

---

## SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Senator Sabrina Cervantes, Chair  
2025 - 2026 Regular Session

---

### SB 898 (Weber Pierson) - Connected consumer products

**Version:** May 5, 2026

**Policy Vote:** P., D.T., & C.P. 7 - 1, JUD.  
11 - 0

**Urgency:** No

**Mandate:** No

**Hearing Date:** May 11, 2026

**Consultant:** Bob Franzoia

**Bill Summary:** SB 898 requires manufacturers of connected consumer products (CCPs) to establish minimum guaranteed support timeframes for their products and to disclose support timeframes before purchase and as the product reaches its end of life. A violation of these provisions would constitute a deceptive act or practice under the Unfair Competition Law (UCL).

**Fiscal Impact:** Unknown, potentially significant court cost pressure if the Attorney General (AG) brings civil actions for violations against any person who engages in a deceptive act or practice. Actual costs will depend on the number of actions filed and the amount of time needed to adjudicate each case. Jury trials would likely be few.

Unknown, likely significant court cost pressure as the UCL permits private plaintiffs and there are thousands of CCP's sold annually that may contain end of life or timeframe functions subject to action. Although courts are not funded based on workload, increased pressure on the Trial Court Trust Fund may create a demand for increased funding for courts. The proposed FY 2026-07 Governor's budget would provide \$70 million General Fund support (Trial Court Trust Fund, General Fund).

**Background:** Consumer devices are increasingly connected to the internet. These CCPs encompass a wide range of products, such as wearable health devices that report on the wearer's activity or sleep; refrigerators that can send a message to their owners when the milk is running low; e-readers; and a wide range of children's toys.

The proliferation of CCPs raises two consumer concerns. First, unlike a traditional device, which lasts until its physical parts break, a CCP can be "broken" when the manufacturer stops updating it or supporting its connected functionality. Consumers who pay for a CCP device currently have no way of knowing how long it will be before their product becomes e-waste. Second, CCPs have levels of security. Existing law requires CCPs to be equipped with reasonable security features that are appropriate for the device. When manufacturers stop providing these devices with security updates and full functionality, security risks skyrocket and there are concerns consumers are not adequately informed when their devices become potential security hazards.

**Proposed Law:** The provisions of this bill apply to CCPs sold at retail. The provisions apply to CCPs sold at the point of internet sale, if practicable. This bill requires manufacturers of connected consumer products to disclose to consumers a minimum guaranteed support timeframe, which must be at least five years, and to notify consumers as the product is reaching its end of life. The bill also requires businesses

leasing or providing customers with such products to ensure the products are updated promptly and replaced when no longer supported.

This bill defines the following terms:

“Connected consumer product” means a physical product, including a mobile application or cloud infrastructure related to the functioning of the physical product, that is intended for consumer use and depends for its functioning, in whole or in part, on a connection to the internet.

“End of life” means the point after which the manufacturer no longer provides necessary support or updates for a connected consumer product.

“Manufacturer” means the manufacturer of a connected consumer product sold at retail in the state.

“Minimum guaranteed support timeframe” means the minimum amount of time for which a company commits to providing all necessary updates and support to a connected consumer product that includes a specific date at the end of the timeframe.

**Related Legislation:** SB 50 (Ashby, Ch. 676, Stats. 2025) requires account managers of connected devices to provide a process for survivors or their representatives to terminate or disable perpetrators’ access to such devices through a “device protection request” with specified documentation from survivors of “covered acts,” as defined.

**Staff Comments:** Unlike the AG, who may seek significant civil penalties for UCL violations, the remedies available to private plaintiffs are more limited. They may seek neither penalties nor damages to compensate for injuries caused by the violation. Instead, private plaintiffs may seek an injunction to halt the unfair, unlawful or fraudulent practice and restitution of any gains obtained as a result of the violation. As injunctions and restitution are equitable remedies that do not require submission to a jury, private UCL actions are tried before a judge, who has the sole discretion to determine if the alleged wrongful act is an unfair, fraudulent, or unlawful business practice and to determine the appropriate equitable remedy. A court may order restitution in a UCL action without individual proof of injury if it determines that such a remedy is necessary to prevent the unfair practice.

Neither public prosecutors or private plaintiffs may seek punitive damages under the UCL.