

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

SB 1050 (Ashby)
Version: February 12, 2026
Hearing Date: April 21, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
AWM

SUBJECT

False advertising: synthetic digital performers

DIGEST

This bill makes it an unlawful practice for a person, in connection with the creation or dissemination of an advertisement in this state, to use or cause to be used a synthetic performer, as defined, without a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the performer is synthetic.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As AI models and applications become more sophisticated and integrated into our daily lives, more attention is being paid to where thoughtful regulation may be needed, including measures to ensure the safety and reliability of these systems. In addition, the rapid advancement of this technology, specifically the wide-scale introduction of generative AI (GenAI) models, has made it drastically cheaper and easier to produce synthetic content – audio, images, text, and video recordings that are not real, but that are so realistic that they are virtually impossible to distinguish from authentic content, including so-called “deepfakes.” Existing law addresses the artificially generated use of a real person’s image, but does not currently regulate the use of an AI-generated image of a human who does not correspond to any particular living, breathing human being.

This bill is intended to address the issue of synthetic content in advertisements by making it unlawful for any person, in connection with the creation or dissemination of an advertisement in this state, to include a synthetic performer in the advertisement without a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the performer is synthetic. The bill details the requirements, including that the disclosure appear in close proximity to the synthetic performer; be presented in a manner and duration sufficient for a reasonable consumer to understand that the performer is not a real human being; and use wording substantially similar to “this performance features a synthetic digital performer,” or “no human performer is depicted.” A violation of this bill’s requirements constitutes a

violation of the False Advertising Law (FAL) and may be enforced through the Unfair Competition Law (UCL). The author has agreed to amendments to respond to stakeholder concerns relating to the scope of the bill and liability for a publisher who broadcasts, streams, or otherwise disseminates an advertisement without a disclosure in violation of the bill's requirements.

This bill is sponsored by the Screen Actors Guild (SAG-AFTRA) and is supported by the California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO; the California Institute for Technology & Democracy; the Music Artists Coalition; and TechEquity Action. This bill is opposed by the California Broadband & Video Association; the California Chamber of Commerce; the Computer and Communications Industry Association; the Motion Picture Association; and TechNet. The Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee passed this bill with a vote of 7-0.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Establishes the California AI Transparency Act, which becomes operative, in part, on August 2, 2026, and requires certain "covered providers" to make an AI detection tool available at no cost by which a person can assess whether content was created or altered by the provider's GenAI system. (Bus. & Prof. Code, div. 8, ch. 25, §§ 22757 et seq.)
- 2) Requires a covered provider under 1) to offer users the option to include in AI-generated image, video, or audio content created by its own generative AI system a manifest disclosure that meets specified criteria, including that it identifies the content as AI-generated content. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22757.3(a).)
- 3) Requires a covered provider to include in AI-generated image, audio, and video content created by its generative AI system a latent disclosure that is detectable by the tool specified above and is, to the extent technically feasible, permanent or extraordinarily difficult to remove. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22757.3(b).)
- 4) Requires a large online platform, beginning January 1, 2027, to do one of the following:
 - a) Detect whether any provenance data that is compliant with widely adopted specifications adopted by an established standards-setting body is embedded into or attached to content distributed on the large online platform.
 - b) Provide a user interface to disclose the availability of system provenance data that reliably indicates that the content was generated or substantially altered by a GenAI system or captured by a capture device. The user interface shall make clearly and conspicuously available to users information sufficient to

