

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair
2025-2026 Regular Session

AB 2164 (Bauer-Kahan)
Version: April 23, 2026
Hearing Date: June 30, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AM

SUBJECT

Legally protected activities

DIGEST

This bill prohibits, except when required by federal law, the Governor from recognizing any demand for extradition of any person who receives, assists, or materially supports, as specified, any legally protected health care activity, unless the executive authority of the demanding state alleges that the accused was physically present in the demanding state at the time of the commission of the alleged crime. The bill also extends existing California protections to any person who has previously undertaken any act in another state to aid or encourage another in the exercise of their rights to reproductive health care services or gender-affirming health care services.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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. 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.¹ 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

¹ 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>.

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.”

This bill is sponsored by the Abortion Coalition for Telemedicine Access. The bill is supported by numerous advocacy organizations supporting legally protected healthcare activities. The bill is opposed by CAUSE: Californians United for Sex-based Evidence in Policy and Law and Democrats for an Informed Approach to Gender. This bill passed the Senate Public Safety Committee on a vote of 5 to 1.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing federal law:

- 1) Provides that each state shall give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state, and that Congress may prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved and the effect thereof. (U.S. Const., art. IV, § 1.)
- 2) Provides that persons in the United States may travel freely throughout the United States. (*E.g.*, *U.S. v. Guest* (1966) 383 U.S. 745, 758 (“freedom to travel throughout the United States has long been recognized as a basic right under the Constitution”).)²
- 3) A person charged in any state with treason, felony, or other crime, who shall flee from justice, and be found in another state, shall on demand of the executive authority of the state from which he fled, be delivered up, to be removed to the state having jurisdiction of the crime. (U.S. Const., art. IV, sec. 2, cl. 2.)

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 Although the right to travel is not expressly set forth in the Constitution, it has been recognized as emanating from both the Interstate Commerce Clause (*e.g.*, *Edwards v. People of State of California* (1941) 314 U.S. 160, 174) and the Privileges and Immunities Clause (*e.g.*, *Saenz v. Roe* (1999) 526 U.S. 501-502).

- 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) Provides that a person may not be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law or denied equal protection of the laws. (Cal. Const., art. I, § 7.)
- 4) 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.)
- 5) Provides that all people have inalienable rights, including the right to pursue and obtain safety, happiness, and privacy. (Cal. Const., art. I, §1.)
- 6) Prohibits, under the California 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, div. 1, pt. 2.6, §§ 56 et seq.)
- 7) Establishes the Reproductive Privacy Act and provides that the Legislature finds and declares that every individual possesses a fundamental right of privacy with respect to personal reproductive decisions and, therefore, it is the public policy of the State of California that:
 - a) every individual has the fundamental right to choose or refuse birth control;
 - b) every individual has the fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion, with specified limited exceptions; and
 - c) the state shall not deny or interfere with a person's fundamental right to choose to bear a child or to choose to obtain an abortion, except as specifically permitted (Health & Saf. Code §§ 123460 et. seq., § 123462.)
- 8) 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 & Saf. Code § 123466.)
- 9) Provides that a law of another state that authorizes a person to bring a civil action against a person or entity who does any of the following is contrary to the public policy of this state:
 - a) receives or seeks an abortion;
 - b) performs or induces an abortion;
 - c) knowingly engages in conduct that aids or abets the performance or inducement of an abortion; or
 - d) attempts or intends to engage in the conduct described in a) through c). (Health & Saf. Code § 123467.5(a).)

10) 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. (Civ. Code § 1798.300 (d).); Pen. Code, § 1549.15, subd. (b)(1)(A)-(C).)

11) Provides various safeguards against the enforcement of other states’ laws that purport to penalize individuals from obtaining gender-affirming care that is legal in California. (Civ. Code § 56.109, Code Civ. Proc. §§ 2029.300 & 2029.350, Fam. Code §§ 3421, 3424, 3427, 3428, and 3453.5.)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits, except when required by federal law, the Governor from recognizing any demand for extradition of any person who receives, assists, or materially supports, as specified, any legally protected health care activity unless the executive authority of the demanding state alleges in writing that the accused was physically present in the demanding state at the time of the commission of the alleged crime, and that thereafter such accused fled from that state.
- 2) Extends existing California protections for legally protected health care activities to any person who has previously undertaken any act in another state to aid or encourage another in the exercise and enjoyment of their rights to reproductive health care services or gender-affirming health care services. States that such protections would only apply if the act was permissible under the laws of the jurisdiction in which the person was located at the time.
- 3) States that legally protected health care activity includes reproductive healthcare services, as defined, and gender-affirming-healthcare services, as defined.

