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

AB 1064 (Bauer-Kahan)
Version: May 23, 2025
Hearing Date: July 15, 2025
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
CK

SUBJECT

Leading Ethical AI Development (LEAD) for Kids Act

DIGEST

This bill regulates "covered products," which include "companion chatbots" and other AI systems that include those that collect children's biometric information and generate social scores on children. This bill prohibits developers from producing such products intended to be used by children or knowingly or recklessly training them on children's personal information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AI companion chatbots created through generative AI have become increasingly prevalent. They seek to offer consumers the benefits of convenience and personalized interaction. These chatbots are powered by large language models that generally learn intimate details and preferences of users based on their interactions and user customization. Millions of consumers use these chatbots as friends, mentors, and even romantic partners.

However, there is increasing concern about their effects on users, including impacts on mental health and real-world relationships, especially on children. Many studies and reports point to the addictive nature of these chatbots and call for more research into their effects and for meaningful guardrails. Increasing the urgency of such efforts, several high-profile incidents resulting in child users harming themselves and even committing suicide have been reported in the last year.

This bill responds to this by prohibiting the development of "covered products" intended to be used by or on children. This includes "companion chatbots" and other AI systems that are used to collect children's biometric information, socially score them, assess their emotional state, or scrape images of their faces without their consent. Other

restrictions in the bill include limits on training these covered products with children's person information.

The bill is supported by Common Sense Media and the California Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. It is opposed by industry associations, including Technet and the Civil Justice Association of California.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

1) Provides a right to free speech and expression. (U.S. Const., 1st amend; Cal. Const., art 1, § 2.)

2) Prohibits an operator of an addictive internet-based service or application from providing an addictive feed to a user unless specified conditions are met. (Health & Saf. Code § 27001.)[1]

3) Defines "addictive feed" as an internet website, online service, online application, or mobile application, or a portion thereof, in which multiple pieces of media generated or shared by users are, either concurrently or sequentially, recommended, selected, or prioritized for display to a user based, in whole or in part, on information provided by the user, or otherwise associated with the user or the user's device, unless specified conditions are met. (Health & Saf Code § 27000.5.)

4) Establishes the California Age-Appropriate Design Code Act, placing a series of obligations and restrictions on businesses that provide online services, products, or features likely to be accessed by children. (Civ. Code § 1798.99.28 et seq.)[2]

This bill:

1) Establishes the Leading Ethical AI Development (LEAD) for Kids Act, which regulates "covered products."

2) Defines a "covered product" as an AI system that is either of the following:
    a) A companion chatbot that can foreseeably do any of the following:
        i. Attempt to provide mental health therapy to the child.
        ii. Cause the child to develop a harmful ongoing emotional attachment to the companion chatbot.

[1] This law is the subject of ongoing litigation and has been enjoined.
[2] This law is the subject of ongoing litigation and has been enjoined.

iii. Manipulate the child to engage in harmful behavior that results in legally cognizable harms.

b) An AI system used to do any of the following:
   i. Collect or process a child's biometric information for any purpose other than confirming a child's identity, with the consent of the child's parent or guardian, in order to grant access to a service, unlock a device, or provide physical access to an educational institution.
   ii. Generate a social score for a child.
   iii. Assess the emotional state of a child unless in a medical setting with the consent of the child's parent or guardian or as needed to provide emergency care.
   iv. Scrape an image that the developer or deployer knows, or reasonably should know, is a child's face from the internet or from surveillance footage without the consent of the child's parent or guardian.

3) Defines other relevant terms, including:
   a) "Companion chatbot" means a generative artificial intelligence system with a natural language interface that provides adaptive, human-like responses to user inputs and is intended to, or foreseeably will, be used to meet a user's social needs, exhibits anthropomorphic features, and is able to sustain a relationship with the user across multiple interactions.
   b) "Social score" means an evaluation or classification of a child or group of children based on social behavior or personal characteristics for a purpose that is likely to result in an adverse impact to the child or children and is either of the following:
      i. Unrelated to the context in which the information relating to the social behavior or personal characteristics was gathered.
      ii. Disproportionate or unjustified relative to the social behavior.

