

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

AB 2721 (Carrillo)
Version: June 22, 2026
Hearing Date: June 30, 2026
Fiscal: Yes
Urgency: No
ID

SUBJECT

Unfair Competition Law: hotels

DIGEST

This bill requires an operator of a hotel with actual knowledge of a reservation by U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement on the premises to post a notice in a prominent and accessible place that discloses the possible presence of those federal officers on the premises, 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 addition, in many instances, federal agents have stayed in local hotels. AB 2721 creates a transparency measure that requires a hotel to display a notice that U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) may be present on the premises whenever the hotel operator has actual knowledge of a reservation by CBP or ICE on the premises. This notice must be placed in an area that is prominent and accessible to hotel workers and guests. AB 2721 requires that this notice be posted no later than the time of arrival of an employee of that federal entity, and that it remain for the duration of the reservation.

AB 2721 is sponsored by UNITE HERE Local 11, and is supported by the California Federation of Labor Unions. It is opposed by the Asian American Hotel Owners Association.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE LAW

Existing 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.)
- 4) Establishes the Unfair Competition Law (UCL) to prohibit unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business acts or practices and unfair, deceptive, or untrue or misleading advertising, as specified, including anything that is “a business practice and that at the same time is forbidden by law.” Provides that the Attorney General, a district attorney, and city attorneys and county counsel of cities or counties of more than

750,000 people, may bring a civil action for injunctive relief and civil penalties of up to \$2,500 for an unfair business practice, and permits a private plaintiff who has suffered injury in fact and lost money because of the unfair competition to bring a limited action for restitution and injunctive relief. (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq., *Nolte v. Cedars-Sinai Medical Center* (2015) 236 Cal.App.4th 1401, 1407.)

- 5) Defines “hotel” to mean any hotel, motel, bed and breakfast inn, or other similar transient lodging establishment, but does not include any residential hotel as defined in Health and Safety Code section 50519. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17210.)

This bill:

- 1) Requires a hotel operator with actual knowledge of a reservation with the U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) on its premises to, no later than the time of arrival of an employee of that federal entity, post a notice in a prominent and accessible place where it can be seen by all workers and guests that discloses the potential presence of CBP or ICE on its premises.
- 2) Requires the operator to ensure that the notice remains prominently displayed for the duration of the reservation.
- 3) Specifies that an operator who has established a protocol to comply with this section in good faith shall be found in compliance with these provisions.
- 4) Specifies that the bill’s requirements do not impose any duty on an operator to seek information.
- 5) Specifies that the hotel and its operator shall not be liable for loss of life, injuries, violations, penalties, liabilities, or any damages that might occur pursuant to compliance with the requirements of these provisions.
- 6) Deems a violation of these provisions engaging in unfair competition for the purposes of the UCL.
- 7) Defines, for the purposes of these provisions, the following:
 - a) “hotel” to have the same meaning as Business and Professions Code section 17210;
 - b) “operator” to mean a person who, at a minimum, meets both of the following:
 - i. is employed directly by the hotel owner or an entity charged with overseeing the day-to-day operations of the hotel; and
 - ii. is classified as a “manager” by title and works 40 or more hours per week at the hotel.

COMMENTS

1. Author's statement

In support of this measure, the author states:

Transparency is a cornerstone of public trust. AB 2721 ensures that hotels operating within our communities are open about any reservations with law enforcement agencies, so that the public is not left in the dark about how local spaces are being used. By establishing a clear, consistent statewide standard for disclosure, this measure promotes accountability, supports informed communities, and reinforces the principle that institutions serving the public must do so with honesty and openness.

