

Date of Hearing: June 30, 2026

Counsel: Dustin Weber

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY

Nick Schultz, Chair

SB 948 (Arreguín) – As Amended May 14, 2026

As Proposed to be Amended in Committee

SUMMARY: Requires applicants for firearm safety certificates (FSCs) to complete a four-hour training course and personal firearms importers to send a report to the California Department of Justice (DOJ) that includes a valid FSC. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Requires a personal firearm importer, i.e., person moving into the State of California, to do the following within 180 days:
 - a) Submit to DOJ a report with details about the person, residence, and firearm(s).
 - b) Obtain a valid firearm safety certificate (FSC) and include a copy of the valid FSC within the report to DOJ.
- 2) Punishes with an infraction, the failure to include an FSC within the report submitted to DOJ.
- 3) Punishes with an infraction a person bringing any firearm, except an antique firearm, into California without obtaining a valid FSC within 180 days of bringing that firearm into this state if the person is required to report the importation of the firearm to DOJ.
- 4) Requires every applicant for an FSC to complete a 4-hour training course that shall include the following:
 - a) Federal and state laws related to possession, transportation, and storage of firearms, including the transfer of a firearm.
 - b) The importance of secure storage to prevent unauthorized access and use of firearms.
 - c) Safe firearm handling and fundamentals of shooting firearms.
 - d) How to legally and voluntarily surrender or transfer a firearm.
 - e) State laws pertaining to self-defense, use-of-force guidelines, and techniques for conflict resolution.
 - f) The training shall be taught and supervised by firearms instructors certified by the DOJ, as defined.

- g) The live-fire shooting exercises shall take place on a firing range and shall include a demonstration by the applicant of safe handling of firearms and basic firearm shooting proficiency.
- 5) States that the training course requirement shall not apply to individuals with valid concealed carry weapons permits.
- 6) Provides that the DOJ may promulgate regulations and provide additional information for the implementation of this section.
- 7) Authorizes the Dealers' Record of Sale Special Account to be used, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for any costs associated with this law's implementation and ongoing expenses.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Provides that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. (U.S. Const., 2nd Amend.)
- 2) Requires a personal firearms importer to submit to the DOJ a report including information concerning that individual and a description of the firearm in question. (Pen. Code, § 27560, subd. (a)(1)(A).)
- 3) Authorizes DOJ to request photographs of the firearm to determine if the firearm is a generally prohibited weapon, assault weapon, or machinegun, or is otherwise prohibited. (Pen. Code, § 27560, subd. (a)(1)(A).)
- 4) Prohibits a person from furnishing a fictitious name or address, knowingly furnish any incorrect information, or knowingly omit any information required to be provided in this report. (Pen. Code, § 27560, subd. (a)(1)(A).)
- 5) Requires DOJ to establish a fee for submission of the personal firearms importer form and an additional fee for each additional firearm, but prohibits the fee from exceeding the reasonable and actual costs of processing the form. (Pen. Code, § 27560, subd. (a)(2).)
- 6) States that it is a misdemeanor if a person purchases or receives any firearm, except an antique firearm, without a valid FSC, except that in the case of a handgun, an unexpired handgun safety certificate may be used. (Pen. Code, § 31615, subs. (a)(1) & (b).)
- 7) States that it is misdemeanor if a person sells, delivers, loans, or transfers any firearm, except an antique firearm, to any person who does not have a valid firearm safety certificate, except that in the case of a handgun, an unexpired handgun safety certificate may be used. (Pen. Code, § 31615, subs. (a)(2) & (b).)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown**COMMENTS:**