- identify the content's authenticity, origin, or history of modification, including specified information such as whether provenance data is available.
- c) Allow a user to inspect all available system provenance data that is compliant with widely adopted specifications adopted by an established standards-setting body in an easily accessible manner by any of several specified means. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22757.3.1.)
- 5) Provides that violators of 1)-4) are liable for a civil penalty in the amount of \$5,000 per violation to be collected in a civil action filed by the Attorney General, a city attorney, or a county counsel. Each day in violation is deemed a discrete violation. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 22757.4.)
- 6) Establishes the Unfair Competition Law (UCL), which provides a statutory cause of action for any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice and unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising, including over the internet. (Bus. & Prof. Code, div. 7, pt. 2, ch. 5, §§ 17200 et seq.)
- 7) Establishes the False Advertising Law (FAL), which proscribes making or disseminating any statement that is known or should be known to be untrue or misleading with intent to directly or indirectly dispose of real or personal property. (Bus. & Prof. Code, div. 7, pt. 3, ch. 1, §§ 17500 et seq.)
- 8) Defines "unfair competition" for purposes of 6) to mean and include any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice, any unfair, deceptive, untrue, or misleading advertising, and any act prohibited by the FAL. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17200.)
- 9) Provides that any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17203.)
- 10) Requires actions for relief pursuant to the UCL to be prosecuted exclusively in a court of competent jurisdiction and only by specified public prosecutors and certain injured parties, as specified. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17204.)
- 11) Provides that any person who engages, has engaged, or proposes to engage in unfair competition is liable for a civil penalty not to exceed \$2,500 for each violation in a suit brought by a qualified public prosecutor. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17206.)
- 12) Provides remedies for individuals who have suffered damages as a result of fraud or deceit, including situations involving fraudulent misrepresentations. (Civ. Code, §§ 1572-1573, 1709-1710.)

- 13) Provides that any person who knowingly uses another's name, voice, signature, photograph, or likeness, in any manner, on or in products, merchandise, or goods, or for purposes of advertising or selling, or soliciting purchases of, products, merchandise, goods, or services, without that person's prior consent, or, in the case of a minor, the prior consent of their parent or legal guardian, shall be liable for any damages sustained by the person or persons injured as a result thereof. (Civ. Code, § 3344(a).)

This bill:

- 1) Finds and declares the following:
 - a) Consumers have a substantial interest in knowing when an advertisement uses a synthetic digital performer in a manner that could reasonably be interpreted as a human performance.
 - b) Requiring a factual disclosure regarding the use of a synthetic performer is necessary to prevent deceptive or misleading advertising practices.
 - c) It is the intent of the Legislature that the disclosure required by this act is a purely factual commercial disclosure consistent with constitutional protections for commercial speech.
- 2) Defines the following terms:
 - a) "Advertisement" means any message, statement, audiovisual recording, digital communication, or other representation disseminated in any manner or by any means, including through online platforms, that is intended to induce, or that is reasonably expected to induce, the purchase of goods or services, as described in the FAL.
 - b) "Clear and conspicuous disclosure" means a disclosure that is difficult to miss, easily understandable, and presented in a manner that a reasonable consumer would notice, read, and comprehend, taking into account the medium, format, and context in which the advertisement appears.
 - c) "Synthetic performer" means a human-life digital figure, voice, or representation created in whole or in part using artificial intelligence, machine learning, or computational techniques, and not based on, derived from, or intended to depict any particular identifiable natural person as described in Civil Code section 3344.
- 3) Provides that it is unlawful for any person, in connection with the creation or dissemination of an advertisement in this state, to use or cause to be used a synthetic performer without a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the performer is synthetic.
- 4) Requires the disclosure under 3) to satisfy, at a minimum, all of the following:
 - a) Appear in close proximity to the synthetic performer.

- b) Be presented in a manner and duration sufficient for a reasonable consumer to understand that the performer is not a real human being.
 - c) Use wording substantially similar to “this performance features a synthetic digital performer,” or “no human performer is depicted.”
- 5) Provides that nothing in 2)-7) shall be construed to do any of the following:
- a) Restrict or prohibit the creation, distribution, or exhibition of synthetic content.
 - b) Regulate the expressive or informational content of an advertisement, except to require the factual disclosure under 3).
 - c) Affect or limit any rights or remedies under the UCL or the FAL.
 - d) Apply to advertisements for expressive works, including, but not limited to, motion pictures, television programs, streaming content, documentaries, video games, or other similar audiovisual works, provided that the use of a synthetic performer in the advertisement in the promotional material is consistent with its use in the expressive work.
- 6) Provides that a violation of 2)-5) constitutes a violation of the FAL and may be enforced through the UCL.
- 7) Includes a severability clause.

