

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

SB 1257 (Arreguín)
Version: April 6, 2026
Hearing Date: April 14, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
ID

SUBJECT

Federal immigration enforcement: report

DIGEST

This bill requires the Attorney General to submit to the Legislature and post on its internet website, on or before October 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, a report regarding immigration enforcement incidents and activities conducted at designated safe locations, as specified.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since the start of its second term, the Trump Administration has expanded immigration enforcement and altered the immigration system at an unprecedented scale. In the past year, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Border Protection (CBP) have conducted unprecedented, destructive sweeps of entire communities and cities. President Trump also ended long-standing federal policy that limited immigration enforcement activity at “sensitive locations” like schools, places of worship, shelters, medical facilities, funerals, and religious ceremonies. Consequently, there have been reports across the state of ICE attempting to enter hospitals, schools, and courthouses to detain and arrest individuals for immigration enforcement. In response to these developments, the Legislature passed various laws aimed at protecting the state’s immigrant community and minimizing the disruption that immigration enforcement activities can have on the state and its communities. In addition, the Attorney General launched an online portal for reporting the unlawful actions of federal agents. SB 1257 builds upon these measures by requiring the Attorney General to submit to the Legislature and post on its internet website, beginning October 30, 2027 and annually thereafter, a report regarding reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities at designated safe locations, as specified. SB 1257 is sponsored by the Latino Coalition for a Healthy California and Todec Legal Center, and is supported by numerous nonprofits and public interest entities. The Committee has

received no timely letters of opposition. SB 1257 previously passed out of the Senate Public Safety Committee by a vote of 4 to 1.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Prohibits law enforcement agencies from using agency or department moneys or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified, place peace officers under the supervision of federal agencies, use immigration authorities as interpreters for law enforcement matters, transfer an individual to immigration authorities unless authorized by a judicial warrant, provide office space exclusively dedicated to immigration authorities, and contract with the federal government for the use of law enforcement agency facilities to house individuals as federal detainees for the purposes of civil immigration custody, as specified. (Gov. Code § 7284.6.)
- 2) Requires the Attorney General, by April 1, 2018, and in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, to publish model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, public libraries, health facilities operated by the state or a political subdivision thereof, courthouses, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement facilities, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers Compensation, and shelters, to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law, and ensuring that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status.
 - a) Requires all public schools, health facilities operated by the state or a political division thereof, and courthouses to implement the Attorney General's model policy, or an equivalent.
 - b) Encourages the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, the Division of Workers' Compensation, the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, shelters, libraries, and all other organizations and entities that provide services related to physical or mental health and wellness, education, or access to justice, including the University of California, to adopt the model policy. (Gov. Code § 7284.8.)
- 3) Requires the superintendent of a school district and county office of education, and the principal of a charter school, to report to their respective governing board or body in a timely manner and in a manner that ensures the confidentiality and privacy of any potentially identifying information, any requests for information or access to a schoolsite by an officer or employee of a law enforcement agency for the purpose of enforcing immigration law. (Ed. Code § 234.7(b).)
- 4) Requires the Attorney General, by April 1, 2018, and in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders, to publish model policies limiting assistance with

immigration enforcement at public schools, to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law, and ensuring that public schools remain safe and accessible to all California residents, regardless of immigration status. Requires the Attorney General to consider, at a minimum, all of the following in developing the model policies:

- a) procedures related to requests for access to school grounds for purposes related to immigration enforcement;
- b) procedures for local educational agency employees to notify specified officers of the governing board or body of public or charter schools if an individual requests or gains access to school grounds for purposes related to immigration enforcement; and
- c) procedures for responding to requests for personal information about students or their family members for purposes of immigration enforcement. (Ed. Code § 234.7(f).)

