

Date of Hearing: June 30, 2026

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY
Ash Kalra, Chair
SB 1257 (Arreguín) – As Amended June 24, 2026

SENATE VOTE: 29-8

SUBJECT: FEDERAL IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT: REPORT

SYNOPSIS

On the first day of his second term in office, Donald Trump rescinded the long-standing “sensitive locations” memo which restricted immigration enforcement in and around locations such as schools, hospitals, and domestic violence shelters. The “sensitive locations” memo had recognized that the threat of being detained while seeking necessary, and often emergency, services was detrimental to the health and wellbeing of society at large. In the last year, the Legislature has enacted various statutes mirroring the policy of the original “sensitive locations” memo to attempt to protect California’s immigrant communities in and around specific facilities such as health care facilities, schools, and day cares. Additionally, in the fall of last year, the Attorney General developed a platform available to the public to submit reports of civil rights violations by federal agents. In an effort to provide greater transparency to the public regarding statewide rates of immigration enforcement, this bill requires the Attorney General to disseminate an annual report summarizing reports of immigration enforcement incidents the agency receives from its platform and designated locations, as defined. The bill also authorizes the Attorney General to engage in enforcement actions and impose civil penalties “as needed.” Finally, the bill prohibits the report from releasing personally identifiable information regarding individuals impacted by the immigration enforcement action.

This bill is sponsored by the Latino Coalition for a Healthy California which contends that there is a lack of sufficient accountability and transparency from the state regarding the rates of immigration enforcement throughout California. It enjoys broad support from civil rights organizations, immigrant rights advocates, legal services organizations, labor unions, and health advocates. There is no known opposition. The bill was previously heard by the Assembly Committee on Public Safety where it was approved by a vote of 7-1.

SUMMARY: Requires the Attorney General to post an annual report regarding a summary of reports of immigration enforcement incidents in the state that the department receives. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires the Attorney General, on or before October 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, to submit to the Legislature and post on its internet website, a report that includes all of the following:
 - a) A summary of all immigration enforcement incidents occurring on or after September 1, 2025, conducted by a person at a designated location that have been reported by the designated location or a person who witnessed the activity to the Attorney General, including, but not limited to, reports submitted onsite or through the Attorney General’s federal agent misconduct online portal.

- b) Information of each immigration enforcement incident and activity described above, including, but not limited to, the date of occurrence, the county of occurrence, the type of designated location impacted, the governmental agency involved, and followup or resolution status. Requires the Attorney General to adhere to privacy laws and procedures in reporting the followup or resolutions status to ensure the integrity of the investigations.
 - c) The number of immigration enforcement incidents and activities described above that resulted in legal action regarding the incident or activity's legality and the county or court in which the legal action was filed. Clarifies that a legal action does not include a legal action or administrative proceeding against an individual for the enforcement of federal immigration law or a prosecution of an individual under federal criminal law.
- 2) Authorizes the Attorney General to request representatives of a designated location to furnish any reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities as part of compiling its annual report. Authorizes the Attorney General to issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance.
 - 3) Authorizes the Attorney General to consider whether a designated location is in compliance with other state laws related to immigration enforcement and may take enforcement action to enforce those laws, as needed.
 - 4) Defines the following for purposes of the bill:
 - a) "Designated location" means schoolsites, as defined; health care provider entities, as defined; shelters, including, but not limited to, homeless shelters; polling places; state courthouses; public transportation access points, including, but not limited to, bus stops and transit stations; and state and local government property.
 - b) "Immigration enforcement" means an effort to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of a federal civil immigration law or a federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person's presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in the United States.
 - 5) Prohibits the report required by this bill and any information therein from including either of the following: personally identifiable information regarding an individual stopped, detained, or arrested by an individual conducting an immigration enforcement incident or activity; the physical address of the designated location.

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 Code Section 7284.6.)

