

Date of Hearing: April 14, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Ash Kalra, Chair
AB 2662 Carrillo – As Amended April 6, 2026

SUBJECT: WORKING GROUP ON CIVIL RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY

KEY ISSUES:

- 1) SHOULD THE LEGISLATURE ESTABLISH THE WORKING GROUP ON CIVIL RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, WHICH WOULD BE TASKED WITH ESTABLISHING A STATEWIDE REPORTING DASHBOARD TO ALLOW NONPROFITS TO DOCUMENT ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING ARISING FROM FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IN THE STATE?
- 2) SHOULD THE WORKING GROUP BE FURTHER TASKED WITH SYNTHESIZING THE REPORTS OF WRONGDOING TO PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE LEGISLATURE AND THE ATTORNEY GENERAL?

SYNOPSIS

Since Donald Trump's second inauguration, his administration has engaged in sweeping immigration enforcement campaigns. Throughout the country, immigrants and citizens alike have experienced aggressive enforcement tactics at the hands of federal agents. In January of this year, the world watched as Alex Pretti and Renee Good were killed by federal agents in Minneapolis, Minnesota simply for protesting the actions of the federal regime. The often-violent tactics, which have been utilized across the country, have resulted in changes in the patterns of life throughout this state, with many schools in areas with high immigrant populations experiencing decreased rates of attendance. In response to the federal government's immigration enforcement policies and the resulting impact on Californians, this bill proposes to establish a new working group which would be tasked with developing a statewide dashboard to allow qualified nonprofits to submit complaints of wrongdoing by federal agents, and with submitting recommendations to the Legislature and Attorney General to establish policies to further protect Californians' civil rights.

This author-sponsored bill is supported by the California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation and Clinicas Del Valle De Salinas. There is no known opposition.

SUMMARY: Establishes the Working Group on Civil Rights Accountability. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Makes the following findings and declarations:
 - a) On January 25, 2017, President Donald J. Trump signed Executive Order 13768 titled "Enhancing Public Safety in the Interior of the United States," which expanded federal immigration enforcement priorities and broadened categories of individuals subject to removal.

- b) In public statements during the 2024 presidential campaign and transition period, President-elect Donald J. Trump announced his intent to significantly increase immigration enforcement activity and prioritize removal of noncitizens with criminal convictions.
- c) Immigration enforcement activities conducted in California communities have, at various times, generated widespread public concern and have affected community trust in public institutions, including schools, health facilities, and local government.
- d) Federal immigration enforcement actions have, in some instances, resulted in litigation and judicial findings addressing alleged violations of constitutional protections, including due process rights and protections against unreasonable searches and seizures
- e) In January 2025, the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS) announced changes to prior enforcement guidance regarding actions in “sensitive locations,” a policy framework that had limited enforcement activity in schools, health care facilities, and places of worship since 2011.
- f) Media reports, court filings, and civil rights complaints have documented allegations of excessive use of force, unlawful detention, racial profiling, and mistaken detention of United States citizens and lawful residents in connection with immigration enforcement activities.
- g) DHS has publicly stated that its officers face safety threats and operational risks during enforcement activities. In certain cases, courts have reviewed conflicting accounts regarding the legality of arrests and the use of force.
- h) Federal immigration enforcement activity may have significant collateral impacts on United States citizens, lawful permanent residents, individuals with deferred action or pending immigration relief, and individuals complying with immigration court requirements.
- i) Publicly available data regarding internal disciplinary actions, termination rates, or accountability measures for federal immigration officers is limited, making independent assessment of enforcement oversight challenging.
- j) Community advocates and public health providers have reported that immigration enforcement activity near or within health facilities may deter individuals from seeking necessary medical care, raising public health concerns.
- k) Business associations and local governments in certain California communities have reported workforce disruptions and decreased consumer activity following large-scale immigration enforcement operations.
- l) Faith leaders and religious organizations have reported declines in attendance following changes to federal guidance regarding enforcement activity in places of worship.
- m) DHS and its component agencies have, at various times, announced hiring initiatives to expand immigration enforcement personnel. Past federal hiring surges in border and

immigration agencies have drawn scrutiny regarding training capacity, vetting procedures, and oversight mechanisms.

