

THIRD READING

Bill No: SB 1103
Author: Pérez (D)
Amended: 4/28/26
Vote: 21

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE: 11-1, 4/21/26

AYES: Umberg, Allen, Ashby, Caballero, Durazo, Laird, Reyes, Stern, Wahab,
Weber Pierson, Wiener

NOES: Niello

NO VOTE RECORDED: Valladares

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE: 5-2, 5/14/26

AYES: Cervantes, Cabaldon, Grayson, Richardson, Wahab

NOES: Seyarto, Dahle

SUBJECT: Large home improvement retailers: immigration enforcement:
reporting

SOURCE: National Day Laborer Organizing Network

DIGEST: This bill requires a large home improvement retailer, as defined, to provide the Attorney General specified documents and records related to immigration enforcement activities on the retailer's premises within 24 hours of documentation, requires a large home improvement retailer to post on its website a daily record of immigration enforcement activities occurring on its premises and any policy or procedures the retailer maintains regarding immigration enforcement activities, and permits the Attorney General and any person acting in the public interest to bring a suit for injunctive relief for violations of those requirements.

ANALYSIS:

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits law enforcement agencies from using agency or department moneys or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for

immigration enforcement purposes, as specified, place peace officers under the supervision of federal agencies, use immigration authorities as interpreters for law enforcement matters, transfer an individual to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant, provide office space exclusively dedicated to immigration authorities, and contract with the federal government for the use of law enforcement agency facilities to house individuals as federal detainees for the purposes of civil immigration custody, as specified.

(Government (Gov.) Code § 7284.6.)

- 2) Requires the Attorney General, by April 1, 2018, and in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, public libraries, health facilities operated by the state or a political subdivision thereof, courthouses, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement facilities, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers Compensation, and shelters, to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law, and ensuring that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status.
 - a) Encourages the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers' Compensation, the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, shelters, libraries, and all other organizations and entities that provide services related to physical or mental health and wellness, education, or access to justice, including the University of California, to adopt the model policy. (Gov. Code § 7284.8.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes various findings and declarations regarding immigration enforcement in California their occurrence at and the importance of large home improvement retailers in California.
- 2) Requires a large home improvement retailer, as defined, doing business in the state to, at a minimum:
 - a) Provide the Attorney General with copies of any video footage, photographs, written reports, and any other documentation of immigration enforcement activity gathered in the normal course of business within 72 hours of receipt of an administrative subpoena issued by the Attorney General; and
 - b) Compile and disclose on the retailer's website a daily record of any immigration enforcement activity occurring on its premises, including

information on: the date, time, and specific store at which immigration enforcement activity occurred; and a description of the immigration enforcement activity, which may include the law enforcement agencies involved, the number of law enforcement officers and vehicles present, the number of individuals subjected to search, detention, and arrest, whether weapons of any kind were drawn, and whether any injuries occurred.

- 3) Requires a large home improvement retailer to preserve all documentation described in (1)(a), above, and specifies that any documentation submitted to the Attorney General shall not be considered a public record and must not be disclosed pursuant to a request under the California Public Records Act.
- 4) Requires a large home improvement retailer to disclose on its website any policies and practices it maintains that relate to immigration enforcement activity on its premises, including:
 - a) Whether the retailer maintains policies regarding interaction between its employees or agents and the federal immigration authorities; and
 - b) Whether the retailer provides surveillance data, directly or indirectly, to federal immigration authorities or any agency that provides that data to federal immigration authorities.
- 5) Requires the information required by 2) to be made available via a conspicuous link on the home page of the large home improvement retailer's website.
- 6) Permits the Attorney General to bring a civil action for injunctive relief for a violation of the above-described requirements.
- 7) Defines, for the purposes of its provisions, the following terms:
 - a) "immigration enforcement activity" to mean any surveillance, consensual or nonconsensual stop, detention, search, arrest, or use of force by an immigration enforcement authority conducted wholly or in part for the purposes of enforcing federal immigration law;
 - b) "immigration enforcement authority" to mean officers or agents of the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) or the United States Customs and Border Protection (CBP);
 - c) "large home improvement retailer" to mean a business entity that operates 50 or more retail stores in the state with an average size of 100,000 square feet or more of enclosed space that sells a large variety of goods, including but not limited to, hardware, lumber,

plumbing supplies, electrical fixtures and supplies, windows, doors, plants, and similar items used in the maintenance, improvement, or expansion of a dwelling, buildings, or sites;

