

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

AB 1807 (Gabriel)
Version: June 24, 2026
Hearing Date: June 30, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
ID

SUBJECT

Immigration enforcement: use of state-owned property

DIGEST

This bill prohibits the use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes, requires the Department of General Services to identify and post signage upon state-owned properties that have been used, or likely will be used, for immigration enforcement, and requires state agencies to create policies to ensure the documentation of any attempts or actual uses of state-owned property for immigration enforcement, and as well as various related provisions.

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 addition, in many instances, federal agents have used state and city property to prepare for these raids, including conducting staging and assembling and the processing of detained individuals in school and public parking lots. This use of state- or city-owned property has denied the state and the city use of their property for the purposes for which the property was intended.

AB 1807 intends to ensure that state-owned property can be used by the state for its intended purposes, and not commandeered for immigration enforcement activities. It prohibits state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes, including for staging and processing, as specified. It also requires the Department of General Services to identify state-owned property that has been used for immigration enforcement purposes, or is likely to be used for such purposes, and to post specified signage at such properties relating to the fact that the property may not be used for immigration purposes. It also requires state agencies to, wherever

practicable, ensure that physical barriers are placed to limit access to these state-owned properties for immigration enforcement. Lastly, it requires state agencies to develop policies regarding documenting attempts or actual uses of state-owned property for immigration enforcement, and requires state agencies and the Attorney General to develop and make available standardized signage and educational materials regarding employees' rights when federal agents enter state-owned property, as specified.

AB 1807 is sponsored by the California Immigrant Policy Center, and is supported by a broad coalition of immigrants' rights groups, labor unions, cities, social justice nonprofits, and other groups. It is opposed by the SFV Alliance. AB 1807 previously passed out of the Senate Governmental Organization Committee by a vote of 10 to 3.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing federal law:

- 1) Pursuant to the Tenth Amendment, limits the power of Congress to directly compel states to enact and enforce a federal regulatory program. (*New York v. United States* (1992) 505 U.S. 144, 161.)
- 2) Establishes the Immigration and Nationality Act which provides guidance and procedures relating to federal immigration law. (8 U.S.C. Section 1101 et. seq.)

Existing state law:

- 1) Prohibits state 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) Prohibits a city, county, city and county, or local law enforcement agency that does not, as of January 1, 2018, have a contract with the federal government or any federal agency or a private corporation to house or detain noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody, from entering, on or after January 1, 2019, into a contract with the federal government or any federal agency or a private corporation, to house or detain in a locked detention facility noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody, and prohibits a city, county, city and county, or local law enforcement agency that, as of January 1, 2018, has an existing contract with the federal government or any federal agency or a private corporation to detain noncitizens for

civil immigration custody, from renewing or modifying that contract in a manner that would expand the maximum number of contract beds that may be utilized to house or detain noncitizens for civil immigration custody. (Civ. Code § 1670.9.)

- 3) Prohibits a city, county, city and county, or local law enforcement agency that does not, as of June 15, 2017, have a contract with the federal government or any federal agency to detain adult noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration enforcement from entering into a new contract with the federal government or any federal agency, to house or detain in a locked detention facility owned and operated by a local entity, noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody. Prohibits a local government or law enforcement agency that, as of June 15, 2017, has an existing contract to detain adult noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody, from renewing or modifying that contract to expand the maximum number of contract beds that may be utilized to house or detain in a locked detention facility noncitizens for purposes of civil immigration custody. (Gov. Code § 7310.)

This bill:

- 1) Makes findings and declarations regarding the 2025 large-scale immigration enforcement actions carried out by the federal government and the use of the state's resources, property, and personnel for those actions.
- 2) Defines, for the purposes of its provisions:
 - a) "immigration enforcement" to mean any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal civil immigration law, and also includes any and all efforts to investigate, enforce, or assist in the investigation or enforcement of any federal criminal immigration law that penalizes a person's presence in, entry or reentry to, or employment in, the United States;
 - b) "staging area" to mean an area that is used to assemble, mobilize, and deploy vehicles, equipment, or materials, and related personnel, for the purpose of carrying out immigration enforcement operations; and
 - c) "state-owned property" to mean real property, buildings, structures, or grounds owned by the state or a state agency, including, but not limited to, a garage, parking lot, state park, or vacant lot.
- 3) Prohibits state-owned property from being used for immigration enforcement purposes, including for:
 - a) Staging, assembling, mobilizing, parking, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel for immigration enforcement;
 - b) Processing, interviewing, temporarily detaining, monitoring and collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement purposes.

