

Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

SB 1056 (Grayson) – As Amended June 24, 2026

Policy Committee: Public Safety

Vote: 9 - 0

Urgency: No

State Mandated Local Program: Yes

Reimbursable: Yes

**SUMMARY:**

This bill requires a court, in a criminal case prosecuting specified serious felonies subject to sex offender registration or specified invasion-of-privacy offenses, to issue a protective order governing the disclosure of sexually explicit material depicting an adult victim, upon a noticed motion of either party or on the court's own motion with notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard.

Specifically, this bill:

- 1) Requires the protective order to include conditions sufficient to safeguard the adult victim's privacy, prevent unnecessary copying, transmission, or dissemination of the material, and ensure the defendant's right to a fair trial and a meaningful opportunity to participate in their own defense.
- 2) Requires the court, if a defendant is self-represented, to consider whether the protective order should require the material to be viewed at the courthouse or in a secured location, and prohibits the defendant from retaining a copy of the material after the case has ended.
- 3) Authorizes an attorney for any party to disclose material subject to the protective order to a person necessary for the preparation of the case, including the defendant.
- 4) Requires a party that receives any other sexually explicit material of the adult victim to notify the court for inclusion of the material in an existing, new, or separate protective order.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

- 1) One-time costs (State Court Facilities Construction Fund, General Fund) of approximately \$270.6 million to the Judicial Council to construct new rooms or retrofit existing spaces within courthouses with criminal calendars, contingent on the bill being interpreted, as courts interpreted last year's AB 528 (Alanis), of this legislative session, to mean courts may not deny a viewing request and must therefore provide space where sensitive materials can be viewed. Judicial Council also reports it would need funding to conduct an official survey of impacted courthouses to determine the number of rooms needed, locations, construction needs and costs, and a construction timeline. The bill contains no delayed implementation date, and Judicial Council reports courts may be unable to comply if courthouses are the selected viewing location.

- 2) Cost pressures (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund) of an unknown but potentially moderate amount to the courts for calendaring impacts from new hearings required to establish the protective orders. The courts have no estimate of the affected population — persons who commit a strike offense and are also required to register pursuant to Penal Code section 290 — but do not anticipate it to be significant. Actual costs will depend on the number of protective order hearings and the amount of court time needed for each hearing. It generally costs approximately \$1,000 to operate a courtroom for one hour. Although courts are not funded on the basis of workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts from the General Fund.

#### COMMENTS:

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

While child sexual abuse material is appropriately subject to explicit statutory safeguards, no parallel provision expressly requires similar court supervision when the material depicts or involves adult victims. As a result, safeguards may depend on prosecutorial discretion rather than consistent judicial oversight. SB 1056 extends a proven statutory framework currently applied to child sexual abuse material to similarly sensitive material involving adult survivors, while preserving defendants' rights to reasonable access necessary to prepare a defense.

This bill is sponsored by Volare, a survivor-centered advocacy organization.

- 2) **Background.** Penal Code section 1054.10 generally prohibits an attorney from disclosing copies of child sexual abuse material evidence unless the court expressly permits disclosure upon a showing of good cause. No parallel statutory framework governs sexually explicit material depicting adult victims; existing protections depend on prosecutors seeking protective orders case by case, and on general discovery safeguards such as the prohibition on disclosing a victim's personal identifying information under Penal Code section 1054.2.

This bill was inspired by the case of Denise Huskins and Aaron Quinn. In 2015, Huskins was kidnapped from Quinn's Vallejo home, held for two days, and sexually assaulted by Matthew Muller, who recorded the assaults. Vallejo police initially and publicly dismissed the kidnapping as a hoax before Muller was apprehended and convicted. The case reached a national audience through the 2024 Netflix documentary "American Nightmare." During the subsequent prosecution, the prosecutor did not seek a protective order over the recorded evidence of the assaults, and Muller, representing himself, was permitted to retain digital copies of the recordings of his own crimes. The Assembly Public Safety Committee analysis characterizes the failure to seek any limiting order over that evidence as "a terrible lapse in judgment," noting that existing law already defines a victim's image and voiceprint as personal identifying information subject to protection.

This bill responds by removing that protection from prosecutorial discretion and making the protective order mandatory in covered cases. Upon a noticed motion of either party, or on the court's own motion with notice and a meaningful opportunity to be heard, the court must issue a protective order with conditions sufficient to safeguard the adult victim's privacy, prevent unnecessary copying, transmission, or dissemination of the material, and ensure the defendant's right to a fair trial and a meaningful opportunity to participate in their own

defense. Where a defendant is self-represented, the court must consider requiring the material to be viewed at the courthouse or in a secured location, and the defendant may not retain a copy of the material after the case has ended. The bill preserves the prosecution's duty to disclose relevant or exculpatory evidence and does not affect the admissibility of any relevant evidence.

- 3) **Support and Opposition.** Supporters, including the California District Attorneys Association, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office, and numerous law enforcement associations, argue survivors should not have to choose between seeking justice and protecting their privacy. ACLU California Action and California Attorneys for Criminal Justice are registered in opposition.

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