

CONCURRENCE IN SENATE AMENDMENTS

AB 2760 (Sharp-Collins, et al.)

As Amended August 28, 2026

Majority vote

SUMMARY

Prohibits any California law enforcement agency and any federal law enforcement agency from using a wearable electroshock device, as defined, within California.

Senate Amendments

1) Delete the contents of the bill and replace it with the following:

- a) Prohibits any California state or local law enforcement agency and any federal law enforcement agency from using a wearable electroshock device, as defined, within California.
- b) Prohibits any California state or local law enforcement agency and any federal law enforcement agency from using state funds to purchase a wearable electroshock device.
- c) Requires California state or local law enforcement agencies and federal law enforcement agencies to update their use of force policies to prohibit the use of a wearable electroshock device.
- d) Defines "law enforcement agency" to mean any department or agency of the state or any local government, special district, or other political subdivision thereof, that employs any peace officer, as specified, or any federal law enforcement agency.
- e) Defines "wearable electroshock device" to mean a weapon that is designed to temporarily incapacitate a person through the controlled delivery of an electric shock and is designed to be worn as a glove. This does not include a taser, energy weapon, 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.
- f) Requires the Division of Law Enforcement in the Department of Justice (DOJ), in consultation with relevant stakeholders, including, but not limited to, immigrants' rights and social justice advocates, law enforcement, technology experts, and other affected parties as deemed necessary by the DOJ, to conduct a study on the safety and community impacts of wearable electroshock devices and provide recommendations for appropriate standards and safeguards for their use.
- g) Requires the DOJ to report to the Legislature, as specified, the findings and recommendations of the study on or before January 1, 2029.
- h) Repeal the provisions of this bill on January 1, 2030.

COMMENTS

As Passed by the Assembly: This bill authorized counties to establish an Office of the Inspector General (OIG) to assist the board of supervisors with duties as they relate to the county animal control or chief probation.

According to the Author

"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."

Arguments in Support

According to *La Defensa*, AB 2760 "prohibits state and local law enforcement agencies from purchasing, possessing, or using taser gloves and other substantially similar wearable conducted-energy devices.

"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."

Arguments in Opposition

According to the *California State Sheriff's Association*, CSSA "remains opposed to Assembly Bill 2760, which has been gutted and amended to preclude a law enforcement agency from using a wearable electroshock device.

"By restricting when and under what conditions an officer may use certain tools, their response to a particular situation may end up being guided by choices about practices that feel acceptable or unacceptable to some instead of what measure is most appropriate in the context of the event. And when force options are removed from the spectrum of permissible responses, the ability to de-escalate a situation becomes more difficult.

"Also, all indications are that this bill is focused on federal immigration authorities and their enforcement practices. This is one of a number of measures that attempt to regulate federal practices and at the same time implicate state and local law enforcement. As we have already seen with bills enacted during this session, it is not uncommon for courts to eliminate such bills' application to federal entities, thereby leaving the measures to only apply to state and/or local agencies."

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee, "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."

VOTES:**ASM PUBLIC SAFETY: 6-0-3**

YES: Schultz, Alanis, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Sharp-Collins

ABS, ABST OR NV: Lackey, Nguyen, Ramos

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 51-7-22

YES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Ávila Farías, Bains, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Calderon, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Gabriel, Gallagher, Garcia, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Irwin, Jackson, Kalra, Krell, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Ortega, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Petrie-Norris, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Stefani, Wallis, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NO: Castillo, Hadwick, Johnson, Macedo, Patterson, Sanchez, Tangipa

ABS, ABST OR NV: Alanis, Arambula, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gipson, Jeff Gonzalez, Hoover, Lackey, Muratsuchi, Nguyen, Pacheco, Ramos, Celeste Rodriguez, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Soria, Ta, Valencia

UPDATED

VERSION: August 28, 2026

CONSULTANT: Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744

FN: 0004569