COMMENTS

1. Stated need for the bill

The author writes:

Despite California's strong protections, laws in states across the nation penalizing access to abortion pose a threat to our California providers. Under other state's laws, anyone aiding or assisting someone in obtaining an abortion could face arrest. These bills are not empty threats; Louisiana has sued and sought extradition of California reproductive health care providers.

The increase of restrictive laws passing around the country has resulted in more patients relying on California providers for reproductive and gender affirming care, and California has the unique opportunity to protect this right for the millions in need. The current laws that protect California doctors from extradition to other states with punitive health care laws allow the California Governor discretion over when an extradition request is denied or accepted. While the current Governor has been a strong ally in the fight to protect patients and providers in California, the individuals providing these lifesaving services should not be subject to potentially shifting political winds. One gubernatorial candidate has already stated that they would accept future extradition requests if elected.

AB 2164 prohibits future Governors from recognizing a request for extradition of a person providing or aiding reproductive health care services or gender affirming care that is legal in California and further strengthens our shield laws in alignment with other states.

2. This bill seeks to build upon existing California protections related to reproductive health care services and gender-affirming care

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.³ 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

³ *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health* (2022) 142 S. Ct. 2228, which overruled *Roe v. Wade* (1973) 410 U.S. 113.

against a person who obtains, provides, or assists an abortion.⁴ As of June 2026, 13 states have a total ban on abortion.⁵ 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.⁶ 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).⁷ 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.⁸

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.⁹ In 2022, SB 107 (Wiener, Ch. 810, Stats. 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."¹⁰

⁴ See Tex. Health & Safety Code § 171.201 et seq. (enacted through Texas Senate Bill 8).

⁵ 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>.

⁶ Kristen Hwang, *Newsom signs abortion protections into law*, CalMatters (Sept. 27, 2022), available at <https://calmatters.org/health/2022/09/california-abortion-bills/>.

⁷ 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>.

⁸ 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>.

⁹ 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).

¹⁰ 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>.

On January 20, 2025, a federal executive order was issued stating that the federal government would only recognize two biological sexes,¹¹ even though this is biologically incorrect.¹² Additionally, an order was issued banning transgender girls and women from participating in women's sports.¹³ 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,¹⁴ while another banned transgender individuals from serving in the U.S. Military.¹⁵ 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.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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

¹¹ Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 8615 (Jan. 20, 2025).

¹² 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.>

¹³ Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 9279 (January 20, 2025).

¹⁴ Exec. Order No. 14187, 90 Fed. Reg. 8771 (Jan. 28, 2025).

¹⁵ Exec. Order No. 14004, 90 Fed. Reg. 8757 (Jan. 27, 2025).

¹⁶ 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/>.

¹⁷ 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/department-justice-subpoenas-doctors-and-clinics-involved-performing-transgender-medical>.

¹⁸ 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>.

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.¹⁹

This bill seeks to strengthen California's laws in two ways. First, it seeks to codify the Governor's Executive Order Number 12-22. For a detailed analysis of the bill's impact on extradition, please see the Senate Public Safety Committee Analysis of this bill.²⁰

The second part of the bill enacts a reciprocity statute modelled after one recently enacted in Vermont. (Vt. Sen. Bill No. 28 (2025-2026 Reg. Sess.)) The purpose of the statute is to protect a person who practiced legally protected healthcare activities in one state and then travels to another state from being prosecuted while traveling. For example, a doctor from Vermont visits California, and Texas seeks to enforce their anti-abortion or anti gender-affirming care laws on the Vermont doctor while they are physically located in California. Under this bill, all the protections afforded patients and providers in California would apply to the Vermont doctor for any conduct they undertook in Vermont that was legal under the laws of Vermont while they were in California.