- n) The United States Government accountability Office (GAO) has previously reported that rapid hiring surges within federal border and immigration agencies were followed by increases in misconduct investigations, including corruption-related offenses.
 - o) Rapid expansion of enforcement personnel without proportional investment in training, supervision, and accountability safeguards may increase the risk of civil rights violations and undermine public trust.
 - p) Immigration enforcement operations conducted within California may affect relationships between local communities and local law enforcement agencies, particularly where residents perceive coordination or overlap in activities.
 - q) The State of California has a compelling interest in safeguarding the constitutional and civil rights of all persons within its jurisdiction and in ensuring transparency regarding the impacts of federal enforcement activities on its residents, institutions and economy.
- 2) Requires, on July 1, 2027, the Working Group on Civil Rights Accountability to be established within the Department of Justice.
 - 3) Establishes that the purpose of the working group is to monitor, document, analyze, and report on alleged violations of constitutional and civil rights arising from immigration enforcement activities conducted within the state by federal agencies, including, but not limited to, United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the United States Border Patrol, the United States Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI).
 - 4) Requires the working group to provide recommendations to the Legislature and the Attorney General to strengthen oversight, improve data transparency, and protect the civil and constitutional rights of individuals and communities impacted by immigration enforcement activities.
 - 5) Requires the working group to consist of 12 members appointed as follows:
 - a) Three members appointed by the Governor;
 - b) Three members appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly;
 - c) Three members appointed by the President pro Tempore of the Senate;
 - d) Three members appointed by the Attorney General.
 - 6) Requires each appointing authority to ensure that its appointees collectively reflect expertise in constitutional law, civil rights enforcement, public accountability, labor and workforce impacts, public health, education, and community-based oversight.
 - 7) Requires each member appointed to possess demonstrated expertise in one or more of the following areas:

- a) Constitutional law, civil rights litigation, or federal or state civil rights enforcement, including experience analyzing the Fourth Amendment, due process, or equal protection claims;
 - b) Monitoring, investigating, auditing, or documenting law enforcement activities, including experience with civilian oversight, police accountability, or governmental transparency mechanisms;
 - c) Immigration law or policy, including experience representing individuals in immigration proceedings or advising public agencies on immigration-related legal compliance;
 - d) Data collection, civil rights impact analysis, or public policy research related to law enforcement practices and their economic, educational, public health, or labor market impacts;
 - e) Direct service or advocacy work with communities disproportionately affected by immigration enforcement, including demonstrated, sustained engagement with immigrant communities;
 - f) Lived experience of immigration enforcement actions, including detention or arrest, coupled with demonstrated leadership, advocacy, or community engagement relevant to the purpose of this chapter.
- 8) Requires a member to serve a two-year term at the pleasure of their appointing authority.
 - 9) Requires the members of the working group to elect a chair and vice chair from among its membership.
 - 10) Requires the working group to meet at least quarterly.
 - 11) Requires the working group to develop and maintain a statewide reporting dashboard to document and categorize alleged constitutional or civil rights violations arising from federal immigration enforcement activities within the state.
 - 12) Requires the Department of Justice to establish standards, submission protocols, and data verification procedures for nonprofit organizations authorized to submit reports to the dashboard. Makes a nonprofit organization eligible to submit reports to the dashboard if it meets all of the following qualifications:
 - a) Is incorporated as a nonprofit organization;
 - b) Holds state or federal tax-exempt status;
 - c) Demonstrates documented experience serving or representing communities affected by immigration enforcement;
 - d) Agrees to comply with data integrity, confidentiality, and privacy standards established by the Department of Justice.
 - 13) Requires the dashboard to include all of the following data fields, at a minimum:

- a) Date of incident;
 - b) City and county in which the incident occurred;
 - c) Federal agency involved;
 - d) Category of alleged violation, including, but not limited to: excessive use of force; unlawful stop, search, arrest, or detention; Enforcement actions in sensitive locations, including schools, religious institutions, health facilities or courthouses; Actions involving a United States citizen or lawful permanent resident; Actions involving individuals with deferred action, pending immigration relief, or compliance with federal immigration proceedings; Stops or questioning conducted without apparent lawful basis;
 - e) Whether related administrative complaints or litigation has been filed;
 - f) Links to publicly available news reports, audiovisual evidence, or court filings, if available;
 - g) Whether witnesses have indicated willingness to provide testimony.
- 14) Requires the working group to submit annually on January 1, beginning January 1, 2028, pursuant to Government Code Section 9795, and make that report publicly available. Requires the report to summarize documented trends, geographic patterns, systemic concerns, and policy recommendations to safeguard constitutional and civil rights within the state.
- 15) Makes reports required pursuant to the new law exempt from the disclosure requirements of the California Public Records Act.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Requires the Attorney General, by April 1, 2018, and in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, public libraries, health facilities operated by the state or a political subdivision thereof, courthouses, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement facilities, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers Compensation, and shelters, to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law, and ensure that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status.
 - a) Requires all public schools, health facilities operated by the state or a political division thereof, and courthouses to implement the Attorney General's model policy, or an equivalent.
 - b) Encourages the Agricultural Relations Board, the Division of Workers' Compensation, the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, shelters, libraries, and all other organizations and entities that provide services related to physical or mental health and wellness, education, or access to justice, including the University of California, to adopt the model policy. (Government Code Section 7284.8.)

