

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

AB 1650 (Caloza)
Version: June 15, 2026
Hearing Date: June 23, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
ID

SUBJECT

Rental vehicles: law enforcement

DIGEST

This bill requires any privately owned vehicle rented by, or furnished to, any federal, state, or local law enforcement agency for use in detaining, arresting, or transporting persons suspected of violating any law to display a temporary decal displaying the agency name and logo, as specified.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the past year, the federal government has conducted unprecedented immigration enforcement sweeps and raids in cities across California. There have been numerous reports of federal agents using excessive force and causing injury and property damage while conducting these raids, and officers have often conducted such raids without identification and while using unmarked vehicles. In numerous instances, agents have used rented vehicles or vans to conduct these raids, further concealing their identities and evading accountability. This bill would require any privately owned vehicle that is rented by, or furnished to, a federal, state, or local law enforcement agency for the detention, arrest, or transporting of persons suspected of violating any law to display a temporary decal displaying the agency name and logo. AB 1650 places specified requirements on the decal appearance and visibility, and requires the government entity using the vehicles to create and affix the decal. It makes a failure to display this decal unlawful, and authorizes the Attorney General, a district attorney, county counsel, or a city attorney to bring a suit for injunctive and declaratory relief for such a violation, and provides a prevailing plaintiff their reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

AB 1650 is author-sponsored, and is supported by SEIU California, the California Faculty Association, California School Employees Association, and UDW/AFSCME Local 3930. It is opposed by the Peace Officers Research Association of California and the California State Sheriff's Association.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing law:

- 1) Requires every authorized emergency vehicle to be equipped with at least one steady burning red warning lamp visible from at least 1,000 feet to the front of the vehicle, as specified. (Veh. Code § 25252.)
- 2) Provides that a rental company and a renter may agree that the renter will be responsible for no more than all of the following:
 - a) Physical or mechanical damage to the rented vehicle up to its fair market value, as determined in the customary market for the sale of that vehicle, resulting from a collision, regardless of the cause of the damage;
 - b) Loss due to theft of the rented vehicle up to its fair market value, as determined in the customary market for the sale of that vehicle, provided that the rental company establishes by clear and convincing evidence that the renter or the authorized driver failed to exercise ordinary care while in possession of the vehicle, as specified;
 - c) Physical damage to the rented vehicle up to its fair market value, as determined in the customary market for the sale of that vehicle, resulting from vandalism occurring after, or in connection with, the theft of the rented vehicle;
 - d) Physical damage to the rented vehicle up to a total of five hundred dollars (\$500) resulting from vandalism unrelated to the theft of the rented vehicle;
 - e) Actual charges for towing, storage, and impound fees paid by the rental company if the renter is liable for damage or loss; and
 - f) An administrative charge, which includes the cost of appraisal and all other costs and expenses incident to the damage, loss, repair, or replacement of the rented vehicle. (Civ. Code § 1939.03.)
- 3) Specifies the content of optional damage waivers in a rental car contract. (Civ. Code § 1939.09 (c).)
- 4) Defines the following terms, for the purposes of various provisions regulating vehicle rentals:
 - a) “rental company” to mean a person or entity in the business of renting passenger vehicles to the public;
 - b) “renter” to mean any person in a manner obligated under a contract for the lease or hire of a passenger vehicle from a rental company for a period of less than 30 days. (Civ. Code § 1939.01.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes various findings and declarations related to public safety and the need to appropriately mark rental vehicles used by law enforcement agencies.

