

**SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**  
**Senator Thomas Umberg, Chair**  
**2025-2026 Regular Session**

SB 497 (Wiener)  
Version: March 28, 2025  
Hearing Date: April 8, 2025  
Fiscal: Yes  
Urgency: No  
AM

**SUBJECT**

Legally protected health care activity

**DIGEST**

This bill enacts various safeguards against the enforcement of other states' laws that purport to penalize individuals from obtaining gender-affirming care that is legal in California.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In the past few years, numerous states have introduced legislation targeting transgender individuals in an attempt to prohibit or limit their ability to obtain gender affirming care. Most recently, a slew of executive orders were issued by the Trump administration attacking the rights of transgender individuals. In response to recent federal action, this bill seeks to build upon existing state protections for individuals obtaining gender-affirming care by enacting various safeguards against the sharing of medical information in order to protect against the enforcement of other states' laws that interfere with an individual's rights to seek or obtain gender-affirming health care and reproductive health care services that are legal in California. This bill is sponsored by Equality California and Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California and is supported by a numerous organizations dedicated to LGBTQ rights and civil rights, medical organizations, and the California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus. No timely opposition was received by the Committee. Should this bill pass out of this Committee, it will next be heard in Senate Public Safety Committee, which will analyze the bill's provisions that affect criminal law. This analysis will focus on the effects of the bill as they relate to civil law.

## **PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW**

Existing federal law:

- 1) Provides that each state shall give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state, and that Congress may prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved and the effect thereof. (U.S. Const., art. IV, § 1.)
- 2) Provides that persons in the United States may travel freely throughout the United States. (*E.g., U.S. v. Guest* (1966) 383 U.S. 745, 758 (“freedom to travel throughout the United States has long been recognized as a basic right under the Constitution”).)<sup>1</sup>
- 3) Provides that records and judicial proceedings of any court of any state, territory or possession, or copies thereof, must be proved or admitted in other courts within the United States and its territories and possessions by the attestation of the clerk and seal of the court annexed, if a seal exists, together with a certificate of a judge of the court that the said attestation is in proper form; and that such acts, records, and judicial proceedings, or copies thereof, once authenticated, have the same full faith and credit in every court within the United States and its territories and possessions as they have by law or usage in the courts of such State, territory or possession from which they are taken. (28 U.S.C. § 1738.)
- 4) Establishes, under the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), privacy protections for patients’ protected health information and generally provides that a covered entity, as defined (including a health plan, health care provider, and health care clearing house), may not use or disclose protected health information except as specified or as authorized by the patient in writing. (45 C.F.R. §§ 164.500 *et seq.*)

Existing law:

- 1) Provides that all people have inalienable rights, including the right to pursue and obtain safety, happiness, and privacy. (Cal. Const., art. I, §1.)
- 2) Prohibits, under the California Medical Information Act (CMIA), providers of health care, health care service plans, or contractors, as defined, from sharing medical information without the patient’s written authorization, subject to certain exceptions. (Civ. Code, div. 1, pt. 2.6, §§ 56 *et seq.*)

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the right to travel is not expressly set forth in the Constitution, it has been recognized as emanating from both the Interstate Commerce Clause (*e.g., Edwards v. People of State of California* (1941) 314 U.S. 160, 174) and the Privileges and Immunities Clause (*e.g., Saenz v. Roe* (1999) 526 U.S. 501-502).

- 3) Requires, under CMIA, a provider of health care, health care service plan, or contractor to disclose medical information if the disclosure is compelled by any of the following:
  - a) by a court pursuant to an order of that court;
  - b) by a board, commission, or administrative agency for purposes of adjudication to its lawful authority;
  - c) by a party to a proceeding before a court or administrative entity pursuant to a subpoena, subpoena duces tecum, notice to appear served pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1987, or any provision authorizing discovery in a proceeding before a court or administrative agency;
  - d) by a board, commission, or administrative agency pursuant to an investigative subpoena, as specified;
  - e) by an arbitrator or arbitration panel, as specified, pursuant to a subpoena duces tecum;
  - f) by a search warrant lawfully issued to a governmental law enforcement agency;
  - g) by the patient or the patient's representative, as specified;
  - h) by a medical examiner, forensic pathologist, or coroner, under specified circumstances; and
  - i) where otherwise specifically required by law. (Civ. Code, § 56.10(b).)
- 4) Permits, under CMIA, a provider of health care, a health care service plan, or a contractor to disclose medical information in specified circumstances to specified recipients, including to medical practitioners for diagnostic and health care purposes, insurers or other payors, and public agencies. (Civ. Code, § 56.10(c).)
- 5) Prohibits, under CMIA, a provider of health care, a health care service plan, or a contractor from releasing medical information relating to a person or entity allowing a child to receive gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care in response to any civil action based on another state's law that authorizes a person to bring a civil action against a person or entity that allows a child to receive gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care.
- 6) Provides that a court of this state may exercise jurisdiction on any basis not inconsistent with the Constitution of this state or of the United States. (Code Civ. Proc., § 410.10.)
- 7) Provides that when a court, upon motion of a party or its own motion, finds that in the interest of substantial justice a civil action should be heard in a forum outside this state, the court must stay or dismiss the action in whole or in part on any conditions that may be just. (Code Civ. Proc., § 410.30.)

