

Date of Hearing: April 14, 2026

Counsel: Dustin Weber

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 2344 (Haney) – As Amended March 19, 2026

SUMMARY: Creates an animal abuse registry that would require individuals convicted of defined crimes to register with the Department of Justice (DOJ) and makes failure to register, as specified, punishable as a misdemeanor. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Establishes that any person who is convicted in any court in this state of animal abuse shall be required to register, in accordance with the provisions of this section, for a period of 10 years, commencing from the date of conviction.
- 2) States that every person, as defined, while residing or located in this state or within 10 days of coming to this state, shall:
 - a) Register with the chief of police of the city where the person is residing, or if the person has no residence, where the person is located.
 - b) Register with the sheriff of the county where the person is residing, or if the person has no residence, where the person is located in an unincorporated area or city that has no police department.
 - c) Additionally, register with the chief of police of a campus of the University of California, the California State University, or the California Community Colleges where the person is residing, or if the person has no residence, where the person is located upon the campus or any of its facilities.
- 3) Requires any person who must register, as specified, who is released from confinement because of the commission of animal abuse, to be informed of their duty to register by the official in charge of the place of confinement. All forms shall be transmitted in time so as to be received by the local law enforcement agency and prosecuting agency 30 days prior to the discharge, parole, or release of the person.
- 4) Provides that the registration shall consist of a statement in writing signed by the person with all of the following information:
 - i) The legal name and any other names or aliases that the person is using or has used.
 - ii) Date of birth.
 - iii) The current address or location of the person.
 - iv) Name and address of employer.

- v) Animal abuse offense for which the person was convicted.
 - vi) The date and place of the animal abuse offense conviction of the person.
 - vii) Any other information, as may be required by DOJ.
- b) The complete set of fingerprints and a photograph of the person.
 - c) A description of any tattoos, scars, or other distinguishing features on the person's body that would assist in identifying the person.
 - d) Within three days after registration, the registering law enforcement agency shall electronically forward the statement, fingerprints, and photograph to DOJ.
- 5) Establishes that if any person required to register changes their residence address, they shall inform, in writing within 10 days, the law enforcement agency with whom they last registered of their new address. The law enforcement agency shall, within three days after receipt of the information, electronically forward it to DOJ. DOJ shall forward appropriate registration data to the law enforcement agency having local jurisdiction of the new place of residence.
 - 6) States that any person required to register who violates any of these provisions is guilty of a misdemeanor. Any person who has been convicted of animal abuse who is required to register who willfully violates any of the provisions thereof is guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be sentenced to serve a term of not less than 90 days nor more than one year in a county jail. In no event does the court have the power to absolve a person who willfully violates this law from the obligation of spending at least 90 days of confinement in a county jail and of completing probation of at least one year.
 - 7) Provides that the information required for registration shall be open to inspection by the public through the use of an internet website maintained by DOJ, or by telephone or upon written request where practicable. DOJ shall update the internet website on an ongoing basis. The name or address of the person's employer and the listed person's criminal history other than the specific crimes for which the person is required to register shall not be included on the internet website. The internet website shall be translated into languages other than English as determined by DOJ.
 - 8) States that in any case in which a person who would be required to register is to be temporarily sent outside the institution where they are confined on any assignment within a city or county, the local law enforcement agency having jurisdiction over the place or places where that assignment shall occur shall be notified within a reasonable time prior to removal from the institution.
 - 9) Specifies that nothing shall be construed to conflict with requirements concerning termination of probation and release from penalties and disabilities of probation.

