

Date of Hearing: June 23, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Ash Kalra, Chair
SB 1160 (Durazo) – As Amended June 18, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 39-0

SUBJECT: JUDICIAL COUNCIL: EVICTION DATA REPORTING

SYNOPSIS

According to the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), landlords submitted nearly 136,000 tenant eviction filings in the fiscal year ending in 2024, with most evictions based on failure to pay rent. A PPIC survey found that 4% of all Californians and 13% of low-income households reported that they faced the threat of eviction in 2024. Overall, PPIC found that evictions rates had leveled off in 2024, though efforts to track evictions over recent years are skewed by the fact that evictions declined sharply when the COVID crisis resulted in limitations on evictions, then rose sharply when those restrictions were lifted. PPIC found that eviction rates varied widely across counties, from a high of 38 filings per 1,000 renter households (San Bernardino County) to a low of 8 per 1,000 renter households (Santa Cruz County). However, such aggregate county-level numbers do not always tell as much as policy makers might like to know about outcomes or how trends vary within a county.

According to the author and supporters of this bill, more granular data on evictions will provide legislators, local policymakers, and service providers with information that would help develop more targeted measures to address problems of housing stability. Specifically, the bill establishes a timeline for county courts to begin submitting data to the Judicial Council of California, aggregated by the ZIP Code of the premises subject to unlawful detainer (eviction) filings. The required data points are (1) cases filed each month; (2) cases that were subject to default, stipulated, and other types of pretrial and posttrial judgments; and (3) cases that were dismissed at the plaintiff's (landlord's) request or by order of the court. Beginning July 1, 2027, the Judicial Council will assess which county courts will have the capacity to submit the data points required by the bill through the existing Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Beginning January 1, 2028, county courts identified by the Judicial Council as able to submit the information will begin to do so on a quarterly basis. On or before January 1, 2029, all county courts will use JBSIS to submit the data on a quarterly basis, aggregated by ZIP Code. Finally, beginning January 1, 2029, the bill requires the Judicial Council to format the information received in an electronic spreadsheet and to make the spreadsheet available on its internet website.

The bill is supported by a broad coalition of affordable housing and tenant advocacy groups. It is opposed by several regional organizations representing landlords, who claim that the bill raises privacy concerns, and that aggregated data could be "misinterpreted" without proper context. The bill is also opposed by the Judicial Council of California for cost and feasibility reasons, though it is not entirely clear if the recent amendments establishing additional time for county courts to comply will alter the Judicial Council's position.

SUMMARY: Establishes a timeline, based on a Judicial Council assessment, by which each county court will report to the Judicial Council specified data on unlawful detainer actions, and requires the Judicial Council to post this information in an electronic spreadsheet on its website by January 1, 2029. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2027, to assess the timeline by which each county court has the ability to submit data on unlawful detainer cases to the Judicial Council, utilizing the Judicial Branch Statistical Information (JBSIS). Requires submissions to contain the following data points:
 - a) Cases filed each month.
 - b) Cases that were subject to default, stipulated, or other types of pretrial and posttrial judgements.
 - c) Cases that were dismissed at the plaintiff's request or by order of the court.
- 2) Requires, beginning January 1, 2028, the county courts identified by the Judicial Council as able to report to the Judicial Council using JBSIS to submit the data points specified in 1) above, on a quarterly basis and aggregated by the ZIP Code of the premises subject to action.
- 3) Requires, on or before January 1, 2029, *all* county courts to report the data points specified in 1) above to the Judicial Council utilizing JBSIS on a quarterly basis, aggregated by ZIP Code of the premises subject of the action.
- 4) Requires the Judicial Council, beginning January 1, 2029, and annually thereafter, to format the information submitted by the county courts into an electronic spreadsheet and publicly post the spreadsheet on its internet website. Specifies that the data shall be aggregated by ZIP Code; however, if any county has an average of 100 or fewer unlawful detainer case filings during the previous five fiscal years, that county's data shall only be provided in the electronic spreadsheet at the county level.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Establishes procedures for obtaining possession of real property, including an unlawful detainer action against a tenant who unlawfully remains in possession of rental property, and sets timelines regarding the filing of a complaint and the defendant's response, including a demurrer or motion to strike, as specified. (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1159 *et seq.*)
- 2) Establishes the Judicial Council and requires the adoption of rules for court administration, practice, and procedures. Requires county clerks and the clerks of courts of record to keep such records and make such reports to the Judicial Council, in the manner and at such times, as the Chair of the Judicial Council requires, respecting the condition and manner of disposal of judicial business in their respective courts. (California Constitution Article VI, Section 6; Government Code Section 68505.)
- 3) Establishes the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), consistent with the constitutional and statutory provisions in 2) above. Declares that the purpose of JBSIS is to provide accurate, consistent, and timely information for the Judicial Branch, the Legislature, and other state agencies that require information from the courts to fulfill their mandates.