- d) “premises” to mean both enclosed and outside space occupied by a large home improvement retailer, and the retailer’s parking lot and any public walkways directly adjacent to the parking lot; and
 - e) “surveillance data” to include, but not be limited to, data collected by automated license plate reader systems and artificial intelligence-driven analytics.
- 8) Declares that its provisions described in (2), above, impose a limitation on the public’s right of access to the meetings of public bodies or writings of public officials and agencies within the meaning of the California Constitution, and finds that this limitation is necessary because:
- Documentation of immigration enforcement activity submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to this act may contain sensitive personal information regarding workers, customers, and other individuals present at the time of the enforcement activity, as well as information the disclosure of which could compromise the integrity of ongoing investigations. In order to protect the privacy of individuals depicted in or identified by those records, to preserve the integrity of investigations conducted pursuant to this act, and to prevent the disclosure of investigatory records in a manner that would undermine the Attorney General’s ability to enforce this act, it is necessary that the act limits the public’s right of access to records submitted to the Attorney General pursuant to this act.

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

According to the Senate Appropriations Committee:

Unknown number of actions by the AG or a person acting in the public interest for injunctive relief.

Unknown, likely significant cost to the AG to manage documents and records related to immigration enforcement on a retailer’s premises.

Unknown, significant to major cost pressure to the courts to the extent there are additional civil filings for new violations created by this bill. Actual costs would depend on the number of operators in the state, violations and the amount of court time required for each action. Although courts are not funded based on workload,

increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts. The proposed FY 2026-07 Governor's budget would provide \$70 million General Fund support (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund).

SUPPORT: (Verified 5/15/2026)

National Day Laborer Organizing Network (source)
Alliance for Boys and Men of Color
Border Angels
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
California State Council of Service Employees International Union
Centro del Inmigrante, Inc.
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
Day Worker Center of Mountain View
Democratic Socialists of America - Los Angeles
El Centro Cultural de Mexico
Employee Rights Center
End Child Poverty California Powered by Grace
Escondido Indivisible
Escondido Neighbors for Solutions
Escondido Neighbors United
Freedom for Immigrants
Harbor Institute for Immigrant and Economic Justice
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Inclusive Action for the City
Julian Indivisible
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
The Multicultural Institute
No Small ACT
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Orange County Communities Organized for Responsible Development
Pasadenans Organizing for Progress
Pomona Economic Opportunity Center
RotaCare Clinic of San Rafael
SALVA
San Diego Immigrant Rights Consortium
Sembrando Semillas Day Laborer Worker Center
South Bay People Power
South County Crosscultural Council
SURJ San Diego
VietRISE

18 Million Rising

OPPOSITION: (Verified 5/15/2026)

California Business Properties Association
California Chamber of Commerce
California Retailers Association
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Valley Industry and Commerce Association

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: According to the National Day Laborer Organizing Network, which is the sponsor of this bill:

For better or worse, large home improvement stores have become a modern local hardware store for many of us. But for the last year, these superstores have become sites of unlawful arrests, intimidation, racial profiling, physical violence, and even injuries and deaths -- as masked and militarized federal agents - armed with literal weapons of war - have descended upon these businesses with impunity. These raids that racially profile Latinos and endanger everyone are quite literally intended to cause chaos, confusion, and fear.

So far, some large home improvement stores have done very little to mitigate the crisis at its stores. When asked, many won't even tell the public which locations have been hit, or what the parent company is doing in response, or in furtherance of the raids . Communities are left guessing what is true, what is rumor, and whether it is safe to go about daily life.

