

Date of Hearing: July 15, 2025

Counsel: Ilan Zur

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

SB 841 (Rubio) – As Amended June 19, 2025

**SUMMARY:** Prohibits an employee of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider from allowing immigration enforcement activity in the nonpublic areas of the facility without a valid warrant or court order. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Prohibits an employee of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider from, to the extent possible, allowing access to the nonpublic areas of the site for immigration enforcement activity without a valid judicial warrant or court order, except as required by state or federal law, or as required to administer a state or federally supported protected provider.
- 2) Requires a director of a such a provider, or their designee, to grant access if provided all of the following:
  - a) A valid identification;
  - b) A written statement of purpose; and,
  - c) A valid judicial warrant.
- 3) Defines “immigration enforcement” to include any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal civil immigration law, and also includes any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person’s presence in, entry, or reentry to, or employment in, the United States.
- 4) Contains a severability clause.

**EXISTING FEDERAL LAW**

- 1) Prohibits the federal government from “conscripting” the states to enforce federal regulatory programs. (U.S. Const., 10th Amend.)
- 2) Prohibits a federal, state, or local government entity or official from prohibiting, or in any way restricting, any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual. (8 U.S.C. §§ 1373, 1644.)

**EXISTING STATE LAW**

- 1) Prohibits, except as otherwise required by federal law, a public or private employer from providing voluntary consent to an immigration enforcement agent to enter any nonpublic area of a place of labor, unless the agent provides a judicial warrant, and specifies civil penalties, enforceable by the Labor Commissioner or the Attorney General (AG), for an employer who violates this prohibition. (Gov. Code, § 7285.1, subs. (b)-(c).)
- 2) Provides that the above prohibition does not preclude an employer from taking the agent to a nonpublic area, where employees are not present, to verify whether the agent has a warrant, provided that no consent to search the nonpublic areas is given in the process. (Gov. Code, § 7285.1, subd. (c).)
- 3) Prohibits, except as otherwise required by federal law, a public or private employer from providing voluntary consent to an immigration enforcement agent to access, review, or obtain the employer's employee records without a subpoena or judicial warrant, except for access to I-9 employment eligibility verification forms or other documents for which a Notice of Inspection has been provided to the employer, and establishes specified civil penalties for a violation of this prohibition. (Gov. Code, § 7285.2.)
- 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 school district, county office of education, or charter school from collecting information or documents regarding citizenship or immigration status of pupils or their family members. (Ed. Code, § 234.7, subd. (a).)
- 5) Requires the AG, 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 ensure that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. (Gov. Code, § 7284.8, subd. (a).)
- 6) Establishes the California Values Act, which prohibits law enforcement agencies from using agency or department money or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, subject to specified exemptions. (Gov. Code, §§ 7282.5, 7284.6.)
- 7) Provides that the Values Act does not restrict any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, federal immigration authorities information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of an individual, as specified. (Gov. Code, § 7284.6, subd. (e).)

**FISCAL EFFECT:** Unknown

**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, "Federal policy has traditionally designated domestic violence shelters, homeless shelters, rape crisis centers, and courthouses as locations protected from immigration and customs enforcement. However, this longstanding policy was rescinded in January under the current presidential administration – and since

then, these locations have reported a chilling effect and significant anxiety over this policy change.

“Immigrant survivors of domestic violence already face many barriers to accessing support, and after the recent policy change, they may be even less likely to seek assistance due to the fear of detention and deportation. In addition, immigration status and the threat of deportation can be used as a tool of coercive control by perpetrators of domestic violence and sexual assault, through threats of reporting survivors’ immigration statuses to the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency (ICE). This fear of ICE can have a significant effect in reducing the willingness of survivors to seek help.

“When survivors are too afraid to seek help, it makes our communities less safe. SB 841 strengthens public safety and equity by ensuring that all survivors—regardless of immigration status—can access emergency support without fear of government action. It is clear that in the absence of compassionate federal policy, the state must take action to ensure domestic violence shelters and similar locations are seen as safe spaces for the vulnerable people who need their services. We have already seen domestic violence organizations impacted by immigration enforcement actions in Los Angeles.”