Provides further that each trial court must collect and report information to the Judicial Council according to its capability and level of automation as prescribed by the *JBSIS Manual* adopted by the Judicial Council. (California Rule of Court 10.400.)

FISCAL EFFECT: As currently in print this bill is keyed fiscal.

COMMENTS: According to the author, SB 1160 “sheds light on California’s eviction process by addressing the lack of comprehensive residential eviction data in California.” The author explains further:

Specifically, SB 1160 brings data transparency and access to key eviction statistics including the number of eviction proceedings initiated, the number of tenants and landlords represented by counsel, and the geographical distribution of these cases.

California's housing crisis has reached alarming levels. As of 2022, nearly one-third of renters in the state faced housing cost burdens, and by 2023 the homeless population had increased by 53% over the past decade. Eviction plays a significant role in the path to homelessness, and understanding eviction patterns is critical to developing strategies to mitigate housing instability. However, eviction data is currently not publicly available and often requires individual requests to access. This lack of transparency hampers efforts to track eviction trends and make data-driven decisions that can alleviate homelessness.

Access to this data will help policymakers tackle the deepening housing crisis across the state. With Senate Bill 1160, the state and local jurisdictions can implement targeted solutions to prevent homelessness. We have the opportunity and the responsibility to act now by ensuring that accurate, official data is collected and made accessible to guide our own decisions.

Eviction Rates and the Unlawful Detainer Process in California. According to a recent report by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), landlords submitted nearly 136,000 tenant eviction filings in the fiscal year ending in 2024, most of which were based on failure to pay rent. A PPIC survey found that 4% of all Californians and 13% of low-income households reported that they faced the threat of eviction in 2024. Overall, PPIC found that evictions rates had leveled off in 2024, though efforts to track evictions over recent years are skewed by the fact that evictions declined sharply when the COVID crisis resulted in limitations on evictions, then rose sharply when those restrictions were lifted. PPIC found that eviction rates varied widely across counties, from a high of 38 filings per 1,000 renter households (San Bernardino County) to a low of 8 per 1,000 renter households (Santa Cruz County).

Eviction of a tenant for failure to pay rent typically begins when the landlord serves the tenant with a three-day notice to “pay or quit” (that is, pay the amount of rent due or vacate the premises). If the tenant fails to pay or move out within the three days, the landlord may file an unlawful detainer (UD) complaint with the court for recovery of the property. The landlord must simultaneously serve a copy of the complaint and a summons on the tenant. Because the UD action is considered a “summary” proceeding, timelines are accelerated. The tenant has only 10 days to file an answer to the UD complaint. If the tenant does not respond within 10 days, the court may grant a default judgment to the landlord. If the tenant responds on time, however, then the court must hear the matter within 20 days (subject to certain delays). If, after trial, the judge decides in the landlord’s favor, the landlord is provided with a “writ of possession” that

authorizes a sheriff's deputy to remove the tenant and their property from the premises. The deputy will post a notice on the property, warning the tenant that they have five days to vacate the premises or be physically removed.

Of course, not all three-day notices to "pay or quit" result in the landlord filing an unlawful detainer action in court, and not all unlawful detainer filings result in a hearing or trial, much less a physical eviction. As the brief summary of the process above suggests, there are many points throughout the process where the issue can be resolved. Having more accurate data about how this process typically unfolds on the ground might allow lawmakers and local officials to fashion more thoughtfully timed and targeted policy interventions. As the author and supporters of this measure point out, finding ways to resolve issues in ways that avoid evictions is especially critical at a time when California is facing high rents, scarce housing, and unconscionable levels of homelessness.

This bill seeks to arm policymakers and legal service providers with information that will help them target limited resources toward those places, and at those points in the process, where intervention will be most helpful. The bill does not change any aspect of existing landlord-tenant law or tilt the balance in favor of one side or the other. Rather, the bill seeks data so that future legislative and policy proposals will proceed in a more informed manner. The bill, as recently amended, develops a staggered timeline that requires county courts to begin providing the Judicial Council with specific data points regarding the eviction process on a quarterly basis.