This bill:

- 1) Requires, on or before October 30, 2027, and then annually thereafter, that the Attorney General submit to the Legislature and post on its internet website a report that includes:
 - a) A summary of all immigration enforcement incidents and activities conducted by a person at a designated safe location that has reported the incident either onsite or to the Attorney General, including, but not limited to, reports submitted through the Attorney General's federal agent misconduct online portal;
 - b) Information on each immigration enforcement incident and activity, including the date of occurrence, the county of occurrence, the type of facility or location impacted, the government agency involved, and follow-up or resolution status of the incident; and
 - c) The number of immigration enforcement incidents and activities that resulted in legal action, and the counties in which the legal action took place.
- 2) Defines, for its purposes, "designated safe location" as educational institutions, health care provider entities as defined in Health and Safety Code section 24252, shelters, polling places, courthouses, public transportation property, and state and local government property.
- 3) Permits the Attorney General to request that representatives of designated safe locations furnish any reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities as part of compiling the annual report, and permits the Attorney General to issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance.

- 4) Specifies that, as part of compiling the report, the Attorney General may consider whether the designated safe location is in compliance with other state laws related to immigration enforcement, and permits the Attorney General to take enforcement action to enforce those laws.
- 5) Defines “immigration enforcement” as an effort to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of a federal civil immigration law or a federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person’s presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in the United States.

COMMENTS

1. Author’s statement

According to the author:

California is recognized for its commitment to human rights and is home to nearly 11 million immigrants. However, the state has seen a marked rise in unjust immigration enforcement. Between January and October 2025, ICE made over 18,000 arrests in California.

Recently, ICE actions have impacted communities nationwide, regardless of legal status, and in some cases, resulted in the loss of U.S. citizens' lives. Many California immigrant communities now fear for their safety when leaving their homes.

This increase in fear leads to skipped medical appointments, school absences, and avoiding public areas, resulting in a low quality of life. This is why accountability and transparency is needed regarding ICE activity in and across our state. This bill ensures that designated health locations entities are reporting ICE activity and that Californians are aware of actions taken to hold entities accountable.

2. California’s undocumented and non-citizen community members

California is home to about 10.6 million immigrants, accounting for 22% of the foreign-born population nationwide.¹ In 2023, 27% of the state’s population was foreign born, the highest of any state. There are an estimated 133,000 undocumented children in California public K-12 schools, and one in five California children live in a mixed-status household where at least one member is not a U.S. Citizen.² About 76% of

¹ Marisol Cuellar Mejia et al., Fact Sheet: Immigrants in California, Public Policy Institute of California (Jan. 2025), available at <https://www.ppic.org/publication/immigrants-in-california/>.

² Migrant Policy Institute, “Profile of the unauthorized population: California” (accessed Apr. 13, 2025), <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/unauthorized-immigrant-population/state/CA#>; Office of

undocumented students arrived in the United States when they were children or adolescents, and those who arrived to the United States as adults have lived in the United States for eight years on average.³ Non-citizen Californians are important members of their communities who are entitled to constitutionally-protected rights and to live in their communities without the constant fear of being forcibly deported to a foreign country.

3. Increased immigration enforcement under the Trump Administration

The federal government, primarily through the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency (ICE), enforces federal immigration laws in the interior of the country, through placing individuals suspected of being deportable into deportation proceedings, carrying out expedited removals in certain circumstances, or executing outstanding deportation orders.⁴ In order to be deported from the United States, an individual needs to be found to have triggered a ground of deportability. There are numerous grounds of deportability, such as making a false claim to U.S. Citizenship or being convicted of certain criminal offenses. (8 U.S.C. § 1227.) An individual who is present in the United States without ever having been admitted or paroled into the United States by an immigration officer is deportable, as is an individual who has violated their immigration status or has had their immigration status expire. Thus, an undocumented person is always at risk of being subject to immigration enforcement activities by the federal government. However, any person in the United States who is not a citizen has some level of risk that they could be deported from the United States.

Since the start of its second term, the Trump Administration has expanded immigration enforcement and altered the immigration system at an unprecedented scale. Through various executive actions, President Trump has declared a national emergency at the southern border to limit lawful entries, halted refugee admission, expanded who immigration enforcement officers can prioritize for deportation, expanded expedited removal, increased the hiring of immigration officers, expanded immigration detention, and attempted to significantly curtail the availability of various immigration visas and

Digital Services, "Immigration and California families," Ca.gov (accessed Apr. 13, 2025), <https://www.ca.gov/immigration/>.