- 8) Permits a defendant in a civil action, on or before the last day of their time to plead or within any further time that the court may for good cause allow, may serve and file a notice of motion for one or more of the following purposes:
  - a) to quash service of summons on the ground that the court lacks jurisdiction over them;
  - b) to stay or dismiss the action on the ground of inconvenient forum; and
  - c) to dismiss the action for failure to prosecute the action in a timely manner.  
(Code Civ. Proc., § 418.10.)
- 9) Enumerates, under the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act, the procedure for obtaining discovery in California for a civil case pending in a jurisdiction outside of California. (Code Civ. Proc., pt. 4, tit. 4, ch. 12, art. 1, §§ 2029.100 *et seq.*)
  - a) If a party to a proceeding pending in a foreign jurisdiction retains an attorney licensed to practice in this state, who is an active member of the State Bar, and that attorney receives the original or a true and correct copy of a foreign subpoena, the attorney may issue a subpoena under the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act. (Code of Civ. Proc. § 2029.350(a).)
  - b) Prohibits an authorized attorney from issuing a subpoena in that action described in a), above, based on a foreign subpoena if the foreign subpoena is based on a violation of another state's laws that interfere with a person's right to allow a child to receive gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care. (*Id.* at subd. (b).)
  - c) Prohibits an attorney from issuing a subpoena based on a foreign subpoena that relates to a foreign penal civil action and that would require disclosure of information related to sensitive services. (*Id.* at subd. (c).)
  - d) Prohibits a clerk of a superior court in the county in which discovery in a foreign action is sought from issuing a subpoena for discovery in this state based on a foreign subpoena if the foreign subpoena is based on a violation of another state's laws that interfere with a person's right to allow a child to receive gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care.
- 10) Sets forth a subpoena process by which a witness may be required to appear before a court or magistrate in a criminal action, which may include a subpoena compelling the production of records or other documents. (Pen. Code, § 1326.)
- 11) Establishes the Controlled Substance Utilization Review and Evaluation System (CURES), for the purposes of collecting records of dispensed Schedule II, III, IV, and V controlled substances. (Health & Saf. Code § 11165.)
- 12) Requires health care practitioners in receipt of a federal Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) registration providing authorization to prescribe controlled

substances, as well as pharmacists, to register for access to the CURES database. (Health & Saf. Code § 11165.1.)

- 13) Provides that CURES data may be disclosed to public or private entities, as approved by the Department of Justice, for educational, peer review, statistical, or research purposes, if patient information, including information that may identify the patient, is not compromised. (Health & Saf. Code § 11165(c)(2).)

This bill:

- 1) Prohibits, under CMIA, a provider of health care, a health care service plan, or a contractor from releasing medical information relating to person seeking or obtaining gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care in response to any subpoena or request, including a foreign subpoena, based on another state's law that interferes with an individual's right to seek or obtain gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care.
  - a) Prohibits, under CMIA, a provider of health care, health care service plan, contractor, or an employer from cooperating with any inquiry or investigation by, or providing medical information to, any individual, agency, or department from another state or, to the extent permitted by federal law, to a federal law enforcement agency that would identify an individual and that is related to an individual seeking or obtaining gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care that is lawful under the laws of this state.
  - b) Specifies that these provisions do not prohibit compliance with the investigation of an activity that is punishable as a crime under the laws of this state.
- 2) Prohibits a subpoena from being issued if the foreign subpoena is based on a violation of another state's laws that interfere with a person's right to seek or obtain gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care.
  - a) Prohibits an authorized attorney from issuing a subpoena pursuant to a foreign subpoena if the foreign subpoena is based on a violation of another state's laws that interfere with a person's right to seek or obtain gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care.
- 3) Prohibits a state or local agency or employee, appointee, officer, contractor, or official or any other person acting on behalf of a public agency from providing any CURES data or to expend or use time, money, facilities, property, equipment, personnel, or other resources in furtherance of any interstate investigation or proceeding seeking to impose civil, criminal, or disciplinary liability upon the provision or receipt of legally protected health care activity.
  - a) Specifies that this provision does not prohibit the investigation of any activity that is punishable as a crime under the laws of this state so long as no CURES

data related to any legally protected health care activity is shared with any individual or entity from another state.