An earlier version of the bill would have required all county courts to provide information on the outcome of unlawful detainer actions, on a monthly basis and by broken down by the ZIP Code of the premises subject to the unlawful detainer. However, addressing concerns raised by the Judicial Council, the author recently amended the bill to require only quarterly (instead of monthly) reports and to establish a timeline that allows county courts to begin reporting as they develop the capacity to do so. Specifically, the bill in print now requires the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2027, to assess the timeline by which each county court will have the ability to submit the required data points utilizing the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS), the existing system through which county clerks and clerks of the court submit to the Judicial Council information on the operation of the courts and the administration of justice. Beginning on January 1, 2028, the bill would require each county that has been identified by the Judicial Council as capable of doing so to begin reporting data. The bill would require the Judicial Council, beginning January 1, 2029, and annually thereafter, to format the information received in an electronic spreadsheet and publicly post the spreadsheet on its internet website.

The bill requires the county courts to submit the following data points: (1) the UD cases filed each month; (2) the cases subject to default, stipulated, and other types of pretrial or posttrial judgments; (3) the cases that were dismissed at the plaintiff's request or by order of the court. Most significantly – and perhaps most difficult – the bill requires the county court to report these data points by the ZIP Code of the premises that is the subject to the UD action. The bill similarly requires the spreadsheet based on this information and posted by the Judicial Council to aggregate the data by ZIP Code.

Judicial Council concerns. The Judicial Council opposed the earlier version of this bill that would have required *all* county courts to submit this data on a monthly basis beginning on January 1, 2027. The Judicial Council points out that some courts, including Los Angeles County, had the capacity to submit the data by ZIP Code as required, but most others do not. In

consideration of these concerns, as noted above, the author amended the bill to require only quarterly reporting and established the timeline that would require courts that had the capacity to do so to begin reporting by January 1, 2028, and to require all others to begin reporting by January 1, 2029. However, the Judicial Council remains concerned about the potential costs and staff time that will be needed to change the way that the courts collect and categorize case information. Clearly, it is possible for the courts to categorize and report the information by ZIP Code, given that Los Angeles County already does so. However, while it is certainly possible for other counties to do so, the Judicial Council raises a valid question: Will the benefit derived from the granularity of ZIP Code-level data be worth the costs and staff time that will be needed to develop a new method of identifying and tracking cases. While the author and supporters make the quite sound argument that accurate data on UD outcomes will allow legislators to make better informed and targeted policies, it is not entirely clear how having the data broken down by ZIP Code would result in crafting different policies or procedures. The data may end up simply affirming what we already know or suspect: that evictions are highest in low income neighborhoods where people struggle to make the rent. Having said that, more granular data is always more helpful than less granular data.

“Privacy” and “Misinterpretation” concerns appear to be overstated. The bill is opposed by several regional apartment and property owners’ associations. In addition to sharing the Judicial Council concerns about the burden on the courts, these associations raise two additional points. First, they claim that collecting and posting this data will create significant privacy concerns, for both tenants and landlords. Privacy is indeed a concern for tenants, which is why existing law masks court records in unlawful detainer cases for limited periods of time, and in some cases permanently depending upon the outcome of the case. In general, if the landlord prevails, the records become public after 60 days. If the tenant prevails, the records may be masked permanently. (Code of Civil Procedure Section 1162.1.) Nothing in this bill changes that. Moreover, privacy risks to either tenant or landlord seems minimal given that the county courts will only provide “data points” (essentially outcomes) aggregated by ZIP Code. The spreadsheet posted by the Judicial Council will, presumably, not contain personal identifying information, but merely aggregate statistics. Second, the opponents argue that data could be “misinterpreted” without proper context. While this is certainly true, one could argue more persuasively that the less granular, county-level data collected now is even more subject to misinterpretation.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: The Legal Aid Association of California (LAAC), whose member organizations provide legal services to low income communities, supports this bill for the following reasons:

As a membership organization for legal service providers specializing in eviction defense, we are familiar with the lack of comprehensive data and the struggles our members face when protecting their clients from becoming unhoused. The organizations we proudly represent are experts on the housing crisis and the hardships that come with being a renter in California. Since California does not publish thorough residential eviction data, trends and patterns in housing remain inaccessible to the public. Reports from the Little Hoover Commission showed that in 2022, nearly one-third of California owners were cost-burdened, and by 2023, our state’s homeless population had grown by 53% compared to a decade prior.

Individuals are far more likely to end up in homelessness following an eviction, and understanding eviction trends is key to local and statewide efforts to mitigate

homelessness. However, ascertaining precise data regarding trends in eviction filings and geographic variation in evictions is very difficult. California's eviction data is currently available by request only, not through the state's judicial branch website. Without precise data to know the number of evictions during a period, where the evictions are happening and how those numbers are changing, policy makers and service providers cannot develop and implement the best solutions to these problems.