- 1) **Sponsor:** Brady United Against Gun Violence
- 2) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, “Although California has enacted some of the strongest gun safety laws in the nation, currently state law does not require those that import guns into California to secure a Firearm Safety Certificate. Additionally, new gun purchasers are not required to complete education courses or training in safe firearm handling, including live-fire instruction. SB 948 address this gap by requiring comprehensive and meaningful training for anyone seeking to obtain a Firearm Safety Certificate. By strengthening the education and training component tied to the certificate, this measure ensures that individuals who choose to own firearms have demonstrated both a clear understanding of applicable laws and the practical skills necessary to handle a firearm safely.”
- 3) **Effect of the Bill:** SB 948, as proposed to be amended in committee, would make it an infraction for 1) a person who fails to send a report with a valid FSC to DOJ upon moving into California and for 2) a person who brings any firearm, except an antique firearm, into this state without obtaining a valid firearm safety certificate within 180 days of bringing that firearm into this state. The bill also includes a safe harbor provision, as proposed to be amended, that does not authorize penalty if the evidence of that penalty only arises out of compliance with the law. It is unclear whether 180 days is sufficient, constitutionally or practically, for a new resident to manage the move, possibly start a new job, and to secure an FSC, inclusive of this bill’s new requirements.
- 4) **Firearm Safety Certificates (FSC) vs. Concealed Carry Weapons (CCW) Permits:** This bill would require new residents to report bringing their firearms with them to California DOJ with a copy of their FSC. This bill would also significantly expand the training requirements needed to acquire an FSC.

FSC’s are required for many actions a person undertakes as part of firearm ownership in California. This includes, among other acts, purchase, transport, and loans.¹ The current requirement to obtain an FSC in California involves scoring 75% or greater on a 25-question multiple choice exam issued by a DOJ-certified instructor.² This bill would expand that requirement to four hours of in person instruction, with numerous defined areas of instruction, and one hour of live fire shooting. The defined areas of instruction under this bill are: federal and state laws related to possession, transportation, and storage of firearms; the importance of secure storage to prevent unauthorized access and use of firearms; safe firearm handling and fundamentals of shooting firearms; risks of firearms and causes of accidents; how to legally relinquish or transfer a firearm; state laws pertaining to self-defense and techniques for conflict resolution; and mental health, suicide prevention, and domestic violence issues associated with firearms and firearm violence.

An FSC is valid for five years from the date of issuance.³ The stated intent of the California Legislature in enacting the current FSC law is for persons who obtain firearms to have a *basic* familiarity with those firearms, including, but not limited to, the safe handling and

¹ *Firearm Safety Certificate Program Frequently Asked Questions*, California Department of Justice <<https://oag.ca.gov/firearms/fscfaqs>> [as of June 24, 2026].

² *Firearms Safety Certificate Study Guide*, California Department of Justice (June 2020) <<https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/firearms/forms/hscsg.pdf>> [as of June 24, 2026].

³ *Ibid.*

storage of those firearms.⁴ A firearms dealer cannot deliver a firearm unless the person receiving the firearm presents a valid FSC.⁵ Prior to taking delivery of a firearm from a licensed firearms dealer, the purchaser/recipient must also successfully perform a safe handling demonstration with that firearm.⁶ Even though these training requirements should help firearms owners better understand the law, whether a four-hour course, which is designed in statute to include things like an understanding of firearms case law, self-defense laws, and use-of-force guidelines, advances the intent of California's FSC requirement that firearms owners have a basic familiarity with firearms.

Compare this bill's requirements to our state's requirements to acquire a concealed carry weapons permit, which generally allows licensees to publicly carry a loaded firearm in non-prohibited places. To get a CCW license, which is valid for two years, new license applicants must complete a training course that meets all of the following minimum criteria: the course shall be no less than 16 hours in length, the course shall include instruction on firearm safety, firearm handling, shooting technique, safe storage, legal methods to transport firearms and securing firearms in vehicles, laws governing where permit holders may carry firearms, laws regarding the permissible use of a firearm, and laws regarding the permissible use of lethal force in self-defense. (Pen. Code, § 26165.) The course shall also include a component, no less than one hour in length, on mental health and mental health resources, shall be taught and supervised by firearms instructors certified by the DOJ, shall require students to pass a written examination to demonstrate their understanding of the covered topics; and the course shall include live-fire shooting exercises on a firing range and shall include a demonstration by the applicant of safe handling of, and shooting proficiency with, each firearm that the applicant is applying to be licensed to carry. (Pen. Code, § 26165, subd. (a)(1)-(6).) CCW *renewal* applicants, however, must complete only an eight-hour course, inclusive of most of the new licensee criteria. (Pen. Code, § 26165, subd. (e).)