- 2) Specifies that any privately owned vehicle rented by, or furnished to, any federal, state, or local law enforcement agency for the use of detaining, arresting, or transporting persons who have violated, or are suspected of having violated, any law, must be required to have a temporary decal displaying the agency name and logo.
- 3) Requires that the indicia or name of the governmental entity operating the vehicle be displayed in sharp contrast to the background on the front door panels and must be of such size, shape, and color as to be readily legible during daylight hours from a distance of 50 feet. Requires the governmental entity to create and affix the temporary decal to the vehicle.
- 4) Specifies that the requirement described in (2) and (3), above, does not apply to:
 - a) an officer engaged in plainclothes operations who is employed by the Business, Consumer Services, and Housing Agency, the Office of Law Enforcement Support, the California Health and Human Services Agency, the Labor and Workforce Development Agency, the Natural Resources Agency, the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the Transportation Agency, the California Environmental Protection Agency, the Government Operations Agency, or by any department, board, commission, or other entity within those agencies or the federal equivalent;
 - b) exigent circumstances involving an imminent danger to persons or property, the escape of a perpetrator, or the destruction of evidence, including if the officer is responding while off duty;
 - c) a Special Weapons and Tactics or tactical team unit that is actively performing their tactical team responsibilities;
 - d) an officer engaged in protective operations involving elected officials, judicial officers, or other designated dignitaries if the display of identification would compromise the safety, anonymity, or tactical effectiveness of the protection detail;
 - e) an officer engaged in active undercover operations or investigative activities; or
 - f) when the vehicle is used solely for the transport of a person who is already in lawful custodial status following arrest pursuant to a judicial warrant issued by a court of competent jurisdiction, or pursuant to a judicially issued extradition order, and is being transported to or from a custodial facility or transportation hub, where the officer reasonably determines that the display of a decal would compromise officer safety, public safety, or the security of the person being transported, as specified.
- 5) Specifies that a failure to display a decal in accordance with these provisions shall subject the entity renting the vehicle to liability to be enforced in a civil action by the Attorney General, a district attorney, county counsel, or a city attorney. Permits such

suits to be for injunctive or declaratory relief, and provides that a prevailing party is entitled to all reasonable attorney's fees and costs.

- 6) Requires the terms and conditions of the rental car contract to specify that compliance with the temporary decal requirement is mandatory, and permits the contract to include a term requiring the law enforcement agency to indemnify the owner of the private vehicle.
- 7) Specifies that these provisions do not apply to any rental car contract entered into prior to January 1, 2027.

COMMENTS

1. Author's statement

In support of this bill, the author states:

It has been one year since ICE began its reign of terror against immigrant communities across Los Angeles and our nation. Since then, families have lived in fear, parents have worried about their children and loved ones, and small businesses have struggled under the weight of uncertainty and intimidation. That is why I am proud to work alongside my community to author AB 1650, the Slam the Brakes on ICE Act. This bill sends a clear message: ICE should not operate from the shadows. If a government agency is carrying out enforcement actions in our neighborhoods, the vehicles they use should be clearly marked, identifiable, and accountable to the public. Transparency builds trust, and Californians deserve both. No one should have to fear an unmarked vehicle in their own neighborhood.

2. ICE has been utilizing unmarked vehicles as part of its unprecedented reign of terror

Since the start of its second term, the Trump Administration has expanded immigration enforcement and immigration detention to an unprecedented scale. In early 2025, the administration announced an arrest quota of 3,000 arrests a day.¹ To fund this effort, the budget reconciliation bill signed into law by President Trump in July 2025 included 170 billion dollars for immigration detention and enforcement, including 85 billion dollars for ICE.² That windfall represents an eight-fold increase in ICE's budget from previous years.

¹ José Olivares, "Trump Administration sets quota to arrest 3,000 people a day in anti-immigration agenda," The Guardian (May 29, 2025), <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/may/29/trump-ice-arrest-quota>.

² 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>.

As part of its effort, ICE and CBP have conducted massive immigration enforcement sweeps and raids of entire communities and cities across the United States, specifically targeting states run by Democrats and sanctuary cities. In May of 2025, hundreds of federal agents began conducting raids and immigration sweeps across Los Angeles, detaining and arresting hundreds of individuals through “at large” arrests on the street, and often through blatant racial profiling.³ These raids often targeted places where Latino people often work, frequent, and live, including Home Depot parking lots where day laborers look for work.⁴ Federal agents often conducted these raids in civilian clothing or military uniforms, and often while masked, heavily armed, and without providing identification.⁵ There have also been numerous reports of federal agents using excessive force and causing injury and property damage while conducting these raids, as well as reports that agents have denied those detained access to legal counsel.⁶ As a result of these raids, there was a four-fold increase in arrests by ICE in 2025, including a record 14,000 arrests in Los Angeles alone.⁷

Many of the arrests that resulted from the Los Angeles immigration raids were made on the basis of an individual’s perceived race or ethnicity, that the individual was speaking Spanish or speaking English with an accent, the individual’s presence at a certain business like a tow yard or car wash, or on the basis of the individual’s occupation. In July 2025, a U.S. District Court judge found that these bases were not enough for reasonable suspicion to justify such stops, and ordered the federal government to stop such indiscriminate stops and arrests in Southern California.⁸ However, the U.S. Supreme Court inexplicably overturned this ruling in September 2025, holding that such reasons, including the individual’s race or ethnicity, can be sufficient to justify such stops.⁹

³ 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/>.

