
SENATE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Senator Jesse Arreguín, Chair
2025 - 2026 Regular

Bill No: AB 2760 **Hearing Date:** August 26, 2026
Author: Sharp-Collins
Version: August 21, 2026
Urgency: No **Fiscal:** Yes
Consultant: ML

Subject: *Law enforcement: wearable electrochock devices*

HISTORY

Source: Author

Prior Legislation: SB 627 (Wiener), Ch. 125, Stats. of 2025
AB 392 (Weber), Ch. 170, Stats. of 2019
SB 230 (Caballero), Ch. 285, Stats. of 2019

Support: Alliance San Diego; California Community Foundation; Courage California; Disability Rights California; Drug Policy Alliance; Justice2Jobs Coalition; La Defensa; Prosecutors Alliance Action

Opposition: Arcadia Police Officers' Association; Brea Police Association; Burbank Police Officers' Association; California Narcotic Officers' Association; California Police Chiefs Association; California Reserve Peace Officers Association; California State Sheriffs' Association; Corona Police Officers Association; Fullerton Police Officers' Association; Murrieta Police Officers' Association; Newport Beach Police Association; Palos Verdes Police Officers Association; Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association; Pomona Police Officers' Association; Riverside Police Officers Association; Riverside Sheriffs' Association; Sacramento County Sheriff Jim Cooper

Assembly Floor Vote: Not relevant

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to prohibit certain law enforcement agencies, as defined, from using wearable electroshock devices, as defined, within the state of California; to prohibit a law enforcement agency from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices; and to require law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

Existing law declares the intent of the Legislature that the authority to use physical force, conferred on peace officers by existing law, is a serious responsibility that shall be exercised judiciously and with respect for human rights and dignity and for the sanctity of every human life, and that every person has a right to be free from excessive use of force by officers acting under color of law. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (a)(1).)

Existing law includes a legislative finding and declaration that the decision by a peace officer to use force shall be evaluated carefully and thoroughly, in a manner that reflects the gravity of that authority and the serious consequences of the use of force by peace officers, in order to ensure that officers use force consistent with law and agency policies. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (a)(3).)

Existing law authorizes a peace officer who has reasonable cause to believe that a person to be arrested has committed a public offense to use objectively reasonable force to effect the arrest, to prevent escape, or to overcome resistance. (Pen. Code, § 835a, subd. (b).)

Existing law permits a peace officer who is authorized to make an arrest and who has stated their intention to do so to use all necessary means to effect the arrest if the person to be arrested either flees or forcibly resists. (Pen. Code, § 843.)

Existing law requires each law enforcement agency to maintain a policy that provides a minimum standard on the use of force which, among other elements, must include all of the following:

- A requirement that officers utilize de-escalation techniques, crisis intervention tactics, and other alternatives to force when feasible.
- A requirement that an officer may only use a level of force that they reasonably believe is proportional to the seriousness of the suspected offense or the reasonably perceived level of actual or threatened resistance.
- A requirement that officers immediately report potential excessive force to a superior officer when present and observing another officer using force that the officer believes to be beyond that which is necessary, as determined by an objectively reasonable officer under the circumstances based upon the totality of information actually known to the officer.
- A requirement that officers promptly provide, if properly trained, or otherwise promptly procure medical assistance for persons injured in a use of force incident, when reasonable and safe to do so.
- Training standards and requirements relating to demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the law enforcement agency's use of force policy by officers, investigators, and supervisors.
- Training and guidelines regarding vulnerable populations, including, but not limited to, children, elderly persons, people who are pregnant, and people with physical, mental, and developmental disabilities. (Gov. Code, § 7286, subd. (b).)

Existing law prohibits a law enforcement agency from authorizing the use of a carotid restraint, as defined, by any peace officer employed by that agency. (Gov. Code, § 7286.5, subd. (a).)

Existing law prohibits a law enforcement agency from authorizing techniques or transport methods that involve a substantial risk of positional asphyxia. (Gov. Code, § 7286.5, subd. (b).)

Existing law generally prohibits law enforcement agencies from using kinetic energy projectiles and chemical agents, as defined, to disperse any assembly, protest or demonstration. (Pen. Code, § 13652, subd. (a).)