- 4) Prohibits an out-of-state authorized user who obtains CURES data through the interstate data sharing hub from providing any CURES data in furtherance of any investigation or proceeding seeking to impose civil, criminal, or disciplinary liability upon the provision or receipt of legally protected health care activity.
- 5) Prohibits out-of-state law enforcement from having access to CURES data absent a warrant, subpoena, or court order, as specified.
- 6) Provides that any person who accesses the CURES database and who is not authorized by law to do so is guilty of a misdemeanor.
  - a) Any person authorized by law to access the CURES database and who knowingly furnishes the information from the CURES database to a person who is not authorized by law to receive that information is guilty of a misdemeanor, except as specified.
- 7) Prohibits a provider of health care, health care service plan, or contractor from releasing medical information related to sensitive services in response to any foreign subpoena that is based on a violation of another state's laws authorizing a criminal action against a person or entity for the provision or receipt of legally protected health care activity.
- 8) Prohibits a provider of health care, a health care service plan, or a contractor from releasing medical information related to an individual seeking or obtaining gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care in response to any foreign subpoena that is based on a violation of another state's laws authorizing a criminal action that interferes with an individual's rights to seek or obtain gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care.

### COMMENTS

#### 1. Stated need for the bill

The author writes:

California must strongly reject Trump's disgusting efforts to distract from his own incompetent failures by demonizing our transgender neighbors. The President is attempting to eliminate trans people's very existence in the eyes of the law, and he has made clear he is willing to violate laws and norms to target them. We must do all we can to prevent him, his lawless administration, and his cruel extremist allies from abusing Californians' sensitive medical information.

Senate Bill 497 recognizes California's role in prioritizing the safety of those seeking gender affirming health care by: (1) requiring warrants for law enforcement requests through the state's healthcare database; (2) establishing that accessing and knowingly sharing health data from state database without a warrant to unauthorized parties is punishable as a misdemeanor; and (3) expanding California's transgender shield laws to prohibit health care providers from complying with subpoenas requiring the disclosure of medical information related to gender-affirming health care; and (4) stating intent to protect teachers affirming of trans youth.

2. This bill seeks to build upon existing protections for transgender youth in light of recent actions at the federal level

a. *SB 107 (Wiener, Ch. 810, Stats, 2022) – transgender shield law*

Conservative hysteria over transgender individuals reached new heights in 2022. According to Human Rights Watch, as of March 2022, legislatures nationwide had introduced over 300 anti-LGBTQ+ bills, over 130 of which specifically targeted transgender people.<sup>2</sup> As Utah Governor Spencer Cox said in his veto message for a bill that would ban transgender youth from high school sports – a bill functionally targeting the *four* transgender youths playing high school sports in the state – “[r]arely has so much fear and anger been directed at so few.”<sup>3</sup> One particularly pernicious type of anti-transgender legislation that several states have passed is legislation to prevent gender-affirming medical care. Many of these laws and orders impose civil and/or criminal liability on transgender youth and the adults who assist them in obtaining gender-affirming care, putting parents and doctors in the position of risking sentences of up to ten years in prison for simply getting their child the medical care they need. Worse, many of these laws and orders are not limited in geographic scope, meaning the state could attempt to penalize a transgender youth or other person for obtaining gender-affirming care in a state where that care is legal, such as California. In 2022, SB 107 (Wiener, Ch. 810, Stats, 2022) was enacted in response to these anti-transgender statutes. Governor Newsom’s signing message of SB 107 stated “[i]n California we believe in equality and acceptance. We believe that no one should be prosecuted or persecuted for getting the care they need – including gender-affirming care.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Human Rights Watch, Press Release, ICYMI: As Lawmakers Escalate Attacks on Transgender Youth Across the Country, Some GOP Leaders Stand Up for Transgender Youth (Mar. 24, 2022), <https://www.hrc.org/press-releases/icymi-as-lawmakers-escalate-attacks-on-transgender-youth-across-the-country-some-gop-leaders-stand-up-for-transgender-youth> (all links current as of August 29, 2022).

