
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1930
Author: Zbur (D), et al.
Amended: 7/2/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-2, 6/23/26

AYES: Umberg, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern, Wahab,
Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Niello, Valladares

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 6/30/26

AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener

NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 8/13/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-17, 5/27/26 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Abortion or gender-affirming health care services: investigations,
subpoenas, or summons

SOURCE: Attorney General Rob Bonta
Equality California

DIGEST: This bill seeks to bolster existing protections against the enforcement of laws of other jurisdictions that aim to punish individuals who obtain or seek to obtain abortion or gender-affirming care that is legal in California by requiring that notice be provided to the Attorney General, as provided, when being served with, or being subject to a civil, criminal, or regulatory investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care services that are legal in California, as specified.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits the state from denying or interfering with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions, which includes their fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and their fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives. Specifies that this provision is intended to further the constitutional right to privacy guaranteed by Section 1 of Article I of the California Constitution, and the constitutional right to not be denied equal protection guaranteed by Section 7 of Article I of the California Constitution, and that nothing herein narrows or limits the right to privacy or equal protection. (California Constitution (Cal. Const.), Article (art.) I, § 1.1.)
- 2) Provides that all people are by nature free and independent and have inalienable rights including, among others, the right to privacy. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 1.)
- 3) Holds that the state constitution's express right to privacy extends to an individual's decision about whether or not to have an abortion. (*People v. Belous* (1969) 71 Cal.2d 954.)
- 4) Provides various protections to persons seeking or obtaining abortion or gender-affirming health care services that are legal in California. (Civil (Civ.) Code § 56.109, Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2029.300 & 2029.350, Family (Fam.) Code §§ 3421, 3424, 3427, 3428, and 3453.5; Health & Safety (Saf.) Code §§ 123460 et. seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits, notwithstanding any other law, 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 investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care services from complying with or providing information in response to the investigation, subpoena, or summons unless ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction or if the conditions in 2) through 4), below, are met.
- 2) Requires, except for an investigation, subpoena, or summons issued by an agency of the federal government, that the investigation, subpoena, or summons contains or is accompanied by an affidavit under penalty of perjury attesting that:

- a. it is related to an investigation or proceeding regarding activity that is unlawful under California civil or criminal law;
 - b. it is related to an investigation or proceeding regarding activity that is grounds for professional discipline in California; or,
 - c. 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 abortion or gender-affirming health care services.
- 3) Requires the receiver of the request to notify the Attorney General within 7 days of receipt and indicate whether the person or entity intends to comply with or provide information in response. The receiver must also make reasonable attempts to notify the individual or individuals who provided, sought, received, facilitated, or otherwise engaged in the abortion or gender-affirming health care service to which the request pertains at least 30 days prior to providing any responsive information, unless otherwise ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction or required by a federal statute or regulation.
- 4) Requires 30 days to elapse after providing notice to the Attorney General before a response to the request can be provided, unless otherwise ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction or required by a federal statute or regulation.
- 5) Provides that, if a person or entity that is located, headquartered, incorporated, or otherwise conducting business in California receives, is served with, or is subject to a civil, criminal, or regulatory investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care services and they institute a civil action to protect against compliance with or the providing of information in response to the investigation, subpoena, or summons, the Attorney General may intervene in the action.
- 6) Provides for civil liability for noncompliance which is enforceable by the Attorney General.
 - a. The submission of a false affidavit is punishable by a civil penalty of \$15,000 in addition to any other remedies or penalties.
 - b. The Attorney General may commence an action to enforce these provisions, including, but not limited to, an application or motion for an order enjoining ongoing or subsequent.
 - c. The Attorney General is not to commence an action unless the Attorney General has reason to believe the defendant or respondent intends to

- comply or has complied with an investigation, subpoena, or summons regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care services.
- d. A court is required to assess a statutory penalty of \$10,000 for a first violation and \$15,000 for each subsequent violation against any person found to have intentionally, knowingly, willingly, or recklessly complied with a request for information.
 - e. Any action by the Attorney General is to be commenced within six years of the date on which the Attorney General received notice of the request and a court is to award costs and attorney's fees to the Attorney General.