The training required to acquire an FSC under this bill would include comparable training requirements as those for a CCW renewal. Licensing regimes are broadly constitutional, but the Court has warned against regimes that are too onerous or not designed to accomplish valid objectives. Imagine a law that establishes a requirement that any social media user be required to go through hours of training to learn about various laws relating to the First Amendment, social media, and mental health before being permitted to use a social media platform. It is difficult to imagine such a law surviving constitutional scrutiny. While speech and firearms exist in significantly different contexts and can create concerns unique to those contexts, there are very real physical and mental safety risks associated with use of both social media platforms and firearms.⁷ The more onerous California law makes exercise of Second Amendment rights, the greater the likelihood that our laws will run afoul of the Court's admonitions that the Second Amendment is not a second-class right and that

⁴ *Firearm Safety Certificate Manual for Firearms Dealers and DOJ Certified Instructors*, California Department of Justice (June 2020) <<https://oag.ca.gov/sites/all/files/agweb/pdfs/firearms/forms/hscman.pdf>> [as of June 24, 2026].

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ Chatterjee, Screen addiction and suicidal behaviors are linked for teens, a study shows (June 18, 2025) National Public Radio <<https://www.npr.org/sections/shots-health-news/2025/06/18/nx-s1-5436951/jama-screens-teens-addiction-suicide-abc>> [as of June 26, 2026].

licensing regimes put towards abusive ends could be constitutionally dubious. (*New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen* (2022) 597 U.S. 1.)

- 5) **Practical Concerns:** SB 948 raises certain practical concerns that may need to be addressed. California law currently requires an FSC to receive a firearm. (Pen. Code, § 31615, subd. (a).) Violators are subject to a misdemeanor penalty. (*Id.*, at subd. (b).) SB 948 would require a live-fire demonstration in its requirements to obtain an FSC. It is unclear how a person would go about completing the live-fire demonstration to acquire an FSC without receiving a firearm. This may be clearer in regulation or practice, however, it may need clarity in statute, too.

While the amended SB 948 does reduce the penalty for violators to an infraction, some of the goals of the bill may be more likely to be accomplished through additional educational and assistive resources. For example, if someone inherited a firearm from a deceased relative who knows nothing about this law and that person decided to relocate while managing the affairs of that deceased relative, during this hectic time in a person's life registering a report with DOJ is unlikely to be anywhere near their immediate set of priorities. Another example is a new resident to California who may be moving here for other reasons, like serving as a primary caregiver for an ailing family member or relocating for a significant new job opportunity. During these times, a newly arriving resident is understandably not going to be focused on obtaining an FSC and reporting their firearm(s) to DOJ.

- 6) **Constitutional Concerns:** SB 948 raises numerous constitutional concerns, including those involving the Second Amendment and Article IV of the United States Constitution.

a) *The Second Amendment*

To evaluate whether a law comports with the Second Amendment, the threshold consideration is determining whether the law infringes on plain text Second Amendment conduct. (*New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen* (2022) 597 U.S. 1, 17.) This is a low threshold to clear and generally will be cleared when a law purports to regulate a person's conduct with firearms. Assuming the threshold step is cleared, to survive constitutional scrutiny the government must demonstrate the law is "consistent with the nation's historical tradition of firearms regulation." (*Id.* at p. 24.) A firearms regulation is constitutional if the government establishes the proposed law is "relevantly similar" to historical laws, regulations, and traditions. (*Id.* at p. 29.) This means showing that historical laws comparably regulated for comparable reasons, i.e., *how* the laws regulated conduct and *why* the laws were established. (*Ibid.*) The appropriate analysis involves evaluating whether the law is consistent with the principles that underpin the Nation's regulatory tradition. (*United States v. Rahimi* (2024) 602 U.S. 680, 692.)

