
THIRD READING

Bill No: AB 572
Author: Kalra (D), et al.
Amended: 9/5/25 in Senate
Vote: 21

SENATE PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: 5-1, 7/8/25
AYES: Arreguín, Caballero, Gonzalez, Pérez, Wiener
NOES: Seyarto

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: Senate Rule 28.8

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 44-22, 6/4/25 - See last page for vote

SUBJECT: Criminal procedure: interrogations

SOURCE: Californians for Safety and Justice and Silicon Valley De-Bug

DIGEST: This bill requires law enforcement officers to identify themselves and provide specified information prior to interviewing, questioning, or interrogating the family member of person who has been killed or seriously injured by an officer.

Senate floor amendments of 9/5/2025 (1) require a law enforcement agency to maintain a policy by January 1, 2027; (2) modify the requirements currently included in the bill; (3) create exemptions for when an officer believes evidence would be destroyed or lost or there is an imminent threat to public safety; (4) define specified terms; and (5) move the provisions from the Penal Code to the Government Code.

ANALYSIS:

Existing Law:

- 1) Requires a state prosecutor to investigate incidents involving officer-involved use of force resulting in the death of an unarmed civilian, and incidents

involving a shooting by a peace officer that results in the death of a civilian if the civilian was unarmed or if there is a reasonable dispute as to whether the person was armed. (Government Code (Gov. Code), § 12525.3, subd. (b)(1) & (2).)

- 2) Provides that, if criminal charges against the involved officer are found to be warranted, the state prosecutor shall initiate and prosecute a criminal action against the officer. (Gov. Code, § 12525.3, subd. (b)(2)(C).)
- 3) Requires the Commission on Peace Officers Standard and Training to establish the Robert Presley Institute of Criminal Investigation (ICI) which makes available to criminal investigators of California's law enforcement agencies an advanced training program to meet the needs of working investigators in specialty assignments, such as arson, auto theft, homicide, and narcotics. (Penal Code (Pen. Code), § 13519.9, subd. (a).)
- 4) Requires the ICI to provide an array of investigation training, including core instruction in matters common to all investigative activities, advanced instruction through foundation specialty courses in the various investigative specialties, and completion of a variety of elective courses pertaining to investigation. (Pen. Code, § 13519.9, subd. (b).)
- 5) Provides that during the custodial interrogation of a minor 17 years of age or younger relating to the commission of a misdemeanor or felony, a law enforcement officer shall not employ threats, physical harm, deception, or psychologically manipulative interrogation tactics, as specified. (Welfare and Institutions Code (Welfare and Institutions Code (Welf. & Inst. Code), § 625.7.)
- 6) Requires law enforcement to furnish written notice to victims of domestic violence at the scene with information on victims' rights and resources. (Pen. Code, § 13701.)
- 7) Requires, upon the initial interaction with a sexual assault victim, a law enforcement officer to provide the victim with a card explaining the rights of sexual assault victims, including that they do not need to participate in the criminal justice system. (Pen. Code, § 680.2, subd. (a).)
- 8) States that whenever there has been a crime committed against a victim, the law enforcement officer assigned to the case may provide the victim of the crime with a "Victim's Rights Card," as specified. (Pen. Code, § 679.08, subd. (a).)
- 9) Requires every law enforcement agency investigating a criminal act and every agency prosecuting a criminal act, at the time of initial contact with a crime

victim, during follow-up investigation, or as soon as deemed appropriate by investigating officers or prosecuting attorneys, to provide to each victim a “Marsy Rights” card, which states the rights of crime victims described in the California Constitution. (Pen. Code, § 679.026, subd. (c)(1).)

This bill:

- 1) Requires, beginning January 1, 2027, every law enforcement and prosecutorial agency to have a policy for when law enforcement initiates a formal interview to gather evidence related to a law enforcement incident resulting in a person’s death or serious bodily injury.
- 2) States that the policy must adhere to the following requirements before any initial formal interview with an immediate family member of the person killed or seriously injured, or upon confirming the relationship as an immediate family member:
 - a) Clearly identify themselves and provide the full name of the agency by whom they are employed. If the interview takes place in person, the officer or prosecutor shall also show the person a business card, official badge, or other form of official identification;
 - b) Inform the person of the status of their family member, if known, including whether the family member has been killed or seriously injured;
 - c) Inform the person that they are conducting a formal interview for purposes of an investigation and that the investigation may or may not involve an assessment of the conduct of the person that was killed or injured;
 - d) Inform the person that they can have a trusted support person present who can also accompany them if they are asked to go to the police station for a formal interview.
 - e) Prohibiting the use of threats or deception, as specified.
- 3) Exempts the following circumstances from these requirements:
 - a) When a reasonable officer believes that delay would result in the loss or destruction of evidence or pose an imminent threat to public safety; and,
 - b) When an immediate family member has received advisements substantially equivalent to Miranda warnings.
- 4) Defines various terms for the purposes of these provisions.

Background

According to a 2023 *Los Angeles Times* report:

For years, law enforcement agencies across California have been trained to quickly question family members after a police killing in order to collect information that, among other things, is used to protect the involved officers and their department, an investigation by the *Los Angeles Times* and the Investigative Reporting Program at UC Berkeley's Graduate School of Journalism has found.

Police and prosecutors routinely incorporate the information into disparaging accounts about the people who have been killed that help justify the killings, bolster the department's defense against civil suits and reduce the amount of money families receive in settlements and jury verdicts, according to police reports, court records and interviews with families and their attorneys.

The *Times* and the Investigative Reporting Program documented 20 instances of the practice by 15 law enforcement agencies across the state since 2008. Attorneys specializing in police misconduct lawsuits say those cases are just a fraction of what they describe as a routine practice.