⁴ Human Rights Watch, *Report: US: ICE Abuses in Los Angeles Set Stage for Other Cities* (Nov. 4, 2025), available at <https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/11/04/us-ice-abuses-in-los-angeles-set-stage-for-other-cities>.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ Elly Yu and Jordan Rynning, “ICE arrests tripled last year in LA – and more than half of those arrested had no criminal record,” LAist (Mar. 31, 2026), <https://laist.com/news/ice-arrests-tripled-los-angeles-immigration-customs-enforcement-data>.

⁸ The Associated Press, “Appeals court keeps order blocking indiscriminate immigration sweeps,” NPR (Aug. 2, 2025), <https://www.npr.org/2025/08/02/g-s1-80737/appeals-court-block-administration-immigration-sweeps>.

⁹ *Pedro Vasquez Perdomo v. Kristi Noem* (2025) 146 S. Ct. 1, 2025 U.S. LEXIS 2779. This unsigned per curiam decision included a brief concurrence by Justice Kavanaugh that stated that apparent ethnicity may be a relevant factor supporting reasonable suspicion to stop an individual and inquire about their immigration status, creating the now-infamous “Kavanaugh stop” that permits racial profiling in detentive stops by ICE or CBP.

ICE and CBP have also utilized unmarked vehicles and rental cars for this reign of terror. In one raid, masked agents in military gear and carrying military-style weapons raided two garment facilities in downtown Los Angeles, arresting over 40 workers and loading them into unmarked vans.¹⁰ In another, absurd example, CBP agents jumped out of a large rental truck to ambush and arrest a dozen people in a Home Depot parking lot.¹¹ In Illinois, there were reports that ICE agents were renting cars and then switching the license plates in violation of state law, in order to evade detection and accountability.¹² All of these incidents have led to protests across the areas where ICE has conducted raids against both ICE and the rental car companies that have been complicit in ICE's actions.

3. California has worked to require accountability and transparency in the conduct of immigration enforcement

In the wake of these troubling and fascist tactics by immigration officers, California has taken the lead in enacting laws to ensure accountability and transparency when immigration enforcement is conducted in this state. The Legislature passed SB 627 (Weiner, Ch. 125, Stats. 2025) to prohibit a law enforcement officer from wearing a mask while performing their law enforcement functions, except in limited circumstances. The Legislature also passed SB 805 (Pérez, Ch. 126, Stats. 2025) to require that federal law enforcement officers visibly display identification while they are performing federal law enforcement duties in the state. Unfortunately, both laws were blocked from going into effect by the courts.¹³

4. AB 1650 requires rental cars utilized for immigration enforcement to display a temporary decal indicating the agency using the vehicle

AB 1650 requires vehicles rented or furnished to any federal, state, or local law enforcement agency for detaining, arresting, or transporting individuals suspected of having violated a law to display a temporary decal displaying the agency name and logo of the agency using the vehicle. It requires this decal to be readily legible, and requires that the government agency renting the vehicle create and affix this decal. If an appropriate decal is not displayed, the Attorney General, a district attorney, county counsel, or a city attorney may enforce the requirement against the entity that rented the vehicle by seeking injunctive or declaratory relief in court. A prevailing plaintiff in such a suit would also be entitled to reasonable attorney's fees and costs. AB 1650 also

¹⁰ Human Rights Watch, *supra* note 4.

¹¹ LA Tenants Union, "Border patrol agents use unmarked rental truck to ambush people at LA Home Depot," The Guardian (Aug. 6, 2025), <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/video/2025/aug/06/border-patrol-agents-use-unmarked-rental-truck-to-ambush-people-at-la-home-depot-video>.

¹² Matthew Chapman, "Rental car companies hit with warning they can't let ICE agents tamper with license plates," Raw Story (Dec. 2, 2025), <https://www.rawstory.com/ice-license-plates/>.

¹³ *U.S. v. California* (2026) 173 F.4th 1060.

requires that the terms and conditions of the rental car contract specify that compliance with the temporary decal requirement is mandatory, and permits the vehicle owner to require the law enforcement agency to indemnify the owner of the vehicle.

AB 1650 does not apply in all circumstances. It provides exceptions for: certain plainclothes officers; exigent circumstances involving imminent danger, the escape of a perpetrator, or the destruction of evidence; vehicles rented to a Special Weapons and Tactics unit; vehicles rented to an officer for protective operations for elected officials; an officer engaged in undercover or investigative operations; and for vehicles used solely to transport a person already in lawful custody following arrest pursuant to a judicial warrant.