Existing law prohibits peace officers who carry electroshock devices from holstering or carrying those devices on the same lateral side of the officer's body as the officer's primary firearm is holstering or otherwise carried. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (a).)

Existing law defines “electroshock device” to mean a taser, stun gun, or similar weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock, and is designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol and operated using a finger trigger. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (b)(1).)

This bill prohibits a law enforcement agency—defined as any local agency that employs a peace officer, any law enforcement agency of another state, or any federal law enforcement agency—from using wearable electroshock devices, as defined, within the state of California.

This bill prohibits a law enforcement agency—defined as any agency, department, or other entity of the state or any political subdivision thereof that employs any peace officer—from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices.

This bill requires law enforcement agencies—defined as any agency, department, or other entity of the state or any political subdivision thereof—to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

This bill defines “wearable,” for the purposes of this bill, to mean any clothing or accessory item.

This bill defines, by cross reference to existing law, “electroshock device” to mean a taser, stun gun, or similar weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock, and is designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol and operated using a finger trigger.

COMMENTS

1. Need for This Bill

The author writes:

Policymaking must evolve as we learn of new threats such as emerging technology that directly poses an immediate and unacceptable risk to public safety. As the federal presence in California grows and state and local law enforcement agencies consider adopting new technologies, we cannot wait for a tragedy to force us to act.

Taser shock gloves are largely untested in real-world encounters, yet they are already being marketed to and considered by law enforcement agencies. In one tragic case, a man died after being repeatedly shocked with these gloves while in custody. Californians should never serve as test subjects for unproven law enforcement technology. There are also reports of these gloves being used by school resource officers despite clear guidance against use on children. These gloves are marketed as a solution to litigation over the use of excessive force based on optics, eliminating one of the key ways the public is able to keep law enforcement accountable. This bill is about drawing a clear line: public safety technology must be proven safe and accountable before it is deployed, not after someone is killed.

2. Immigration Enforcement Under President Trump's Second Term

From the outset of President Trump's second term, his Administration has expanded immigration enforcement and altered the immigration system at an unprecedented scale. This ramp-up of immigration enforcement has been accompanied by aggressive recruitment efforts, including attempts by federal immigration agencies to lure state peace officers. Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) has taken steps to significantly expand hiring, such as giving out \$50,000 signing bonuses, offering student loan forgiveness, lowering the age limit for recruits from 21 to 18, and waiving the 37-year-old hiring cap, among others. (Ray & Sanchez, *ICE expansion has outpaced accountability. What are the remedies?* (Jan. 26, 2026) Brookings <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/ice-expansion-has-outpaced-accountability-what-are-the-remedies/> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) But amid this hiring surge, evidence has surfaced that ICE had misrepresented the rigor of its training for new officers, including legal training over whether they are permitted to use deadly force. According to a recent whistleblower account, training for new officers has been pared down to the point where it is "deficient, defective[,] and broken." (*ICE whistleblower accuses agency of 'deficient, defective and broken' training amid hiring surge* (Feb. 23, 2026) The Hill <https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/5751455-ice-officer-training-whistleblower/> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) Moreover, a recent review by the Associated Press found that at least two dozen ICE employees and contractors have been charged with crimes since 2020, including 9 such instances in 2025 alone. (*Takeaways from AP's review of recent criminal cases against ICE employees and contractors* (Feb. 10, 2026) Associated Press <https://apnews.com/article/ice-agents-arrested-misconduct-abuse-corruption-charged-d3aeb8c20191fa357f87078fc169cc17> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].)