Comments

In the past few years, both the federal government and other states have begun demanding information from various businesses and health care providers related to reproductive health care and gender-affirming health care services, with the goal of intimidating and discouraging individuals from seeking and receiving these services. In response, this bill seeks to build upon existing state privacy protections for individuals obtaining these services by requiring any person or entity that receives a civil, criminal, or regulatory inquiry, investigation, subpoena, or summons for information regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care activities, to refrain from responding to such requests until several conditions are met, specifically that notice is provided to the Attorney General. This will allow the Attorney General to decide if they need to intervene or bring a separate cause of action to ensure that rights of individuals protected under the California Constitution and state laws are not infringed upon.

Over the past several years California has enacted several laws (shield laws) to protect against attempts by the federal government and other states to intimidate, harass, and punish individuals providing, receiving, or otherwise facilitating reproductive and gender-affirming health care services or abortion related services.

Prior to the *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* decision by the U.S. Supreme Court in 2022, an implied federal constitutional right to privacy existed regarding a person's decision whether to terminate a pregnancy, while allowing that some state regulation of abortion access could be permissible.¹ The ruling in *Dobbs* eliminated this right, thus federal protections for abortion care, and opened the flood gates for states to enact various abortion bans and other statutes seeking to provide for both criminal and civil liability against a person who obtains, provides, or assists an

¹ *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* (2022) 142 S. Ct. 2228, which overruled *Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113.

abortion.² As of June 2026, 13 states have a total ban on abortion.³ 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.⁴ 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.

Other states are intensifying their laws in response to shield laws enacted in other states. As of June 2026, 21 states have introduced bills to criminalize the sale, purchase or distribution of medication abortion pills with four states successfully enacting such laws (Iowa, Mississippi, Oklahoma and South Dakota).⁵ Access to telehealth abortion care, can be a lifeline for people in states with total abortion bans and other restrictions on care and shield laws help to ensure providers and patients are protected. In 2025, Texas attempted to enforce its abortion ban in New York but was prevented from filing papers to collect a judgment against a New York doctor who provided safe, legal telehealth abortion care under New York's shield laws.⁶

At the beginning of this year, Louisiana sought extradition of a California doctor that Louisiana accused of violating its abortion laws by providing abortion medication through telehealth.⁷ Governor Newsom denied Louisiana's request pointing to his Executive Order Number 12-22 which, among other things, specifically stated that the Governor's Office would "decline any request received from the executive authority of any other state to issue a warrant for the arrest or surrender of any person charged with a criminal violation of a law of that other state where the violation alleged involves the provision of, receipt of, or assistance with reproductive health care services, unless required by the U.S. Constitution or

² See Tex. Health & Safety Code § 171.201 et seq. (enacted through Texas Senate Bill 8).

³ Guttmacher Institute, *State Bans on Abortion Throughout Pregnancy*, (as of June 4, 2026), available at <https://www.guttmacher.org/state-policy/explore/state-policies-abortion-bans>.

⁴ Kristen Hwang, *Newsom signs abortion protections into law*, CalMatters (Sept. 27, 2022), available at <https://calmatters.org/health/2022/09/california-abortion-bills/>.

⁵ Guttmacher Institute, *State Policy Trends Midyear Analysis: Five Key Issues to Watch in 2026*, available at <https://www.guttmacher.org/2026/06/state-policy-trends-midyear-analysis-five-key-issues-watch-2026>.

⁶ N.Y. State Attorney General, *Attorney General James Defends New York's Shield Law Against Texas Attack*, (Spt. 8, 2025), available at <https://ag.ny.gov/press-release/2025/attorney-general-james-defends-new-yorks-shield-law-against-texas-attack>.