- 2) Requires a law enforcement agency that participates in a joint law enforcement task force to annually report to the Department of Justice (DOJ) the purpose of the task force, the agencies involved, the number of arrests made during the reporting period, and the number of people arrested for immigration enforcement purposes. (Government Code Section 7284.6 (c)(1).)
- 3) 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) Requires all public schools, health facilities operated by the state or a political division thereof, and courthouses to implement the Attorney General's model policy, or an equivalent.
 - b) 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. (Government Code Section 7284.8.)
- 4) Prohibits, except as required by state or federal law or as required to administer a state or federally supported educational program, school officials and employees of a local agency from allowing an officer of an agency conducting immigration enforcement to enter a nonpublic area of a school, except as specified. (Education Code Section 234.7 (a)(2).)
- 5) Requires the superintendent of a school district and county office of education, and the principal of a charter school, to report to their respective governing board or body in a timely manner and in a manner that ensures the confidentiality and privacy of any potentially identifying information, any requests for information or access to a schoolsite by an officer or employee of a law enforcement agency for the purpose of enforcing immigration law. (Education Code Section 234.7 (b).)
- 6) Requires the superintendent of a school district or county office of education, and the principal of a charter school, to report to the governing board or body of the local educational agency any requests for information or access to a school site by an officer of a law enforcement agency for immigration enforcement. (Education Code Section 234.7 (c).)
- 7) 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, 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. Requires the Attorney General to consider, at a minimum, all of the following in developing the model policies:
 - a) Procedures related to requests for access to school grounds for purposes related to immigration enforcement;

- b) Procedures for local educational agency employees to notify specified officers of the governing board or body of public or charter schools if an individual requests or gains access to school grounds for purposes related to immigration enforcement; and
 - c) Procedures for responding to requests for personal information about students or their family members for purposes of immigration enforcement. (Education Code Section 234.7 (f).)
- 8) Requires the licensee or administrator of a licensed child daycare facility to report to the AG any requests for information or access to the facility by an officer of a law enforcement agency for immigration enforcement, and permits a license-exempt California state preschool program to do the same. (Health and Safety Code Section 1597.640 (b)(1).)
- 9) Prohibits a health care provider entity and its personnel, unless required by state and federal law, from allowing any person access to the nonpublic areas of the facility for immigration enforcement purposes, unless that person has a valid judicial warrant or court order that specifically grants access to the nonpublic areas of the facility. Defines “health care provider entity” broadly, to include hospitals, clinics, and individual health care providers. (Health and Safety Code Sections 24251 (b), 24252.)
- 10) Requires a health care provider entity, to the extent possible, to establish procedures for monitoring, documenting, and receiving visitors to health care provider entities that are consistent with 9) above, and encourages health care provider entities to post a “notice to authorities” at facility entrances. (Health and Safety Code Section 24250 (a).)
- 11) Requires health care provider entity personnel to notify management, administration, or legal counsel of any request for access to a health care provider entity site or patient for immigration enforcement. (Health and Safety Code Section 24250 (b).)

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

COMMENTS: Since at least 2007, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement (ICE) had identified certain facilities and locations as “sensitive locations” where immigration enforcement actions were limited. The Biden administration reiterated that restriction in a 2021 memo that directed “[t]o the fullest extent possible, [ICE and CBP] should not take enforcement action in or near a location that would restrain people’s access to essential services or engagement in essential activities. Such a location is referred to as a ‘protected area.’” The memo went on to describe a number of protected areas, including “medical or mental healthcare facility, such as a hospital, doctor’s office, health clinic, vaccination or testing site, urgent care center, site that serves pregnant individuals, or community health center,” a “social services establishment, such as a crisis center, domestic violence shelter, victims services center, child advocacy center, supervised visitation center, family justice center, community-based organization, facility that serves disabled persons, homeless shelter, drug or alcohol counseling and treatment facility, or foodbank or pantry or other establishment distributing food or other essentials of life to people in need.” In justifying the directive, the memo stated the “need to consider the fact that an enforcement action taken near – and not necessarily in—the protected area can have the same restraining impact on an individual’s access to the protected area itself. [...] The fundamental question is whether our enforcement action would restrain people from accessing the protected area to receive essential services or engage in essential activities.” (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Guidelines for Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas*, (October

27, 2021) available at: <https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/2022-06/ICE%20-%20Immigration%20Enforcement%20at%20Sensitive%20Locations.pdf>.)