ICE has used aggressive tactics in federal immigration enforcement during President Trump's second term, especially here in California. Hundreds of federal agents conducted raids and immigration sweeps across Los Angeles, detaining and arresting individuals through "at large" arrests on the street, and often through blatant racial profiling. (*Trump's immigration crackdown upended life in California. It continues as the new year begins* (Dec. 29, 2025) CalMatters <https://calmatters.org/justice/2025/12/immigration-2025-year-in-review/> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) Federal agents often conducted raids in civilian clothing or military uniforms, and often while masked, heavily armed, and without providing identification. There have also been numerous reports of federal agents using excessive force and causing injury and property damage while conducting these raids, as well as reports that agents have denied those detained access to legal counsel. Such tactics were used during Operation Metro Surge, a joint operation of ICE and Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) that took place throughout Minnesota (though primarily in the Twin Cities area) beginning in December 2025 and concluding early February 2026. During this operation, federal immigration officials employed harsh, confrontational, and arguably illegal tactics to make arrests, serve warrants, conduct raids and contain protesters. (*Minneapolis, MN: Operation Metro Surge. Sanctuary Information, December 2025* (Dec. 2025) Immigrant Legal Resource Center <https://www.ilrc.org/immigration-enforcement/federal-tracking/large-scale-raids/minneapolis-mn-operation-metro-surge> [as of Aug. 24, 2026]; *Judge Partially Blocks Operation Metro Surge Tactics Against Protesters in Minnesota* (Jan. 17, 2024) JURIST News <https://www.jurist.org/news/2026/01/judge-partially-blocks-operation-metro-surge-tactics-against-protesters-in-minnesota/> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) Operation Metro Surge also resulted in the shooting of three civilians by federal immigration agents, two of which were fatal: the killings of Alex Pretti and Renee Good.

In August of 2026, DHS published plans to spend up to \$20 million to supply ICE officers with gloves that can deliver electric shocks. (Wilkins, *Horrid School District Pleads Police to Stop Using Electric Shock Torture Gloves on Students* (Aug. 22, 2026) Futurism <https://futurism.com/science-energy/school-district-police-electric-shock-torture-gloves> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) Such gloves are already used across the country by various police departments and even in schools. (Wilkins, *Horrid School District Pleads Police to Stop Using Electric Shock Torture Gloves on Students* (Aug. 22, 2026) Futurism <https://futurism.com/science-energy/school-district-police-electric-shock-torture-gloves> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) While the devices are marketed as nonlethal and safe for the heart, a pending lawsuit alleges a 43-year-old man died in 2024 after he was shocked 27 times with the gloves and 13 more times by a Taser at a jail in Richmond, Kentucky. (Foley, *ICE's plan to give officers electric shock gloves draws outrage and fears of misuse* (Aug. 13, 2026) PBS NewsHour <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/ices-plan-to-give-officers-electric-shock-gloves-draws-outrage-and-fears-of-misuse> [as of Aug. 24, 2026].) An internal investigation found two of the glove shocks lasted 45 and 99 seconds apiece — far more than the manufacturer's recommended 15-second limit.

3. Existing Law Governing Law Enforcement Use of Force

In 1989, the U.S. Supreme Court set the standard for reasonable use of force in law enforcement. The general rule for how much force a law enforcement officer can use in response to a given situation is determined by a reasonableness test, requiring the careful balancing of the force against the countervailing government interest at stake. (*Graham v. Connor* (1989) 490 U.S. 386, 396.) The central question of this legal inquiry is whether the amount and type of force applied was reasonably necessary in light of the police need to prevent the subject from engaging in whatever conduct it was that they were engaging in at the time the force was used. Three important factors to that test are: 1) the severity of the crime at issue; 2) whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others; and 3) whether the person is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.

In 2019, California refined its use of force statutes in order to provide clearer guidance to law enforcement and the public, specifically regarding when the use of deadly force is appropriate. Namely, AB 392 (Weber), Chapter 170, Statutes of 2019, specified the circumstances in which deadly force is and is not appropriate, and SB 230 (Caballero), Chapter 285, Statutes of 2019, required law enforcement agencies to update their training and policies with specific requirements regarding use of force, including a requirement that an officer may only use a level of force that they reasonably believe is proportional to the seriousness of the suspected offense or the reasonably perceived level of actual or threatened resistance. (Gov. Code, § 7286, subd. (b).)

4. Effect of This Bill

This bill prohibits certain law enforcement agencies from using wearable electroshock devices within the state of California. The bill applies this provision only to certain defined law enforcement agencies, specifically, any local agency that employs peace officers, any law enforcement agency of another state, or any federal law enforcement agency. Notably, this definition excludes California state law enforcement agencies from this provision. The definition cross referenced for this provision of the bill is the same as that used by SB 627 (Wiener), Chapter 125, Statutes of 2025, which sought to regulate the use of masks by law enforcement

officers. Importantly, as discussed below, that bill was held to be unconstitutional because it failed to apply equally to state law enforcement agencies. The author may wish to consider using a different definition of “law enforcement agency” for this provision of the bill such that it applies to all law enforcement, including California state law enforcement, so that it has a greater chance of succeeding on constitutional grounds.

