

SENATE THIRD READING
SB 1160 (Durazo)
As Amended August 13, 2026
Majority vote

SUMMARY

Establishes a timeline, based on a Judicial Council assessment, by which county courts will report to the Judicial Council specified data and requires the Judicial Council to post this information in an electronic spreadsheet on its website by January 1, 2034.

Major Provisions

- 1) Requires the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2032, to assess the timeline by which each county court has the ability to submit data on unlawful detainer cases to the Judicial Council, utilizing an automated data collection system. 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, 2033, the county courts identified by the Judicial Council as able to report to the Judicial Council using an automated data collection system 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, 2034, *all* county courts to report the data points specified in 1) above to the Judicial Council utilizing an automated data collection system on a quarterly basis, aggregated by ZIP Code of the premises subject of the action.
- 4) Requires the Judicial Council, beginning January 1, 2034, 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.
- 5) Specifies that implementation of the above is contingent upon funding, as specified.

COMMENTS

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.

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. The bill would require the Judicial Council, by July 1, 2032, to assess the timeline by which each county court has the ability to submit data using an automated data collection system. The bill would require the counties identified by the Judicial Council as having the capacity to begin submitting data by January 1, 2033. All other counties would begin submitting the data by January 1, 2034.

According to the Author

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.

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 delayed 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.]

FISCAL COMMENTS

According to the Assembly Appropriations Committee, 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.

Costs may be reduced by delayed implementation and flexibility in automated data collection system.

VOTES

SENATE FLOOR: 39-0-1

YES: Allen, Alvarado-Gil, Archuleta, Arreguín, Ashby, Becker, Blakespear, Cabaldon, Caballero, Cervantes, Choi, Cortese, Durazo, Gonzalez, Grayson, Grove, Hurtado, Jones, Laird, Limón, McGuire, McNerney, Menjivar, Niello, Ochoa Bogh, Padilla, Pérez, Reyes, Richardson, Rubio, Seyarto, Smallwood-Cuevas, Stern, Strickland, Umberg, Valladares, Wahab, Weber Pierson, Wiener

ABS, ABST OR NV: Dahle

ASM JUDICIARY: 9-2-1

YES: Kalra, Bauer-Kahan, Bryan, Connolly, Harabedian, Pacheco, Papan, Stefani, Zbur

NO: Macedo, Sanchez

ABS, ABST OR NV: Dixon

ASM APPROPRIATIONS: 11-4-0

YES: Wicks, Arambula, Calderon, Caloza, Fong, Mark González, Krell, Pacheco, Pellerin, Sharp-Collins, Solache

NO: Hoover, Dixon, Ta, Tangipa

UPDATED

VERSION: August 13, 2026

CONSULTANT: Tom Clark / JUD. / (916) 319-2334

FN: 0003532