<sup>3</sup> Utah Gov. Spencer Cox, Veto Message to HB 11 (Mar. 22, 2022), reprinted in the St. Louis Tribune, available at <https://www.sltrib.com/news/politics/2022/03/22/gov-spencer-coxs/>. The Utah Legislature overrode the veto. (Medina, *Utah Legislature Overrides Governor's Veto of Transgender Athlete Bill*, NY Times (Mar. 25, 2022), available at <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/25/us/utah-transgender-athlete-ban-override.html>).

<sup>4</sup> Governor’s signing message on Sen. Bill No. 107 (Sep. 29, 2022), available at <https://www.gov.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/SB-107-SIGNING.pdf?emrc=1a80c5>.

SB 107 did several things, including: prohibiting the sharing of medical records regarding the receipt of gender-affirming care related to a child receiving such care; prohibiting the enforcement of out-of-state subpoenas seeking information regarding the receipt of gender-affirming medical care of a child in California; revised the Uniform Child Custody Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act to provide California courts jurisdictional guidance on family law matters arising as a result of a minor receiving gender-affirming care; and made several reforms to California's criminal laws regarding the enforcement of out-of-state criminal statutes related to gender-affirming health care.

*b. Recent federal action targeting transgender persons*

Conservative hysteria over the very existence of transgender people continues as evidenced by a slew of federal executive orders issued during the first week of the Trump Administration. On January 20, 2025, a federal executive order was issued stating that the federal government would only recognize two biological sexes,<sup>5</sup> even though this is biologically incorrect.<sup>6</sup> Additionally, an order was issued banning transgender girls and women from participating in women's sports.<sup>7</sup> Another executive order banned all federal funding for youth gender affirming care, including the removal of any funding from medical and educational institutions for research on gender affirming care,<sup>8</sup> while another banned transgender individuals from serving in the U.S. Military.<sup>9</sup> Some of these orders are currently being challenged in court; however, it is unclear what their ultimate fate will be. In response to these executive orders the Trump Administration has taken several actions, including: rescinding all existing federal policies protecting transgender people from sex and disability discrimination; revoking the ability to obtain passports and federal documents reflecting their gender identity; denying transition-related healthcare to federal employees; and ordering law enforcement to prosecute school officials who recognize transgender students.<sup>10</sup> These actions elucidate a general hostility towards the transgender community from the current federal administration.

---

<sup>5</sup> Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 8615 (Jan. 20, 2025).

<sup>6</sup> Claire Ainsworth & Nature Magazine, Scientific American, *Sex Redefined: The Idea of 2 Sexes Is Overly Simplistic* (Oct. 22, 2018) available at <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/sex-redefined-the-idea-of-2-sexes-is-overly-simplistic1/#:~:text=According%20to%20the%20simple%20scenario,or%20sexual%20anatomy%20say%20another.>

<sup>7</sup> Exec. Order No. 14168, 90 Fed. Reg. 9279 (January 20, 2025).

<sup>8</sup> Exec. Order No. 14187, 90 Fed. Reg. 8771 (Jan. 28, 2025).

<sup>9</sup> Exec. Order No. 14004, 90 Fed. Reg. 8757 (Jan. 27, 2025).

<sup>10</sup> Jennifer Levi, GLADD, *From the Front Lines: The Fight for Transgender Rights Is a Fight for Democracy*, (Feb. 10, 2025), available at <https://www.glad.org/the-fight-for-transgender-rights-is-a-fight-for-democracy/>.

*c. Building upon existing statutory protections*

In light of the above, the author and sponsors seek to expand on the protections enacted in SB 107 in several ways. First, the bill prohibits the release of medical information related to any person seeking or obtaining gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care by a provider of health care, health care service plan, or contractor in response to a request, including a foreign subpoena, based on another state's law that interferes with an individual's right to seek that gender-affirming health care or that authorizes a person to bring a civil or criminal action against a person for providing, seeking, obtaining, or receiving such care. Second, the bill prohibits a provider of health care, health care service plan, contractor, or employer from cooperating with any inquiry or investigation by, or providing medical information to, any individual, agency, or department from another state or, to the extent permitted by federal law, to a federal law enforcement agency that would identify an individual and that is related to an individual seeking or obtaining gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care that is lawful under the laws of this state. This provision is similar to Section 56.108 of the Civil Code, which has similar protections for individuals seeking or obtaining an abortion or abortion-related services that are lawful under the laws of this state. The bill specifies that it does not prohibit compliance with the investigation of an activity that is punishable as a crime in this state, so long as no medical information related to gender-affirming health care and gender-affirming mental health care is shared with an out-of-state agency or any other individual. The bill also amends the Interstate and International Depositions and Discovery Act to prohibit issuing a subpoena in this state based upon a foreign subpoena that alleges a violation of another state's laws which interfere with a person's right to seek or obtain gender-affirming health care or gender-affirming mental health care. It applies this same prohibition on issuing a subpoena to an authorized attorney.