Complicating the Second Amendment analysis is new US Supreme Court precedent that held unconstitutional the Gun Control Act's (GCAs) categorical prohibition on firearms for unlawful users of drugs. (*U.S. v. Hemani* (June 18, 2026, No. 24-1234) 608 U.S. ___ [2026 U.S. LEXIS 2559].) While the Court's holding is narrow and the issue in *Hemani* is not squarely relevant to this bill, the Court's application of *Bruen* and *Rahimi* in this case could indirectly impact SB 948 and other firearms laws. (*Hemani, supra* [finding the GCAs blanket firearms prohibition for "unlawful users of drugs" unconstitutional because the historical laws were not relevantly similar, i.e., ". . . the governments analogy fails under every

measure it asks us to consider: The historical laws on which it relies targeted different kinds of people, did so for different reasons, and operated in different ways.”].) The Court’s skepticism of categorical bans in the context of the GCA leaves unclear whether future Second Amendment challenges, in any context, will similarly require more particularized or individualized applications of firearms laws or greater scrutiny of blanket bans. (See *ibid.*)

Further complicating Second Amendment analysis is yet another new decision by the Court this month holding that Hawaii’s law prohibiting licensed concealed-carry permit holders from carrying handguns on private property open to the public without the property owner’s express authorization violates the Second and Fourteenth Amendments. (*Wolford v. Lopez* (June 25, 2026, No. 24-106) ___ U.S. ___.) The Court somewhat supplemented the traditional *Bruen* analysis in *Wolford* with subsidiary questions courts have addressed in previous cases and must answer in addition to evaluating the challenged law under the *Bruen* test. (*Ibid.*) Those questions include 1) does the law apply to “the people”—which is to say, to “all members of the political community?” 2) Does the law concern any form of “arms,” i.e., any weapon customarily used for offensive or defensive purposes? 3) does the law place any restrictions on either the “keeping” (i.e., possession) or the “bearing” (i.e., carrying) of arms? (*Ibid.*) This third subsidiary question is really the threshold step in the *Bruen* analysis.

The Court noted at the threshold step of the *Bruen* analysis that if a challenged law falls within the plain text of the Second Amendment, it is presumptively unconstitutional, which means that it *may* violate the preexisting right that the Amendment codified. (*Ibid.*) At this step, the Court appears to suggest historical analysis is not required, but instead simply a plain textual analysis. (*Ibid.* [historical authorities cited by the State of Hawaii at the threshold step are out of place at this step of *Bruen* because “the question is simply whether a challenged law falls within the Second Amendment’s ‘plain text.’”].) “A party defending against a Second Amendment claim may rely on a single analogue or a group of analogues.” (*Ibid.*) It is unclear whether the Court’s statement here indicates that a single historical analogue is sufficient to justify the constitutionality of a firearms law.

While *Hemani* and *Wolford* offer answers to specific controversies over federal and state statutes in the context of the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms, the *Bruen* test remained intact as the constitutional method of analyzing firearms laws. As it pertains to SB 948, a plain text reading of the Second Amendment’s right to keep and bear arms will cover most conduct involving individuals who want to possess a firearm. This means SB 948 must be evaluated under the historical tradition test mandated in *Bruen* and reaffirmed in *Hemani* and *Wolford*. So, in the context of SB 948, we must evaluate whether there is a historical tradition, at least in principle, of relevantly similar firearms laws that regulate 1) a licensing/certification scheme regulating firearms ownership, i.e, keeping arms, and 2) a regulatory/licensing scheme aimed at firearms owners who are new residents to a state.

