
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 1930
Author: Zbur (D), et al.
Amended: 8/18/26 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, or legislative investigation regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care services that are legal in California, as specified.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/18/26 streamline the notice requirements under the bill, remove requirements that business entities notify individuals before providing the requested information, and make other clarifying changes.

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. (Cal. Const., 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. (Civ. Code § 56.109, Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2029.300 & 2029.350, Fam. Code §§ 3421, 3424, 3427, 3428, and 3453.5; Health & Saf. Code §§ 123460 et. seq.)

This bill:

- 1) Requires, 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 subpoena, discovery request, or other request for information that is part of a legal process related to a civil, criminal, regulatory, or legislative investigation regarding abortion or gender-affirming health care services to provide notice to the Attorney General (AG) at least seven business days prior to producing responsive records. If a shorter time is required by federal law or federal obligation, the responding party it to provide

notice to the Attorney General contemporaneously with production of the responsive records.

- a) The records are not to be produced until at least seven business days after providing notice to the AG, unless a shorter response time is required by federal law or federal obligation.
 - b) Provides certain exceptions to this requirement.
 - c) Authorizes the Ag to intervene in any action described above.
- 2) Authorizes the AG to commence an action against any person that attaches a false attestation to a subpoena, discovery request, or other request for information described in 1), above, punishable by a civil penalty of \$15,000.
- 3) Authorizes a court to assess a statutory penalty of up to \$10,000 for the first violation and up to \$15,000 for each subsequent violation against any person or entity found to have intentionally, knowingly, willingly, or recklessly violating the provisions in 1), above.

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 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

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

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>.

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 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

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>.

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-simplistic1/#:~:text=According%20to%20the%20simple%20scenario,or%20sexual%20anatomy%20say%20another.>

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

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 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).”

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

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

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>.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/20/26)

Attorney General Rob Bonta (co-source)
Equality California (co-source)
Access Reproductive Justice
Bet Tzedek Legal Services
California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus
Casita Feliz Latine LGBTQ+ Center
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, Aft, Afl-cio
City of West Hollywood
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
Western Center on Law & Poverty

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/20/26)

California Bankers Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Family Council
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

8/20/26 13:16:53

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