This bill also prohibits a law enforcement agency—defined by way of cross reference as any agency, department, or other entity of the state or any political subdivision thereof, that employs any peace officer—from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices, and it requires such law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

The bill defines, by cross reference, “electroshock device” to mean a taser, stun gun, or similar weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock, and is designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol and operated using a finger trigger. Notably, this definition is likely inadequate to apply to electroshock gloves because such gloves are likely not designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol or operated using a finger trigger. Thus, the author may consider amending the definition so that the bill applies only to “worn gloves or similar articles of clothing” that temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock.

The bill further defines “wearable,” for the purposes of this bill, to mean any clothing or accessory item. This definition may be overbroad, as it is unclear what is an “accessory item.” A taser or other electroshock device is arguably an “accessory item.” Thus, this bill prohibits the use of tasers by many law enforcement agencies in California, which is likely not the intent of the bill.

5. Supremacy Clause Constitutional Issues

This bill’s provisions apply to federal law enforcement agencies, and as discussed below, the regulation of federal agencies and officers is constitutionally questionable, specifically with regard to the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution.

State laws that conflict with federal laws or attempt to regulate the federal government may be invalidated for several reasons. The Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution provides that federal law “shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.” (U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2.) The doctrine of intergovernmental immunity is derived from the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution and demands that “the activities of the Federal Government are free from regulation by any state.” (*United States v. California* (9th Cir. 2019) 921 F.3d 865, 879.) This makes a state regulation invalid if it “regulates the United States directly or discriminates against the Federal Government or those with whom it deals.” (*N.D. v. United States* (1990) 495 U.S. 423, 435.) “A state or local law discriminates against the federal government if it treats someone else better than it treats the government.” (*Boeing, supra*, 768 F.3d at p. 842, quoting *United States v. City of Arcata* (9th Cir. 2010) 629 F.3d 986, 991.) However, it is well settled that generally applicable state laws can apply to federal entities. (See *United States ex rel. Drury v. Lewis* (1906) 200 U.S. 1, 7-8.)

A related doctrine is conflict preemption, whereby state laws that conflict with federal law are preempted, which “includes cases where compliance with both federal and state regulations is a physical impossibility, and those instances where the challenged state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress.” (*United States v. California*, *supra*, 921 F.3d at pp. 878-879; *Arizona v. United States* (2012) 567 U.S. 387, 399.) For example, in *United States v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the provisions of the California Values Act relating to law enforcement cooperation with ICE. The court of appeals had “no doubt that SB 54 makes the jobs of federal immigration authorities more difficult.” (*Id.* at p. 886.) But the court concluded that “this frustration does not constitute obstacle preemption,” because federal law “does not require any particular action on the part of California or its political subdivisions.” The court reasoned that “even if SB 54 obstructs federal immigration enforcement, the United States’ position that such obstruction is unlawful runs directly afoul of the Tenth Amendment and the anticommandeering rule,” and that “California has the right, pursuant to the anticommandeering rule, to refrain from assisting with federal efforts.” (*Id.* at pp. 888-891.) The court concluded that SB 54 does not violate the United States’ intergovernmental immunity for similar reasons.

The provisions of this bill seeking to regulate federal agencies and their agents will undoubtedly be subject legal challenge under the doctrines of intergovernmental immunity and conflict preemption. Though the outcome of such a claim is unclear and dependent on several factors, a recent decision from the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, which assessed the constitutionality of SB 627 (Wiener), Chapter 125, Statutes of 2025, and SB 805 (Perez), Chapter 126, Statutes of 2025, provides some useful guidance. (*United States of America v. State of California et al.* (C.D.Cal. 2026) Case No. 2:25-cv-10999-CAS-AJRx <gov.uscourts.cacd.995805.63.029.pdf>.) SB 627 prohibited local and federal law enforcement officers from wearing certain facial coverings in the performance of their duties, and SB 805 required local, state, and federal officers to visibly display identification, including a name or badge number and their agency, when performing their duties. The court ultimately concluded, analyzing the statutes under the intergovernmental immunity doctrine, that:

[SB 805] does not violate the Supremacy Clause by directly regulating the federal government. Further, because it does not treat federal officers differently from state officers, [SB 805] does not discriminate against the federal government. [...] With regard to SB 627 [...] the United States has failed to demonstrate that the facial covering prohibition directly regulates the federal government. The Court finds that federal officers can perform their federal functions without wearing masks. However, because [SB 627] as presently enacted does not apply equally to all law enforcement officers in the state, it unlawfully discriminates against federal officers. Because such discrimination violates the Supremacy Clause, the Court is constrained to enjoin the facial covering prohibition. (*Id.* at pp. 29-30.)