- 4) Specifies that the provisions described in (3), above, do not apply to, or interfere with, property that is subject to an existing lease to which the state is a party, and does not apply to uses of state property by the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, as specified.
- 5) Requires the Department of General Services, in coordination with state agencies, to identify all state-owned property that has been used, or is likely to be used, for immigration enforcement purposes, including as a staging area, processing location, or operations base.
- 6) Requires state agencies to post clear signage stating: "This property is owned by the State of California. It may not be used for immigration enforcement purposes."
- 7) Requires state agencies to ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers, including locked gates, are used to limit access to state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes.
- 8) Requires state agencies to develop procedures, on or before January 1, 2027, that ensure that an attempted or actual use of state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes is documented in writing, that this documentation includes any photographic or video evidence, and that the Attorney General's office or their designee is notified.
- 9) Requires the Attorney General to design standardized signage for use by an individual seeking to lawfully restrict activities related to immigration enforcement, and requires the Attorney General to make this signage available to download free of charge on its public website.
- 10) Requires state agencies to make available educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.
- 11) Specifies that its provisions do not restrict or interfere with the execution of a lawful judicial warrant.

COMMENTS

1. Author's statement

In support of this bill, the author states:

California's state-owned properties are a public trust and must not be used in ways that harm the communities they are meant to serve. AB 1807 is a measured and necessary exercise of state authority, one that protects immigrant communities,

pushes back against federal overreach, and defends the constitutional rights of all Californians. We remain committed to ensuring that state resources are used to support our residents, not to advance policies that undermine their safety and well-being.

2. ICE's 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.

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 targeted places where Latino people often work, frequent, and live, and have been conducted in Home Depot parking lots where day laborers look for work.⁴ 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.⁵

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>.

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

Federal agents often conducted these raids in civilian clothing or military uniforms, and often while masked, heavily armed, and without providing identification.⁶ 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.⁷ 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.⁸

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.⁹ However, the U.S. Supreme Court inexplicably overturned this ruling in September, holding that such reasons, including the individual's race or ethnicity, can be sufficient to justify such stops.¹⁰

ICE and CBP reportedly often assembled and conducted staging for the raids on city or county property, including at school and public parking lots and California Highway Patrol facilities.¹¹ In doing so, ICE and CBP have commandeered the state's resources for their own law enforcement purposes, and have prevented the state and the public from using those spaces for their proper uses.

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ 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>.

⁹ 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>.

¹⁰ *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.

¹¹ See, "SBCC's statement on recent law enforcement activities on campus," Santa Barbara City College (Dec. 18, 2025) <https://www.sbccc.edu/newsandevents/pressreleases/2025-12-18-SBCC-Statement-Recent-Law-Enforcement-Activities-Campus.php>; "Responding to today's ICE incident," Letter from the President of CSU Dominguez Hills (Jul. 1, 2025) <https://news.csudh.edu/responding-to-todays-ice-incident/>; Memo Torres & Izzy Ramirez, "DAILY MEMO: ICE continues to use CHP and local police resources despite California's sanctuary state policy," LA Taco (Jan. 26, 2026) <https://lataco.com/daily-memo-january-26th-ice-continues-to-use-chp-and-local-police-resources-despite-californias-sanctuary-state-policy>; "Update on federal presence at the Whittier Civic Center" (Jun. 10, 2025) <https://www.cityofwhittier.org/Home/Components/News/News/1497/16?arch=1>.