⁷ Sara Cline, Associated Press, *Louisiana seeks California doctor's extradition, testing the limits of shield laws*, (Jan. 13, 2026), available at <https://apnews.com/article/louisiana-california-abortion-pill-extradite-doctor-f99a0f638daa6996bf2affd9194b2809>.

the acts forming the basis of the prosecution of the crime charged would also constitute a criminal offense under the laws of California.”

Around the same time Dobbs was decided, conservative hysteria over transgender individuals reached new heights. According to Human Rights Watch, as of March 2022, legislatures nationwide had introduced over 300 anti-LGBTQ+ bills, over 130 of which specifically targeted transgender people.⁸ In 2022, SB 107 (Wiener, Chapter 810, Statutes of 2022) was enacted in response to these anti-transgender statutes to act as shield law. Governor Newsom’s signing message of SB 107 stated, “[i]n California we believe in equality and acceptance. We believe that no one should be prosecuted or persecuted for getting the care they need—including gender-affirming care.”⁹

On January 20, 2025, a federal executive order was issued stating that the federal government would only recognize two biological sexes,¹⁰ even though this is biologically incorrect.¹¹ Additionally, an order was issued banning transgender girls and women from participating in women’s sports.¹² Another executive order banned all federal funding for youth gender affirming care, including the removal of any funding from medical and educational institutions for research on gender affirming care,¹³ while another banned transgender individuals from serving in the U.S. Military.¹⁴ Some of these orders are currently being challenged in court; however, it is unclear what their ultimate fate will be. 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 ordering law enforcement to prosecute school officials who

⁸ Human Rights Watch, Press Release, ICYMI: As Lawmakers Escalate Attacks on Transgender Youth Across the Country, Some GOP Leaders Stand Up for Transgender Youth (Mar. 24, 2022), <https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/icymi-as-lawmakers-escalate-attacks-on-transgender-youth-across-the-country-some-gop-leaders-stand-up-for-transgender-youth> (all links current as of August 29, 2022).

⁹ Governor’s signing message on Sen. Bill No. 107 (Sep. 29, 2022), available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/SB-107-SIGNING.pdf?emrc=1a80c5>.

¹⁰ Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 8615 (Jan. 20, 2025).

¹¹ Claire Ainsworth & Nature Magazine, Scientific American, *Sex Redefined: The Idea of 2 Sexes Is Overly Simplistic* (Oct. 22, 2018) available at <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/sex-redefined-the-idea-of-2-sexes-is-overly-simplistic/#:~:text=According%20to%20the%20simple%20scenario,or%20sexual%20anatomy%20say%20another.>

¹² Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 9279 (January 20, 2025).

¹³ Exec. Order No. 14187, 90 Fed. Reg. 8771 (Jan. 28, 2025).

¹⁴ Exec. Order No. 14004, 90 Fed. Reg. 8757 (Jan. 27, 2025).

recognize transgender students.¹⁵ These actions elucidate a general hostility towards the transgender community from the current federal administration.

In 2025, the federal Department of Justice announced that it had sent out over 20 subpoenas to doctors and clinics providing gender-affirming health care to minors.¹⁶ California's Attorney General, in conjunction with other states, has fought to prevent the federal government and out-of-state officials from obtaining these kinds of records.¹⁷ However, the ability of the Attorney General to successfully prevent disclosure is directly tied to the Attorney General having the authority to intervene in disputes regarding the provision of this information, and having notice of an inquiry in the first instance. Following efforts by the Trump administration to restrict access to gender-affirming care for minors, come California healthcare providers scaled back care for transgender youth. Children's Hospital of Los Angeles was the first to cease providing such care, followed by Stanford Medicine, Kaiser Permanent, Sutter Health (though they backtracked on their decision due to public pressure), and Rady.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: No

The Senate Appropriations Committee analysis states “[n]o to significant costs to the extent a person or entity in the state is subject to a civil, criminal, or regulatory investigation, subpoena or summons regarding a legally protected health activity and the Attorney General (AG) is notified and intervenes. (General Fund).”