While *Bruen* found an insufficient historical tradition regulating arms-bearing conduct, arms-keeping conduct may have a greater tradition from which to work. In the roughly 300 years during the 1600s through the early 1900s, licensing laws were enacted in almost every state in the union, including the District of Columbia.⁸ “At least 89 licensing requirement laws

⁸ Spitzer, *Historic Weapons Licensing Laws* (June 4, 2025) Duke Center for Firearms Law <<https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/2025/06/historic-weapons-licensing-laws>> [as of June 25, 2026].

were enacted in at least 34 states for individuals as a pre-requisite to carrying or owning weapons; 18 states enacted such laws in the 1800s and 29 did so in the 1900s (some states enacted laws in multiple centuries).”⁹

Approximately 27 states enacted laws regulating discharge of firearms through licensing between the 1700s and 1900.¹⁰ Hunting licensing laws were enacted in at least 12 states during this time.¹¹ 21 states required a license for the commercial sale, transport, or firing of weapons during roughly the same period of time.¹² A minimum of 22 states required a license for the possession, handling, or transport of gunpowder.¹³ “Laws in at least 17 states required those selling or otherwise providing weapons to individuals to record and keep information pertaining to the buyers of weapons in the late 1800s and early 1900s.”¹⁴

Historic licensing laws for ownership were significant because they relatively frequently regulated for similar reasons and in similar ways.¹⁵ “In short, weapons licensing was a ubiquitous regulatory tool from the country’s beginnings that then spread widely in the nineteenth century.” Historical support could very well be constitutionally sufficient to justify SB 948’s new FSC requirements.

Answering whether there is a historical tradition of regulating firearms conduct for new residents to a state is more difficult. As an initial matter, interstate travel is a fundamental right protected pursuant to numerous constitutional provisions. (*Saenz v. Roe* (1999) 526 U.S. 489, 501–02.) This complicates the Second Amendment analysis both because of the intersection with other constitutional provisions and attempting to ascertain what, if any, hierarchical treatment is needed for evaluating the historical tradition of a fundamental right (to keep arms) in conjunction with another fundamental right (the right to interstate travel, including the right to become a new resident of a state). Identifying and evaluating these rights independently is a simpler task than evaluating them together. Due to the ambiguity with this second question and other difficulties, it is unclear whether SB 948 will encounter fatal constitutional scrutiny.

b) *Article IV – Privileges and Immunities*¹⁶

The US Constitution states that, “the Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States.” (U.S. Const., art. IV, §, cl. 2.) This clause is meant “to place the citizens of each State upon the same footing with citizens of other States.” (*United Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. Camden* (1984) 465 U.S. 208, 215-216.) The purpose behind this clause, like that relating to full faith and credit, is to help forge one nation among a collection of independent, sovereign states. (*Id.* at p. 216.) To this end, the

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵

¹⁶ It is important to note that although there is some overlap between Article IV’s Privileges *and* Immunities Clause and the Fourteenth Amendment’s Privileges *or* Immunities Clause, these constitutional provisions are doctrinally distinct. The author does not intend to analyze the bill under the Privileges or Immunities Clause, though some case law invokes both clauses.

Privileges and Immunities Clause prohibits certain types of discrimination between in-state and out-of-state residents.