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 also 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.⁴ Numerous reports detail immigration officers detaining and arresting U.S. citizens and those with lawful immigration status, despite detained individuals' repeated statements to officers that

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>.

they are citizens or have immigration status.⁵ 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 There has also been a significant increase in immigration detention, as 68,289 individuals were in immigration detention as of February 2026, a 65 percent increase from February of last year.⁹

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.¹⁰ 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.¹¹

3. AB 2721 requires hotels to disclose to guests and workers when ICE and CBP stay at the hotel

To carry out these raids, ICE and CBP have often come into cities in masse, booking into local hotels for the duration of the raids. ICE and CBP have used these reservations for lodging, and there have been reports they have also used hotels to temporarily keep

⁵ Lisa Desjardins, "U.S. citizens detained by immigration agents describe how they were treated," PBS News Hour (Feb. 13, 2026), <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/u-s-citizens-detained-by-immigration-agents-describe-how-they-were-treated>.

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 TRAC Immigration, "ICE Detainees," TRAC Reports (accessed Mar. 30, 2026) https://tracreports.org/immigration/detentionstats/pop_agen_table.html.

¹⁰ 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>.

¹¹ *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.

detainees. During the Minneapolis immigration raids earlier this year, hotels experienced a 17 percent increase in occupancy.¹² This has caused additional fear and concern for the workers and other guests of those hotels, and have made such hotels prominent contributors to ICE and CBP's actions. The hotel industry employs many workers who are routinely targeted or profiled by the raids. The hotels that house ICE and CBP are thus complicit in ICE and CBP's actions, and risk creating fear among their other guests and employees.

AB 2721 attempts to provide transparency for hotel guests and workers whenever ICE or CBP are staying on the property. It requires a hotel operator who has actual knowledge of a reservation by CBP or ICE to post a notice disclosing the potential presence of ICE or CBP. This notice must be posted no later than the time of arrival of ICE or CBP, and must be posted in a prominent and accessible location where it can be seen by all workers and guests. The notice must remain for the duration of ICE or CBP's reservation.

AB 2721 includes some limitations to this requirement and on liability for the hotel. It provides the hotel with a safe harbor, in which, if the hotel operator has established a protocol to comply with these provisions, it shall be found in compliance. It further clarifies that its requirements do not require the hotel to seek information, and that the hotel and its operator shall not be liable for any loss of life, injuries, violations, penalties, liabilities, or other damages that might occur due to compliance with the bill's requirements. These provisions provide the hotel protection when it does not actually know of the ICE or CBP reservation, and makes clear that a hotel does not have to seek out this information.

AB 2721 specifies that a violation of its requirement shall be deemed engaging in unfair competition pursuant to the Unfair Competition Law (UCL). The UCL prohibits "unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent" activities, including anything that is "a business practice and that at the same time is forbidden by law."¹³ The Attorney General, a district attorney, and city attorneys and county counsel of cities or counties of more than 750,000 people may bring civil actions under the UCL for injunctive relief and civil penalties of up to \$2,500. (Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq.) A private plaintiff who has suffered injury in fact and lost money because of the unfair competition also may bring a limited action for restitution and injunctive relief. (Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204.)

4. Supremacy clause considerations

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

¹² Nick Halter, "ICE surge boosts Twin Cities hotels, but owners warn of long-term damage," Axios Twin Cities (Feb. 4, 2026), <https://www.axios.com/local/twin-cities/2026/02/04/hotels-suffer-ice-agents-protests-vandalism-events>.

¹³ *Nolte v. Cedars-Sinai Medical Center* (2015) 236 Cal.App.4th 1401, 1407.

of the federal government, the states have broad police powers to regulate 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.). 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.)

While AB 2721 is specific to ICE and CBP, it regulates private businesses (hotels), not the federal government. Moreover, it does not require that hotels particularly do anything with ICE or CBP reservations, nor does it prohibit ICE or CBP from using or accessing the hotels they have reserved. It is simply a requirement regarding notice, and places the obligation to make this notice upon the hotel. Thus, AB 2721 does not interfere with the federal government's immigration enforcement activities, and is likely constitutional.