COMMENTS

1. Author’s comment

California is home to the largest and most influential creative sector in the world. Hundreds of thousands of workers power the state’s creative economy, which generates billions of dollars in economic activity. At the heart of this industry are the people who bring stories and brands to life. However, recent advances in artificial intelligence have led to the creation of human-like digital figures that convincingly appear, speak, move, and perform like real people. These ‘synthetic performers’ are increasingly used online and in advertisements to promote products and services, often without any disclosure to consumers. The absence of transparency threatens California’s entertainment workforce and enables the continued deception of consumers.

California has long led the nation in protecting both workers and consumers. With the advent of AI and its impact on commercial media, the state must ensure existing advertising laws are updated to reflect new realities. SB 1050 addresses this issue by establishing a disclosure requirement for advertisements that include synthetic performers. The disclosure must be clear, conspicuous, and understandable to a reasonable consumer, and a violation of this requirement

falls under the existing False Advertising Law. This bill is necessary to provide greater transparency and to protect workers and consumers.

2. Background on AI-generated content

GenAI produces text, images, code, or music based on works produced by humans. A GenAI platform is “trained” on billions of books, poems, paintings, photos, etc., and “learns” patterns that appear throughout those works. When a user enters a prompt into a GenAI platform, the GenAI spits out a writing, image, code, or song that is based on the common themes, or “statistically probable outputs,” that it picked up from human artists’ works.¹

Because of the widespread availability of photographic and video materials for GenAI to train on (especially through social media platforms), some GenAI platforms are now able to generate convincingly photorealistic images and videos. As explained by the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee’s analysis of this bill:

The relevant issue here is not about the growing incidence of synthetic content alone, but about the quickly blurring line between what is real and what is not. As one recent article phrased it, there is a “New Authenticity Crisis”:

OpenAI launched Sora 2 recently, an app that generates photorealistic video from text prompts. Within a week, Hollywood talent agencies called it exploitation. The Motion Picture Association objected to its copyright policies. Then came the flood of videos featuring copyrighted characters in unauthorized scenes. Despite being invite-only, the app hit one million downloads in five days. Faster than ChatGPT’s launch. Social media is now overwhelmed with synthetic clips so convincing that Zelda Williams, daughter of Robin Williams, publicly asked strangers to stop sending her AI-generated videos of her deceased father.

This is not an isolated technology story. It represents the acceleration of something larger happening across business and wider society.²

Relevant here, the deployment of online, synthetic content has exploded, from fake influencers to full advertising campaigns:

When Representative Nancy Pelosi of California, the former speaker of the House, attended the Outside Lands music festival last month in her home

¹ Saw & Tan, *Unpacking copyright infringement issues in the GenAI development lifecycle and a peek into the future* (Sept. 2025) *Computer Law & Security Review*, Vol. 58.

² Saxena, *Authenticity in the Age of AI* (Dec. 22, 2025) *California Management Review*, available at <https://cmr.berkeley.edu/assets/documents/pdf/2025-12-authenticity-in-the-age-of-ai.pdf>. All links in this analysis are current as of April 16, 2026.

district of San Francisco, she took a selfie with a popular influencer who has 2.4 million followers.

“me vibing to @gracieabrams and i look up and it’s literally @speakerpelosi,” the influencer, who goes by Lil’ Miquela, captioned the photo, in which the two are seen smiling.

The catch, of course, is that Lil’ Miquela isn’t real. She is one of a slew of influencers created through artificial intelligence who have gained popularity in recent years, despite the fact that they don’t exist.

Mia Zelu, a blond-haired, blue-eyed A.I. influencer with 167,000 followers, recently made headlines for “attending” Wimbledon. And a recent report by the online creation platform Kapwing found that computer-generated celebrities are amassing millions of followers – and dollars – for the teams behind them. Lu of Magalu, a Brazilian A.I. influencer with more than eight million Instagram followers who serves as the voice of the Brazilian retailer Magalu, rakes in \$34,320 per post, while Miquela makes about \$73,920.