## 2) **Background:**

### *a) Increased Federal Immigration Enforcement*

President Trump has vowed to carry out the largest deportation program in U.S. history during his second term. The White House has set a goal of 1 million annual deportations.<sup>1</sup>

On January 20, 2025, the President issued an order titled “Protecting the American People Against Invasion.” The order states that “[i]t is the policy of the United States to faithfully execute the immigration laws against all inadmissible and removable aliens, particularly those aliens who threaten the safety or security of the American people. Further, it is the policy of the United States to achieve the total and efficient enforcement of those laws, including through lawful incentives and detention capabilities.”<sup>2</sup> Notable provisions of this order include: 1) directing the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to set enforcement priorities, emphasizing criminal histories; 2) establishing Homeland Security Task Forces in each state; 3) requiring all noncitizens to register with DHS, with civil and criminal penalties for failure to register; 4) directing DHS to collect all civil fines and penalties from undocumented individuals, such as for unlawful entry or attempted unlawful entry; 5) expanding the use of expedited removal; 6) building more detention facilities; 7) encouraging federal/state cooperation, as specified; 8) encouraging voluntary departure, as specified; 9) limiting access to humanitarian parole and Temporary Protected Status; 10) directing the U.S. AG and DHS to ensure that “sanctuary” jurisdictions do not receive access to federal funds; 11) reviewing federal grants to non-profits assisting undocumented persons and

---

<sup>1</sup> Politico, *Trump got \$170 billion for immigration. Now he has to enact it* (July 5, 2025), available at: <https://www.politico.com/news/2025/07/05/trump-got-170-billion-for-immigration-now-he-has-to-enact-it-00439785>

<sup>2</sup> The White House, *Protecting the American People Against Invasion* (Jan. 20, 2025), available at: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/protecting-the-american-people-against-invasion/>

denying public benefits to undocumented persons; and 12) hiring more U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) officers.<sup>3</sup>

Immigration arrests have significantly increased since President Trump's second term began.<sup>4</sup> Just last month, protests grew in Los Angeles (L.A.) in response to widespread immigration enforcement activity throughout the area. From June 6 to June 22 federal immigration enforcement teams arrested 1,618 immigrants for deportation in L.A. and surrounding Southern California regions.<sup>5</sup> In response to the protests, President Trump deployed National Guard troops and Marines to L.A. over the objection of state officials.<sup>6</sup> Immigration raids have continued throughout L.A. in the weeks since the protests, prompting residents to stay home out of fear of being detained.<sup>7</sup> Most of the persons arrested by ICE from June 1 to June 10 had never been charged with a crime.<sup>8</sup>

*b) Rescission of the ICE Sensitive Locations Memo*

DHS has had standing guidance prohibiting immigration authorities from conducting enforcement actions in certain “sensitive locations,” including schools, hospitals, and churches, unless exigent circumstances existed, prior approval was obtained, or other law enforcement actions have led officers to a sensitive location, as specified.<sup>9</sup> In 2021, the Biden Administration issued a memo expanding these sensitive places to include, as pertains to this bill, social service establishments, 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 food bank or pantry or other establishment distributing food or other essentials of life to people in need.<sup>10</sup> 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.”<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Albert Sun, *Immigration Arrests Are Up Sharply in Every State. Here Are the Numbers*, New York Times (June 27, 2025), available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2025/06/27/us/ice-arrests-trump.html>

<sup>5</sup> Andrea Castillo, *More than 1600 immigrants detained in Southern California this month, DHS says*, Los Angeles Times (June 25, 2025), available at: <https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2025-06-25/more-than-1-600-immigrants-detained-in-southern-california-this-month-dhs-says>

<sup>6</sup> Bill Hutchinson, *LA protests timeline: How ICE raids sparked demonstrations and Trump to send in the military*, ABC News (June 11, 2025), available at: <https://abcnews.go.com/US/timeline-ice-raids-sparked-la-protests-prompted-trump/story?id=122688437>.)

