
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 2760
Author: Sharp-Collins (D), Lee (D) and Schultz (D), et al.
Amended: 8/28/26 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 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; and 3) requires law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/28/26 change the definition of “wearable electroshock device” to include “taser energy weapon” rather than “taser”; delete the term “and operated using a trigger finger” from the description of devices that are not “wearable electroshock devices”; add a requirement that the California Department of Justice Division of Law Enforcement conduct a study on the safety

and community impacts of wearable electroshock devices to be completed by January 1, 2029; and add a sunset date for the bills provisions of January 1, 2030.

Senate Floor Amendments of 8/27/26 fix drafting errors, refine the bill's definitions, and add co-authors.

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 law enforcement agencies from using wearable electroshock devices within the state of California. This bill also prohibits a law enforcement agency from using funds to purchase wearable electroshock devices and requires law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of wearable electroshock devices.

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 8/28/26)

ACLU California Action

All of US or None (HQ)

Alliance San Diego

Black Women Organized for Political Action (BWOPA)

California Association of Black Lawyers
California Coalition for Sheriff Oversight (CCSO)
California Community Foundation
California Faculty Association
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Nurses Association
Californians for Safety and Justice
CFT – a Union of Educators & Classified Professionals, AFT, AFL-CIO
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)
County of San Diego Fourth District Supervisor Monica Montgomery Steppe
Courage California
Disability Rights California
Drug Policy Alliance
Equality California
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
Secure Justice
Smart Justice California, a Project of Beyond Impact
United Domestic Workers/AFSCME Local 3930
Western Center on Law & Poverty

OPPOSITION: (Verified 8/28/26)

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
8/30/26 15:01:34

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