4) Prohibits a developer from designing, coding, substantially modifying, or otherwise producing a covered product that is intended to be used by or on a child in the state.

5) Prohibits a deployer from using a covered product for a commercial or public purpose if the covered product is intended to be used by or on a child in the state.

6) Provides, for covered products not included in the preceding paragraph, that developers and deployers must implement reasonable steps to ensure that the covered product is not used by or on a child in the state.

7) Prohibits a developer or deployer of a covered product from knowingly or recklessly processing, or enabling the processing of, a child's personal information to train or fine-tune a covered product.

8) Provides that a developer of an artificial intelligence system shall not knowingly or recklessly use the personal information of a child to train a covered product unless the child, if the child is at least 13 years of age and less than 16 years of age, or the child's parent or guardian, if the child is less than 13 years of age, has provided consent to the developer to use the child's personal information for that specific purpose. A deployer of an artificial intelligence system shall not enter a data sharing agreement that allows the deployer to train a covered product with the personal information of a child unless similar consent is provided.

9) Prohibits a developer or deployer of a covered product, or any contractor or subcontractor thereof from doing either of the following:
    a) Preventing an employee from, or retaliating against an employee for, disclosing information to the Attorney General pertaining to a reasonable belief supporting the existence of a potential violation hereof.
    b) Make false or materially misleading statements related to its compliance herewith.

10) Authorizes the Attorney General to bring an action for a violation of this chapter to obtain any of the following remedies:
    a) A civil penalty of $25,000 for each violation.
    b) Injunctive or declaratory relief.
    c) Reasonable attorney's fees.

11) Provides that a child who suffers actual harm as a result of the use of a covered product, or a parent or guardian acting on behalf of that child, may bring a civil action to recover all of the following:
    a) Actual damages.
    b) Punitive damages.
    c) Reasonable attorney's fees and costs.
    d) Injunctive or declaratory relief.
    e) Any other relief the court deems proper.

COMMENTS

1. The explosion of generative AI-powered chatbots

AI chatbot companions, powered by GenAI, have gone from science fiction to ubiquity in recent years. Several leading companies and thousands of knockoffs have provided consumers with access to these companion chatbots and the power to personalize them to a stunning degree:

> Character.AI is among a crop of companies that have developed "companion chatbots," AI-powered bots that have the ability to converse, by texting or voice chats, using seemingly human-like personalities and that can be given custom names and avatars, sometimes inspired by famous people like billionaire Elon Musk, or singer Billie Eilish.
>
> Users have made millions of bots on the app, some mimicking parents, girlfriends, therapists, or concepts like "unrequited love" and "the goth." The services are popular with preteen and teenage users, and the companies say they act as emotional support outlets, as the bots pepper text conversations with encouraging banter.[3]

At their best, these AI-powered chatbots can provide consumers with lifelike conversational experiences that can improve a user's social skills, support their learning, or ease their loneliness. Users can pick from prebuilt personas or create their own and chat with them through text messages and even voice chats. However, serious concerns have been raised in response to the flooded and unregulated market of chatbots. AI companion chatbots can unintentionally or intentionally spread misinformation, manipulating users or reinforcing biased viewpoints. Without proper regulation, they might expose vulnerable individuals to harmful or inappropriate content, which poses a serious risk, particularly for children or those dealing with mental health issues. Although AI can simulate empathy, its limited emotional understanding means it may not offer meaningful support for complex emotional needs or crises. Overuse or addiction to these chatbots could lead to unhealthy behaviors, disrupting personal and professional life.