5. Considerations regarding compelled speech and privacy

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution protects an individual's freedom of speech, as well as freedom from compelled speech. Under the First Amendment, any restriction on speech that is based on the content of the speech is presumptively unconstitutional and subject to strict scrutiny. (*Reed v. Town of Gilbert* (2015), 576 U.S. 155, 163.) However, when the speech involved is commercial speech, in that it solely relates to the economic interests of the speaker and its audience, it is less protected than other forms of speech. (*Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Soc. Comm'n of N.Y.* (1980) 447 U.S. 557, 562.) Limitations on commercial speech is generally upheld if the law advances a substantial government interest and directly advances that interest. Because AB 2721 requires hotels to place notices on its premises for both guests and employees, it may be considered compelled speech. While a hotel and its premises are commercial in nature, it can be argued that the speech required by AB 2721 does not solely relate to the hotel or its guests' economic interests. Nonetheless, the governmental interest behind AB 2721 is substantial, as the bill is meant to provide guests and employees of the hotel transparency regarding any risks for immigration enforcement while on the property. Its required notice directly advances the interest and policy goal of increasing transparency for hotel guests and employees.

The state protects the privacy of hotel guests' information. Civil Code section 53.5 prohibits a hotel from disclosing or producing the names or identities of guests or their personal information. (Civ. Code § 53.5.) This law was enacted in 2018 through SB 1194 (Lara, Ch. 853, Stats. 2018) as a result of reports that some hotels were sharing guests' names and information with ICE for immigration enforcement. (See Senate Judiciary

Committee Analysis for SB 1194, Apr. 2018.) SB 1194 was designed to protect hotel guests' privacy from disclosure by the hotel. U.S. Supreme Court precedent has found that hotels enjoy fourth amendment protection and have a right to the privacy of their hotel registries, and thus cannot be compelled to share them without a warrant. (*City of Los Angeles v. Patel* (2015) 576 U.S. 409.)

The opposition has raised concerns with AB 2721's provisions related to hotel guest privacy. This bill does raise some questions regarding its relation to guest privacy, as the required disclosure would compel hotels to warn of ICE or CBP presence only when there is an ICE or CBP reservation at the hotel. However, its provisions do not necessarily require any specific disclosures regarding guests. It does not require the disclosure of individual ICE or CBP officers' names or identities, or even that they are necessarily staying in the hotel; it only requires that it be disclosed that ICE and CBP may be present on the hotel premises. Moreover, AB 2721 only deals with reservations by federal agencies in the line of duty, and not individual officers or private citizens.

6. Amendments

The author has agreed to amendments that will require that the notice only be displayed in a prominent and accessible place where it can be seen by all workers, thereby removing the requirement that it be visible to guests. A mock-up of these amendments is attached at the end of this analysis.

7. Arguments in support

According to UNITE HERE, Local 11, which is the sponsor of AB 2721:

AB 2721 is a commonsense transparency measure. As amended, the bill requires hotels to provide notice when they knowingly host, or should know they are hosting, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) or U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). The bill does not regulate federal law enforcement activities, disclose personal information, or prohibit hotels from contracting with these agencies. It simply ensures that workers and guests are informed when these agencies are present.

For our members, this issue is not abstract. Hotel workers have raised serious concerns about the presence of federal agents in hotels, including fear, uncertainty, and workplace safety concerns. Workers deserve to know the conditions of their workplace before they walk in. Families on vacation and people traveling for work likewise deserve transparency about the conditions of the places where they stay.

The Assembly amendments significantly narrowed and clarified the bill. AB 2721 now applies only to ICE and CBP reservations, only where a hotel operator knows or should know of the reservation and requires only a neutral notice identifying the

agency and the duration of its stay. We appreciate these amendments and support the bill in its current form. They ensure the bill remains narrowly tailored while advancing its core purpose: transparency.

Hotels routinely provide notice when amenities are unavailable or hotel operations may be affected. AB 2721 applies that same principle of transparency to federal immigration enforcement activity. Families on vacation, business travelers, and hotel workers alike deserve to know the conditions of the places where they stay and work. No one should be left in the dark about the presence of federal immigration enforcement agencies in a hotel.

8. Arguments in opposition

According to the Asian American Hotel Owners Association, which opposes AB 2721:

While the bill has been narrowed to apply specifically to reservations associated with Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) and Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the fundamental concerns remain unchanged. AB 2721 creates new legal, operational, and compliance burdens for hotel owners while establishing a troubling precedent that undermines long-standing hospitality principles centered on guest privacy and operational discretion. [...]

