

Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

SB 1050 (Ashby) – As Amended June 11, 2026

Policy Committee:	Privacy and Consumer Protection	Vote:	13 - 2
	Arts, Entertainment, Sports, and Tourism		9 - 0
	Judiciary		10 - 1

Urgency: No State Mandated Local Program: Yes Reimbursable: No

SUMMARY:

This bill makes it unlawful for any person to create and cause to be published in an advertising medium an advertisement that prominently includes a “synthetic performer” without a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the advertisement includes a synthetic performer.

Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Defines “synthetic performer” as a digital figure, voice, or representation created in whole or in part using generative artificial intelligence that creates the realistic impression of a human performance.
- 2) Requires the disclosure to use wording substantially similar to “this performance features a synthetic performer” or “no human performer is depicted.”
- 3) Exempts advertisements for expressive works, where the use of the synthetic performer is consistent with its use in the expressive work, and advertisements in which generative artificial intelligence is used solely for language translation of a human performer.
- 4) Prohibits an advertising medium from continuing to transmit or display an advertisement after being served with a court order finding the advertisement violates these provisions, and requires the advertising medium to remove the advertisement and cease accepting payment as soon as commercially reasonable and technically feasible.
- 5) Provides that a violation constitutes a violation of the False Advertising Law (FAL), enforceable pursuant to the Unfair Competition Law (UCL) by public prosecutors and, in limited circumstances, injured private parties.

FISCAL EFFECT:

- 1) Potential court cost pressures of an unknown, but potentially significant amount (Trial Court Trust Fund (TCTF)), to the extent civil actions are filed to enforce the bill’s new disclosure requirement. Actual costs would depend on the number of violations and the amount of court time each action requires. Although trial courts are not funded on a workload basis, increased pressure on the TCTF may create demand for increased General Fund support. The state provides approximately \$117.3 million in annual General Fund backfill to the TCTF in 2025-26.

- 2) Minor and absorbable costs to the Department of Justice (DOJ) to enforce the bill's provisions, as UCL enforcement is discretionary and falls within DOJ's baseline false advertising enforcement operations.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Purpose.** According to the author:

Recent advances in artificial intelligence have led to the creation of human-like digital figures that convincingly appear, speak, move, and perform like real people. These “synthetic performers” are increasingly used online and in advertisements to promote products and services, often without any disclosure to consumers. The absence of transparency threatens California’s entertainment workforce and enables the continued deception of consumers.

- 2) **Background.** Unlike “digital replicas,” which are AI-generated versions of actual performers, synthetic performers do not correspond to any identifiable natural person. This bill, modeled after New York’s AB 8887B and sponsored by SAG-AFTRA, requires a purely factual disclosure in advertisements that prominently include a synthetic performer, and expressly disclaims any regulation of the expressive or informational content of an advertisement. The bill builds on California’s existing AI transparency framework, including SB 942 (Becker), Chapter 291, Statutes of 2024, and AB 853 (Wicks), Chapter 674, Statutes of 2025, which impose provenance and disclosure requirements on generative artificial intelligence providers, large online platforms, and capture device manufacturers.

Opponents, including the Motion Picture Association and a coalition led by TechNet and the California Chamber of Commerce, argue the disclosure requirement is overbroad because the requirement applies regardless of whether a use is likely to deceive a reasonable consumer, and contend the bill is likely to be challenged under the First Amendment’s commercial speech doctrine. The bill includes legislative findings that the required disclosure is a purely factual commercial disclosure consistent with constitutional protections for commercial speech, and the Assembly Judiciary Committee analysis concludes the bill would likely satisfy the applicable four-prong test in *Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp. v. Public Service Commission* (1980) 447 U.S. 557. To the extent the bill is challenged in court, any defense costs would be borne by the Department of Justice.

- 3) **Support and Opposition.** Supporters, including the California Federation of Labor Unions and the National Association of Voice Actors, argue consumers deserve to know when a performance is synthetic and that disclosure protects performers from displacement without transparency. Opponents, including advertising industry associations, seek a materiality standard tied to the risk of consumer deception, flexibility in disclosure methods, and a right to cure.
- 4) **Related Legislation.** SB 1146 (Gonzalez), of this legislative session, requires disclosures for advertisements depicting AI-generated health care providers promoting health-related products or services; this bill contains a contingent carve-out to avoid overlapping liability if both bills are enacted. SB 1146 is pending in this committee.

SB 1111 (Ashby), of this legislative session, would incorporate digital replicas into the right of publicity law and criminal false impersonation statutes and is also pending in this committee.

Analysis Prepared by: Shiran Zohar / APPR. / (916) 319-2081