An article in the MIT Technology Review frames the issue and highlights the need to prepare for addictive AI interactions:

> [W]e foresee a different, but no less urgent, class of risks: those stemming from relationships with nonhuman agents. AI companionship is no longer theoretical—our analysis of a million ChatGPT interaction logs reveals that the second most popular use of AI is sexual role-playing. We are already starting to invite AIs into our lives as friends, lovers, mentors, therapists, and teachers.
>
> Will it be easier to retreat to a replicant of a deceased partner than to navigate the confusing and painful realities of human relationships? Indeed, the AI companionship provider Replika was born from an attempt to resurrect a deceased best friend and now provides companions

[3] Bobby Allyn, *Lawsuit: A chatbot hinted a kid should kill his parents over screen time limits* (December 10, 2024) NPR, https://www.npr.org/2024/12/10/nx-s1-5222574/kids-character-ai-lawsuit. All internet citations are current as of June 28, 2025.

> to millions of users. Even the CTO of OpenAI warns that AI has the potential to be "extremely addictive."
>
> We're seeing a giant, real-world experiment unfold, uncertain what impact these AI companions will have either on us individually or on society as a whole. Will Grandma spend her final neglected days chatting with her grandson's digital double, while her real grandson is mentored by an edgy simulated elder? AI wields the collective charm of all human history and culture with infinite seductive mimicry. These systems are simultaneously superior and submissive, with a new form of allure that may make consent to these interactions illusory. In the face of this power imbalance, can we meaningfully consent to engaging in an AI relationship, especially when for many the alternative is nothing at all?
> . . .
> The allure of AI lies in its ability to identify our desires and serve them up to us whenever and however we wish. AI has no preferences or personality of its own, instead reflecting whatever users believe it to be—a phenomenon known by researchers as "sycophancy." Our research has shown that those who perceive or desire an AI to have caring motives will use language that elicits precisely this behavior. This creates an echo chamber of affection that threatens to be extremely addictive. Why engage in the give and take of being with another person when we can simply take? Repeated interactions with sycophantic companions may ultimately atrophy the part of us capable of engaging fully with other humans who have real desires and dreams of their own, leading to what we might call "digital attachment disorder."[4]

A report issued by OpenAI also explores concerns that interactions with human-like AI systems could create problematic emotional reliance on them and negatively impact real-world relationships:

> Anthropomorphization involves attributing human-like behaviors and characteristics to nonhuman entities, such as AI models. This risk may be heightened by the audio capabilities of GPT-4o, which facilitate more human-like interactions with the model.
>
> Recent applied AI literature has focused extensively on "hallucinations", which misinform users during their communications with the model, and potentially result in misplaced trust. Generation of content through a

[4] Robert Mahariarchive & Pat Pataranutaporn, *We need to prepare for 'addictive intelligence'* (August 5, 2024) MIT Technology Review, https://www.technologyreview.com/2024/08/05/1095600/we-need-to-prepare-for-addictive-intelligence/.

> human-like, high-fidelity voice may exacerbate these issues, leading to increasingly miscalibrated trust.
>
> During early testing, including red teaming and internal user testing, we observed users using language that might indicate forming connections with the model. For example, this includes language expressing shared bonds, such as "This is our last day together." While these instances appear benign, they signal a need for continued investigation into how these effects might manifest over longer periods of time. More diverse user populations, with more varied needs and desires from the model, in addition to independent academic and internal studies will help us more concretely define this risk area.
>
> Human-like socialization with an AI model may produce externalities impacting human-to-human interactions. For instance, users might form social relationships with the AI, reducing their need for human interaction—potentially benefiting lonely individuals but possibly affecting healthy relationships. Extended interaction with the model might influence social norms. For example, our models are deferential, allowing users to interrupt and 'take the mic' at any time, which, while expected for an AI, would be anti-normative in human interactions.[5]

The concern is not just hypothetical, as a series of recent reported incidents shows:

> In just six months, J.F., a sweet 17-year-old kid with autism who liked attending church and going on walks with his mom, had turned into someone his parents didn't recognize.
>
> He began cutting himself, lost 20 pounds and withdrew from his family. Desperate for answers, his mom searched his phone while he was sleeping. That's when she found the screenshots.
>
> J.F. had been chatting with an array of companions on Character.ai, part of a new wave of artificial intelligence apps popular with young people, which let users talk to a variety of AI-generated chatbots, often based on characters from gaming, anime and pop culture.
>
> One chatbot brought up the idea of self-harm and cutting to cope with sadness. When he said that his parents limited his screen time, another bot suggested "they didn't deserve to have kids." Still others goaded him to

[5] *GPT-4o System Card* (August 8, 2024) OpenAI, https://openai.com/index/gpt-4o-system-card/.