Introduced in 2016, and considered by many to be the “original” A.I. influencer, Miquela has appeared on magazine covers, released music and served as the face of campaigns for Calvin Klein and Prada, all while purporting to be a Brazilian American teen from Downey, Calif. (She now identifies as 22.)

The account is run by a team at the tech company Dapper Labs, which specializes in creating video games and collectibles. The team creates the story lines, images and captions that bring Miquela to life, and builds partnerships with brands, celebrities and politicians that give the impression Miquela exists beyond the computer screen.³

3. Prior legislative efforts to regulate AI-generated content

As explained by the Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection’s analysis of this bill:

Last session, the Legislature responded to some of these issues by passing the California AI Transparency Act (CAIT Act), SB 942 (Becker, Ch. 291, Stats. 2024), which is set to become operative, in part, later this year. The CAIT Act imposes obligations on “covered providers,” persons that create, code, or otherwise produce a GenAI system that has over 1,000,000 monthly visitors or users and is publicly

³ Roy, *They’re Famous. They’re Everywhere. And They’re Fake.* (Sept. 3, 2025) New York Times, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/03/style/ai-influencers-lil-miquela-mia-zelu.html?login=email&auth=login-email>.

accessible within the geographic boundaries of the state. It requires such providers to make an AI detection tool available at no cost by which a person can assess whether content was created or altered by the provider's GenAI system.

The CAIT Act also regulates AI-generated images, video, or audio that are created by a GenAI system. Covered providers are required to include a latent disclosure in such content that is detectable using the above tool, and that is, to the extent technically feasible, permanent or extraordinarily difficult to remove. This latent disclosure must identify the provider, the tool, and the time and date of the content's creation or alteration. Covered providers are also required to provide users making such content with their system with the option to include a manifest disclosure that identifies it as AI-generated content.

Last year, AB 853 (Wicks, Ch. 674, Stats. 2025) bolstered the CAIT Act by establishing similar transparency requirements on large online platforms, capture device manufacturers, and GenAI system hosting platforms.

4. This bill requires an advertisement featuring a synthetic performer to include a disclosure identifying the synthetic performer

This bill is intended to address the issue of synthetic content in advertisements by making it unlawful for any person, in connection with the creation or dissemination of an advertisement in this state, to include a synthetic performer in the advertisement without a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the performer is synthetic. The bill details the requirements, including that the disclosure appear in close proximity to the synthetic performer; be presented in a manner and duration sufficient for a reasonable consumer to understand that the performer is not a real human being; and use wording substantially similar to "this performance features a synthetic digital performer," or "no human performer is depicted." A violation of this bill's requirements constitutes a violation of the FAL and may be enforced through the UCL. The author has agreed to amendments to narrow the definition of "synthetic performer" in response to stakeholder concerns.

The Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee considered this bill from an overall policy standpoint and passed it with a vote of 7-0. This Committee has jurisdiction over (1) the remedies created by the bill and (2) the First Amendment question that arises whenever the state compels commercial speech.

a. Remedies

Rather than creating a new enforcement mechanism, this bill provides that a violation of its requirements constitutes a violation of the FAL and that a violation may be enforced under the UCL.

The FAL makes it a misdemeanor to make or disseminate statements that are untrue or misleading in an advertisement or other inducement to sell a product or service, when the speaker or disseminator knew or should have known that the statement was untrue or misleading.⁴ The FAL has an exception for broadcasters and publishers who disseminated the advertisement in good faith and without knowledge of its false, deceptive, or misleading character.⁵ As currently drafted, this bill could be read to impose liability on an entity that broadcasts, streams, or otherwise transmits an advertisement created by a third party that omits the required disclosure. In response to stakeholder concerns, the author has agreed to amend the bill to provide that a disseminating entity has no obligations under the bill until they are served with a court judgment or order finding that the advertisement violates the bill or enjoining the publication of the advertisement, at which point the entity must cease publication of the advertisement. The author has committed to continue working with stakeholders to ensure that broadcasters with no ability to control the content of a broadcast are provided with an appropriately tailored exemption.