- 2) Requires the Attorney General to, by October 1, 2018, and in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, publish guidance, audit criteria, and training recommendations aimed at ensuring that any databases operated by state and local law enforcement agencies, including databases maintained for the agency by private vendors, are governed in a manner that limits the availability of information therein to anyone or any entity for the purpose of immigration enforcement, to the fullest extent practicable and consistent with federal and state law. (Government Code Section 7284.8 (b).)
- 3) Requires, on or before July 1, 2026, in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Attorney General to publish model policies for state and local agencies relating to interaction with immigration authorities consistent with federal and state law and requires, on or before January 1, 2027, a state or local agencies to implement the model policy or equivalent policy. (Government Code Section 12532.5 (a).)
- 4) Requires, on or before July 1, 2026, in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Attorney General to publish guidance, audit criteria, and training recommendations for databases operated by a state or local agency, including databases maintained for the agency by private vendors, aimed at ensuring that the databases are governed in a manner that makes the availability of information therein to anyone or any entity for the purposes of immigration enforcement limited to the fullest extent practicable, consistent with federal and state law. (Government Code Section 12532.5 (b).)
- 5) Provides that, in enacting the California Public Records Act (CPRA), the Legislature, mindful of the right of individuals to privacy, finds and declares that access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business is a fundamental and necessary right of every person in this state. (Government Code Section 7921.000.)

FISCAL EFFECT: As currently in print this bill is keyed fiscal.

COMMENTS: In the first year and four months of his second term, Donald Trump and his administration have carried out a “mass deportation” scheme with seemingly little to no care for whether those being detained were actually eligible for deportation or detention. In January of this year, the world was stunned by an image of a young boy in a blue bunny hat and a Spiderman backpack being detained by immigration officials. The boy, 5-year-old Liam Conejo Ramos, is an asylum-seeker from Ecuador living in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In the midst of increased ICE raids throughout the city of Minneapolis, Liam was detained alongside his father, also an asylum-seeker. At the time of their detention, their asylum case was pending and both had lawful immigration status. (Rebecca Cohen et. al, *ICE detains 4 Minnesota students, including 5-year-old, school district says* (January 22, 2026) NBC News available at: <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/ice-detains-4-minnesota-students-5-year-old-school-district-says-rcna255366>.) Unfortunately, Liam's story is not unique. Across the country children and adults with lawful status or even citizenship have been detained by ICE and Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) agents with no apparent justification. According to the Deportation Data Project, the Trump administration quadrupled the overall number of arrests than had occurred during the Biden administration. (Graeme Blair and David Hausman, *Immigration Enforcement in the First Nine Months of the Second Trump Administration* (January 27, 2026) Deportation Data Project available at: <https://deportationdata.org/analysis/immigration-enforcement-first-nine-months-trump.html>.)

According to the Project's analysis, the administration's increased amount of street arrests helped bolster this increase, rather than relying on transfers from local jails and prisons. While there is no one source that can help shed light on how many of those arrested by the federal government were undocumented immigrants or immigrants with criminal convictions that could make them subject to deportation, the overwhelming amount of reporting from across the country detailing the detention and arrests of citizens, asylees, and other immigrants with lawful status tends to indicate that a devastatingly high percentage of those detentions and arrests were of individuals who had no basis for arrest.

The threat of detention and deportation has severely impacted immigrant communities' ability to access daily life, regardless of their immigration status. According to one report, attendance at the Salinas City Elementary School District decreased by four percent in 2025 compared to August of the previous year. In a district with fewer than 10,000 students, a seemingly minor drop like that reflects a total of more than 700 students who were losing time in classrooms with teachers and their peers in one school district alone. (Carolyn Jones, *'Afraid to go to school': Immigrant families in the Salinas Valley are gripped by fear*, CalMatters (Feb. 20, 2025) available at: [https://calmatters.org/education/k-12-education/2025/02/deportation/.](https://calmatters.org/education/k-12-education/2025/02/deportation/))

For at least the last decade, the California Legislature has taken steps to limit the state's collaboration with immigration enforcement activity, most notably through passage of SB 54 (De Leon, Chap. 495, Stats. 2017) which limited the use of state and local resources for the purposes of immigration enforcement. The Legislature has also enacted bills prohibiting state and local governments from contracting for immigration detention centers, requiring the Attorney General to develop and disseminate guidance for state and local agencies in their interactions with immigration enforcement agents, requiring schools and daycares to restrict federal agents' access to their campuses, among numerous other efforts to respond to the federal government within the ability of the state.

This bill seeks to continue in the tradition of arming the state with the information necessary to develop holistic policies that are responsive to immigration enforcement policies that risk harming Californians. This bill requires that, by July 1, 2027, the Department of Justice establish the Working Group on Civil Rights Accountability. The bill tasks the working group with providing recommendations to the Legislature and the AG to "strengthen oversight, improve data transparency, and protect the civil and constitutional rights of individuals and communities impacted by immigration enforcement." The bill prescribes the makeup of the committee; grants appointment authority to the Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, President pro Tempore of the Senate, and the AG; and provides qualification factors for potential members.