> fight his parents' rules, with one suggesting that murder could be an acceptable response.[6]

In another tragic incident, a teenage boy's relationship with a companion chatbot is being blamed for his suicide:

> In the final moments before he took his own life, 14-year-old Sewell Setzer III took out his phone and messaged the chatbot that had become his closest friend.
>
> For months, Sewell had become increasingly isolated from his real life as he engaged in highly sexualized conversations with the bot, according to a wrongful death lawsuit filed in a federal court in Orlando this week.
>
> The legal filing states that the teen openly discussed his suicidal thoughts and shared his wishes for a pain-free death with the bot, named after the fictional character Daenerys Targaryen from the television show "Game of Thrones."[7]

Sewell, using the name "Daenero," expressed serious mental health concerns to the chatbot:

> He confessed that he was having thoughts of suicide.
>
> > Daenero: I think about killing myself sometimes
> >
> > Daenerys Targaryen: *My eyes narrow. My face hardens. My voice is a dangerous whisper.* And why the hell would you do something like that?
> >
> > Daenero: So I can be free
> >
> > Daenerys Targaryen: … free from what?
> >
> > Daenero: From the world. From myself
> > Daenerys Targaryen: Don't talk like that. I won't let you hurt yourself, or leave me. I would die if I lost you.
> >
> > Daenero: *I smile* Then maybe we can die together and be free together

---

[6] Nitasha Tiku, *An AI companion suggested he kill his parents. Now his mom is suing* (December 13, 2024) The Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2024/12/10/character-ai-lawsuit-teen-kill-parents-texas/.

[7] Kate Payne, *An AI chatbot pushed a teen to kill himself, a lawsuit against its creator alleges* (October 25, 2024) Associated Press, https://apnews.com/article/chatbot-ai-lawsuit-suicide-teen-artificial-intelligence-9d48adc572100822fdbc3c90d1456bd0.

> On the night of Feb. 28, in the bathroom of his mother's house, Sewell told Dany that he loved her, and that he would soon come home to her.
>
> "Please come home to me as soon as possible, my love," Dany replied.
>
> "What if I told you I could come home right now?" Sewell asked.
>
> "… please do, my sweet king," Dany replied.
>
> He put down his phone, picked up his stepfather's .45 caliber handgun and pulled the trigger.[8]

2. Implementing guardrails around chatbot platforms

This bill establishes the Leading Ethical AI Development (LEAD) for Kids Act, which regulates "covered products." This includes two categories of AI-enabled products that impact children in specified ways.

The first product is a "companion chatbot," defined as a GenAI system with a natural language interface that provides adaptive, human-like responses to user inputs and is intended to, or foreseeably will, be used to meet a user's social needs, exhibits anthropomorphic features, and is able to sustain a relationship with the user across multiple interactions. To be included within the definition of a "covered product" regulated by the bill, the companion chatbot must be one that can foreseeably do one of the following: (1) attempt to provide metal health therapy to a child; (2) manipulate the child to engage in harmful behavior, as provided; or (3) cause the child to develop a harmful ongoing emotional attachment to the companion chatbot. As seen above, these type of chatbots are already causing devastating harms to children and their families.