Therefore, to survive constitutional challenge, this bill will need to be amended to apply equally to federal and state law enforcement agencies. Provided that change occurs, the success of a Supremacy Clause challenge to this bill may turn on whether the electroshock devices in question are so essential to federal law enforcement as to interfere with or control federal law enforcement functions. If they are as or less essential to such functions as the masking and identification practices at issue in *U.S. v. State of California* were, it is possible that the bill would survive a Supremacy Clause challenge.

6. Amendments

The author intends to amend the bill's language to address the Supremacy Clause concerns described above and to change the definition of "wearable electroshock device" to be more narrowly targeted at gloves. These amendments are anticipated to be taken in Appropriations, rather than in this committee, for reasons of timing. The amendments are copied below, with deletions in strikethrough and additions in italics:

SECTION 1. Section 7286.1 is added to the Government Code, to read:

7286.1. (a) A law enforcement ~~agency, as defined in Section 7289, agency~~ shall not use a wearable electroshock ~~device, as defined in Section 13660 of the Penal Code, device~~ within the State of California.

(b) A law enforcement agency, as defined in Section 7286.5, shall not use state funds to purchase a wearable electroshock device.

(c) Law enforcement agencies, as defined in Section 7286.5, shall update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of a wearable electroshock device.

~~(d) For the purposes of this section, "wearable" includes any clothing or accessory item.~~

(d) For the purposes of this section, the following terms have the following meanings:

(1) "Law enforcement agency" means either of the following:

(A) Any department or agency of the state or any local government, special district, or other political subdivision thereof, that employs any peace officer, as described in Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 830) of Title 3 of Part 2 of the Penal Code.

(B) Any federal law enforcement agency.

(2) (A) "Wearable electroshock device" means a weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock and is designed to be worn like a glove.

(B) "Wearable electroshock device" does not mean a taser, stun gun, or similar weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock, and is designed to be held in a manner similar to a pistol and operated using a finger trigger.

7. Argument in Support

La Defensa writes:

Unlike other conducted-energy weapons, these devices are concealed within a glove and can be activated during close physical contact, resulting in serious health risks from longer-than-recommended usage and a lack of accountability posed by challenges even seeing where the electrical shock was administered. This lack of visibility undermines meaningful oversight and complicates the review of use-of-force incidents.

AB 2760 takes a proactive approach by preventing the adoption of a technology that raises significant public health and oversight concerns while offering no demonstrated benefit beyond existing law enforcement tools and de-escalation practices.

8. Argument in Opposition

The California Police Chiefs Association writes:

... [A] categorical prohibition on an emerging less-lethal technology, absent sufficient evidence that the technology cannot be safely deployed under appropriate policies, training, and restrictions, is premature and represents the wrong policy approach.

California already has among the most comprehensive use-of-force laws in the nation. In 2019, the Legislature enacted SB 230 and AB 392, establishing extensive statutory requirements governing when and how force may be used. SB 230 requires every law enforcement agency to maintain a comprehensive use-of-force policy addressing de-escalation, proportionality, approved methods and devices for applying force, medical assistance, supervisory review, reporting, training, vulnerable populations, and the evaluation of use-of-force incidents. Importantly, SB 230 specifically requires agencies to maintain “comprehensive and specific guidelines regarding approved methods and devices available for the application of force.”

...

Less-lethal options can protect both officers and the public. Police officers routinely encounter individuals who are actively resisting, assaultive, or engaged in hand-to-hand combat with officers. These encounters can escalate rapidly and create significant risks of injury to officers, suspects, and bystanders. Technology that provides officers with another intermediate force option during close-contact encounters may, when appropriately deployed, allow an officer to gain control without resorting to strikes, impact weapons, conventional conducted-energy weapons, or potentially higher levels of force.

-- END --