

Date of Hearing: August 5, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Buffy Wicks, Chair

SB 1160 (Durazo) – As Amended June 18, 2026

Policy Committee: Judiciary

Vote: 9 - 2

Urgency: No

State Mandated Local Program: No

Reimbursable: No

SUMMARY:

This bill establishes a staggered timeline by which each county court system reports specified unlawful detainer case data to the Judicial Council, aggregated by ZIP Code, and requires the Judicial Council to publicly post that data beginning January 1, 2029.

More specifically, this bill:

- 1) Requires the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2027, to assess the timeline by which each county court system will have the ability to submit specified unlawful detainer data points to the Judicial Council utilizing the Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS).
- 2) Specifies the data points as cases filed each month; cases subject to default, stipulated, and other types of pretrial and posttrial judgments; and cases dismissed at the plaintiff's request or by order of the court.
- 3) Requires, beginning January 1, 2028, county court systems identified by the Judicial Council as able to report through JBSIS to submit the specified data points quarterly, aggregated by ZIP Code of the premises that is the subject of the action.
- 4) Requires, on or before January 1, 2029, all county court systems to report the specified data points through JBSIS quarterly, aggregated by ZIP Code of the premises that is the subject of the action.
- 5) Requires the Judicial Council, beginning January 1, 2029, and annually thereafter, to format the reported information in an electronic spreadsheet and publicly post the spreadsheet on the Judicial Council's internet website, aggregated by ZIP Code, except that a county averaging 100 or fewer unlawful detainer filings over the previous five fiscal years is reported only at the county level.

FISCAL EFFECT:

One-time costs of \$6.1 million to create the system and onboard all 58 courts, and ongoing costs of \$5.4 million annually to regularly validate, host, and securely post the data on the website (General Fund, Trial Court Trust Fund). According to the Judicial Council, these costs include staffing at the courts, and likely a systems analyst to verify the information prior to submission to the Judicial Council, with larger staffing needs at the Judicial Council to verify and combine data from all 58 courts. Funding would largely be from the General Fund, with smaller amounts of funding for staffing time being allocated to the Trial Court Trust Fund.

The Judicial Council points out that some courts, including Los Angeles County, have the capacity to submit the data by ZIP Code as required, but that most county court systems do not currently capture the ZIP code of the premises in a form that can be extracted for reporting, and case management system modification would be required across the majority of the 58 superior courts, followed by ongoing costs to gather, validate, and post the data. According to the Judicial Council, until system updates are implemented, court clerks would manually track each unlawful detainer case and update the tracking method at each change in case status, requiring multiple touch points throughout each case, diverting clerk time from other case processing.

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Purpose.** 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 states that eviction data is currently available by request only rather than through the judicial branch website, and that without precise data on the number, location, and trend of evictions, policymakers and service providers cannot develop the best solutions.
- 2) **Background.** An unlawful detainer action is the summary civil proceeding by which a landlord recovers possession of rental property. The Judicial Council maintains public caseload data through the Court Statistics Report, which includes unlawful detainer filings, dispositions, clearance rates, and time to disposition, but reports at the county rather than the ZIP Code level. According to the Assembly Judiciary Committee analysis, the Public Policy Institute of California reported nearly 136,000 tenant eviction filings in the fiscal year ending in 2024, with eviction rates varying widely across counties, from 38 filings per 1,000 renter households in San Bernardino County to eight per 1,000 in Santa Cruz County. Reporting under this bill occurs through JBSIS, the existing system through which trial courts report caseload information to the Judicial Council. Under the California Rules of Court, each trial court collects and reports information to the Judicial Council according to its capability and level of automation.
- 3) **Support and Opposition.** This bill is supported by a broad coalition of affordable housing, legal services, and tenant advocacy organizations, including the Legal Aid Association of California, Housing California, Western Center on Law & Poverty, Tenants Together, and the County of Los Angeles, who state that granular eviction data is necessary to target limited legal services and policy interventions. The Judicial Council opposes on cost and feasibility grounds. The property owner associations raise privacy concerns regarding identifiability in less densely populated ZIP Codes, the administrative burden on courts absent dedicated funding, and the risk that data published without context may be misinterpreted.
- 4) **Related Legislation.** SB 768 (Durazo), of the 2025-26 Legislative Session, was substantially similar to this bill and additionally required reporting on party representation by counsel. SB 768 was held on the Senate Appropriations suspense file.
- 5) **Prior Legislation.** AB 875 (Gabriel), of the 2023-24 Legislative Session, was substantially similar to this bill and was vetoed. In his veto message, the Governor stated that the bill could cost the state millions of dollars and must be considered as part of the annual budget process.