³ American Immigration Council and Presidents' Alliance on Higher Education and Immigration, "Undocumented Students in U.S. Higher Education" (Jun. 2024), available at <https://www.higheredimmigrationportal.org/research/undocumented-students-in-higher-education-updated-march-2021/> (*hereafter* American Immigration Council).

⁴ Deportation proceedings are administrative proceedings that are adjudicated by an immigration judge, who must make the determination of whether the non-citizen respondent is deportable, and whether they qualify for relief from deportation like asylum. Expedited removal is a process by which an immigration officer, not an immigration judge, may remove an individual from the United States without a hearing on their deportability. While expedited removal has historically been limited to narrow circumstances where an individual is apprehended close to the border, the Trump Administration has significantly expanded the circumstances to which it applies, despite significant due process and other constitutional concerns with the practice.

statuses. President Trump also ended long-standing federal policy that limited immigration enforcement activity at “sensitive locations” like schools, places of worship, shelters, medical facilities, funerals, and religious ceremonies.⁵ In reversing this policy, the Trump administration’s new guidance explicitly permits immigration enforcement officers to conduct enforcement activities at any location at their individual discretion.⁶ In addition, the “big beautiful bill,” the budget reconciliation bill signed into law by President Trump in July 2025, included a whopping 170 billion dollars for immigration detention and enforcement, including 85 billion dollars for ICE.⁷ That windfall represents an eight-fold increase in ICE’s budget from previous years, and makes ICE’s budget larger than that of all other federal law enforcement agencies - combined.

And immigration enforcement activities have skyrocketed in the months since. ICE and CBP have conducted unprecedented, large sweeps of entire communities and cities, often detaining and arresting individuals at work, on the street, or through traffic stops, and often through blatant racial profiling.⁸ They have taken place as ICE has claimed sweeping additional powers to detain and arrest individuals, including the clearly unconstitutional authority to forcibly enter an individual’s home without a warrant.⁹ These immigration sweeps have occurred in Los Angeles, Portland, Chicago, Minneapolis, and many other cities, antagonizing protestors, arresting and detaining non-citizen and citizen residents alike, and disrupting those cities’ communities and economies. There also have been reports across the state of ICE attempting to enter hospitals, schools, and courthouses to detain and arrest individuals for immigration enforcement.¹⁰ ICE agents have often carried out these immigration crackdowns with

⁵ See Benjamine C. Huffman, Memorandum: Enforcement Actions in or Near Protected Areas, Dept. of Homeland Sec. (Jan. 20, 2025), available at <https://www.nafsa.org/regulatory-information/dhs-rescinds-biden-protected-areas-enforcement-policy> (*hereafter* Huffman memo); James A. Puleo, Memorandum: Enforcement Activities at Schools, Places of Worship, or at funerals or other religious ceremonies, Imm. & Nationality Svcs., HQ 807-P (May 17, 1993) (*hereafter* 1993 memo). It should be noted that President Biden expanded the protections provided in the Puleo memo to additional locations, and that the Huffman memo rescinded that policy, along with the long-standing 1993 memo.

⁶ See, Huffman memo, *supra* note 5.

⁷ Bill Chappel, “How ICE grew to be the highest-funded U.S. law enforcement agency,” NPR (Jan. 21, 2026) <https://www.npr.org/2026/01/21/nx-s1-5674887/ice-budget-funding-congress-trump>.

⁸ Wendy Fry, “Trump’s immigration crackdown upended life in California. It continues as the new year begins,” Cal Matters (Dec. 29, 2025) <https://calmatters.org/justice/2025/12/immigration-2025-year-in-review/>.

⁹ Rebecca Santana, “Immigration officers assert sweeping power to enter homes without a judge’s warrant, memo says,” AP News (Jan. 21, 2026) <https://apnews.com/article/ice-arrests-warrants-minneapolis-trump-00d0ab0338e82341fd91b160758aeb2d>.