On January 21, 2025, Acting Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Benjamine Huffman rescinded the Biden directive stating that it “thwart[ed] law enforcement in or near so-called ‘sensitive’ areas.” (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Statement from a DHS Spokesperson on Directives Expanding Law Enforcement and Ending the Abuse of Humanitarian Parole* (January 21, 2025) available at:

<https://www.dhs.gov/news/2025/01/21/statement-dhs-spokesperson-directives-expanding-law-enforcement-and-ending-abuse>.) On January 31, 2025, DHS issued a new directive stating they were “not issuing rules regarding where immigration laws are permitted to be enforced. Instead [...] the ICE Director charges Assistant Field Office Directors and Assistant Special Agents in Charge with responsibility for making case-by-case determinations regarding whether, where and when to conduct an immigration enforcement action in or near a protected area.” (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *ICE Directive Common Sense Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas*, (January 31, 2025) available at: <https://www.ice.gov/about-ice/ero/protected-areas>.) In March 2025, the Department issued yet another directive, reverting back to the 2021 policy only in relation to places of worship. (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Enforcement Actions in or Near Places of Worship – Injunction*, (March 2025) available at: <https://www.ice.gov/about-ice/ero/protected-areas>.)

Responding to these changes on the federal level, this Legislature has enacted a number of statutes enacting protections for particularly vulnerable communities at what had been considered “sensitive locations.” AB 495 (C. Rodriguez), Chap. 664, Stats. 2025, required, among its numerous provisions, day care facilities to adopt policies developed by the Attorney General relating to how to respond in the event of an immigration enforcement action, prohibited the collection of information relating to students’ and families’ immigration status, and required day care centers to report to the Attorney General when they received a request for information or access to the day care for the purposes of immigration enforcement. AB 49 (Muratsuchi), Chap. 122, Stats. 2025, expanded some existing provisions of the Education Code to require local education agencies to post “know-your-rights” information regarding immigration enforcement, to adopt the AG’s model policies, and prohibited local education agencies from allowing access to schools for purposes of immigration enforcement without first being presented with a valid judicial warrant. SB 81 (Arreguin), Chap. 123, Stats. 2025, prohibited health care facilities from allowing access to nonpublic areas of a facility and required facility employees to report any request to access the nonpublic areas for purposes of immigration enforcement to management or to their legal counsel.

In addition to the myriad of policy requirements imposed on the AG by the Legislature, the California Department of Justice also took it upon itself last year to develop a reporting mechanism to allow individuals to submit reports of misconduct by federal agents. As noted by the platform, submission of a report does not necessarily require the AG to act, and directs users of the platform to sources for retaining an attorney. According to their press release, the portal “will help the California Department of Justice capture and create a record of potential unlawful conduct by federal agents, such as the use of excessive force, and inform potential actions the Department may take to protect the rights and safety of Californians.” (*California Announces New Online Portal to Report Misconduct by Federal Agents* (December 2, 2025) California Department of Justice available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/california-announces-new-online-portal-report-misconduct-federal-agents>.)

This bill requires the Attorney General to disseminate an annual report capturing a summary of information relating to immigration enforcement incidents and activities in and around “designated locations” since September 1, 2025. Specifically, the report must include the date of each occurrence, the county of the occurrence, the type of designated location impacted and agency involved, and any follow-up or resolution status. The report is also required to specify the number of immigration enforcement incidents “that resulted in legal action regarding the incident or activity’s legality and the county or court in which the legal action was filed,” except where the legal action is an administrative immigration proceeding or prosecution under federal criminal law.