3. Constitutional issues

a. Full Faith and Credit Clause

Article IV, Section 1 of the U. S. Constitution, known as the Full Faith and Credit Clause, requires every state to give full faith and credit to the public acts (statutes), records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. As the bill requires certain laws and judgments of other states to not be enforced in California, it potentially implicates the Full Faith and Credit Clause. Current legal scholarship regarding the Full Faith and Credit Clause posits that the clause applies differently to public acts (statutes), records, and judicial proceedings.²¹ The current jurisprudence seems to provide that determinative judicial proceedings should be enforced in another jurisdiction as evidenced by the Court in *Baker v. General Motors Corp.* stating "for claim and issue preclusion purposes...the judgement of the rendering state gains nationwide force." ((1998) 522 U.S. 222, 233; *see also Mills v. Duryee* (1813) 11 U.S. 481, 484-485 holding that the judgment of a court of one of the states was conclusive evidence in every court within the United States.) Public acts or statutes and state records; however, may not need to be as strictly enforced. (*see Alaska Packers Association v. Industrial Accident Comm.* (1935) 294 U.S. 532; *Adar v. Smith* (5th Cir. 2011) 639 F.3d 146.) The U.S. Supreme Court provides some guidance:

¹⁹ Kristen Hwang, CalMatters, *Parents of trans kids ask: Does California really protect our rights?*, (Feb. 4, 2026), available at <https://calmatters.org/health/2026/02/rady-transgender-health-bonta-lawsuit/>.

²⁰ Sen. Pub. Saf. analysis AB 2164 (2025-26 reg. sess.) as amended Apr. 23, 2026.

²¹ Redpath, *Between Judgment and Law: Full Faith and Credit, Public Policy, and State Records* (2013) 62 Emory L.J. 639.

Our precedent differentiates the credit owed to laws (legislative measures and common law) and to judgments. “In numerous cases this Court has held that credit must be given to the judgment of another state although the forum would not be required to entertain the suit on which the judgment was founded.” 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. For claim and issue preclusion (*res judicata*) purposes, in other words, the judgment of the rendering State gains nationwide force.²²

The Court upheld the application of California law to settle a dispute of conflicting workers compensation statutes, holding that “[a] rigid and literal enforcement of the Full Faith and Credit Clause, without regard to the statute of the forum, would lead to the absurd result that wherever a conflict arises, the statute of each state must be enforced in the courts of the other, but cannot be in its own.” (*Alaska Packers Association supra.* at 547.) The Court further stated: “Prima facie every state is entitled to enforce in its own courts its own statutes, lawfully enacted. One who challenges that right, because of the force given to a conflicting statute of another state by the full faith and credit clause, assumes the burden of showing, upon some rational basis, that of the conflicting interests involved those of the foreign state are superior to those of the forum.” (*Id.* at 547-48.) A few years later, the Court noted that “the Full Faith and Credit Clause is not an inexorable and unqualified command. It leaves some scope for state control within its borders...” (*Pink v. AAA Highway Express, Inc.* (1941) 314 U.S. 201,210.) These cases seem to indicate that states can uphold their public policy and apply their laws when a conflict of laws arises in a forum in that state and not run afoul of the Full Faith and Credit Clause.

The Court has generally held, dating back to 1813, that states must recognize and enforce the judicial determinations of another state. (*Mills v. Duryee* (1813) 7 Cranch 481, 484-485.) However, the Court has intimated that there may be exceptions to this general rule, stating that states are not automatically required to enforce civil judgments of another state that are based on that state’s civil statutes when the goal or purpose of the civil statute is punishing a person for an offence against the “public justice.” (*Huntington v Attrill* (1892) 146 U.S. 657, 673-674.) The *Huntington* court explained that whether or not a law [was] considered penal, and thus could not be enforced in the court of another jurisdiction, “depends on the question whether its purpose is to punish an offense against the public justice of the state, or to afford a private remedy to a person injured by the wrongful act.” (*Huntington v. Attrill, supra*, 146 U.S. 657, 673-674.) Although the *Huntington* court held that the New York statute in question was not

²² *Baker v. GMC* (1998) 522 U.S. 222, 232-33 (internal citations omitted).

penal, as it related to compensating a victim of a fraud, the Supreme Court has continued to examine Full Faith and Credit Clause claims using the penal exception standard. (See *Milwaukee County v. M. E. White Company* (1935) 296 U.S. 268.)²³ The Supreme Court also continues to apply the *Huntington* analysis of whether a statute is penal in nature to this day. (See *Kokesh v. Securities & Exchange Commission* (2017) 137 S. Ct. 1635, 1642.)

b. Extraterritorial Jurisdiction

The U.S. Supreme Court has held “a state does not acquire power or supervision over the internal affairs of another State merely because the welfare and health of its own citizens may be affected when they travel to that State.” (*Bigelow v. Virginia* (1975) 421 U.S. 809, 824.) In *Bigelow*, a Virginia newspaper editor was convicted in Virginia for printing an advertisement for an abortion referral service in New York. The Supreme Court overturned the conviction. However, other cases do not follow a strict prohibition on the application of one state’s laws on another state, as 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.)