A violation of the FAL also constitutes an act of unfair competition prohibited by the UCL.⁶ The UCL does not establish an action for damages; instead, it establishes equitable remedies, plus the possibility of civil penalties in actions brought by specified public prosecutors.⁷ Specifically, any person injured by an act of unfair competition may file a UCL action to obtain an injunction to stop the practice, and the court may also award restitution of any property obtained by means of the unfair competition.⁸ The Attorney General, a district attorney, and specified city attorneys and county counsels from counties with a population in excess of 750,000 can also file a UCL suit and obtain a civil penalty of up to \$2,500 for each violation.⁹ In assessing the amount of the civil penalty, the court shall consider the factors relevant to the case, including: “the nature and seriousness of the misconduct, the number of violations, the persistence of the misconduct, the length of time over which the misconduct occurred, the willfulness of the defendant’s misconduct, and the defendant’s assets, liabilities, and net worth.”¹⁰

b. First Amendment analysis

“Commercial speech,” including statements made in advertising, is protected by the First Amendment but enjoys a lesser degree of protection than other forms of constitutionally guaranteed expression.¹¹ “The First Amendment’s concern for commercial speech is based on the informational function of advertising.”¹²

⁴ Bus. & Prof. Code, § 17500.

⁵ *Id.*, § 17502.

⁶ *Id.*, § 17200.

⁷ *Id.*, §§ 17203-17206.

⁸ *Id.*, §§ 17203, 17204.

⁹ *Id.*, § 17206(a).

¹⁰ *Id.*, § 17206(b).

¹¹ *Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Service Commission of New York* (1980) 447 U.S. 557, 562-563.

¹² *Id.* at p. 563.

Advertising that is misleading or unlawful has no informational value and can be banned by the government.¹³ But for an advertisement that “is neither misleading nor unrelated to unlawful activity, the government’s power is more circumscribed.”¹⁴ To regulate accurate speech relating to legal activity, the government must assert a “substantial interest” to be achieved, and the limitation “must be designed carefully to achieve the State’s goal.”¹⁵ When a state seeks to compel commercial speech, e.g., require an advertisement to disclose specific information, “a requirement that [an advertiser] include in [their] advertising purely factual and uncontroversial information” that will “dissipate the possibility of consumer confusion or deception” will generally pass First Amendment muster.¹⁶

It seems likely that the state has a substantial interest in informing consumers that they are watching a synthetic performer in an advertisement. A synthetic performer can convey a type of visual flawlessness or other hyperreal appearance that is impossible in real life, which can be inherently deceptive. Moreover, consumers may wish to consider whether a company uses real human actors or synthetic versions when they are deliberating whether to buy a product.

5. Amendments

As noted above, the author has agreed to a number of amendments to address stakeholder concerns. The amendments are set forth below, subject to any nonsubstantive changes the Office of Legislative Counsel may make.

Amendment 1

On page 2, in line 19, after “any” insert “audiovisual”

Amendment 2

On page 2, in line 24, after “17500.” insert “ “Advertisement” does not include an audio-only advertisement.”

Amendment 3

On page 2, delete line 32 after “techniques,” and delete lines 33-35 and insert:

that creates the impression that the asset is engaging in an audiovisual and/or visual performance of a human performer who is not recognizable as any identifiable natural human performer.

¹³ *Ibid.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Zauderer v. Office of Disciplinary Counsel of Supreme Court of Ohio* (1985) 471 U.S. 626, 651.

(4) “Advertising medium” means any broadcast station, cable operator, multichannel video programming distributor, online platform, streaming service, digital advertising network, publisher, or other person or entity that distributes, displays, transmits, or makes available an audiovisual advertisement to consumers in this state.

Amendment 4

On page 2, delete lines 36-37, and on page 3, delete lines 1-2, and insert:

(b) It is unlawful for any person to create and cause to be published in an advertising medium an advertisement that includes a synthetic performer without a clear and conspicuous disclosure that the performer is synthetic.

Amendment 5

On page 3, between lines 27 and 28, insert:

(5) Apply to an advertisement in which the use of artificial intelligence solely involves the language translation of a human performer.