¹⁰ Ana Ibarra & Kristen Hwang, “ICE is suddenly showing up in California hospitals. Workers want more guidance on what to do,” Cal Matters (Aug. 26, 2025) <https://calmatters.org/health/2025/08/immigration-hospitals-workers-fear/>; Melissa Gomez & Howard Blume, “Federal officials arrived, denied entry at L.A. schools amid immigration enforcement fears,” Los Angeles Times (Apr. 9, 2026) <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2025-04-09/federal-agents-arrived-denied-entry-at-los-angeles-schools-officials-say>; Gene Johnson & Heather Hollingsworth, “Recent immigration arrests at courthouses around the country have advocates worried,” AP News (May

aggressive force and while armed, masked, and without identification. Since the Trump Administration's increased enforcement activities began last year, ICE has shot and injured at least eight people, and has killed at least four, including the killing of Alex Pretti and Renee Good during ICE's surge in Minneapolis earlier this year.¹¹

4. The significant harm of increased immigration enforcement

These immigration sweeps have had significant negative consequences on communities across the state. Schools across California and the nation are experiencing significant drops in school attendance as students and their families fear being stopped or questioned by immigration authorities at school.¹² Research has also shown that many immigrant youth experience high levels of mental health conditions like anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress due to fears of immigration enforcement and separation from their family.¹³ Stressors related to immigration status and the risk of deportation negatively impact all aspects of an undocumented or non-citizen's life, and can cause many immigrants to skip medical care, be under-insured, and be hesitant to access vital assistance programs like those for health care coverage.¹⁴ In addition, a detention or deportation can severely impact the individual targeted, separating them from their families and possibly sending them to a country in which they have not lived for many years or where they fear for their life. Family members of those subject to immigration enforcement often suffer as well, through the psychological pain of family separation as well as through financial strain and other hardships as a result.

5. Recent California laws aimed at protecting the state's non-citizen residents

Given increased immigration enforcement in the past ten years, the Legislature has passed various laws aimed at protecting the state's immigrant community and minimizing the disruption that immigration enforcement activities can have on the state and its communities. In 2017, the Legislature passed a number of bills to provide protections for immigrant communities. It passed AB 699 (O'Donnell, Ch. 493, Stats. 2017) to ensure that all students in California public schools have equal access to education regardless of their immigration status. AB 699 also required that, by April

1, 2025) <https://apnews.com/article/immigration-court-house-arrests-dugan-trump-ice-4a56deb366c22a409ee1be65bb20b656>.

¹¹ Joshua Barajas, "Shooting deaths climb in Trump's mass deportation effort," PBS (Jan. 29, 2026) <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/a-look-at-shootings-by-federal-immigration-officers>.

¹² Jasmine Garsd, "The prospect of immigration agents entering schools is sending shockwaves among communities," NPR (Feb. 4, 2025), <https://www.npr.org/2025/02/04/nx-s1-5277170/schools-ice-immigration>.

¹³ Randy Capps & Michael Fox, "How the fear of immigration enforcement affects the mental health of Latino youth," Migration Policy Institute (Dec. 2020), <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/how-fear-immigration-enforcement-affects-mental-health-latino-youth>.

¹⁴ Kaiser Family Foundation, "Key facts on health coverage of immigrants" (Jan. 15, 2025), <https://www.kff.org/racial-equity-and-health-policy/fact-sheet/key-facts-on-health-coverage-of-immigrants/>.

2018, the Attorney General issue and publish model policies for public schools regarding limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at schools, which all local educational agencies must adopt (or an equivalent policy). A similar bill was AB 21 (Kalra, Ch. 488, Stats. 2017), which required the California State University, California Community Colleges, and independent institutions of higher education, and requested the Regents of the University of California, to take certain actions regarding immigration enforcement activities on campus, including: refraining from disclosing personal information concerning students, faculty, and staff except under specified circumstances; advising all students, faculty, and staff to notify the office of the chancellor or president that an immigration officer will or has entered campus to execute an immigration order; complying with a request from an immigration officer for access to a non-public area of campus only upon the presentation of a judicial warrant; and implementing the Attorney General's model policy limiting assistance with immigration enforcement, or an equivalent.

The Legislature also passed SB 54 (De León, Ch. 495, Stats. 2017). SB 54 prohibited law enforcement agencies from using their resources for immigration enforcement or from cooperating in immigration enforcement activities, and prohibited law enforcement agencies from using their resources for immigration enforcement or from cooperating in immigration enforcement activities. In addition, SB 54 required the Attorney General to publish various model policies regarding local entities' involvement or cooperation with immigration enforcement. These model policies included policies for limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, public libraries, health care facilities, courthouses, and various state agencies, which public schools, health facilities operated by the state, and courthouses were required to implement.