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/13/26)

Attorney General Rob Bonta (source)
 Equality California (source)
 Access Reproductive Justice
 Bet Tzedek Legal Services
 California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus
 Casita Feliz Latine LGBTQ+ Center

¹⁵ Jennifer Levi, GLADD, *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/>.

¹⁶ 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/departement-justice-subpoenas-doctors-and-clinics-involved-performing-transgender-medical>.

¹⁷ 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>.

CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, Aft, Afl-cio
 Courage California
 El/la Para Translatinas
 Electronic Frontier Foundation
 Gender Affirming Professionals
 LGBTQ+ Inclusivity, Visibility, and Empowerment
 Los Angeles County
 Los Angeles LGBT Center
 Los Angeles LGBTQ Chamber of Commerce
 Oakland Privacy
 PFLAG Clayton-concord
 Rainbow Families Action Bay Area
 Reproductive Freedom for All California
 San Francisco Aids Foundation
 Somos Familia Valle
 The San Diego LGBT Community Center
 The Translatin@ Coalition
 West Hollywood/hernan Molina, Governmental Affairs Liaison
 Western Center on Law & Poverty,

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/13/26)

California Bankers Association
 California Chamber of Commerce
 California Family Council
 California Hospital Association
 California Teachers Supporting Gender-nonconforming Youth
 Cause: Californians United for Sex-based Evidence in Policy and Law
 Democrats for an Informed Approach to Gender
 Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Alliance Foundation
 Our Duty
 Women are Real
 Women's Liberation Front

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The author writes:

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.

The Attorney General, Rob Bonta, one of the sponsors of the bill, writes:

Recent actions by federal and out-of-state officials have raised concerns about attempts to obtain private medical information or prosecute individuals involved in legally protected health care. Without strong safeguards, subpoenas, investigations, and other legal demands may be used to circumvent California law and undermine the rights of patients and providers.

AB 1930 would address these issues by expanding shield law coverage to more California entities and individuals who receive demands for information and would establish a notification process so the Attorney General can intervene and stop improper disclosures.

If a California entity plans to respond to a subpoena, investigation, or summons related to abortion or gender affirming care, before they comply, AB 1930 would require them to 1) notify the AG of the inquiry within seven days of receiving it, 2) make reasonable attempts to notify any individuals who the inquiry pertains to within 30 days of receiving the notification, and 3) respond no sooner than 30 days after notification of the AG. Additionally, AB 1930 explicitly gives the AG authority to both intervene and to enforce the provisions of the bill, including through civil action and civil penalties.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The California Chamber writes in opposition stating:

[...] AB 1930 raises some practical compliance concerns, despite its good intentions. We are concerned that, as written, the bill requires businesses take action (demand a compliant affidavit and give notice to potentially covered individuals that their information was requested) when they receive a request related to “gender-affirming health care services” or “abortion.” These terms, though defined in California law, are not necessarily attached to all communications or financial records that relate to them. In other words – a financial record, such as a list of withdrawals and deposits to an account, will not carry these terms. As a result, a business facing a request for information may not be able to identify, based on the request’s terms, that it would produce records that relate to “gender-affirming health care services” or “abortion.” Because these records are not necessarily easily identifiable, we are concerned about AB 1930’s implications for subpoenas or requests that do not clearly identify themselves as covered by AB 1930’s provisions. [...]

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 60-17, 5/27/26

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Garcia, Gipson, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Valencia, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff

Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Johnson, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa

NO VOTE RECORDED: Alanis, Lackey, Celeste Rodriguez

Prepared by: Amanda Mattson / JUD. / (916) 651-4113

8/14/26 13:34:48

**** **END** ****