
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2760
Author: Sharp-Collins (D)
Amended: 8/21/26 in Senate
Vote: 21

PRIOR SENATE VOTES NOT RELEVANT PURSUANT TO SENATE RULE
29.10(c)

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 8/26/26
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Cortese, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 4-2, 8/27/26
AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Wahab
NOES: Seyarto, Dahle
NO VOTE RECORDED: Richardson

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: Not relevant

SUBJECT: Law enforcement: wearable electroshock devices

SOURCE: Author

DIGEST: This bill 1) prohibits certain law enforcement agencies, as defined, from using wearable electroshock devices, as defined, within the state of California; 2) prohibits a law enforcement agency from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices; requires law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices; and 3) defines “wearable,” for the purposes of this bill, to mean any clothing or accessory item.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/21/26 delete the prior version of the bill and insert a new bill.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) 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. (Penal (Pen.) Code, § 835a, subd. (a)(1).)
- 2) 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).)
- 3) 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).)
- 4) 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.)
- 5) 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) A requirement that officers utilize de-escalation techniques, crisis intervention tactics, and other alternatives to force when feasible.
 - b) 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.
 - c) 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.

- d) 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.
 - e) 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.
 - f) 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. (Government (Gov.) Code, § 7286, subd. (b).)
- 6) 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).)
- 7) 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).)
- 8) Prohibits, generally, 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).)
- 9) 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 holstered or otherwise carried. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (a).)
- 10) 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:

- 1) 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.

- 2) 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.
- 3) 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.
- 4) Defines “wearable,” for the purposes of this bill, to mean any clothing or accessory item.
- 5) 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. (Pen. Code, § 13660, subd. (b)(1).)

Background

From the outset of President Trump’s second term, his Administration has expanded immigration enforcement and altered the immigration system at an unprecedented scale. 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. (Sara Braun, *Alarm over \$20m plan to supply ICE officers with electric-shock gloves*, The Guardian (Aug. 24, 2026) <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/aug/24/ice-officers-electric-shock-gloves> [as of Aug. 27, 2026].) Such gloves are already used across the country by various police departments and even in schools. (Wilkins, *Horrificed 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. The manufacturer notes that the devices can cause sudden death, increase in blood pressure, changes in blood chemistry, increase in respiration and heart rates, changes in heart rhythm, increase in adrenaline, and, the longer the exposure, the greater the potential risk. (Compliant Technologies, *Gen 3 & Gen 4 G.L.O.V.E. Produce User Guide*, Nov. 1, 2024, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uee38Qfyr46ZqjUPzRs_axR7ITv3jQtM/view [as of Aug 27, 2026].)

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).)

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.

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.

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 would prohibit the use of tasers by many law enforcement agencies in California, which is likely not the intent of the bill.

Finally, 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. For an analysis of the constitutional issues, see the Senate Public Safety Committee analysis.

In order 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.

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.

FISCAL EFFECT: Appropriation: No Fiscal Com.: Yes Local: Yes

The Senate Appropriations Committee writes:

Unknown, potentially minor one-time costs to state and local law enforcement agencies (General Fund, local funds) to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of a wearable electroshock device.

SUPPORT: (Verified 8/27/26)

ACLU California Action

All of US or None (HQ)

Alliance San Diego

California Coalition for Sheriff Oversight (CCSO)

California Community Foundation

California Immigrant Policy Center

California Nurses Association

Californians for Safety and Justice

Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)

Courage California

Disability Rights California

Drug Policy Alliance

Friends Committee on Legislation of California

Grace Institute - End Child Poverty in CA

Justice2Jobs Coalition

LA Defensa

Legal Aid At Work

Legal Services for Prisoners With Children

Prosecutors Alliance Action

Smart Justice California, a Project of Beyond Impact

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/27/26)

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
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
Sacramento County Sheriff Jim Cooper

Prepared by: Marshal Lawler / PUB. S. /916-651-4118
8/27/26 20:00:45

**** **END** ****