Given the unprecedented expansion of immigration enforcement and the termination of the "sensitive locations" policy in the past year, the Legislature passed additional bills in 2025 meant to limit immigration enforcement at various state and community locations. These bills limited immigration enforcement activities in the nonpublic areas of health care facilities (SB 81 (Arreguín, Ch. 123, Stats. 2025)) and local schoolsites (AB 49 (Muratsuchi, Ch. 122, Stats. 2025)) without a warrant. Another bill required public schools and universities to notify students or their parents and guardians, teachers, and other specified school community members when immigration enforcement activity is confirmed on the schoolsite or campus (SB 98 (Cervantes, Ch. 124, Stats. 2025)), and another required local schools to post the Attorney General's "know your educational rights" guide on their websites and in schools and administrative buildings (AB 419 (Connolly, Ch. 663, Stats. 2025)).

Just recently, the Attorney General launched an online portal for reporting unlawful actions of federal agents.¹⁵ The portal will help the Attorney General document potential unlawful conduct by federal officers and will help inform the Attorney General regarding potential legal action to protect Californians from unlawful activity by the federal government, though the Attorney General is not required to take any specific actions on the complaints submitted through the portal.

6. SB 1257 requires the Attorney General to report immigration enforcement activities that occur at certain locations

The author proposes SB 1257 to help increase transparency regarding immigration enforcement actions in the state. It requires the Attorney General to annually report to the Legislature and post on its website a report that includes: a summary of all reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities at specified locations; information on each reported immigration enforcement incident regarding where the incident occurred, the government agency involved, and any follow-up or resolution; and the number of immigration enforcement incidents that resulted in legal action. The specified locations required to be reported on include health care providers, shelters, polling places, courthouses, public transportation property, and state and local government property. SB 1257 also permits the Attorney General to request information regarding any reported immigration enforcement incidents from these locations, and provides that the Attorney General can enforce any such requests via civil penalties or other enforcement activity.

This report will provide the Legislature and the public with information regarding the immigration enforcement incidents that have occurred in the state, and what, if any, litigation has arisen with regards to the incident. Increased information will help the public and the Attorney General know where immigration enforcement is occurring, the means being used, and whether such actions are leading to litigation.

7. Amendments

The author has agreed to clarifying amendments. These amendments clarify that the immigration enforcement incidents or activities included in the report are those reported by the designated safe location or a person who witnessed the incident or activity, and clarify that legal actions required to be reported are those regarding the legality of the immigration enforcement activities and not any legal actions or administrative proceedings regarding an individual detained or arrested by ICE. The amendments also specify that the report must provide information on the county or the court in which the legal action was filed, and must not include personally identifying

¹⁵ Office of Attorney General, “California announces new online portal to report misconduct by federal agents” (Dec. 2, 2025) <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/california-announces-new-online-portal-report-misconduct-federal-agents>.

information of individuals stopped, detained, or arrested by individuals conducting immigration enforcement activities. A mock-up of the amendments is attached to the end of this analysis.

SUPPORT

Latino Coalition for a Healthy California (co-sponsor)
Todec Legal Center (co-sponsor)
Access Reproductive Justice
Asian Americans for Community Involvement
Asociacion De Migrantes Guatemaltecos Los Angeles
Buen Vecino
California Community Foundation
California Coverage Health Initiatives (CCHI)
California Immigrant Policy Center
California LGBTQ Health and Human Services Network
California Pan - Ethnic Health Network
California Physicians Alliance
California Public Defenders Association
Campaign for College Opportunity
Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)
Centro Binacional Para El Desarrollo Indigena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)
Coalition of Orange County Community Health Centers
Courage California
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
Farm2people
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Healthy Contra Costa
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
JWCH Institute
Latino Coalition for a Healthy California
Lideres Campesinas
Oasis Legal Services
South Asian Network
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center
Thai Community Development Center
The Black Alliance for Just Immigration
The Children's Partnership
Transitions Clinic Network
UnidosUS
Vision Y Compromiso (UNREG)
Western Center on Law & Poverty, Inc.