Discrimination only implicates this clause, however, when it relates to a right or activity that is “sufficiently fundamental.” (*Baldwin v. Montana Fish and Game Commission* (1978) 436 U. S. 371, 383.) “Only with respect to those ‘privileges’ and ‘immunities’ bearing upon the vitality of the Nation as a single entity must the State treat all citizens, resident and nonresident, equally.” (*Ibid.*) Application of the Privileges and Immunities Clause to an instance of discrimination against out-of-state residents involves a two-step inquiry. (*Supreme Ct. of N.H. v. Piper* (1985) 470 U.S. 274, 280.) First, the state must demonstrate that the law has a substantial reason for the difference in treatment. (*Ibid.*) Second, the discrimination made in the law must bear a substantial relationship to the law’s objective. (*Ibid.*) Included in the Clause’s protections are laws that have the “practical effect” of discriminating between in-state and out-of-state residents. (*Hillside Dairy Inc. v. Lyons* (2003) 539 U.S. 59, 67.) The lack of an express statement in the laws and regulations identifying out of-state residency as a basis for disparate treatment is not a sufficient basis for rejecting a claim under the Privileges and Immunities Clause. (*Ibid.*) Every inquiry under the Privileges and Immunities Clause “must . . . be conducted with due regard for the principle that the States should have considerable leeway in analyzing local evils and in prescribing appropriate cures.” (*Camden, supra*, at pp. 222-23.)

SB 948 could face scrutiny under the Privileges and Immunities Clause because the requirement that new residents, or personal firearm importers, send a report to DOJ with a valid FSC shortly after moving into California is not required of current residents. Existing law already requires newly arriving residents to send a report to DOJ with specific information (Pen. Code, § 27560), but SB 948 would mandate a valid FSC be included with the report and failure to do so punishable with an infraction. So, this bill would not only create a distinction between existing and new residents but only subject those new residents to a criminal penalty. Because the FSC requirement applies to all firearms owners in California, the law arguably does not discriminate between current and new residents. Though it is not entirely clear that the distinction SB 948 would create is the type of disparate treatment proscribed by Article IV, it is nevertheless worth evaluating the law under the two-step test used by courts.

There is a sound argument that a substantial reason exists for the difference in treatment between existing and new residents as it applies to SB 948’s updated reporting requirement. As an initial matter, it is difficult to envision another mechanism by which California could capture the type of data from new residents who own firearms that it captures through the Dealer Record of Sale (DROS) process for current residents. Two reasons for collecting this data is rooted in protecting public safety and reducing unsafe conduct involving firearms, which can contribute to the maintenance and protection of public safety. Because public safety is almost certainly a valid, substantial state interest, it is likely this reason is sufficient to justify the disparate treatment. Whether the discrimination in the law bears a substantial relationship to the law’s objective may be a more difficult question. Due to the practical application of the DROS process, however, it may be argued that DROS and the new personal firearm importer requirements are functionally the same and thus, the discrimination is not a matter of intent but one of limited alternatives. Given these issues, it is ultimately difficult to ascertain how SB 948 would be evaluated under this second step of the Privileges and Immunities Clause analysis or whether an Article IV concern exists at all.

Certain complications remain, however, even with sound arguments supporting the bill in the face of Article IV's restrictions. One right protected by the Privileges and Immunities Clause is the right to interstate travel. (*Saenz, supra.*) While generally this right has been protected in the context of durational residency requirements to qualify for certain benefits, an argument could be made that SB 948 burdens the right to interstate travel because California's labyrinthine firearms laws make incompatible the ability to exercise a fundamental right during relocation. Another Article IV right acknowledged, at least in part by the Court, is the right to acquire and own property. (*Oyama v. California* (1948) 332 U.S. 633.) Ultimately, the right to keep and bear arms is not an obvious fundamental right *for Article IV purposes*, i.e., bearing upon the vitality of the nation as a whole, but we know from *McDonald* it is a fundamental right for purposes of the Fourteenth Amendment's Due Process Clause (*McDonald, supra.*) A different legal theory may need to be advanced instead of the Second Amendment right for an Article IV challenge to make sense, like the right of interstate travel or the right to retain property. Thus, Article IV is unlikely to be a common source of authority under which SB 948 would face challenge or terminal scrutiny.