(B. Howey, *After police killings, families are kept in the dark and grilled for information*, L.A. Times, Mar. 28, 2023) <After police killings, California families often kept in the dark - Los Angeles Times (latimes.com) [last visited July 1, 2025].>.)

In an effort to prevent this interview technique, this bill would require a peace officer or prosecutor to provide immediate family members of a person killed or seriously injured by law enforcement of certain information, including the identification of the interviewer; the status of the family member, and advisements that they can consult with an attorney or support person, that they are not required to speak with the interviewer or go to the police station, and that the investigation that they are conducting may or may not involve the culpability of their family member.

In this respect, some of the admonitions are similar to the information provided to victims of certain crimes. However, it is unclear what remedy, if any, there is if the investigating officer or prosecutor does not give the advisement.

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

SUPPORT: (Verified 9/5/25)

Californians for Safety and Justice and Silicon Valley De-Bug (Source)

ACLU California Action

Asian Law Alliance

California Alliance for Youth and Community Justice

California Attorneys for Criminal Justice

California Immigrant Policy Center

California Public Defenders Association

Californians for Safety and Justice

Californians United for a Responsible Budget

Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement

Ella Baker Center for Human Right

Felony Murder Elimination Project

Friends Committee on Legislation of California

Initiate Justice

Initiate Justice Action

Justice2jobs Coalition

LA Defensa

Law Enforcement Action Partnership

Oakland Privacy

Pangea Legal Services

Rubicon Programs

Showing Up for Racial Justice Santa Clara County

Silicon Valley De-bug

Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition

Smart Justice California

Starting Over INC.

Starting Over Strong

The W. Haywood Burns Institute

Ujima Adult and Family Services

United Families for Justice

Vera Institute of Justice

Youth United for Community Action

OPPOSITION: (Verified 9/5/25)

Arcadia Police Officers' Association

Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs

Brea Police Association

Burbank Police Officers' Association
California Association of School Police Chiefs
California Coalition of School Safety Professionals
California District Attorneys Association
California Narcotic Officers' Association
California Peace Officers Association
California Police Chiefs Association
California Reserve Peace Officers Association
Claremont Police Officers Association
Corona Police Officers Association
Culver City Police Officers' Association
Fullerton Police Officers' Association
Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department
Los Angeles Professional Peace Officers Association
Los Angeles School Police Management Association
Los Angeles School Police Officers Association
Murrieta Police Officers' Association
Newport Beach Police Association
Palos Verdes Police Officers Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California
Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association
Pomona Police Officers' Association
Riverside Police Officers Association
Riverside Sheriffs' Association
San Diego County District Attorney's Office

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to Californians for Safety and Justice, a co-sponsor of this bill:

In the aftermath of incidents involving police violence, families of the victim are often approached by law enforcement authorities under the guise of an “interview,” but not officially taken into custody. Sometimes they are told to go to the police precinct for questioning where law enforcement can withhold information about the state of their loved one and the incident. While the family member is distressed and worried for their loved one, law enforcement officers have used this opportunity to coerce information about the victim’s past in order to paint a narrative about the victim or build a case against them. Such tactics not only inflict harm upon the victim and their family but also erode trust in law enforcement. The relatives of individuals affected by police violence

have a reasonable expectation to transparency about the circumstances surrounding their loved ones', without being manipulated in the process.

Californians for Safety and Justice is proud to co-sponsor AB 3021 because it will empower families of victims to exercise their rights in interactions with law enforcement when they are at their most vulnerable.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: According to the California Police Chiefs Association:

While we empathize for individuals in such situations, the rigid and absolute requirements set by AB 572 fail to consider practical applications in a myriad of different scenarios that make this bill unworkable.

CPCA and our members place an extremely high value on transparency and communication, especially in light of incidents involving the death or serious injury to a member of the public. In such instances, we expect our officers to approach family members with sensitivity, honesty, and respect. We maintain these expectations regardless of our opposition to AB 572.

Unfortunately, AB 572 presents several very real issues, including a lack account for situations where family members may be implicated or involved in a crime, potential liability may be found, or when officers have incomplete information about the incident or the relationships of those involved. We also feel this type of requirements is better situated within department policies, not set as an absolute requirement in the Penal Code where criminal penalties result from a violation.

ASSEMBLY FLOOR: 44-22, 6/4/25

AYES: Addis, Aguiar-Curry, Ahrens, Alvarez, Arambula, Bauer-Kahan, Bennett, Berman, Boerner, Bonta, Bryan, Caloza, Carrillo, Connolly, Elhawary, Fong, Garcia, Mark González, Haney, Harabedian, Hart, Jackson, Kalra, Lee, Lowenthal, McKinnor, Ortega, Papan, Patel, Pellerin, Quirk-Silva, Ransom, Celeste Rodriguez, Rogers, Schiavo, Schultz, Sharp-Collins, Solache, Valencia, Ward, Wicks, Wilson, Zbur, Rivas

NOES: Alanis, Ávila Farías, Castillo, Chen, Davies, DeMaio, Dixon, Ellis, Flora, Gallagher, Jeff Gonzalez, Hadwick, Hoover, Irwin, Lackey, Macedo, Patterson, Petrie-Norris, Sanchez, Ta, Tangipa, Wallis

NO VOTE RECORDED: Bains, Calderon, Gabriel, Gipson, Krell, Muratsuchi,
Nguyen, Pacheco, Ramos, Michelle Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Soria, Stefani

Prepared by: Sandy Uribe / PUB. S. /
9/8/25 21:16:22

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