OPPOSITION

None received

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

SB 1103 (Pérez, 2026) requires a large home improvement retailer, as defined, to provide the Attorney General with copies of specified documentation regarding immigration enforcement activity that occurs on the retailer's premises, and requires the large home improvement retailer to disclose on its website any policies and practices it maintains regarding immigration enforcement activity on its premises. SB 1103 authorizes the Attorney General or a person acting in the public interest to bring a civil action for injunctive relief against a large home improvement retailer for violating these provisions. SB 1103 is currently pending before this Committee.

SB 915 (Menjivar, 2026) requires a health care provider entity, upon arrival of a patient accompanied by an immigration enforcement officer, to verify and document the identities and agencies of the accompanying immigration enforcement officers, and requires health care provider entity personnel to ask that the officer step out of the patient's room when discussing any matters pertaining to patient care or providing medical care or physical examinations. SB 915 also prohibits an immigration enforcement officer from having any authority to participate in or influence medical decisions for the patient, and prohibits a health care provider entity from using blackout policies when admitting a patient accompanied by an immigration enforcement officer, as defined. SB 915 is currently pending before the Senate Health Committee.

AB 1807 (Gabriel, 2026) prohibits the use of state-owned property for purposes of immigration enforcement, including for staging, assembling, mobilizing, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel, and requires the Department of General Services to identify state-owned property previously or likely to be used for immigration enforcement purposes. It also requires state agencies to take various actions to limit access to such state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified. AB 1807 is currently pending before the Assembly Judiciary Committee.

AB 1806 (Gabriel, 2026) requires the state prosecutor to conduct an independent, transparent, and thorough investigation of incidents of federal immigration enforcement officer-involved shooting of a civilian, and permits the state prosecutor to criminally prosecute the federal immigration enforcement officer. AB 1806 also requires the state prosecutor to post and maintain each written report regarding the incident on a public website. AB 1806 is currently pending before the Assembly Public Safety Committee.

AB 2230 (Ávila Farías, 2026) makes it a felony for a person with a firearm, a peace officer, private guard, or security personnel to be stationed at or in the immediate vicinity of a polling place, as specified, and prohibits an elections official from authorizing an officer or agency responsible for immigration enforcement or federal law enforcement to be stationed or posted in the immediate vicinity of a polling place. AB 2230 is currently pending before the Assembly Committee on Human Services.

Prior Legislation:

SB 805 (Pérez, Ch. 126, Stats. 2026) required a law enforcement officer operating in California that is not uniformed to visibly display identification that includes their agency and either their name or badge number, and made a violation of this requirement a misdemeanor, among other provisions. SB 805 also required, among other provisions, that any law enforcement agency operating in California maintain and publicly post a written policy on the visible identification of sworn personnel, as specified.

SB 98 (Cervantes, Ch. 125, Stats. 2025) required the governing bodies of local educational agencies and California State Universities, community colleges, and specified independent institutions of higher education, and requested the Regents of the University of California, to notify students or their parents and guardians, teachers, and other specified school community members when immigration enforcement activity is confirmed on the schoolsite or campus.

AB 419 (Connolly, Ch. 663, Stats. 2025) required the governing boards or bodies of local educational agencies post the Attorney General's "Know Your Educational Rights" guide, in every language in which the Attorney General provides it, in the administrative buildings of the agency, on the internet website of the agency, and at each of the agency's schoolsite.

AB 49 (Muratsuchi, Ch. 122, Stats. 2025) prohibited school officials and employees of a local educational agency from allowing an officer conducting immigration enforcement to enter a schoolsite for any purpose, unless the officer or employee provides valid identification and a valid judicial warrant or court order, or exigent circumstances necessitate immediate action.

SB 54 (De León, Ch. 495, Stats. 2017) prohibited state and local law enforcement agencies from using money or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, subject to exception, and required the issuance and adoption by various entities of model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement and limiting the availability of information for immigration enforcement.