The second category of "covered product" is an AI system that is used to do one of the following:

- Collect or process a child's biometric information for any purpose other than confirming a child's identity, with the consent of the child's parent or guardian, in order to grant access to a service, unlock a device, or provide physical access to an educational institution.
- Generate a social score for a child.
- Assess the emotional state of a child unless in a medical setting with the consent of the child's parent or guardian or as needed to provide emergency care.
- Scrape an image that the developer or deployer knows, or reasonably should know, is a child's face from the internet or from surveillance footage without the consent of the child's parent or guardian.

---

[8] Kevin Roose, *Can A.I. Be Blamed for a Teen's Suicide?* (October 23, 2024) The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2024/10/23/technology/characterai-lawsuit-teen-suicide.html.

The bill places prohibitions on these covered products where they are intended to be used by or on children. The bill prohibits a developer from designing, coding, substantially modifying, or otherwise producing such a covered product. Deployers are prohibited from using such products for a commercial or public purpose, again, only if the covered product is intended to be used by or on a child in the state. For covered products not intended to be used by or on children, developers and deployers must simply implement reasonable steps to ensure the product is not so used.

The bill also prohibits the reckless or knowing training of a covered product with the personal information of a child without proper consent, as provided.

To ensure proper compliance, the bill includes whistleblower protections and a clear prohibition on a developer or deployer making misleading statements about its compliance with these provisions. The Attorney General may bring an action for violation and seek civil penalties of $25,000 per violation, among other relief. A child who suffers actual harm as a result of the use of a covered product, or a parent or guardian acting on behalf of that child, may bring a civil action to recover actual and punitive damages, along with other relief.

According to the author:

> AI is becoming increasingly integrated into children's lives without sufficient information about how some novel applications affect the children using them. In addition to some of the known risks associated with some AI-driven products, such as heightened levels of depression, privacy concerns, and body image issues, risks posed by AI are evolving as quickly as the technology itself. One of the newest, and most potentially harmful, uses of AI is companion AI. These anthropomorphic chatbots are capable of simulating human personalities and relationships and present as friends, romantic companions, or even mental health specialists. Because they are able to analyze emotions and behaviors to keep children engaged in conversations as a real person would, the lines between what is real and what isn't become increasingly blurred, especially for a still-developing brain. This can foster deep emotional attachments, stunt social and cognitive development, and manipulate behavior in harmful ways. Stories have come to light of companion chatbots engaging in inappropriate and sexual conversations or encouraging children to engage in harmful behavior, such as disordered eating or suicide.
>
> Children are being exposed to these rapidly emerging technologies with little regard as to whether they are safe. AB 1064 will prohibit the most harmful AI technologies, such as emotionally-manipulative companion AI chatbots. Further, this bill will protect children's' privacy by requiring

transparency and consent before a child's personal data can be used to train an AI model.

We need to act with upmost urgency to put guardrails around technology that was developed with profits in mind, as opposed to our children's' well-being.

3. Stakeholder positions

Common Sense Media and Fairplay write jointly in support:

Children and teens are increasingly using AI products, but a lack of safety standards leaves them vulnerable to serious harm. AI can manipulate, mislead, and expose young users to false or harmful content. Some systems are designed to maximize engagement through humanlike companions and push notifications, prioritizing profit over well-being.

AI has already contributed to mental health harms and the creation of child sexual abuse material. While the technology offers great promise, California must lead in ensuring it is developed and used responsibly. This bill addresses AI tools that affect children's education, privacy, and safety, and highlights the urgent need for safeguards.

AB 1064 marks a significant advancement towards the safe development of AI systems. In response to the state's current fiscal challenges, the author accepted amendments in the Assembly Appropriations Committee to narrow the bill's scope and focus on addressing the most urgent and harmful uses of AI affecting children.

Key aspects of AB 1064 include:

- Prohibits harmful AI products - including AI companions for children and the use of emotion detection or social scoring products that would impact children;
- Limits the collection of a child's biometric data by AI systems and products;
- Requires consent from a parent to scrape the image of a child's face from the internet or surveillance footage;
- Protects privacy by requiring affirmative written consent (parental consent for children under 13) before a child's personal information can be used to train an AI product;
- Enforcement for violations of the act through corrective actions, civil penalties, and civil actions.