The bill further requires hotels to publicly display notices in advance of a reservation, maintain those notices throughout the duration of the stay, and identify the government agency involved. These requirements place hotel operators in the unprecedented position of monitoring and publicly disclosing guest-related government activity. Hotels are not law enforcement agencies and should not be tasked with investigating, tracking, or publicly reporting the nature of guest reservations.

For independent hotel owners, who comprise the overwhelming majority of AAHOA's California membership, these mandates create substantial compliance challenges. Unlike large corporations with dedicated legal and compliance departments, many small business hotel owners lack the resources necessary to navigate vague statutory requirements and the legal risks associated with potential violations.

California's hospitality industry continues to face significant economic challenges, including rising labor costs, escalating insurance premiums, increased regulatory mandates, and ongoing recovery pressures in many markets. AB 2721 adds another layer of uncertainty, compliance obligations, and potential litigation exposure without providing a clear or practical framework for implementation.

SUPPORT

UNITE HERE Local 11

OPPOSITION

Asian American Hotel Owners Association

RELATED LEGISLATION

Pending Legislation:

SB 1257 (Arreguín, 2026) requires the AG 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 AG with copies of specified documentation regarding immigration enforcement activity that occurs on the retailer's premises within 72 hours of receipt of an administrative subpoena from the AG, and requires the large home improvement retailer to disclose on its website immigration enforcement activities that occur on its premises and any policies and practices it maintains regarding immigration enforcement activity on its premises. SB 1103 authorizes the AG 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 the Assembly Judiciary Committee.

AB 2662 (Carrillo, 2026) establishes the Working Group on Civil Rights Accountability within the Department of Justice to monitor, document, analyze, and report on alleged violations of constitutional and civil rights arising from immigration enforcement activities conducted within the state by federal agencies. AB 2662 currently pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee.

AB 1807 (Gabriel, 2026) 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, requires state agencies to create policies to ensure the documentation of any attempts or actual uses of state-owned property for immigration enforcement, and includes various related provisions. AB 1807 will be heard in this Committee the same day as this bill.

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.

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.

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. Both SB 805 and SB 627 were blocked from going into effect by the courts. (*U.S. v. California* (2026) 173 F.4th 1060.)

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 52, Noes 20)

Assembly Appropriations Committee (Ayes 11, Noes 4)

Assembly Privacy and Consumer Protection Committee (Ayes 9, Noes 4)

Mock-up of Proposed Amendments for 2025-2026 AB-2721 (Carrillo)
(Amendments may be subject to technical changes required by Legislative Counsel)

Mock-up based on Version Number 96 - Amended Senate 6/22/26

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

SECTION 1. Section 17211 is added to the Business and Professions Code, to read:

17211. (a) An operator of a hotel with actual knowledge of a reservation with the United States Customs and Border Protection or United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement on its premises shall, no later than the time of arrival of an employee of that federal entity, post a notice in a prominent and accessible place where it can be seen by all workers ~~and guests~~ that discloses the potential presence of the United States Customs and Border Protection or United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement on its premises.

(b) The operator shall ensure that the notice remains prominently displayed for the duration of the reservation.

(c) An operator who has established a protocol to comply with this section in good faith shall be found in compliance with this section.

(d) The hotel and its operator shall not be liable for loss of life, injuries, violations, penalties, liabilities, or any damages that might occur pursuant to compliance with the requirements of this section.

(e) This section does not impose any duty on an operator of a hotel to seek information.

(f) A violation of this section shall be deemed engaging in unfair competition for purposes of this chapter.

(g) For purposes of this section, the following definitions apply:

(1) "Hotel" has the same meaning as Section 17210.

(2) "Operator" means a person who, at a minimum, meets both of the following criteria:

(A) The person is employed directly by the hotel owner or an entity charged with overseeing the day-to-day operations of the hotel.

(B) The person is classified as a "manager" by title and works 40 or more hours per week at the hotel.