- 10) States that a person required to register may initiate a rehabilitation proceeding under and, upon obtaining a certificate of rehabilitation, shall be relieved of any further duty to register under this section.
- 11) Specifies that any state facility that releases from incarceration a person who was incarcerated because of a crime for which they are required to register shall, within 30 days of release, provide the year of release for their most recent offense requiring registration to DOJ.
- 12) Provides that on or before January 1, 2028, DOJ shall make available to the public, via an internet website, as to any registered person, the following information:
 - a) The year of conviction of their most recent offense requiring registration.
 - b) The year they were released from incarceration for that offense.
 - c) Whether they were subsequently incarcerated for any other felony, if that fact is reported to DOJ. If DOJ has no information about a subsequent incarceration for any felony, that fact shall be noted on the internet website.
- 13) States that on or before January 1, 2028, with respect to a person who has been convicted of the commission of any of specified offenses, DOJ shall make available to the public via the internet website, the information included in the person's registration, and any other information that DOJ deems relevant, but not the information excluded.
- 14) Provides that a law enforcement entity may make available by way of an internet website specified information if it determines that the public disclosure of the information about a specific offender is necessary to ensure the public safety.
- 15) Specifies that, notwithstanding specified laws, disclosure of information is not a waiver of exemptions and does not affect other statutory restrictions on disclosure in other situations.
- 16) Punishes any person who uses information disclosed to commit a crime, in addition to any other penalty or fine imposed, a fine of not less than ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) and not more than fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000).
- 17) Punishes any person who is required to register who enters an internet website established under this law by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars (\$1,000), imprisonment in a county jail for a period not to exceed six months, or by both that fine and imprisonment.
- 18) Establishes that a person is authorized to use information disclosed under this law only to protect an animal at risk.
- 19) Provides that use of any information that is disclosed pursuant to this section for purposes relating to any of the following is prohibited:
 - a) Health insurance.
 - b) Insurance.

- c) Loans.
 - d) Credit.
 - e) Employment.
 - f) Education, scholarships, or fellowships.
 - g) Housing or accommodations.
 - h) Benefits, privileges, or services provided by any business establishment.
- 20) States that defined prohibitions on registry information disclosure shall not affect authorized access to, or use of, information pursuant to other specified areas of law.
- 21) States that the use of registry information disclosed for purposes other than those provided shall make the user liable for the specified damages and fees.
- 22) Specifies that where there is reasonable cause to believe that any person or group of persons is engaged in a pattern or practice of misuse of the information available via an internet website established under this law, the Attorney General (AG), any district attorney, or city attorney, or any person aggrieved by the misuse is authorized to bring a civil action in the appropriate court requesting specified remedies.
- 23) States that the public notification provisions are applicable to every person described who is convicted on or after January 1, 2027.
- 24) Immunizes designated law enforcement entities and its employees from liability for good faith conduct.
- 25) Removes from the established internet website any person who becomes relieved of the duty to register.
- 26) States that the AG, in collaboration with local law enforcement and others knowledgeable about animal abuse offenders, shall develop strategies to assist members of the public in understanding and using publicly available information about registered animal abuse offenders to further public safety.
- 27) States that any person convicted of a specified offense shall, in addition to any other penalty or fine imposed, be subject to a fine of five hundred dollars (\$500) for each felony conviction.
- 28) Establishes that fines collected shall be deposited in the Animal Protection Fund, which is hereby created in the State Treasury. Moneys in the fund shall be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, and shall be expended for the following purposes:
- a) By DOJ for creating, administering, and updating the internet website.
 - b) By local governments for spay and neuter programs.

- 29) Limits to no more than three percent of the revenue deposited in the fund for use in the reimbursement of costs of administration, collection, enforcement, and auditing requirements of this law.
- 30) Defines “animal abuse” as a felony conviction of specified laws or a felony conviction for an attempt to commit one of those offenses, or a felony conviction for a comparable offense in another state.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) States that a person who maliciously and intentionally maims, mutilates, tortures, or wounds a living animal, or maliciously and intentionally kills an animal, is guilty of a crime punishable as an alternate felony/misdemeanor, or a fine of up to \$20,000, or by both fine and imprisonment, except as provided. (Pen. Code, § 597, subd. (a).)
- 2) Punishes a person who overdrives, overloads, drives when overloaded, overworks, tortures, torments, deprives of necessary sustenance, drink, or shelter, cruelly beats, mutilates, or cruelly kills an animal, or causes or procures an animal to be so overdriven, overloaded, driven when overloaded, overworked, tortured, tormented, deprived of necessary sustenance, drink, shelter, or to be cruelly beaten, mutilated, or cruelly killed, as specified, with an alternate felony/misdemeanor, or a fine of up to \$20,000, or by both fine and imprisonment, except as provided. (Pen. Code, § 597, subd. (b).)
- 3) Requires, upon the conviction of a person charged with a defined animal cruelty violation, all animals lawfully seized and impounded with respect to the violation by a peace officer, officer of a humane society, or officer of an animal shelter or animal regulation department of a public agency be adjudged by the court to be forfeited. (Pen. Code, § 597, subd. (g)(1).)
- 4) Provides that every owner, driver, or keeper of any animal who permits the animal to be in any building, enclosure, lane, street, square, or lot of any city, county, city and county, or judicial district without proper care and attention is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 597.1, subd. (a)(1).)
- 5) Establishes that it shall be unlawful for any person to willfully do either of the following:
 - a) Sell or give away as part of a commercial transaction a live animal on any street, highway, public right-of-way, parking lot, carnival, or boardwalk.
 - b) Display or offer for sale, or display or offer to give away as part of a commercial transaction, a live animal, if the act of selling or giving away the live animal is to occur on any street, highway, public right-of-way, parking lot, carnival, or boardwalk. (Pen. Code, § 597.4, subd. (a).)
- 6) Provides that any person who does any of the following is guilty of a felony and is punishable by imprisonment for 16 months, or two or three years, or by a fine not to exceed fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000), or by both that fine and imprisonment:

- a) Owns, possesses, keeps, or trains any dog, with the intent that the dog shall be engaged in an exhibition of fighting with another dog.
 - b) For amusement or gain, causes any dog to fight with another dog, or causes any dogs to injure each other.
 - c) Permits any defined prohibited conduct to be done on any premises under his or her charge or control, or aids or abets that act. (Pen. Code, § 597.5, subd. (a).)
- 7) Prohibits any person convicted of defined animal cruelty crimes from owning, possessing, or caring for an animal for five or ten years. Violators are guilty of a public offense, punishable by a fine of one thousand dollars (\$1,000). (Pen. Code, § 597.9, subd. (a)-(b).)
 - 8) States that whoever carries or causes to be carried in or upon any vehicle or otherwise any domestic animal in a cruel or inhuman manner, or knowingly and willfully authorizes or permits it to be subjected to unnecessary torture, suffering, or cruelty of any kind, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 597a.)
 - 9) Provides that any person who impounds, or causes to be impounded in any animal shelter, any domestic animal, shall supply it during confinement with a sufficient quantity of good and wholesome food and water, and in default thereof, is guilty of a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, § 597e.)
 - 10) States that any person who willfully and maliciously and with no legal justification strikes, beats, kicks, cuts, stabs, shoots with a firearm, administers any poison or other harmful or stupefying substance to, or throws, hurls, or projects at, or places any rock, object, or other substance which is used in such a manner as to be capable of producing injury and likely to produce injury, on or in the path of, a horse being used by, or a dog under the supervision of, a peace officer in the discharge or attempted discharge of his or her duties, is guilty of a public offense. (Pen. Code, § 600, subd. (a).)
 - 11) Requires a sex offender to register for ten years, twenty years, or for a lifetime, depending on the offense. (Pen. Code, § 290, subds. (c)-(d).)
 - 12) States that the DOJ is required to make information about registered sex offenders available to the public via an Internet Web site, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 290.46.)
 - 13) Provides that DOJ is required to include on this web site a registrant's name and known aliases, a photograph, a physical description, including gender and race, date of birth, criminal history, any other information that DOJ deems relevant unless expressly excluded under the statute. Requires DOJ to include on its Internet Web site either the home address or zip code of residence of persons who are required to register as sex offenders based upon their registration offense (Pen. Code, §§ 290.46, subds. (b)(2)-(d)(2).)
 - 14) Requires people who are sex offender registrants to disclose this status to the licensee of a community care facility before becoming a client of that facility. (Health & Saf. Code, § 1522.01.)