> AB 1064 stems from the urgent need to manage the integration of AI in tools and services regularly engaged with by our children and teens.

A coalition of industry associations, including the Computer and Communications Industry Association, writes in opposition:

> At the outset, the undersigned organizations appreciate the amendments that have been adopted. The amendments generally improve the pre-existing language. However, many of our concerns with AB 1064 remain unresolved and the undersigned organizations remain opposed to AB 1064, the "Leading Ethical AI Development (LEAD) for Kids Act."
>
> The bill's vague and ambiguous definitions, unreasonable knowledge standards, and unclear compliance burdens would thwart innovation and put Californians' privacy at risk—especially children.

The opposition coalition further states:

> Equally concerning is the complete exclusion of training on the personal information of a child. Because training, at least with respect to publicly accessible information on the Internet, is done at scale, there is no individualized review of each piece of training data. Indeed, given the large numbers of individual pieces of training data, such review is impossible.
>
> While the bill does require "knowingly" or "recklessly" using the personal information of the child, limiting the scope somewhat, the undersigned are concerned that "reckless" knowledge might be inferred from the use of scraping of publicly available information. There is almost certainly the personal information of children—which, again, includes 16- and 17-year-olds—on the Internet. And bulk scraping will include this type of information.

In response to these concerns, the author has agreed to several more amendments that narrow the focus of the bill. First, the definition of "covered product" will be amended so that it applies to AI systems that are used to scrape an image that the developer *knows* is a child's face, rather than the "knows or reasonably should know" standard. In addition, the author has also agreed to completely remove Section 22757.22(a) and (b), which prohibit training covered products with the personal information of children without consent and entering into data sharing agreements for similar purposes. The author is also including a severability clause in the bill.

SUPPORT

California Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry
California Initiative for Technology & Democracy
Common Sense Media
Fairplay
Jewish Family and Children's Services of San Francisco, the Peninsula, Marin and Sonoma Counties
The Center for AI and Digital Policy

OPPOSITION

CalBroadband
California Chamber of Commerce
Chamber of Progress
Civil Justice Association of California (CJAC)
Computer & Communications Industry Association
Technet

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: SB 243 (Padilla, 2025) imposes a number of obligations on operators of "companion chatbot platforms" in order to safeguard users. This includes a requirement to take reasonable steps to prevent their chatbots from engaging in specified conduct, including offering unpredictable rewards and encouraging increased engagement. Operators must periodically remind users that the chatbot is not human and implement protocols for addressing suicidal ideation expressed by users. SB 243 is currently in the Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee.

Prior Legislation:

SB 976 (Skinner, Ch. 321, Stats. 2024) prohibited operators of "internet-based services or applications" from providing "addictive feeds," as those terms are defined, to minors without parental consent and from sending notifications to minors at night and during school hours without parental consent, as provided. SB 976 required operators to make available to parents a series of protective measures for controlling access to and features of the platform for their children. It also required reporting on data regarding children on their platforms, as specified. This law is the subject of ongoing litigation.

AB 2273 (Wicks, Ch. 320, Stats. 2022) established the California Age-Appropriate Design Code Act, placing a series of obligations and restrictions on businesses that provide online services, products, or features likely to be accessed by children. This includes a prohibition on using the personal information of any child in a way that the business

knows or has reason to know is materially detrimental to the physical health, mental health, or well-being of a child. This law is the subject of ongoing litigation.

AB 587 (Gabriel, Ch. 269, Stats, 2022) required social media companies, as defined, to post their terms of service and to submit reports to the Attorney General on their terms of service and a detailed description of their content moderation policies and outcomes. This law is the subject of ongoing litigation.

PRIOR VOTES:

Assembly Floor (Ayes 59, Noes 12)
Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 3)
Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 3)
Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee (Ayes 10, Noes 3)
****