(e) (1) An advertising medium shall not transmit, distribute, display, air, or otherwise make available an advertisement containing a synthetic performer if both of the following conditions are met:

(A) A court of competent jurisdiction has issued an order finding that the advertisement violates this chapter or enjoining the creator from publishing the advertisement, including, but not limited to, an injunction issued under Section 527 of the Code of Civil Procedure; and

(B) The advertising medium is served with the order and information reasonably sufficient to identify the advertisement.

(2) Upon receipt of an order described in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), the advertising medium shall, as soon as commercially reasonable and technically feasible:

(A) Remove, disable access to, or cease further dissemination of the advertisement on the advertising medium in this state;

(B) Cease accepting payment for further dissemination of the advertisement.

6. Arguments in support

According to SAG-AFTRA:

Generative artificial intelligence models present unique opportunities and create serious risks. To maintain trust in a digital world, we need guardrails on certain synthetic creations. This bill is narrowly tailored to target the use of synthetics in advertisements. People deserve to know who is selling to them, and this bill provides that safeguard.

SB 1050 arrives amid increasing concerns over the proliferation of generative A.I. in media, where hyper-realistic clones, deep-fake influencers and A.I. spokespersons have blurred the line between real and fake. This bill puts consumers first, providing a level of accountability and trust urgently needed in the digital world.

The transparency required by this measure also protects our creative community. Disclosure will provide advertisers and consumers with a clear choice when it comes to replacing human performers with synthetics.

7. Arguments in opposition

According to a coalition of the bill's opponents:

The bill's broad reference to artificial intelligence and computational techniques does not distinguish between generative AI systems and long-standing production technologies used across the advertising ecosystem. Absent this distinction, the measure risks capturing widely used tools that do not implicate the bill's core concern—deceptive, human-like synthetic performances.

SB 1050 requires disclosures to appear in close proximity to the synthetic performer and in a specific format. While disclosure is appropriate, a rigid "in-ad" requirement may be technically difficult across formats and may reduce effectiveness by encouraging overuse of labels that consumers may ignore.

A more flexible approach that ensures disclosures are readily accessible and understandable would better serve the bill's transparency goals.

The bill requires disclosure regardless of whether the use of a synthetic performer would materially mislead a reasonable consumer. This departs from established advertising law principles, which focus on whether a representation is likely to influence consumer decision-making. Without a materiality standard, the bill risks requiring disclosures of incidental or clearly fictional content, diluting the value of disclosures where they are truly needed. This approach may not align with the bill's stated intent to prevent misleading advertising.

SUPPORT

SAG-AFTRA (sponsor)
California Federation of Labor Unions, AFL-CIO
California Institute for Technology & Democracy
Music Artists Coalition
TechEquity Action

OPPOSITION

California Broadband & Video Association
California Chamber of Commerce
Computer and Communications Industry Association
Motion Picture Association
TechNet

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending legislation:

SB 1146 (Gonzales, 2026) requires an advertisement for a health-related product that features an AI-generated digital replica or synthetic performer depicted as a licensed medical professional to include a disclaimer, except as specified. SB 1146 is pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

SB 1142 (Becker, 2026) requires certain online platforms with AI-image generation tools to permit a person to request the removal of content featuring their digital replica, as specified, and provides an enhanced civil remedy for a person whose digital replica was used in certain torts or crimes. SB 1142 is pending before this Committee and is set to be heard on the same date as this bill.

SB 1111 (Ashby, 2026) clarifies that California's right of publicity statute includes the unauthorized use of a digital replica and removes the presumption that an employee may use an employee's likeness in an advertisement or publication; and clarifies that the crime of false impersonation includes the use of a digital replica with the intent to impersonate another. SB 1111 is pending before the Senate Public Safety Committee.

Prior legislation:

AB 853 (Wicks, Ch. 674, Stats. 2025) is discussed in Comment 3 of this analysis.

SB 942 (Becker, Ch. 291, Stats. 2024) is discussed in Comment 3 of this analysis.

PRIOR VOTES

Senate Privacy, Digital Technologies, and Consumer Protection Committee (Ayes 7,
Noes 0)