<sup>7</sup> Vives, et. al., *L.A. neighborhoods clear out as immigration raids send people underground*, Los Angeles Times (June 15, 2025), available at: <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-06-15/some-l-a-neighborhoods-clear-out-as-immigration-raids-push-people-underground>

<sup>8</sup> Rachel Uranga, *Most nabbed in L.A. raids were men with no criminal conviction, picked up off the street*, Los Angeles Times (June 24, 2025), available at: <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-06-15/some-l-a-neighborhoods-clear-out-as-immigration-raids-push-people-underground>

<sup>9</sup> U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, *Memorandum: Enforcement Actions at or Focused on Sensitive Locations* (Oct. 24, 2011), available at: <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/ero-outreach/pdf/10029.2-policy.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at p. 45.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

On January 21, 2025, acting DHS Secretary Benjamin Huffman rescinded the Biden directive stating that it “thwart[ed] law enforcement in or near so-called ‘sensitive’ areas.”<sup>12</sup> 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.”<sup>13</sup> In March, ICE reverted back to the 2021 policy, but only in relation to places of worship. (*Ibid.*)

The recent passage of federal legislation allocating \$170 billion for border and immigration enforcement foreshadows the possibility of even more extensive immigration raids in the coming years.<sup>14</sup>

- 3) **Fourth Amendment and the Reasonable Expectation of Privacy:** Both the United States and the California Constitutions guarantee the right of all persons to be secure from unreasonable searches and seizures. (U.S. Const., 4th Amend.; Cal. Const., art. 1, sec. 13.) This protection applies to all unreasonable government intrusions into legitimate expectations of privacy. (*United States v. Chadwick* (1977) 433 U.S. 1, 7, overruled on other grounds by *California v. Acevedo* (1991) 500 U.S. 565.) The Supreme Court has emphasized that the Fourth Amendment requires adherence to judicial processes, and has stressed that searches and seizures occurring without a warrant issued by a judge or magistrate are considered to be per se unreasonable under the Fourth Amendment, subject to certain exceptions. (*Katz v. U.S.* (1967) 389 U.S. 347, 357.) Whether a person has a “reasonable expectation of privacy” in a place, for purposes of triggering Fourth Amendment protections, is an inquiry that takes into account the specific circumstances surrounding the intrusion, societal understanding about the place where the intrusion occurred, and the severity of the intrusion. (See e.g., *Trujillo v. City of Ontario* (9th Cir. 2006) 428 F.Supp.2d 1094, 1103; *Hill v. Nat’l Collegiate Athletic Assn.* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 1, 36-37.)

Fourth Amendment protections generally apply to business premises, although they do not apply to portions of commercial premises that are open to the public. (*Marshall v. Barlow’s, Inc.* (1978) 436 U.S. 307, 311; *People v. Doty* (1985) 165 Cal.App.3d 1060, 1066; *Patel v. City of Montclair* (9th Cir. 2015) 798 F.3d 895.) As such, Fourth Amendment protections extend to employees on the property and to any of their personal property to which an expectation of privacy may reasonably attach. (*Mancusi v. DeForte* (1968) 392 U.S. 364, 369-372; *People v. Thompson* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 1503.) As applied to this bill, a person utilizing the services of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider, and particularly those temporarily using such locations for overnight shelter, may have a reasonable expectation of privacy in the non-public areas of that site, depending on the specific circumstances of that site. For example, there may be a reasonable expectation of privacy in areas of a homeless shelter such as large shared sleeping quarters. (*Community for Creative Non-Violence v.*

---

<sup>12</sup> 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>.

<sup>13</sup> 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>.

<sup>14</sup> Myah Ward, *Trump got \$170 billion for immigration. Now he has to enact it*, Politico (July 5, 2025), available at: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2025/06/27/us/ice-arrests-trump.html>

*Unknown Agents of United States Marshals Service* (1992) 791 F.Supp. 1, 6.)<sup>15</sup> As such, shelter staff are not obligated to consent to a peace officer's warrantless entry into a shelter's bedroom or living quarters, and may refuse to consent to a warrantless entry, or otherwise ask to see a judicial warrant. (*United States v. Prescott* (9th Cir. 1978) 581 F.2d 1343, 1350-1351.)<sup>16</sup> Generally, a judicial warrant is not required for peace officers to look for or approach clients in a public area of a shelter.<sup>17</sup>

- 4) **Effect of this Bill:** In 2017, the California Legislature took significant steps to limit state and local cooperation with federal immigration enforcement officers. Particularly, the Legislature enacted SB 54 (De Leon), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017, also known as the California Values Act, which limited use of state and local resources for the purposes of immigration enforcement. More relevant to this bill, the Legislature also enacted AB 450 (Chiu), Chapter 492, Statutes of 2017, which prohibited an employer from providing access to a federal government immigration enforcement agent to any non-public areas of a place of labor if the agent does not have a warrant. Particularly, AB 450 prohibited, except as otherwise required by federal law, a public or private employer or person acting on their behalf from providing voluntary consent to an immigration enforcement agent to enter any nonpublic area of a place of labor, unless the agent provides a judicial warrant. (Gov. Code, § 7285.1, subds. (b)-(c).) It also outlined specifies civil penalties of \$2,000-\$5,000 for first violation, and \$5,000-\$10,000 for each subsequent violation, enforceable by the Labor Commissioner or AG, for an employer who violates this prohibition. (*Ibid.*)