- 15) Requires each county to develop a procedure using existing systems for electronic data transmission to the DOJ. Law enforcement, court, or other appropriate agency personnel shall enter the data electronically and transmit the data to the California Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (CLETS). The court or its designee must transmit all data filed, with respect to protective orders, to law enforcement personnel within one business day by one of the following methods:
- a) Transmitting a physical copy of the order to a local law enforcement agency authorized to enter orders into CLETS; or,
 - b) With the approval to DOJ, entering the order into CLETS directly. (Fam. Code, § 6380, subd. (a).)
- 16) Requires all available information to be included, however, the inability to provide all categories of information shall not delay the entry of information available:
- a) Names of the protected persons;
 - b) Date of issuance of the order;
 - c) Duration or expiration date of the order;
 - d) Terms and conditions of the protective order, including stay-away, no-contact, residency exclusion, custody, and visitation provisions of the order;
 - e) Department or division number and the address of the court;
 - f) Whether or not the order was served upon the respondent; and,
 - g) Terms and conditions of any restrictions on the ownership or possession of firearms. (Fam. Code, § 6380, subd. (b)(1)-(8).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, “Over the last five years, California has recorded hundreds of cruelty-to-animals arrests statewide each year. California has laws against animal cruelty, but once a felony conviction is entered, there is still no simple statewide system to help shelters, rescues, law enforcement, and the public identify known abusers before another animal is placed at risk.

“Animals are completely dependent on us for care and protection, and when that trust is shattered through abuse, we have a moral obligation to act. By giving shelters, rescues, and the public a tool to prevent repeat cruelty, the registry will help protect vulnerable animals and ensure California leads with both compassion and common sense. AB 2344 closes a major accountability gap by creating a statewide animal abuse registry for adults convicted of felony animal cruelty.”

- 2) **Effect of the Bill:** AB 2344 creates a mandatory registration system for individuals convicted of certain animal abuse crimes. The bill also establishes a designated fund to support administration of the registration program and other animal welfare programs.

According to the author, “Over the last five years, California has recorded hundreds of cruelty-to-animals arrests statewide each year. Once a felony conviction is entered, however, there is still no simple statewide system to help shelters, rescues, law enforcement, and the public identify known abusers before another animal is placed at risk. That leaves a major gap between punishment and prevention. A convicted abuser can move from one community to another, and there is no clear public tool to help stop repeat harm.”

Efforts to address animal cruelty are laudable. Animal cruelty is offensive to the standards of any reasonable person. It is unclear, however, whether establishing a registry is the best way to close the gap between punishment and prevention identified by the author. Part of the punishment in existing law for specified crimes against animals includes a ban on owning animals in the future. (Pen. Code, § 597.9.) The author presumably hopes to reinforce the effectiveness of this punishment by implementing an animal abuse registry that is available to the public. There is not much data available regarding the use and effectiveness of these registries, so it is not clear whether a registry will produce the desired outcomes.

Furthermore, it is uncertain how establishing a registry would contribute to the prevention of crime, at least of animal abuse crimes. A registry may be forward looking based on past conduct, but it is not difficult to speculate on ways the registry may not be effective. For example, what if a person’s information is incorrectly uploaded into the registry? The person who should be prevented from getting another animal may still be able to get a pet. What about cases where a convicted abuser is able to get pets in their home because their unregistered partners or loved ones are the ones adopting or purchasing the animals? The goals of the registry could be subverted in various ways.

A key element to these registries goes beyond just ensuring prevention of convicted abusers from acquiring another animal and additionally represents a sort of public shaming. While some may be comfortable with publicly shaming convicted animal abusers, there does not appear to be much evidence supporting a connection between public shaming and prevention of recidivating. If an identified goal of establishing this registry is prevention of crime, especially animal crimes, then the registry may not be the most effective means of achieving that goal.

Ensuring shelters, adoption agencies, and individuals or families, who are transferring ownership of a pet to another person, have tools to feel confident those pets will be going to a loving home is a notable public safety consideration. There is data showing a connection between people who abuse animals and people who abuse other people, particularly in relationships.¹ There is also evidence showing the same people who abuse animals involved in other crimes.² The connection is not always predictive though and the order between

¹ *Position Statement on Animal Abuse Registries* (2026) American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals <<https://www.aspca.org/about-us/aspca-policy-and-position-statements/position-statement-animal-abuser-registries>> [as of Apr. 8, 2026].

² *Ibid.*

animal abuse and other crime can just as likely precede as well as proceed the other.³ Importantly, research has found that behavior which is more predictable following animal abuse crimes, like hoarding, can be more effectively addressed by community-based long-term monitoring, rather than by special registration.⁴

The offenses for which people would have to register under this bill are arguably overbroad, as well. Certainly, creating mechanisms ensuring those who willfully abuse or torture animals do not get the opportunity to have another pet, but the provisions of AB 2344 require registration of those who may unintentionally cause harm to animals as well. Treating willful abusers of animals with the same registration requirement as someone who is unable to get back to their pets in time before some harm comes to the animal may be unfair and inconsistent with how the law generally differentiates punishment for different states of mind.