In addition to the above, the bill makes several changes that fall within the jurisdiction of the Senate Public Safety Committee. These include changes to the statute governing access to the CURES, making it a misdemeanor to unlawfully access the CURES database or knowingly furnishing information from the CURES database to someone not authorized to receive that information, and prohibiting a health care, health care service plan, or contractor from releasing medical information related to an individual seeking or obtaining gender-affirming health care or a legally protected health care activity in response to a foreign subpoena in a criminal action. Legally protected healthcare activity includes, reproductive health care services, gender-affirming health care services, or gender-affirming mental health care services.

3. Constitutional issues: the Full Faith and Credit Clause

This bill, and the other states' laws this bill responds to, implicate the Constitution's Full Faith and Credit Clause. The Full Faith and Credit Clause states:

Full faith and credit shall be given in each state to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. And the Congress may by general laws prescribe the manner in which such acts, records, and proceedings shall be proved, and the effect thereof.<sup>11</sup>

The primary function of the Clause, it is generally agreed, is to require states to recognize judgments from other state courts, so that “a cause of action merged in a judgment in one state is likewise merged in every other.”<sup>12</sup> Less clear, however, is how the Clause’s mandate that states recognize each other’s “public acts” operates in cases like this one – when one state’s public acts purport to penalize conduct taking place in another state which is legal in that other state.

As evidenced by SB 107 and the Governor’s signing statement, this state has a public policy of protecting people receiving health care they need, including gender affirming care. This bill may very well not run afoul of the Full Faith and Credit Clause as it would fall within the public policy exception for public acts. The Supreme Court upheld the application of California law to settle a dispute of conflicting workers compensation statutes holding “[a] rigid and literal enforcement of the Full Faith and Credit Clause, without regard to the statute of the forum, would lead to the absurd result that wherever a conflict arises, the statute of each state must be enforced in the courts of the other, but cannot be in its own.”<sup>13</sup> The Court further stated: “Prima facie every state is entitled to enforce in its own courts its own statutes, lawfully enacted. One who challenges that right, because of the force given to a conflicting statute of another state by the full faith and credit clause, assumes the burden of showing, upon some rational basis, that of the conflicting interests involved those of the foreign state are superior to those of the forum.”<sup>14</sup> A few years later, the Court noted that “the Full Faith and Credit Clause is not an inexorable and unqualified command. It leaves some scope for state control within its borders...”<sup>15</sup> These cases seem to indicate that states can uphold their public policies and apply their laws when a conflict of laws arises in a forum in that state and not run afoul of the Full Faith and Credit Clause. If California was compelled to enforce an out-of-state law denying a person the right to receive gender affirming care, it would require California to deny individuals their rights under

---

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Const., art. IV, § 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Magnolia Petroleum Co. v. Hunt* (1943) 340 U.S. 430, 439; see *Underwriters National Assurance Co. v. North Carolina Life and Accident and Health Insurance Guaranty Assn.* (1982) 455 U.S. 691, 703-704 (“Ours is a union of States, each having its own judicial system capable of adjudicating the rights and responsibilities of the parties brought before it. Given this structure, there is always a risk that two or more States will exercise their power over the same case or controversy, with the uncertainty, confusion, and delay that necessarily accompany relitigation of the same issue. [Citations.] Recognizing that this risk of relitigation inheres in our federal system, the Framers provided that ‘Full Faith and Credit shall be given in each State to the public Acts, Records, and judicial Proceedings of every other State.’”).

<sup>13</sup> *Alaska Packers Association v. Industrial Accident Commission* (1935) 294 U.S. 532, 547.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 547-48.

<sup>15</sup> *Pink v. AAA Highway Express, Inc.* (1941) 314 U.S. 201, 210.

state law. This would lead to an “absurd result” as described by the Court in *Alaska Packers Association*.