3. California cities and cities across the U.S. have fought back

In light of the ICE raids that have taken place across the country in the past year and a half, many local jurisdictions have sought to limit the federal government's use of city and county property to plan and prepare for immigration enforcement. In early October 2025, Chicago enacted the first "ICE-free zone" ordinance, prohibiting federal immigration agents from using any city-owned property for immigration enforcement operations.¹² Many other municipalities have since followed Chicago's example, including Minneapolis, San Francisco, Denver, Berkeley, Santa Clara County, and Los Angeles and Los Angeles County.¹³

These measures are part of cities' and counties' land-use and administrative authorities, and aim to reserve city and county property for their proper uses by the city or county or the public. ICE-free zones do not prohibit the federal government from making arrests or interfering with the federal government's authority to conduct immigration enforcement; rather, they simply forbid the federal government from overtaking city- or county-owned property to do so. These ordinances typically include an exception for any acts carried out on the property pursuant to a valid judicial warrant, as this bill also does.

4. AB 1807 prohibits the use of state-owned property for staging for immigration enforcement or processing detained individuals

AB 1807 follows in the path of these ordinances. It prohibits state-owned property from being used for staging, assembling, mobilizing, parking, or deploying vehicles, equipment, or personnel for immigration enforcement, or from being used for processing, interviewing, temporarily detaining, monitoring and collecting information, or taking custody of individuals for immigration enforcement. Additionally, it requires the Department of General Services (DGS) to identify all state-owned property that has been used, or is likely to be used, for immigration enforcement purposes, including as a staging area, processing location, or operations base. Any property identified by DGS must have clear signage stating that the property is owned by the state and may not be used for immigration enforcement, and state agencies must ensure that, wherever appropriate, physical barriers, including locked gates, are used to limit access to state-owned property for immigration enforcement purposes.

AB 1807 also requires, by January 1, 2027, that state agencies must develop procedures to ensure that any attempted or actual use of state-owned property for immigration

¹² Office of the Mayor, "Mayor Brandon Johnson signs "ICE Free Zone" Executive Order, prohibiting use of city property for federal immigration operations," City of Chicago (Oct. 6, 2025) https://www.chicago.gov/city/en/depts/mayor/press_room/press_releases/2025/october/city-property-executive-order.html.

¹³ Sam Feineh, " 'ICE-Free Zones' explained: how cities and counties are working together to resist ICE," VERA Institute (Mar. 9, 2026) <https://www.vera.org/news-spotlights/ice-free-zones-explained>.

enforcement is documented, including through any photographs or video, and that the Attorney General is notified of any such attempt or use. The Attorney General must design and make available standardized signage for limiting immigration enforcement, and state agencies must make available educational materials regarding the rights of employees, tenants, and security staff if federal agents enter state-owned property.

5. The state's constitutional right to direct the use of its property and not be commandeered by the federal government

Under the supremacy clause of the U.S. Constitution, federal law is the “supreme law of the land.” (U.S. Const. Art. VI, Cl. 2.) Yet while immigration law is within the authority of the federal government, the states have broad police powers to regulate within their borders for the public health, safety, and general welfare. Zoning and health and safety regulations are an area of traditional state police powers (*La. E. Coast Ry. Co. v. City of W. Palm Beach* (2001) 266 F.3d 1324,1329.), and it has long been recognized that the state has the power “to preserve the property under its control for the use to which it is lawfully dedicated.” (*Adderley v. Florida* (1966) 385 U.S. 39, 47.) Thus, the state has the clear authority to regulate the uses of and purposes to, which its property is used.

However, the intergovernmental immunities doctrine prohibits a state from interfering with the federal government's authority. Under this doctrine, states may not directly regulate the federal government or discriminate against it. (*North Dakota v. U.S.* (1990) 495 U.S. 423, 435.) To determine whether a state law discriminates against the federal government, courts consider whether the state law singles out the federal government for unfavorable treatment or treats a non-federal government actor better than it does the federal government. (*U.S. v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865, 886.)