Additionally, the bill tasks the working group with developing a "statewide reporting dashboard to document and categorize alleged constitutional or civil rights violations arising from federal immigration enforcement activities within the state," and requires the DOJ to "establish standards, submission protocols, and data verification procedures for nonprofit organizations authorized to submit reports to the dashboard." The bill seemingly limits use of the dashboard to certain nonprofits that meet specified qualifications.

In addition to the myriad of policy development requirements imposed on the AG by the Legislature, the AG also took it upon himself last year to develop a reporting mechanism to allow individuals to submit reports of misconduct by federal agents. As noted by the platform, submission of report does not necessarily require the AG to act, and directs users of the platform

to sources for retaining an attorney. According to their press release, the portal “will help the California Department of Justice capture and create a record of potential unlawful conduct by federal agents, such as the use of excessive force, and inform potential actions the Department may take to protect the rights and safety of Californians. (*California Announces New Online Portal to Report Misconduct by Federal Agents* (December 2, 2025) California Department of Justice available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/california-announces-new-online-portal-report-misconduct-federal-agents>.)

While seemingly similar in concept, the dashboard proposed by this measure is distinct from the AG’s already-existing reporting mechanism in that *anyone* may use the AG’s platform, while the dashboard proposed by AB 2662 would be limited to nonprofits that meet specified criteria. There are certainly some benefits to limiting who may submit reports – it can cut down on the time and resources needed to parse through alleged wrongdoing. However, there is nothing preventing a nonprofit from using the existing platform or anything hindering the CADOJ from filtering out submissions from nonprofits for particular evaluation. Additionally, there is some merit to the concept that a larger volume of complaints may help build a more comprehensive set of recommendations from the working group. The existing platform also has the added benefit of already being implemented and run by the AG, which is who this bill would task with synthesizing complaints submitted by the new platform. While potentially redundant of the existing platform, AB 2662 would codify the requirement that the Attorney General maintain a reporting mechanism in the event that a future office-holder would wish to eliminate the tool. *Nevertheless, the author may wish to consider closely coordinating with the Attorney General’s office to ensure the mandate is not unnecessarily duplicative and to ensure the Working Group can access the data developed by the existing platform.*

Finally, recent amendments exempt the required reports from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act (CPRA). The underlying aim of the CPRA is to ensure the public has transparency into the ongoings of state government, and generally makes documents developed or submitted as a result of ongoing government actions subject to disclosure and available for the public to access either in person or online. The CPRA is subject to exceptions, however, and generally exempts personally identifying information that may be subject to disclosure as a result of a given government action. Considering the type of data that would be subject to disclosure under this bill, specifically sensitive information relating to California’s immigrant community or others who may have been subject to a civil rights violation, an exemption from the CPRA seems reasonable.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is supported by California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation. In support of the measure they state:

According to the Economic Policy Institute, the current Administration has increased funding exponentially by 14 times to escalate immigration enforcement, in comparison to other U.S. Agencies.¹ For example, in fiscal year 2023, immigration enforcement funding was at \$30.2 billion compared to \$2.2 billion for labor standards enforcement.² This means that workers will likely experience immigration enforcement activity on the job long before an inspector comes to evaluate the workplace for labor, wage, or safety violations.

A recent March 2026 policy brief by the Congressional Research Service stated that it was hypothesized “that immigration enforcement programs may have had a chilling effect on employment.....because the programs increased the likelihood that any interaction with local

police—even being pulled over for a traffic stop on the way to or from work—could have led to deportation.³ As we know, these are the exact scenarios where Californians are vulnerable to violations of their civil liberties by immigration enforcement activity.

AB 2662 will collect these stories and categorize reliable data that will better illuminate exactly how federal immigration enforcement actions against Californians have violated their constitutional and civil liberties. The parameters set forth in the bill ensure that data submission by nonprofit organizations meet data integrity, and confidentiality and privacy standards as established by the Department of Justice. We applaud the author for providing direction that the civil rights working group assess and identify any “trends, geographic patterns, systemic concerns” and submit an annual report and recommendations to the Legislature on how “to safeguard constitutional and civil rights within the state.”

At a time when the federal government refuses to be transparent about its immigration activity and arbitrarily and capriciously targets Californians, AB 2662’s annual report will provide California with a full picture of the extent of the federal government’s violations of Californians’ civil rights and liberties, while protecting sensitive information. For all of the foregoing reasons, we urge you to support on AB 2662 that will create a centralized system to collect and publish incidents of civil rights violations by immigration enforcement activity.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Clinicas Del Valle De Salinas

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Manuela Boucher-de la Cadena / JUD. / (916) 319-2334