- 3) **Precedent for Animal Abuse Registries:** Tennessee has established an animal abuse registry with a publicly available website.⁵ A growing number of New York counties⁶ have built their own animal abuse registries.⁷ Yet, advocates say a patchwork of local laws isn't enough to keep convicted abusers from simply crossing a county line to obtain another pet.⁸ While some jurisdictions have created animal abuse registries, data is not well developed on the effectiveness of these registries. Additionally, while there appears at one time to have been a national registry for people convicted of animal abuse with a publicly accessible database listing people convicted of abuse by country, state, type of animal, type of abuse and other factors, this website now instead focuses on providing the best care for your pet, information on endangered animals, and general knowledge about both certain domesticated and wild animals.⁹

A recent position statement taken by the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) notably expressed, at best, only lukewarm support for animal abuse registries while also raising significant concerns about registries.¹⁰ In this statement, ASPCA wrote:

Although we appreciate that animal abuser registry proposals derive from a genuine motivation to take animal cruelty seriously, the ASPCA believes that this approach does little to protect animals or people and can have unintended consequences. Existing strategies, such as well-enforced no-contact orders, mandated psychological assessment

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Arluke, A., et al. *International Handbook on Animal Abuse Studies*, at pp.117-29 [Animal Hoarding] (2017) <<https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-43183-7>> [as of Apr. 8, 2026].

⁵ *Tennessee Animal Abuse Registry*. Tennessee Bureau of Investigation <<https://www.tn.gov/tbi/tennessee-animal-abuse-registry.html>> [as of Apr. 7, 2026].

⁶ *Animal Abuse Registries by County in New York State*. New York State Humane Association <<https://www.nyshumane.org/animal-abuser-registries-nys/>> [as of Apr. 7, 2026].

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ Love, N. *Bipartisan push for statewide animal abuse registry aims to close county gaps* (Feb. 27, 2026) Spectrum Local News 1 <<https://spectrumlocalnews.com/nys/central-ny/politics/2026/02/27/bipartisan-push-for-statewide-animal-abuse-registry-aims-to-close-county-gaps>> [as of Apr. 7, 2026].

⁹ *Pet Abuse* (2026) <<https://www.pet-abuse.com/>> [as of Apr. 8, 2026].

¹⁰

and inclusion of pets in orders of protection, provide a response that is more effective in preventing harm to animals and people.¹¹

ASPCA goes on to describe specific concerns associated with registry programs.¹² These concerns include that 1) Registries are expensive to institute and maintain, 2) Registries have limited reach and are rarely utilized, 3) Registries are limited in scope and do not offer real protections for potential victims of animal cruelty, 4) Registries may actually decrease the prosecution of serious animal cruelty cases, 5) Registries do not remove potential access to pets, 6) Registries can create a vigilante mentality in the public, 7) Registries can put additional burdens on animal sheltering organizations, and 8) Other registries like sex offender have not been shown to reduce recidivism of the registered offense.¹³

Given the concerns with these registries, it is questionable whether establishment of one in California will achieve the desired public safety objectives.

- 4) **Argument in Support:** According to *Fix Our Shelters*, “AB 2344 establishes a long-overdue framework to address felony animal abuse through the creation of a statewide registration system and public-facing database. As outlined in the bill, individuals convicted of specified felony animal abuse offenses would be required to register with law enforcement for a defined period, with key identifying information maintained and, in part, made accessible to the public. This approach appropriately aligns with existing public safety models used for other serious offenses, recognizing the well-documented correlation between animal abuse and broader patterns of violence.

“From both a public safety and animal welfare perspective, this bill closes a critical gap. Currently, there is no consistent mechanism to track or monitor individuals convicted of serious animal cruelty offenses once they reenter communities. This lack of visibility creates risk, not only for animals, but for the public at large. AB 2344 introduces a structured, enforceable system that enables law enforcement agencies to maintain accountability while providing communities with tools to make informed decisions.