- 7) **Committee Amendments:** Amendments taken in committee include changing the misdemeanor penalty to an infraction for 1) failing to submit a valid FSC and 2) personal firearm importers who bring any firearm, except an antique firearm, into California without obtaining a valid firearm safety certificate within 180 days of bringing that firearm into California if the person is required to report the importation of the firearm.
- 8) **Argument in Support:** According to the bill's sponsor, the *Brady United Against Gun Violence*, "California has the most comprehensive system of regulating firearms purchases and possession, yet currently does not require either training or education to obtain a firearms safety certificate. It is common sense that those who are purchasing a firearm should be properly trained on how to use, handle, and store firearms and should participate in live-fire training. However, a study from 2015 found that nearly 40% of all gun owners never received any training.

"Firearm training is crucial not only as an effective means to prevent accidental shootings, it also equips gun purchasers to actually protect themselves in the way they envision. Referring to self-defense situations, a study noted that "the quality and frequency of training to maintain acquired skills is predictive of how someone with a firearm will react in a stressful situation and whether they can successfully defend themselves." For example, a police spokesman and a law enforcement firearms trainer told the study's authors "when your adrenaline is pumping and your heart is beating faster, you're not going to shoot the same way you do at the range — not without a lot of training." Another study participant, an NRA member and firearms instructor likewise told the authors that, "in a life-or-death encounter, a gun is only as good as its user's training." The study author's thus concluded that "citizens who seek to carry a firearm, open or concealed, should be a person of sound character and have a minimum skill with the use of a firearm in a stressful situation of self-defense." The study accordingly suggested that civilian gun owners should undertake a combination of classroom, live fire, and judgment shooting. The authors also noted that these reasonable training requirements pale in comparison to what states regularly demand of would-be drivers in driver's training or would-be business owners who want to cut hair or paint nails.

“The responsibilities inherent in carrying a firearm attach from the moment a person takes possession of the firearm, which makes coupling firearm purchasing with training sound policy. Indeed, several other states already require training for gun purchase or possession including Oregon, New Jersey, Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts and Maryland. It is time for California to do the same.

“This bill builds on current Department of Justice requirements to ensure that, on after July 1, 2028, gun purchasers have robust and meaningful training. The one-day training would include instruction on firearm safety and handling and live-fire shooting exercises on a firing range. Additionally, this bill will require individuals who establish residency in California and bring a firearm from outside the state to obtain a firearm safety certificate.”

- 9) **Argument in Opposition:** According to the *California Rifle and Pistol Association*, “Even with the recent amendments extending the personal firearm importer reporting period from 60 to 180 days and reducing the mandated training from eight to four hours, SB 948 remains an unnecessary, burdensome, and constitutionally flawed expansion of government control over law-abiding firearm owners. The bill continues to transform the simple Firearm Safety Certificate (FSC) written test into a de facto licensing regime with mandatory in-person training requirements.

“Key Problems with the Amended Bill:

“New Mandatory In-Person Training Requirement (Effective July 1, 2028)

“FSC applicants must complete a state-mandated four-hour training course within the prior year, including classroom instruction on specified topics and at least one hour of live-fire shooting exercises on a firing range. The course must be taught by DOJ-certified instructors. While CRPA has long supported voluntary firearms safety training through our own programs, we oppose government-mandated live-fire training as a prerequisite for exercising Second Amendment rights.

“Personal Firearm Importer Restrictions

“The bill requires individuals bringing firearms into California (including new residents) to obtain a valid FSC within 180 days and submit it with their DOJ report. This imposes immediate compliance burdens on law-abiding citizens who already lawfully own firearms under the standards of their prior state.

“Significant Ongoing Concerns:

“Capacity and Access Barriers: California’s shooting ranges and certified instructors lack the capacity to handle the anticipated surge in demand for mandatory live-fire sessions. Rural and underserved areas will face severe shortages, long wait times, and denials of access to a constitutional right.

“Financial Burden: The bill imposes no cost caps on training fees, range time, or travel. This will disproportionately harm low-income families, seniors, first-time buyers, and residents in remote areas.