AB 1650's requirements and exceptions are a reasonable step toward greater accountability for any law enforcement agency that engages in law enforcement work using rental vehicles. The ability for the public and individuals detained by law enforcement to identify the agency and officers conducting law enforcement activity is essential for public safety and public trust. In light of the unconscionable and unaccountable tactics of officers conducting immigration enforcement in the past year, such transparency and accountability is more important than ever.

5. Arguments in support

According to SEIU California, which supports AB 1650:

The Supreme Court of the United States ruled that targeting service workers was justified. That is why it should be no surprise that, in the recent raids in Minnesota, over 30 service workers who are members of our union were arrested and detained. Since the summer of 2025, ICE raids targeting immigrant communities and families that began in Los Angeles have spread to San Diego, Sacramento, San Francisco, and other cities.

Among the locations that rental car companies operate out of are airports where SEIU United Service Workers West (USWW) members work. Requiring temporary decals would likely reduce the likelihood these workers would encounter immigration enforcement activity.

6. Arguments in opposition

According to the California Chamber of Commerce, which is opposed to AB 1650:

AB 1650 would require certain privately owned vehicles rented by or furnished to law enforcement agencies to display temporary agency-identifying decals and authorizes civil enforcement actions for noncompliance.

While PORAC supports transparency and public trust in law enforcement, this measure raises significant concerns related to safety, operational effectiveness, and unintended consequences.

First, the bill requires certain privately owned vehicles rented or furnished to law enforcement agencies to display identifying decals when used for detention, arrest, or certain transportation activities, except in limited circumstances. While intended to promote transparency, these requirements could limit the ability of officers to effectively conduct certain operations, including investigative, surveillance, and enforcement activities that rely on discretion. Even with exemptions, the scope of the bill introduces uncertainty and may hinder timely and appropriate responses in dynamic situations.

Second, law enforcement agencies frequently rely on temporary or rented vehicles for specialized operations, task force activities, emergency deployments, and other public safety needs. The bill's requirements may reduce operational flexibility and create uncertainty regarding when and how those vehicles may be used, particularly in rapidly evolving situations.

While recent amendments create a limited exemption for the transportation of individuals already in lawful custody pursuant to a judicial warrant or extradition order, the exemption does not apply to many field operations, detentions, or arrests where officer safety and operational considerations remain equally important. [...]

Finally, the bill authorizes civil enforcement actions for noncompliance, creating additional legal and administrative burdens for both law enforcement agencies and vehicle providers. These provisions may have the unintended effect of discouraging participation by vehicle providers and reducing the flexibility of agencies that rely on temporary vehicles for specialized operations, emergency responses, or other public safety needs.

SUPPORT

California Faculty Association
California School Employees Association
SEIU California
United Domestic Workers/AFSCME Local 3930

OPPOSITION

California State Sheriffs' Association
Peace Officers Research Association of California (PORAC)

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

SB 1257 (Arreguín, 2026) 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. SB 1257 is currently pending in the Assembly Public Safety Committee.

SB 1103 (Pérez, 2026) requires a large home improvement retailer, as defined, to provide the Attorney General specified documents and records related to immigration enforcement activities on the retailer's premises within 72 hours of receipt of an administrative subpoena from the Attorney General, requires a large home improvement retailer to post on its website a daily record of immigration enforcement activities occurring on its premises and any policy or procedures the retailer maintains regarding immigration enforcement activities, and permits the Attorney General and any person acting in the public interest to bring a suit for injunctive relief for violations of those requirements. SB 1103 is currently pending before the Assembly Judiciary 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 Senate Committee on Government Organization.

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 Senate Public Safety Committee.

Prior Legislation:

SB 805 (Pérez, Ch. 126, Stats. 2025) 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. *See Comment 3.*

SB 627 (Weiner, Ch. 125, Stats. 2025) made it a crime for a law enforcement officer to wear a facial covering in the performance of their duties, except as provided, made a violation of this prohibition punishable as an infraction or misdemeanor, and required any law enforcement agency operating in California to maintain and publicly post by July 1, 2026 a written policy limiting the use of facial coverings. *See Comment 3.*

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.

PRIOR VOTES:

Assembly Floor (Ayes 59, Noes 20)

Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 4)

Assembly Public Safety Committee (Ayes 7, Noes 2)

Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 3)