“This legislation is also critically important for animal shelters and rescue organizations, which operate on the front lines of placement. Every day, shelters and rescues adopt animals into homes with limited ability to fully screen adopters beyond available records. Without a centralized accountability mechanism, individuals with documented histories of felony animal abuse can and do re-enter the adoption pipeline undetected. AB 2344 provides a practical safeguard, allowing shelters and rescues to make more informed placement decisions, reduce the risk of re-victimization, and protect both animals and the integrity of adoption programs.

“The public safety rationale for this bill is equally compelling. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) has formally recognized animal cruelty as a distinct and trackable offense within its National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS), reflecting extensive research demonstrating a strong correlation between animal abuse and interpersonal violence. Studies

¹¹ *Supra*, note 1.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

have consistently shown that individuals who commit acts of animal cruelty are statistically more likely to engage in violent crimes against humans, including domestic violence and other serious offenses. By creating a registry and structured tracking system, AB 2344 supports earlier identification of high-risk individuals and strengthens the broader public safety infrastructure.

“Importantly, the bill balances transparency with safeguards. It limits the scope of publicly available information, prohibits misuse of registry data, and establishes penalties for improper use. These provisions ensure that the registry serves its intended purpose—prevention and protection—without enabling harassment or collateral harm.

“AB 2344 also demonstrates thoughtful policy design through the creation of the Animal Protection Fund, directing penalty revenues toward both administration of the registry and critically needed spay and neuter programs. This reinvestment mechanism not only supports enforcement but also addresses upstream contributors to animal suffering and shelter system strain.

“From our work across jurisdictions, we have consistently observed that accountability mechanisms are essential to improving outcomes for animals and communities. Without them, patterns of abuse persist unchecked. AB 2344 provides a meaningful and enforceable tool to disrupt those patterns.

“For these reasons, Fix Our Shelters respectfully urges your “AYE” vote on AB 2344.”

- 5) **Argument in Opposition:** According to the *American Kennel Club*, “The American Kennel Club (AKC) writes on behalf of our 470 California dog clubs and thousands of constituent dog owners in California to oppose Assembly Bill 2344 in its current form. AKC is a strong defender of policies that promote responsible pet ownership and protect the health and welfare of dogs. We unequivocally condemn deliberate animal cruelty and support vigorous enforcement of California’s existing animal protection laws. However, as currently constructed, AB 2344 would expose responsible dog owners and ordinary Californians to a severe, decade-long public registry for conduct that does not constitute the intentional, predatory abuse the bill’s sponsors seek to address.

“AB 2344 would mandate ten-year registry enrollment for any adult convicted of felony animal abuse, but its scope includes all of Penal Code Section 597—a statute considerably broader than the intentional, malicious conduct that public animal abuse registries are designed to deter. Subdivision (b) of Section 597 criminalizes a wide range of neglect-based conduct, including failing to provide an animal with proper food, drink, shelter, or protection from the weather, without requiring proof of malicious intent. Critically, Section 597 is a “wobbler” offense: a prosecutor has complete discretion to charge a neglect-based violation as either a misdemeanor or a felony. A felony conviction—even for an isolated, unintentional lapse in care—would trigger AB 2344’s mandatory registration requirement.

“The real-world effects of including honest mistakes will be severe. The AKC strongly believes all dog owners should act in a responsible manner and ensure the health and safety of their pets. However, a dog owner (say, for example, an elderly person) who inadvertently leaves a pet outside during an unexpected heat event, fails to refill a water bowl on one occasion, or whose animal suffers harm from an oversight rather than any intent to cause

suffering could face a felony charge under Section 597(b). Under AB 2344, as written, that same individual—who may have no history of cruelty whatsoever—would be placed on a public registry alongside individuals convicted of deliberate torture, dogfighting, or malicious killing. This conflation is both inequitable and contrary to the bill’s stated protective purpose.

“The AKC respectfully urges the Committee, that should you desire to move forward with an animal abuse registry, to amend AB 2344 to limit registry eligibility to convictions under Penal Code Section 597(a)—which expressly requires proof that the defendant “maliciously and intentionally” maimed, mutilated, tortured, wounded, or killed an animal—and to other provisions involving inherently intentional conduct, such as the dogfighting statute at Section 597.5. This targeted scope would focus registry resources on the high-risk, intentional offenders the legislation envisions, while shielding responsible animal owners from disproportionate consequences for non-malicious conduct. The AKC also recommends that the bill include individualized judicial findings (with consultation of local animal control) of ongoing risk before mandatory registration is imposed and a clear process for early removal upon a showing of rehabilitation in cases of more minor, correctible offenses.