4. Stakeholder statements

The Abortion Coalition for Telemedicine Access, the sponsor of the bill, writes in support stating:

AB 2164, the Care Without Fear Act, strengthens California’s existing shield laws by prohibiting future governors from honoring extradition requests for individuals who provide or assist with reproductive health care services or gender-affirming care that are legal in California. By removing discretionary authority in these circumstances, the bill ensures that California health care providers cannot be arrested or extradited to states seeking to criminalize care that is lawful within our state.

This legislation is urgently needed as states across the country enact laws that criminalize abortion and threaten providers who assist patients seeking care. Health care providers in California should not have to practice under the uncertainty of shifting political winds. AB 2164 provides the stability and certainty necessary to ensure that California remains a safe place for patients and the clinicians who serve them.

SUPPORT

²³ Asm. Judiciary Comm. Analysis of Asm. Bill 1666 (2021-2022 Reg. Sess.) as amended March 24, 2022, pp. 8-9.

Abortion Coalition for Telemedicine Access (sponsor)
American Association of University Women - California
American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists - District IX
California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians
California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus
California Nurse Midwives Association (CNMA)
California Public Defenders Association
Ella Baker Center for Human Rights
Los Angeles LGBTQ Chamber of Commerce
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California
Reproductive Freedom for All California
Reproductive Futures
San Francisco Marin Medical Society
Western Center on Law & Poverty

OPPOSITION

Cause: Californians United for Sex-based Evidence in Policy and Law
Democrats for an Informed Approach to Gender

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

AB 1854 (Krell, 2026) prohibits a state or local law enforcement agency from knowingly affecting the arrest of, or arresting any person who, the Governor has declined to surrender on the demand of the executive authority of any other state where the accused was not in the demanding state at the time of the commission of the crime and has not fled from another state. AB 1854 is scheduled to be heard in this Committee on the same day as this bill.

AB 1930 (Zbur, 2026) 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 within seven days of receiving, 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. AB 1930 is pending in the Senate Public Safety Committee.

Prior Legislation:

SB 497 (Wiener, Ch. 764, Stats. 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.

SB 345 (Skinner, Ch. 260, Stats. 2023) enacted various safeguards against the enforcement of other states' laws that prohibit, criminalize, sanction, authorize civil liability against, or otherwise interfere with a person, provider, or other entity in California that offers reproductive health care services or gender-affirming health care services.

AB 1666 (Bauer-Kahan, Ch. 42, Stats. 2022) declared that a law of another state that authorizes a person to bring a civil action against a person or entity that receives or seeks, performs or induces, or aids or abets the performance of an abortion, or who attempts or intends to engage in those actions, is contrary to the public policy of this state and prohibited this state from applying that law to a case or controversy heard in state court and the enforcement or satisfaction of a civil judgment received under that law.

AB 2091 (Mia Bonta, Ch. 628, Stats. 2022), among other things, prohibited compelling a person to identify or provide information that would identify an individual who has sought or obtained an abortion in a state, county, city, or other local criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding if the information is being requested based on another state's laws that interfere with a person's right to choose or obtain an abortion or a foreign penal civil action.

AB 2223 (Wicks, Ch. 629, Stats. 2022), among other things, authorized a party aggrieved by a violation of the Reproductive Privacy Act to bring a civil action against an offending state actor, as specified, and provided 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, including prenatal care, childbirth, postpartum care, contraception, sterilization, abortion care, miscarriage management, and infertility care.

PRIOR VOTES

Senate Public Safety Committee (Ayes 5, Noes 1)

Assembly Floor (Ayes 57, Noes 14)

Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 4)

Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 3)

Assembly Public Safety Committee (Ayes 7, Noes 1)