Here, this bill is somewhat similar to AB 450 in that it prohibits an employee of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider from, to the extent possible, allowing access to the nonpublic areas of the site of such an entity for immigration enforcement activity without a valid judicial warrant or court order, except as required by state or federal law, or as required to administer a state or federally supported protected provider. It would require a director of such an entity, or their designee, to grant access if provided a valid identification, a written statement of purpose, or a valid judicial warrant. The bill contains a severability clause.

A prior U.S. District Court case suggests that this bill may be vulnerable to a legal challenge. In 2018 the Trump administration challenged SB 54 and AB 450 in District Court. Specifically, the Trump Administration challenged AB 450's constitutionality as applied to private employers only, arguing that the bill was preempted by federal law and violated the doctrine of intergovernmental immunity. (*United States v. California* (E.D. Cal. 2018) 314 F.Supp.3d 1077, 1096.) The doctrine of intergovernmental immunity, derived from the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution, makes a state regulation invalid if it "regulates the United States directly or discriminates against the Federal Government or those with whom it deals." (*N.D. v. United States* (1990) 495 U.S. 423, 435.) The district court did not reach a conclusion on the issue of preemption, but it did find that the Trump Administration was likely to succeed on the issue of intergovernmental immunity. (*United States v. California*, *supra*, 314 F.Supp.3d. at p. 1096.) In particular, the court held that "a law which imposes monetary penalties on an employer solely because that employer voluntarily consents to

---

<sup>15</sup> See also California Department of Justice, *Promoting Safe and Secure Shelters for All* (Dec. 2024), at p. 16, available at: <https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/immigration/shelter.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at p. 17.

federal immigration enforcement's entry into nonpublic areas of their place of business or access to their employment records impermissibly discriminates against those who choose to deal with the Federal Government.” (*Ibid.*)

The District Court proceeded to find that the provisions of AB 450 that prohibited employers from providing voluntary consent to an immigration agent to enter a nonpublic area of a place of labor and from re-verifying the employment eligibility of current employees when not required by federal law impermissibly infringed on the sovereignty of the U.S. However, the District Court found that SB 54, as well as the employee notice provision of AB 450 (requiring employers to provide notice to their employees of any impending I-9, or other employment record, inspection within 72 hours of receiving notice of that inspection) were not preempted by federal law. (*United States v. California*, *supra*, 314 F.Supp.3d. at p. 1086.)

The Trump Administration appealed this ruling. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit found that the district court properly concluded that AB 450's employee-notice provisions did not violate the doctrine of intergovernmental immunity and were not preempted by federal law. (*United States v. California* (9th Cir. 2019) 921 F.3d 865, 881-882.) The District Court's finding that the Trump Administration's intergovernmental immunity claim pertaining to imposing monetary penalties on an employer who consents to immigration agents entering into non-public areas of a business was likely to succeed on the merits, was not a matter on appeal. Further, the Ninth Circuit upheld SB 54 citing 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*, *supra*, 921 F.3d, at p. 887.) In particular they stated, “SB 54 does not directly conflict with any obligations that the INA or other federal statutes impose on state or local governments, because federal law does not actually mandate any state action[.]” (*Ibid.*) The administration appealed the Ninth Circuit ruling but the Supreme Court denied the request, leaving the decision untouched.

