

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 2001 (Stefani)

As Amended August 4, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Requires the Department of Justice (DOJ) to furnish state summary criminal history information to a city attorney or county counsel pursuing illegal cannabis sales or cultivation, substandard housing violations, illicit massage businesses, violations of alcoholic beverage control laws, or red-light abatement action.

Senate Amendments

Remove public nuisance actions and instead authorize background check information to be provided for actions for illegal cannabis sales or cultivation, substandard housing violations, illicit massage businesses, violations of alcoholic beverage control laws.

COMMENTS

As Passed by the Assembly, this bill: Required the Department of Justice (DOJ) to furnish state summary criminal history information to a city attorney or county counsel pursuing a public nuisance action or red-light abatement action.

According to the Author

"AB 2001 gives City Attorneys and County Counsels a critical tool they've been missing: access to state criminal history records when pursuing public nuisance and Red-Light Abatement cases. Right now, civil prosecutors are going after repeat offenders and illegal operations without the full picture. They can't see prior convictions, outstanding warrants, or patterns of exploitation that cross jurisdictions. That means dangerous operators stay in business longer, and neighborhoods pay the price. This bill closes that gap, giving the attorneys fighting to shut down brothels, gambling dens, and other criminal enterprises the information they need to build stronger cases, move faster, and make smarter decisions that keep residents safe and put bad actors out of business for good."

Arguments in Support

According to the *Civil Prosecutors Coalition*, the sponsor of this bill, "California law already permits civil prosecutors to review criminal history records in certain enforcement contexts, including gang injunctions, drug abatement actions, and gun violence restraining orders. City Attorneys and County Counsels are similarly authorized to pursue civil enforcement against properties used for illegal activities from unlicensed gambling and narcotics sales to prostitution and fencing operations. However, when building these nuisance abatement cases, civil prosecutors currently lack access to the very records that could make their enforcement efforts more effective and more secure, leaving them with an incomplete picture of the individuals and operations they are working to address.

"The challenges of this incomplete information can be seen in cases involving organized prostitution and trafficking networks, which routinely operate across multiple jurisdictions. Without access to criminal history records, civil prosecutors cannot easily identify repeat offenders, connect patterns of conduct across incidents, or assess whether individuals associated with a property pose heightened risks due to prior offenses, active warrants, or weapons

restrictions. This limits their ability to prioritize resources, protect victims, and craft enforcement strategies that reflect the full scope of the threat.

"AB 2001 would resolve this by bringing public nuisance and Red Light Abatement cases in line with other civil enforcement contexts where criminal history access is already permitted, giving civil prosecutors the information they need to act decisively and effectively on behalf of the communities they serve."

Arguments in Opposition

According to *Erotic Service Providers Legal, Education and Research Project*, who is opposed unless amended, "AB 2001 requires the Department of Justice (DOJ) to provide state summary criminal history information to city attorneys and county counsel pursuing public nuisance actions and red-light abatement cases. Current law already grants such access for narrowly tailored purposes including gang injunctions, drug abatement actions, and gun violence restraining orders. AB 2001 would dramatically expand that authority to virtually all public nuisance litigation.

"The Assembly Appropriations analysis characterizes the costs as 'minor' and 'likely absorbable' because the volume of requests is expected to be modest. However, that conclusion rests on an assumption that is unsupported by the scope of the bill itself. Public nuisance actions encompass an extraordinarily broad range of conduct and property disputes, including allegations involving noise, deteriorated properties, waste accumulation, pollution, and other neighborhood complaints. Unlike gang injunctions or gun violence restraining orders, which are relatively limited categories of litigation, public nuisance law reaches thousands of potential matters statewide every year.

"As a result, AB 2001 creates several fiscal concerns:

- 1) Increased DOJ workload. Expanding access to criminal history records across all public nuisance litigation will generate additional requests, processing obligations, record review, compliance monitoring, and potential litigation regarding misuse or improper disclosure of confidential records. The true volume of requests remains unknown.
- 2) Increased local enforcement expenditures. By providing a new investigative tool and incentive for expanded nuisance litigation, the bill may encourage greater reliance on civil enforcement actions that require significant local government staffing, legal resources, and court time.
- 3) Increased court costs. Public nuisance actions can result in extensive litigation, property closures, injunctions, and penalties. Providing broader access to criminal history information may increase the number, complexity, and duration of these proceedings. Existing law already permits substantial remedies including closure of properties and civil penalties.
- 4) Increased litigation risk. Because criminal history information is highly sensitive and protected under California law, expanding access creates additional risks of disclosure disputes, privacy litigation, and challenges regarding the use of criminal records in civil proceedings. The Public Safety Committee analysis specifically noted the constitutional privacy interests implicated by criminal history information.

"These fiscal concerns are compounded by the fact that the bill extends access far beyond the scenarios identified by its proponents. Supporters primarily cite prostitution, human trafficking, gambling, and similar operations as justification for the proposal. Yet the bill grants access in all public nuisance actions, including many circumstances where a person's criminal history may have little or no relevance to the underlying civil dispute. The Senate Public Safety Committee expressly noted that the bill may be broader than necessary and would authorize access in numerous nuisance cases where criminal records may not be relevant.

"At a time when California faces significant budget constraints and the Legislature is being asked to carefully scrutinize all proposed spending and workload increases, the state should be cautious about expanding DOJ responsibilities and creating new downstream costs for local governments and courts without a demonstrated fiscal need. AB 2001 authorizes a substantial expansion of criminal history record dissemination while providing little information regarding anticipated usage, implementation costs, or safeguards to ensure the information is only used when genuinely necessary."

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, "Minor, likely absorbable costs to the Department of Justice (General Fund) for processing additional requests for state summary criminal history information. DOJ already maintains the criminal history database and furnishes records to city attorneys and county counsel in analogous contexts, including gang injunctions, drug abatement actions, and gun violence restraining orders. The bill extends this existing access to public nuisance and red-light abatement cases, which is an incremental expansion that should not require new systems or staff. The volume of additional requests is unknown but expected to be modest."

VOTES:

ASM PUBLIC SAFETY: 9-0-0

YES: Schultz, Alanis, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Lackey, Nguyen, Ramos, Sharp-Collins

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 13-0-2

YES: Wicks, Hoover, Arambula, Caloza, Dixon, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Solache, Ta, Tangipa

ABS, ABST OR NV: Calderon, Muratsuchi

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 73-0-7

YES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alanis, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Carrillo, Castillo, Connolly, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Elhawary, Ellis, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Mark González, Hadwick, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Hoover, Irwin, Jackson, Johnson, Kalra, Krell, Lackey, Lee, Lowenthal, Macedo, McKinnor, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Ortega, Pacheco, Papan, Patel, Patterson, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ramos, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Rogers, Blanca Rubio, Sanchez, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Soria, Stefani, Ta, Tangipa, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Zbur, Rivas

ABS, ABST OR NV: Arambula, Bennett, Caloza, Chen, Flora, Wallis, Wilson

SENATE FLOOR: 40-0-0

YES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Dahle, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

UPDATED

VERSION: June 11, 2026

CONSULTANT: Stella Choe / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744

FN: 0003743