The bill defines “designated location” as schoolsites and health care provider entities, as defined, shelters, including but not limited to homeless shelters; state courthouses; public transportation access points, including but not limited to, bus stops and transit stations; and state and local government property.

In order to develop the report, the bill authorizes the AG to request designated locations provide reports of immigration enforcement incidents and authorizes the AG to “issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this section.” Additionally, the bill authorizes the AG to “consider whether a designated location is in compliance with other state laws related to immigration enforcement” and to take action to enforce those laws “as needed.”

According to the author:

California is recognized for its commitment to human rights and is home to nearly 11 million immigrants. However, the state has seen a marked rise in unjust immigration enforcement. Between January and October 2025, ICE made over 18,000 arrests in California. Recently, ICE actions have impacted communities nationwide, regardless of legal status, and in some cases, resulted in the loss of U.S. citizens' lives. Many California immigrant communities now fear for their safety when leaving their homes.

This increase in fear leads to skipped medical appointments, school absences, and avoiding public areas, resulting in a low quality of life. This is why accountability and transparency are needed regarding ICE activity in and across our state. This bill ensures that designated health locations entities are reporting ICE activity, and that Californians are aware of actions taken to hold entities accountable.

The Attorney General retains broad authority to enforce against violations of any of California’s countless statutes. While existing law requires certain sensitive locations to maintain a record of immigration enforcement activity, and some require those entities to submit reports to the AG regarding immigration enforcement activity, neither requirement is consistent across the implicated statutes. Additionally, in many cases the Legislature intentionally determined it was inadvisable to impose civil penalties on entities that may be the site of immigration enforcement action because, while the statutes imposed some obligation on the entities, the burden of carrying out those obligations is ultimately borne by the staff that appear for work on a daily basis. Therefore, it seemed ill-advised to threaten potential monetary damages on an entity whose staff may also be in precarious circumstances when facing federal agents. Finally, some of the “designated locations” included in this bill, such as courthouses, are not statutorily obligated to report such incidents at all. Considering this past intentional decision regarding financial penalties, the inconsistent application of reporting requirements across “designated locations,” and the already-existing authority for the AG to compel compliance with existing statute, it

seems this bill's provision to "issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity," and take action to enforce those laws "as needed" is superfluous. Moreover, given that the Attorney General likely recognizes that most sensitive locations are also operating under immense pressure and that added civil liability is unlikely to result in effective implementation of existing statute, it seems unlikely that the AG will determine such action to be an effective use of the department's already-limited resources. Understanding the intent of this provision is to encourage compliance with existing requirements relating to the documentation of immigration enforcement actions at sensitive locations, for the purposes of clarity, *the author may wish to consider striking these provisions*. To the extent certain locations that are statutorily required to report incidents of immigration enforcement are failing to do so, it seems that an education campaign may be more appropriately tailored to help bolster compliance.

SB 1257 also understandably attempts to shield the privacy of individuals who may have been subject to an immigration enforcement action at a sensitive location that would otherwise have to be reported by the AG pursuant to the bill's provisions. Specifically, the bill states that the report shall not include either: personally identifiable information regarding an individual stopped, detained, or arrested by an individual conducting an immigration enforcement incident or activity; or the physical address of the designated location. Given, however, that the report *is* required to include the date of occurrence and type of facility impacted, it is not impossible that the mandated report could allow discovery of an individual's identity by implication. For example, if there is only one enforcement action that occurs in a county with only one courthouse, it is possible that the general public could deduce the identity of the individuals affected by that action. In order to avoid unintentionally obligating the AG to release information that could lead to the identification of affected individuals, *the author may wish to consider amending the bill to instead require an aggregated report documenting trends and patterns of practice relating to immigration enforcement across the state*.