SB 841 is somewhat similar AB 450's provision that prohibits an employer from voluntarily consenting to federal immigration enforcement's entry into nonpublic areas of their place of business. This may make this bill vulnerable to the same type of intergovernmental immunity challenge that the District Court stated was likely to succeed on the merits in *United States v. California* (E.D. Cal. 2018) 314 F.Supp.3d 1077, 1096.) However, this bill is distinguishable for several reasons. First, the district court found that AB 450 violated the Supremacy Clause as applied to *private* employers only. Here, SB 841 generally applies to employees of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider, and does not distinguish between public or private providers. This would appear to encompass a variety of public, private, and non-profit entities.<sup>18</sup> There may be no legal issue as to this bill's application to public employers. Second, the district court in *U.S. v. California* specifically discussed the imposition of civil penalties for a violation of AB 450 as a factor in why that law violated the Supremacy Clause. Here, SB 841 does not include any such penalties. Third, AB 450 applied to all employers, regardless of industry, whereas this bill is more narrowly limited to only those

---

<sup>18</sup> Los Angeles Homeless Services Authority, *Find A Shelter* (accessed July 8, 2025), available at: <https://www.lahsa.org/portal/apps/find-a-shelter/adults>; VALORUS, *Rape Crisis Centers Category: California* (accessed July 8, 2025), available at: [https://www.valor.us/get-help/wpbdp\\_category/california/](https://www.valor.us/get-help/wpbdp_category/california/);

employees of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider.

Additionally, this bill contains several qualifiers to avoid conflicts with existing federal or state law. Most notably, the bill's obligations apply "[e]xcept as required by state or federal law, or as required to administer a state or federally supported homeless shelter, rape crisis center, or domestic violence shelter." Therefore, to the extent state or federal law requires an employee of such a site to provide immigration agents with access to the non-public areas of the site, this bill's requirements will not apply. Further, its prohibition against an employee of a homeless shelter, rape crisis center, domestic violence shelter, family justice center, or human trafficking service provider providing access to nonpublic areas of the site, only applies "to the extent possible." This suggests this bill may be more akin to guidance, rather than a mandate. Thus, while it is difficult to predict the outcome of a potential legal challenge to this bill, it is reasonable to believe that this measure would survive constitutional scrutiny.

- 5) **Argument in Support:** According to *Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California*, "SB 841, also known as The Keep Safe Spaces Safe Act, will protect domestic violence shelters and other safe spaces that help vulnerable individuals heal and recover from abuse so that the people who need to access these locations do not need to fear the trauma of unwarranted immigration enforcement.

"Federal policy has traditionally designated domestic violence shelters, homeless shelters, rape crisis centers, family justice centers, and human trafficking service providers as locations protected from immigration and customs enforcement. However, this longstanding policy was rescinded in January under the current presidential administration – and since then, these locations have reported a chilling effect and significant anxiety over this policy change. Immigrant survivors of domestic violence already face many barriers to accessing support, and after the recent policy change, they may be even less likely to seek assistance due to the fear of detention and deportation. In addition, immigration status and the threat of deportation can be used as a tool of coercive control by perpetrators of domestic violence and sexual assault, through threats of reporting survivors' immigration statuses to the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency (ICE). This fear of ICE can have a significant effect in reducing the willingness of survivors to seek help. In a 2019 survey of domestic violence service providers, more than half reported working with survivors who withdrew civil or criminal legal cases against their abusers because of fear of immigration-related consequences.

"In the absence of compassionate federal policy, the state must take action to ensure domestic violence shelters and similar locations are seen as safe spaces for the vulnerable people who need their services. SB 841 will insulate domestic violence shelters, homeless shelters, rape crisis centers, family justice centers, and human trafficking service providers from unwarranted immigration enforcement by requiring employees at these locations to refuse access to the nonpublic areas of these locations for "immigration enforcement activity," as defined, unless valid identification, a written statement of purpose, and a valid judicial warrant or court order is presented.

"By making these changes to state law, SB 841 will help victims of domestic violence and other abuse know that there is a safe space where they can be protected from their abusers."



6) **Argument in Opposition:** None Submitted.

7) **Related Legislation:**

- a) SB 48 (Gonzalez) would prohibit, to the extent possible, a local educational agency's personnel from allowing an officer or employee of an agency conducting immigration enforcement from entering school-sites without a valid judicial warrant or court order, prohibits LEAs from disclosing personal information to immigration authorities without a valid warrant or court order, and requires the AG to publish model policies for schools on responding to immigration enforcement. SB 48 is pending a hearing in the Assembly Judiciary Committee.
- b) SB 81 (Arreguín) would prohibit, to the extent permitted by state and federal law, a health care provider entity and its personnel from granting access to the nonpublic areas of the facility for immigration enforcement without a valid judicial warrant or court order, among other changes. SB 81 is pending a hearing in the Assembly Privacy & Consumer Protection.
- c) SB 635 (Durazo) would prohibit, among other things, a local authority from providing voluntary consent to an immigration enforcement agent to access, review, or obtain any of the local authority's records that include personally identifiable information of any sidewalk vendors in the jurisdiction without a subpoena or judicial warrant. SB 635 is being heard in this committee today.
- d) AB 421 (Solache) would expand the California Values Act by prohibiting California LEAs from collaborating with immigration authorities regarding immigration actions that may be taking place within one mile of a childcare facility, place of worship, hospital, or medical office. AB 421 was never heard in this committee.