ARGUMENTS IN OPPOSITION: The Rental Housing Association, the California Association of Realtors, and several regional apartment owner associations oppose this bill. Writing of the March 23 version of the bill, they contend:

Requiring reporting at the ZIP Code level still presents meaningful privacy concerns for both tenants and housing providers. In smaller or less densely populated communities, this level of granularity may allow for the identification of individual cases or properties, exposing sensitive legal and financial information and increasing the risk of stigma or harassment. Moreover, no database is foolproof, and today data breaches are a critical, high-risk concern and can expose significant amounts of sensitive and confidential data, such as eviction records.

Moreover, SB 1160 continues to impose substantial ongoing and costly administrative burdens on already strained court systems by requiring receipt and processing of reported unlawful detainer data by the Judicial Council. Courts across California continue to face resource constraints and case backlogs, and this mandate diverts already limited court resources away from core judicial functions without providing dedicated funding or staffing to support implementation.

Third, the bill requires the Judicial Council to compile and publish eviction data in a publicly accessible format, which, while intended to support policymaking, may lead to misleading or incomplete conclusions. Eviction filings are often influenced by a wide range of factors—including economic conditions, local regulations, and tenant protections—and raw data, without proper context, risks being misinterpreted leading to poor policy decision making. Additionally, the bill creates a framework where publicly accessible eviction data could be used in ways that discourage housing providers from utilizing lawful eviction processes when necessary. This may result in unintended consequences, including reduced willingness to rent to higher-risk applicants, ultimately limiting housing access for those most in need.

Finally, while increased data collection may have value, SB 1160 does not adequately address data standardization, security, accuracy, or the significant implementation challenges across California's diverse court systems. Without clear and consistent methodologies, the resulting data may not achieve the bill's intended purpose of informing for effective housing policy.

The Judicial Council of California also opposes this bill, not because they do not see the value of the data, but rather because requiring county courts to collect and report ZIP Code level data will be costly in terms of both money and staff time. The Judicial Council points out that while the Los Angeles County system has the ability to extract ZIP Code-level information, most other counties do not. The Judicial Council writes:

[Until] costly system updates could be implemented statewide, court clerks would be required to manually track each unlawful detainer case and keep updating the tracking method each time a change in the case occurs—requiring multiple touch points throughout each case. Valuable court clerk time spent tracking this information takes clerk time away from processing other important cases.

[Note: The recent amendments establishing a timeline for courts to submit data appears to address the Judicial Council’s concerns somewhat, but it is not clear if the recent amendments are enough to remove their opposition entirely.]

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Abundant Housing LA
ACCE Action
Access Reproductive Justice
All Home
Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment
Berkeley Rent Stabilization Board
Bet Tzedek Legal Services
California Coalition for Rural Housing
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California Women’s Law Center
Canal Alliance
Center for Community Action and Environmental Justice
Centro Cultural De México
Centro Legal De LA Raza
Coalition for Economic Survival
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
Communities for a Better Environment
Community Action Marin
Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement
Council of Mexican Federations in North America
Courage California
Debt Collective
Democratic Socialists of America, Los Angeles
Disability Rights California
East Bay Community Law Center
East Bay Housing Organizations
East Yard Communities for Environmental Justice
Ground Game LA
Health in Partnership
Homelessness Hub At UC San Diego
Housing California
Housing Now!
Housing Rights Center
Imperial Valley Equity & Justice Coalition
Inland Southern California United Way

Inner City Law Center
Inquilinos Unidos (United Tenants)
Justice in Aging
Keep LA Housed Coalition
LA Forward
LA Voice
Latino Equality Alliance
Legal Aid Association of California
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles
Legal Aid of Marin
Legal Aid of Sonoma County
Legal Services of Northern California
Long Beach Residents Empowered
Los Angeles County
Los Angeles Right to Counsel Coalition
Michelson Center for Public Policy
Monterey County Renters United
Monterrey County Renters United
Movement Legal
National Coalition for a Civil Right to Counsel
North Bay Organizing Project
People Organized for Westside Renewal
Public Interest Law Project
Public Advocates
Public Counsel
Public Justice Center
Resilience Orange County
Rise Economy
Starting Over
Starting Over Strong
Strategic Actions for a Just Economy
Tech Equity
Techequity Collaborative
Tenants Together
Tenants United Anaheim
Thai Community Development Center
The Eviction Research Network
The Public Interest Law Project
United Ways of California
Urban Habitat
Western Center on Law & Poverty
What We All Deserve

Opposition

Apartment Association of Greater Los Angeles
Apartment Association of Orange County
Berkeley Property Owner's Association
California Rental Housing Association

East Bay Rental Housing Association
Judicial Council of California
Nor Cal Rental Property Association
North Valley Rental Property Association
Santa Barbara Rental Property Association
Small Property Owners of San Francisco Institute
Southern California Rental Housing Association

Analysis Prepared by: Tom Clark / JUD. / (916) 319-2334