We are doing what we can: sending legal observers to stores, providing lawyers to those arrested by ICE, litigating in federal courts to uphold Constitutional rights for everyone. Yet large home improvement stores can and must also do something too. At a bare minimum, they should share what they know. They should provide customers, workers, and neighbors with accurate information about the raids their stores are attracting.

Transparency about these raids would be a modest but meaningful step to honor these big box stores' obligations to the public. It would counter misinformation, reduce panic and affirm that big box stores value the safety of customers, employees and the communities they serve.

Let's be clear: raids by masked agents profiling Latinos and other people of color are deplorable. The White House is driving these actions and the courts have failed to stop them. Human-rights violations at big box stores are tearing families apart, destabilizing communities and eroding trust in public life.

SB 1103 will ensure that large home improvement stores can live up to their commitments to customers and communities. To be transparent. To be accountable. And to stand with their customers, workers and communities. Stand with immigrants against government-led harassment and violence. REPAIR the damage. Do the right thing.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: According to the California Retailers Association, California Business Properties Association, and the California Chamber of Commerce, which oppose this bill:

SB 1103 effectively requires private companies to act as public surveillance for the attorney general, in order to keep tabs on the federal government's enforcement actions. Our member companies do not wish to come between state and federal authorities - but see SB 1103 as forcing their stores and their employees into that dangerous space.

SB 1103 would require retailers to collect, preserve, and transmit documentation and video footage related to enforcement incidents. That mandate could increase confusion on the sales floor and create additional points of contact in a fast-moving and volatile situation where all of the reportable facts are unknown and where attempting to gather those facts may intensify tensions during an already stressful event. [...]

SB 1103 has ambiguous language that will put the reporting burden on employees on what qualifies as "immigration enforcement activity." Under this bill, employees would be required to collect and infer data about possible enforcement activity on the store premises. This includes determining what agencies and how many agents were involved. The broad definition of "premises" only adds to that challenge by including shared parking lots and adjacent walkways that are not on the retailer's property. Fundamentally, these provisions raise deep concerns about the safety and well-being of employees.

SB 1103 also raises potential privacy concerns. Requiring businesses to disclose incident-related footage to state authorities would likely capture the images and movements of employees, customers, and bystanders who had no role in the underlying matter. Retailers already face substantial obligations to safeguard personal information under California law, and this bill would create new pressure to store and disclose data in ways that could expose private individuals to unnecessary risk. In practice, the bill could chill customer trust and employee confidence.

We also have serious concerns about any requirement to post internal policies and data-sharing practices on retailers' websites. This would shift retailers from passive locations where activity occurs to entities that could be viewed as active participants in enforcement, increasing both reputational and legal risk. While transparency has value, forcing public disclosure of internal policies and data practices could invite misinterpretation and wrongly imply retailer involvement in federal enforcement activity.

SB 1103 also raises federal preemption and obstruction of justice concerns. Arguably, this bill would interfere with federal immigration operations by forcing near-real-time disclosures about enforcement activity. There is a strong argument that the bill conflicts with obstruction of justice statutes. SB 1103 could put retail employers and their employees at risk of violating federal law.

Furthermore, SB 1103 may have the opposite effect of its perceived goal to protect undocumented communities. Should this bill pass, the federal government would know that large home improvement retailers in California would have to collect and report large amounts of data on their immigration enforcement activities. The bill's mandatory collection and retention of sensitive incident records would create a record likely to be sought in subsequent investigations or litigation by the federal government, increasing privacy risks. [...]

SB 1103 would allow the Attorney General or a person acting in the public interest to bring an action for injunctive relief for violations of the retailer's disclosure and documentation requirements. This is troublesome because an injunction can force a retailer to change policies quickly, preserve records, or take down or revise website disclosures on short notice. Even a technical mistake in how an incident is documented, retained, or posted could trigger litigation over whether the company complied with the statute.

Prepared by: Ian Dougherty / JUD. / (916) 651-4113
5/18/26 15:19:39

**** END ****