8) **Prior Legislation:**

- a) SB 54 (De Leon), Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017, limited the involvement of state and local law enforcement agencies in federal immigration enforcement.
- b) AB 450 (Chiu), Chapter 492, Statutes of 2017, prohibits an employer from providing access to a federal government immigration enforcement agent to any non-public areas of a place of labor if the agent does not have a warrant.
- c) AB 699 (O'Donnell), Chapter 493, Statutes of 2017, requires the AG to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, requires local educational agencies to adopt the model policies or equivalent policies, and provides education and support to immigrant students and their families.
- d) AB 2792 (Bonta), Chapter 768, Statutes of 2016, requires local law enforcement agencies to provide copies of specified documentation received from ICE to the individual in custody and to notify the individual regarding the intent of the agency to comply with ICE requests.

- e) AB 4 (Ammiano), Chapter 570, Statutes of 2013, prohibits a law enforcement official from detaining an individual on the basis of an ICE hold after that individual becomes eligible for release from custody, unless, at the time that the individual becomes eligible for release from custody, certain conditions are met, including, among other things, that the individual has been convicted of specified crimes.

**REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:**

**Support**

**1 Individual**

Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California  
Asian Americans for Community Involvement  
Asian Women's Shelter  
Building Futures With Women and Children  
CA Family Justice Network  
California Civil Liberties Advocacy  
California Immigrant Policy Center  
California Partnership to End Domestic Violence  
California Public Defenders Association  
California Public Defenders Association (CPDA)  
California Women's Law Center  
Center for Community Solutions  
Center for Domestic Peace  
Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles  
Coalition to Abolish Slavery and Trafficking  
Communities United for Restorative Youth Justice (CURYJ)  
Community Solutions  
Community Solutions for Children, Families, and Individuals  
Cora - Community Overcoming Relationship Abuse  
Domestic Violence Solutions for Santa Barbara County  
East Los Angeles Women's Center  
Empower Tehama  
Family Services of Tulare County  
Family Violence Appellate Project  
Family Violence Law Center  
Gray's Trauma-informed Care Services Corp  
Haven (healthy Alternatives to a Violent Environment)  
Haven Hills, INC.  
Healthy Alternatives to Violent Environments  
Healthy Alternatives to Violent Environments (HAVEN)  
House of Ruth  
House of Ruth, INC.  
Housing California  
Interface Children & Family Services  
Live Violence Free  
Los Angeles Lgbt Center  
Lumina Alliance

Marjaree Mason Center  
Monterey County Rape Crisis Center  
Mountain Crisis Services  
My Sister's House CA  
Napa News  
New STAR Family Justice Center  
Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence  
North Coast Rape Crisis Team  
Oakland Privacy  
Partners Against Violence  
Peace Over Violence  
Praxis Health Empowerment  
Progress Advisors  
Project Sanctuary, INC.  
Project Sister Family Services  
Public Law Center  
Rape Counseling Services of Fresno  
Rape Trauma Services: a Center for Healing and Violence Prevention  
Reach the Valley  
Riverside Area Rape Crisis Center  
Safe Alternatives to Violent Environments  
San Francisco Women Against Rape (SFWAR)  
Shelter From the Storm, INC.  
Sierra Community House  
Siskiyou Domestic Violence & Crisis Center  
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition  
Stopping Domestic Violence  
Survivor Justice Center  
Tahirih Justice Center  
The People Concern  
Tri Valley Haven  
Tri-valley Haven for Women  
Valor US  
Verity  
Walnut Avenue Family & Women's Center  
Waymakers  
Wild Iris Family Counseling & Crisis Center  
Women's and Children's Crisis Shelter  
Women's Center-high Desert, INC.  
Womenshelter of Long Beach  
Ywca Golden Gate Silicon Valley  
Ywca Greater Los Angeles

**Analysis Prepared by:** Ilan Zur / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744