co-Sponsor)  
Access Reproductive Justice  
Casita Feliz Latine Lgbtq+ Center  
Cft – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, Aft, Afl-cio  
Courage California  
El/la Para Translatinas  
Gender Affirming Professionals  
Lgbtq+ Inclusivity, Visibility, and Empowerment (LIVE)  
Los Angeles Lgbt Center  
Oakland Privacy  
Pflag Clayton-concord  
Reproductive Freedom for All California  
San Francisco Aids Foundation  
Somos Familia Valle  
The San Diego Lgbt Community Center  
The Translatin@ Coalition

**Opposition**

California Chamber of Commerce  
California Hospital Association  
California Family Council  
Cause: Californians United for Sex-based Evidence in Policy and Law  
Concerned Women for America  
Democrats for an Informed Approach to Gender  
Lgb (lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual) Alliance Foundation  
Our Duty  
Women are Real  
Women's Liberation Front

**Analysis Prepared by:** Kimberly Horiuchi / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744