AB 699 (O'Donnell, Ch. 493, Stats. 2017) included immigration status in the list of specified characteristics for which law states it is the policy of the State of California to provide equal rights and opportunities in the state's educational institutions, and prohibited school officials and employees of a school district, county office of education, or charter school from collecting information or documents regarding the citizenship or immigration status of pupils or their family members. Required specified school officials to take certain actions in response to requests for information or access to a schoolsite by an immigration officer for the purposes of immigration enforcement, required the Attorney General to publish, by April 1, 2018, model policies limiting assistance with immigration enforcement at public schools, and required all local educational agencies to adopt these model policies or equivalent policies. Required the governing body of local educational agencies to provide specified information of their rights to parents and guardians of students.

AB 450 (Chiu, Ch. 492, Stats. 2017) prohibited an employer from providing voluntary consent to an immigration officer to enter a non-public area of the workplace without being provided a judicial warrant. AB 450 also prohibited an employer from providing immigration officers voluntary consent to access, review, or obtain an employer's employee records without a subpoena or judicial warrant, except for in the context of a valid request to review I-9 employment eligibility verification forms and related records.

AB 21 (Kalra, Ch. 488, Stats. 2017) required the Trustees of the California State University, the governing boards of community college districts, and independent institutions of higher education, and requested the Regents of the University of California, to take certain actions regarding immigration enforcement activities on campus, including: refraining from disclosing personal information concerning students, faculty, and staff except under specified circumstances; advising all students, faculty, and staff to notify the office of the chancellor or president as soon as possible if they are advised that an immigration officer will or has entered campus to execute an immigration order; complying with a request from an immigration officer for access to a non-public area of campus only upon the presentation of a judicial warrant; and designating a staff person to serve as a point of contact for those who may be subject to immigration actions, among other requirements. Required such institutions of higher education to adopt and implement the model policy limiting assistance with immigration enforcement developed by the Attorney General, or an equivalent.

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Public Safety Committee (Ayes 4, Noes 1)

Mock-up of Proposed Amendments for 2025-2026 SB-1257 (Arreguín)
(Amendments subject to any technical changes required by Legislative Counsel)

Mock-up based on Version Number 97 - Amended Senate 4/6/26

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 7284.9 is added to the Government Code, to read:

7284.9. (a) On or before October 30, 2027, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Legislature, and post on its internet website, a report that includes all of the following:

(1) A summary of all immigration enforcement incidents and activities conducted by a person at a designated safe location that ~~have been~~ has reported by the designated safe location or persons who witnessed the activity ~~an immigration enforcement incident or activity either onsite or~~ to the Attorney General, including, but not limited to, reports submitted onsite or through the Attorney General's federal agent misconduct online portal.

(2) Information of each immigration enforcement incident and activity described in paragraph (1), including, but not limited to, the date of occurrence, the county of occurrence, the type of facility or location impacted, the government agency involved, and followup or resolution status.

(3) The number of immigration enforcement incidents and activities described in paragraph (1) that resulted in legal action regarding the incident or activity's legality, and the ~~counties~~ county or court in which the legal action ~~was filed.~~ took place. Legal action does not include legal action or administrative proceedings against an individual for the enforcement of federal immigration law, or a prosecution of an individual under federal criminal law.

(b) For the purposes of this chapter, "designated safe location" means educational institutions, health care provider entities, as defined in Section 24252 of the Health and Safety Code, shelters, polling places, courthouses, public transportation property, and state and local government property.

(c) The Attorney General may request representatives of a designated safe location to furnish any reported immigration enforcement incidents and activities as part of compiling its annual report. The Attorney General may issue civil penalties or conduct other enforcement activity to ensure compliance with this section.

(d) As part of compiling this report, the Attorney General may consider whether a designated safe location is in compliance with other state laws related to immigration enforcement and may take enforcement action to enforce those laws, as needed.

(e) For purposes of this section, “immigration enforcement” means an effort to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of a federal civil immigration law or a federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person’s presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in the United States.

(f) A report to be submitted pursuant to this section shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

(g) The report required by this section and any information therein shall not include personally identifiable information regarding an individual stopped, detained, or arrested by individuals conducting the immigration enforcement incident or activity.

SEC. 2. If the Commission on State Mandates determines that this act contains costs mandated by the state, reimbursement to local agencies and school districts for those costs shall be made pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of Title 2 of the Government Code.