Until recently, this bill amended the California Values Act, enacted via SB 54 (De Leon, Chap. 495, Stats. 2017) which limits the use of state and local resources for the purposes of immigration enforcement. The Trump administration challenged the statute and on appeal the Ninth Circuit upheld the law, concluding that because federal immigration law is silent on the role of state or local governments in immigration enforcement, and SB 54 was focused on *state and local* agencies, the law was not preempted. (*United States v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865.) Although the Administration appealed the Ninth Circuit decision, the Supreme Court declined to hear the case, leaving the provisions of SB 54 valid and enforceable law in California. Recognizing the importance of the Values Act in protecting Californians, the Legislature has taken great pains to avoid opening the statute up to potential new litigation. Recognizing this risk, the author recently amended the bill to remove the statute from the Government Code entirely, instead creating a new statute in the Penal Code in a chapter addressing the administration and responsibilities of the Department of Justice. This bill is now, therefore, largely outside of this Committee's jurisdiction and solely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Public Safety, which previously analyzed and heard this measure.

ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT: This bill is sponsored by the Latino Coalition for a Healthy California. It enjoys broad support from civil rights organizations, immigrant rights advocates, legal services organizations, labor unions, and health advocates. In support of the measure the sponsors submit:

From January to October 2025, over 18,000 ICE arrests occurred in the state. This increase in activity requires a constant commitment to maintain accountability for all individuals and entities found in unlawful immigration-related activities. It is a fundamental responsibility of the Attorney General to ensure that those who participate in these activities are held accountable through appropriate legal measures.

The lack of accountability and transparency from the state allows ICE enforcement to continue to commit violations and stoke fear within California. This increase in fear can lead Californians to skip medical appointments, not attend school, and avoid public areas. As a result, this leads to a low quality of life.

Although the state is collecting information on misconduct by a federal agency for the California Attorney General, the data needs to be made public, and violators need to be held accountable. The state's current lack of accountability and transparency regarding the number and locations of violations. This undermines public trust and will lead to a lack of confidence in the community to report future violations.

A public report on ICE activity, including unlawful enforcement, is key to accountability and transparency for the safety of all Californians. SB1257 will require the Attorney General to publish an annual report on immigration incidents and activities that happen in California. Finally, the Attorney General is authorized to ensure compliance through penalties or other enforcement activities.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Latino Coalition for a Healthy California (sponsor)
Access Reproductive Justice
ACLU California Action
Alliance for a Better Community (UNREG)
Asian Americans for Community Involvement
Asian Resources, INC.
Asociacion De Migrantes Guatemaltecos Los Angeles
Berkeley; City of
Buen Vecino
California Community Foundation
California Consortium for Urban Indian Health
California Coverage Health Initiatives (CCHI)
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
California Immigrant Policy Center
California Latinas for Reproductive Justice
California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network
California Pan - Ethnic Health Network
California Physicians Alliance
California Public Defenders Association
California Teachers Association
Campaign for College Opportunity
Celestria Health
Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)

Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)
Coalition of California Welfare Rights Organizations
Coalition of Orange County Community Health Centers
Community Health Partnership
Courage California
El Arc De California
Emeryville; City of
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
Empowering Pacific Islander Communities (EPIC) Fiscally Sponsored by Community Partners
Farm2people
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Health4kern
Healthy Contra Costa
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
JWCH Institute
Lideres Campesinas
Multicultural Institute
Oakland; City of
Oasis Legal Services
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Orange County Labor Federation, AFL-CIO
Rubicon Programs
San Francisco Aids Foundation
Santa Cruz Community Health
SEIU California
Soledad; City of
South Asian Network
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
Thai Community Development Center
The Black Alliance for Just Immigration
The Children's Partnership
The Los Angeles Trust for Children's Health
Todec Legal Center
Transitions Clinic Network
Trial Impact Project
Unidosus
Vision Y Compromiso (UNREG)
Western Center on Law & Poverty, INC.

Opposition

None on file

Analysis Prepared by: Manuela Boucher-de la Cadena / JUD. / (916) 319-2334