

Date of Hearing: May 6, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

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

Policy Committee:	Judiciary	Vote:	9 - 3
	Public Safety		7 - 0

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

SUMMARY:

This bill prohibits any person or entity located, headquartered, incorporated, or conducting business in California from complying with a civil, criminal, or regulatory inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding legally protected health care activity unless specified affidavit, notification, and waiting-period conditions are met, and authorizes Attorney General (AG) enforcement.

Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Bars compliance with an inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons unless the request is accompanied by an affidavit under penalty of perjury attesting that the request (a) is unrelated to imposing liability or sanctions for engaging in legally protected health care activity, (b) relates to activity unlawful under California law, or (c) relates to activity that is grounds for professional discipline in California.
- 2) Requires the recipient to notify the AG within 7 days of receiving the request, make reasonable attempts to notify affected individuals at least 30 days before responding, and wait at least 30 days from AG notification before responding.
- 3) Authorizes the AG to bring civil actions for false affidavits (\$15,000 civil penalty) and to enforce the bill’s compliance provisions (\$10,000 first violation, \$15,000 each subsequent violation).
- 4) Establishes a 6-year statute of limitations for AG actions and requires courts to award costs and attorney’s fees to the AG when penalties are imposed.

FISCAL EFFECT:

- 1) Costs (General Fund) to the Department of Justice (DOJ). DOJ reports no fiscal impact for this bill. To the extent the bill generates new workload — including receiving and reviewing notifications under the 7-day notice window, intervening in collateral proceedings on behalf of patients, providers, and California entities, and bringing civil enforcement actions against false affidavits and noncompliance — costs would depend on enforcement volume and the level of additional staffing needed. Statutory penalties of \$10,000–\$15,000 per violation, plus AG attorney’s fees recovered when penalties are imposed, would partially offset enforcement costs to the extent they are pursued and collected.

- 2) Cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) of an unknown but potentially significant amount to trial courts. To the extent persons or entities are sued for complying with the bill (and the AG intervenes) or for failing to comply (with the AG bringing enforcement), trial courts will incur costs to adjudicate these matters and assess statutory penalties. Actual costs will depend on the number of cases filed and the amount of court time needed to resolve each case. It generally costs approximately \$1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund. The state budget provides annual General Fund backfills to the Trial Court Trust Fund to offset revenue reductions, totaling approximately \$117.3 million in 2025-26.

The Legislative Analyst's Office recently warned of General Fund structural deficits of around \$35 billion per year beginning in the 2027-28 fiscal year.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Purpose.** 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... 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.

- 2) **Background.** Following the U.S. Supreme Court's 2022 decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, California has enacted a series of "shield laws" to prevent California actors from cooperating with out-of-state efforts to penalize lawful reproductive and gender-affirming health care, including AB 1242 (Bauer-Kahan), Chapter 627, Statutes of 2022, AB 2091 (Bonta), Chapter 628, Statutes of 2022, SB 107 (Wiener), Chapter 810, Statutes of 2022, SB 345 (Skinner), Chapter 260, Statutes of 2023, AB 82 (Ward), Chapter 679, Statutes of 2025, and SB 497 (Wiener), Chapter 764, Statutes of 2025.

Two recent events have prompted further legislative attention. In 2025, the federal Department of Justice issued a subpoena to Children's Hospital Los Angeles seeking information identifying transgender youth receiving gender-affirming care, and the hospital subsequently closed its Center for Trans Youth Health and Development. In January 2026, the Governor rejected Louisiana's request to extradite a California physician for allegedly providing medication abortion to a Louisiana resident through the mail. AB 1930 is one of the bills sponsored by the Attorney General in 2026 to strengthen California's shield law architecture, alongside AB 1854 (Krell).

The bill channels all qualifying inquiries through DOJ for review before a covered entity may respond, via the 7-day notification requirement, 30-day waiting period, and affidavit requirement. The Judiciary Committee analysis observed that the bill's broad reach to any "inquiry" — including routine state agency communications and inquiries from health plans — could materially increase the volume of notifications routed to DOJ.

The Judiciary Committee analysis and stakeholders have raised concerns about how the bill's notification and waiting-period requirements would apply to inquiries from federal

authorities. The Judiciary Committee analysis observes that the federal government is unlikely to provide an affidavit, and without one, covered entities may be unable to comply with a federal inquiry regardless of whether they receive a federal court order — exposing them to federal court sanctions. The California Chamber of Commerce and the California Hospital Association raise a parallel concern that the bill's 37-day minimum delay may exceed federal subpoena response deadlines, placing covered businesses in the position of being unable to comply with both federal and state law. To the extent the bill is challenged in court, any defense costs would be borne by the Department of Justice.

- 3) **Related Legislation.** AB 1854 (Krell), also sponsored by the Attorney General, adds substantively identical notification and enforcement provisions to Penal Code Section 13778.3(f). The Public Safety Committee analysis of AB 1854 questioned the necessity of having identical language in both the Civil Code and Penal Code. If both bills are enacted, DOJ would receive parallel notifications under both code sections from the same recipients regarding the same inquiries, requiring coordinated intake and tracking. The bill is pending in this committee.

Analysis Prepared by: Shiran Zohar / APPR. / (916) 319-2081