With respect to whether a state must prioritize another state’s laws at the expense of its own, the Supreme Court has noted that a “rigid and literal enforcement of the Full Faith and Credit Clause, without regard to the statute of the forum, would lead to the absurd result that wherever a conflict arises, the statute of each state must be enforced in the courts of the other, but cannot be in its own.”<sup>16</sup> Thus, the law now acknowledges a preference to uphold the public policy of the forum state when a conflict of laws arises, recognizing that, “the Full Faith and Credit Clause is not an inexorable and unqualified command. It leaves some scope for state control within its borders...”<sup>17</sup> The Supreme Court has recognized similar policy limitations with respect to state records, holding “just as the mechanisms for enforcing a judgment do not travel with the judgment itself for the purposes of Full Faith and Credit ... similarly [a state] decree cannot determine the evidentiary issues in a lawsuit brought by parties who were not subject to the jurisdiction of the [that state’s court].”<sup>18</sup> As was also concluded in this Committee’s analysis of SB 107, this bill’s provisions appear to fall within California’s right to set its own policies and procedures.

#### 4. Statements in support

The sponsors of the bill write in support stating:

Planned Parenthood affiliates across the state are proud to provide gender affirming care and provide gender-affirming hormone therapy to over ten thousand patients annually. Gender-affirming care encompasses social, psychological, behavioral, or medical interventions aimed to support and affirm an individual’s gender identity. Access to these services is shown to reduce rates of depression and anxiety for transgender, gender non-conforming, and intersex (TGI) people.

In 2022, SB 107 (Wiener), prohibited the issuance of a state subpoena or the disclosure of information relating to gender-affirming care for a child in response to a civil action based on out-of-state laws that interfere with the right to gender-affirming care for minors. Similarly, AB 497 seeks to expand these protections to all TGI people who seek care in California without the repercussion of civil and criminal actions from anti-trans laws in other states. [...]

Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California (PPAC) believes that reproductive justice includes the complete well-being of trans people. Access to gender-

---

<sup>16</sup> *Alaska Packers*, *supra*, at 547.

<sup>17</sup> *Pink*, *supra*, at 210.

<sup>18</sup> *Baker v. General Motors Corp.* (1998) 522 U.S. 222, 239.

affirming care contributes to improved quality of life, increased self-esteem, and better health outcomes.

### **SUPPORT**

Equality California (sponsor)  
Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California (sponsor)  
American College of Obstetricians & Gynecologists - District IX  
API Equality-LA  
California Chapter of the American College of Emergency Physicians  
California Legislative LGBTQ Caucus  
California LGTBQ Health and Human Services Network  
California Medical Association  
California Psychological Association  
CalPride  
CalPride Sierras  
CalPride Valle Central  
Children Now  
Courage California  
El/La Para TransLatinas  
Electronic Frontier Foundation  
Family Violence Appellate Project  
Hmong Innovating Politics  
National Health Law Program  
Oakland Privacy  
Oasis Legal Services  
Our Family Coalition  
PFLAG Los Angeles  
PFLAG Oakland-East Bay  
PFLAG Sacramento  
Pride at the Pier  
Rainbow Families Action Bay Area  
Sacramento LGBT Community Center  
Santa Monica Democratic Club  
Secure Justice  
Seneca Family of Agencies

### **OPPOSITION**

None received

### **RELATED LEGISLATION**

Pending Legislation: None known.

Prior Legislation:

AB 2521 (Santiago, Ch. 869, Stats. 2022) renamed the Transgender Wellness and Equity Fund the Transgender, Gender Nonconforming, or Intersex Wellness and Equity Fund and defined the terms transgender, gender non-conforming, and intersex.

AB 2091 (Mia Bonta, Ch. 377, Stats. 2022), among other things, prohibited the validation of foreign subpoenas pertaining to a foreign penal civil action and the sharing of specified information in response to subpoenas related to out-of-state anti-abortion statutes or foreign penal civil actions; authorized the Insurance Commissioner to issue civil penalties against health insurers who violate the confidentiality of an insured's medical information; and prohibited prison staff from disclosing identifying medical information related to an incarcerated person's right to seek and obtain an abortion if the information being requested is based on out-of-state anti-abortion statutes or foreign penal civil actions.

AB 1666 (Bauer-Kahan, Ch. 42, Stats. 2022) declared that a law of another state that authorizes a person to bring a civil action against a person or entity that receives or seeks, performs or induces, or aids or abets the performance of an abortion, or who attempts or intends to engage in those actions, is contrary to the public policy of this state and prohibits this state from applying that law to a case or controversy heard in state court and the enforcement or satisfaction of a civil judgment received under that law.

\*\*\*\*\*