“The AKC appreciates the Committee’s attention to this issue and the genuine motivation behind AB 2344 to protect the welfare of animals. Thank you for reviewing and considering our position on this bill. Please do not hesitate to contact me to discuss further how we can work together to address your concerns and promote responsible pet ownership in California.”

- 6) **Related Legislation:** AB 2701 (J. Gonzales) would require DOJ, upon an appropriation by the Legislature, to create a database for the purpose of storing and sharing information with local agencies and the court, regarding persons convicted of a registrable offense, as defined. AB 2701 failed passage in this committee.
- 7) **Prior Legislation:**
 - a) SB 717 (Richardson), of the 2025-26 Legislative Session, would have required maintenance of statewide and regional infrastructures and systems, as well as a statewide cancer reporting system. SB 717 was vetoed by the Governor.
 - b) AB 1321 (Castillo), of the 2025-26 Legislative Session, would have required the Attorney General to establish, in consultation with specified groups, agencies, and organizations, an electronic database and support system, as specified, for the public to report and search for missing children, as specified. AB 1321 was held in this committee.
 - c) SB 344 (Rubio), Chapter 867, Statutes of 2023, authorizes the sharing of information collected if the original disclosure is for research that requires researchers to participate in data sharing with specified entities, provided the disclosed data does not include individually identifiable data that could be reasonably used to identify or reidentify the data with an individual person.
 - d) SB 362 (Becker), Chapter 709, Statutes of 2023, requires a data broker to register with, pay a registration fee to, and provide information to, the California Privacy Protection

Agency instead of the Attorney General and would require the California Privacy Protection Agency to maintain an informational internet website.

- e) SB 1277 (Florez), of the 2009-10 Legislative Session, would have authorized DOJ to create a registry for people convicted of specified animal abuse offenses. SB 1277 died in the Senate Appropriations Committee.
- f) AB 416 (Block), of the 2009-10 Legislative Session, would have required a care provider, as defined, to report a substantiated case of abuse of a consumer by a direct service worker to the appropriate investigating agencies. AB 416 was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
- g) AB 416 (Garcia), of the 2007-08 Legislative Session, would have required DOJ to make specified personal identifying information in the arson registry available to the public on its Internet Web site. AB 416 died in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.
- h) AB 488 (Parra), Chapter 745, Statutes of 2004, provides that public dissemination of sex offender information pursuant to “Megan’s Law” shall occur through an Internet web site operated by DOJ.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Angel's Furry Friends Rescue
 Animal Rescue Mission
 Animal Rescuers for Change
 Berkeley Animal Rights Center
 Better Together Forever
 Born Again Animal Rescue and Adoption
 Concerned Citizens Animal Rescue
 Earthheart
 Feline Lucky Adventures
 Fix Our Shelters
 Giantmecha Syndicate
 Greater Los Angeles Animal Spay Neuter Collaborative
 Hugs and Kisses Animal Fund
 In Defense of Animals
 Jaimie Brianna's Legacy Fund
 Latino Alliance for Animal Care Foundation
 Lockwood Animal Rescue Center
 Long Beach Spay and Neuter Foundation
 Los Angeles County Democrats for the Protection of Animals
 Los Angeles Rabbit Foundation
 NY 4 Whales
 Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)
 Pibbles N Kibbles Animal Rescue
 Plant-based Advocates

Project Humanekind
Project Minnie
Rabbit Savior
Real Good Rescue
Sagemodern
Seeds 4 Change Now Animal Rescue
Seniors Citizens for Humane Education and Legislation
Social Compassion in Legislation
Students Against Animal Cruelty Club - Hueneme High School
The Canine Condition
The Pet Loss Support Group
The Spayce Project
Underdog Heroes, INC.
Women United for Animal Welfare (WUFAW)
8 Private Individuals

Oppose

ACLU California Action
American Kennel Club, INC.
California Public Defenders Association
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Legal Services for Prisoners With Children
San Francisco Public Defender

Analysis Prepared by: Dustin Weber / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744