“Lack of Public Safety Benefit: California’s existing FSC test already covers core safety and legal topics. There is no credible evidence that adding mandatory live-fire training will reduce accidents or crime. The bill targets compliant owners rather than prohibited persons or enforcement of current laws.

“Constitutional Issues: Under the U.S. Supreme Court’s Bruen decision, firearm regulations must be consistent with this nation’s historical tradition. Mandatory government-approved training and live-fire proficiency as a condition of ownership or importation lacks historical analogue and impermissibly burdens the core Second Amendment right.

“Exemptions and Inequities: The bill exempts valid concealed carry permit holders from the new training but continues to impose barriers on other responsible citizens who have demonstrated competence through prior ownership and training elsewhere.

“CRPA urges the Assembly Public Safety Committee to reject SB 948 in its entirety. Public safety is better served by enforcing existing laws against prohibited persons, prosecuting violent criminals, and supporting voluntary education programs — not by adding more restrictions that burden law-abiding firearm owners.”

10) **Related Legislation:**

- a) SB 1220 (Hurtado) would add to the 10-year firearms prohibition list a person who engaged in prohibited conduct with an unserialized firearm and subject violators to a misdemeanor. SB 1220 is pending hearing in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.
- b) AB 1810 (Berman) would place new requirements on firearms dealers in California and subject those dealers with the highest percentage of sales to increased inspections, where the firearm is found as part of criminal activity. AB 1810 is pending hearing in the Senate Public Safety Committee.
- c) AB 1948 (Ramos) would extend the concealed carry licensure duration from two years to three years. AB 1948 has been ordered to engrossing and enrolling in the Assembly.
- d) AB 2047 (Bauer-Kahan) would prohibit various conduct with firearms manufacture software as applied to three-dimensional printers and create a misdemeanor for the prohibited conduct. AB 2047 is pending hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

11) **Prior Legislation:**

- a) SB 1002 (Blakespear), Chapter 526, Statutes of 2024, expands prohibitions for the ownership, possession, custody, or control of ammunition. Requires a person subject to the prohibition, because they are a danger to themselves or others as a result of a mental health disorder, to relinquish a firearm, other deadly weapon, or ammunition they own, possess, or control within 72 hours of discharge from a facility.
- b) SB 241 (Min), Chapter 250, Statutes of 2023, requires a licensee and any employees that handle firearms to annually complete specified training. This law requires the DOJ, on or before February 1, 2026, to develop and implement a training course, as specified, including a testing certification component.

- c) AB 355 (Alanis), Chapter 235, Statutes of 2023, exempts from the assault weapons loan prohibition the loaning of an assault weapon to, or the possession of an assault weapon by, a person enrolled in the course of basic training prescribed by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, while engaged in firearms training and being supervised by a firearms instructor.
- d) AB 1420 (Berman), Chapter 245, Statutes of 2023, authorizes the DOJ to conduct inspections and assess a fine for any violation of provisions relating to regulation of specified licenses and for violations of specified provisions regulating the sale of secondhand firearms.
- e) SB 1253 (Gonzales), of the 2023-2024 Legislative Session, would have prohibited bringing any firearm, except an antique firearm, into this state as a personal firearm importer, as defined, without obtaining a valid firearm safety certificate within 120 days of bringing that firearm into this state.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

Brady California (Co-Sponsor)
Brady United Against Gun Violence (Co-Sponsor)
Consumer Protection Policy Center/USD School of Law (Co-Sponsor)
Brady Campaign
California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians
Everytown for Gun Safety Action Fund
Giffords
Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
Students Demand Action for Gun Sense in America
Team Enough - UC Berkeley Chapter

Opposition

California Rifle and Pistol Association, INC.
California Waterfowl Association
Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation
Delta Waterfowl
Gun Owners of California, INC.
National Rifle Association - Institute for Legislative Action
Sci California Coalition
1 Private Individuals

Analysis Prepared by: Dustin Weber / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744