On the opposite side of the Supremacy Clause is the “anti-commandeering” doctrine derived from the states' rights under the Tenth Amendment. The anti-commandeering doctrine prohibits the federal government from requiring state officials to enforce federal laws or use state resources to carry out federal priorities.¹⁴

Under the anti-commandeering doctrine, the state can clearly refuse to cooperate with the federal government's immigration raids and immigration enforcement efforts. When the federal government uses or occupies state property, it is requiring the state to utilize its own property that is lawfully within the state's control to carry out the federal government's functions. Therefore, the anti-commandeering doctrine protects the state's decision not to provide its resources for federal immigration enforcement. AB 1807 also does not single out the federal government, as it focuses on the activity – immigration enforcement – and not the agency or entity carrying out the enforcement. Local law enforcement agencies also can, in limited circumstances, engage in

¹⁴ See *United States v. California* (2019) 921 F.3d 865; *United States v. California* (2020) 141 S. Ct. 124 (upholding California's SB 54 (De Leon, Ch. 495, Stats. 2017) under the anti-commandeering doctrine).

immigration enforcement. They would likewise be prohibited under AB 1807 from utilizing state property to do so. While it is difficult to predict how a court would rule given these competing legal doctrines, AB 1807 operates within the state's lawful authority, is permitted under the anti-commandeering doctrine, and likely does not impermissibly discriminate against the federal government.

SUPPORT

California Immigrant Policy Center (co-sponsor)
Alameda County Office of Education
Alianza Sacramento
Alliance for a Better Community
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO (AFSCME)
Asian Americans Advancing Justice Southern California
Asian Prisoner Support Committee
Building Skills Partnership
Business for Good San Diego
California Coalition for Women Prisoners
California Community Foundation
California Healthy Nail Salon Collaborative
California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
California School Employees Association
Californians United for a Responsible Budget
Canal Alliance
CAUSE
Center for Empowering Refugees and Immigrants
Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP)
Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice
Central American Resource Center of California (CARECEN-LA)
Change Begins With Me (INDIVISIBLE)
Chinese for Affirmative Action
Courage California
Diversity in Health
Empowering Marginalized Asian Communities
End Child Poverty CA
Friends Committee on Legislation of California
Glide Foundation
Harbor Institute for Immigrant and Economic Justice
Immigrant Defenders Law Center
Immigrants Rising
Indivisible CA Statestrong
Inland Coalition for Immigrant Justice
La Defensa
Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE)

Majdal Arab Community Center of San Diego
New Light Wellness
Oakland Privacy
Oakland; City of
Orale: Organizing Rooted in Abolition Liberation and Empowerment
Public Counsel
Rubicon Programs
Sacramento Immigration Coalition
Sacramento Mayor Kevin McCarty
SEIU California
Services, Immigrant Rights and Education Network (SIREN)
Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition
South Asian Network
South Bay People Power
Southeast Asia Resource Action Center (SEARAC)
Thai Community Development Center
The Children's Partnership
The San Diego LGBT Community Center
United Domestic Workers/ AFSCME Local 3930
ValorUS
Vision Y Compromiso
Women's Economic Ventures
Working Partnerships USA

OPPOSITION

SFV Alliance

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation: SB 1367 (Cervantes, 2026) prohibits a city or county from approving new land uses or changes of use that permit a detention facility, as specified. SB 1367 is currently pending in the Assembly Local Government Committee.

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 805 was blocked from going into effect by the courts earlier this year. (*U.S. v. California* (2026) 173 F.4th 1060.)

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 Leon, Ch. 495, Stats. 2017) prohibited state and local law enforcement agencies from using money or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest individuals for immigration enforcement purposes, among other provisions. SB 29 (Lara, Ch. 494, Stats. 2017) prohibited a city, county, city and county, or a local law enforcement agency from entering into a contract to detain noncitizens for immigration custody, and prohibited a city or county from approving or signing a deed or other document to convey land or issue a permit for the construction or reuse of a building to house or detain noncitizens for immigration proceedings unless it has provided specified notice to the public and solicited and heard public comments regarding the proposed detention facility.

PRIOR VOTES:

Senate Governmental Organization (Ayes 10, Noes 3)

Assembly Floor (Ayes 58, Noes 15)

Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 3)

Assembly Governmental Organization Committee (Ayes 15, Noes 3)

Assembly Judiciary Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 3)
