



## Judicial Council of California

520 Capitol Mall, Suite 600 • Sacramento, California 95814-4717

Telephone 916-323-3121 • Fax 916-323-4347

---

# MEMORANDUM

---

**Date**

April 29, 2025

**Action Requested**

For Your Information

**To**

Hon. Patricia Guerrero  
Chief Justice of California

**Deadline**

N/A

**From**

Cory T. Jasperson, Director  
Governmental Affairs

**Contact**

Tracy Kenny, Supervising Attorney  
Governmental Affairs  
916-323-3121

[Tracy.Kenny@jud.ca.gov](mailto:Tracy.Kenny@jud.ca.gov)

**Subject**

Status of 2025 Legislation considered by the  
Legislation Committee

---

Following is the updated status report on 2025 legislation considered by the Judicial Council's Legislation Committee so far during the 2025–2026 legislative session. The bills are listed in numerical order by house (Assembly and Senate) and indexed by subject matter. The second “description” column summarizes the relevant provisions of the bill—and the version of the bill—on which the Legislation Committee's position is based. This column also includes an updated summary to reflect the most current version of the bill. The “position” column tracks the council's initial position and any subsequent change to that position. Because you and Justice Corrigan have recused yourselves from taking part in any deliberations or discussions of any electronic recording issues that may come before the Judicial Council, the status chart does not include any actions taken by the Legislation Committee on behalf of the council concerning Assembly Bill 882 (Papan) Electronic court reporting.

The text of all versions of a bill, committee analyses, vote information, history, and bill status can be found on the Legislature's website at: [leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billSearchClient.xhtml](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billSearchClient.xhtml). Our position letters on legislation as well as fiscal impact statements for those bills that would have a substantial fiscal impact on the judicial branch are hyperlinked in the report. These letters are also published on the Judicial Council's Governmental Affairs Website at: [www.courts.ca.gov/position-letters.htm](https://www.courts.ca.gov/position-letters.htm).

cc: Members of the Legislation Committee  
Michelle Curran, Administrative Director  
Robert Oyung, Chief Deputy Director  
Salena Chow, Chief Operating Officer  
Deborah Brown, Chief Legal Officer

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA  
Legislation Committee Action on 2025–2026 Legislation  
and Status of Bills**

**Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation (See Appendix)**

AB 223 (Pacheco) – Jury selection: acknowledgment and agreement .....	A
---	---

**Legislation Index by Subject**

**Child Welfare**

AB 741 (Ransom) – Department of Justice: child abuse reporting .....	2
AB 1099 (Bryan) – Developmental services: initial intake: assessment .....	4

**Civil and Small Claims<sup>1</sup>**

AB 35 (Alvarez) – California Environmental Quality Act: clean hydrogen transportation projects .....	1
AB 1084 (Zbur) – Change of name and gender and sex identifier .....	4
AB 1384 (Nguyen) – Summary proceedings for obtaining possession of real property: procedural requirements .....	4
SB 59 (Wiener) – Change of gender and sex identifier .....	5
SB 808 (Caballero) Civil Actions: writs: housing development projects. ....	5

**Court Facilities, Employees, Administration, and Technology**

AB 32 (Soria) – Tribal judges .....	1
AB 223 (Pacheco) – Jury selection: acknowledgment and agreement .....	1
AB 343 (Pacheco) – California Public Records Act: elected or appointed officials .....	2
AB 792 (Lee) – Court interpreters .....	2
AB 1073 (Farias) – Judicial officers: disqualification .....	3

**Criminal Law and Procedure**

AB 387 (Alanis) – Juries: voir dire: probation officers .....	2
---	---

**Family Law**

AB 1375 (Hoover) – Consideration when determining child custody: human trafficking .....	4
SB 589 (Alvarado-Gil) – Spousal support: factors .....	5

**Juvenile Justice**

AB 946 (Bryan) – Chief probation officer: designee.....	3
SB 357 (Menjivar) – Juveniles: delinquency .....	5
SB 552 (Cortese) – Juveniles: wards: case plans.....	5

---

<sup>1</sup> Does not include actions taken on AB 882 (Papan) Electronic court reporting.

**JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF CALIFORNIA**  
**Legislation Committee Action on 2025-2026 Legislation**  
**and Status of Bills**

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
<a href="#">AB 32</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u><a href="#">AB 32 (Soria) Tribal Judges.</a></u></p> <p>As introduced December 2, 2024  Expands some of the existing security protections afforded to certain governmental officials so that those protections would include specified tribal court judges. Specifically, this bill: 1) expands the definition of “public safety officer” to include tribal court judges in the statute that allows a public safety officer to make their address, phone number, and email address confidential on the affidavit of voter registration; 2) includes tribal court judges in the statute proscribing the assault or murder of governmental officers as related to the performance of their official duties; and 3) includes tribal court judges in the list of persons who can make their home address confidential in Department of Motor Vehicle records.</p>	<a href="#">Support</a>	Author	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Assembly Appropriations Committee</p>
<a href="#">AB 35</a> (Heather Resetarits)	<p><u><a href="#">AB 35 (Alvarez) California Environmental Quality Act: clean hydrogen transportation projects.</a></u></p> <p>As introduced December 2, 2024  Establishes specified procedures for the administrative and judicial review of the environmental review and approvals granted for a “clean hydrogen transportation project.” Requires an action or proceeding brought to attack, review, set aside, void, or annul the approval of a clean hydrogen environmental assessment or the issuance of a discretionary permit or authorization for a clean hydrogen transportation project, including any potential appeals to the court of appeal or the Supreme Court, to be resolved, to the extent feasible, within 270 days of the filing of the certified record of proceedings with the court.</p> <p>Requires the Judicial Council, on or before December 31, 2026, to adopt a rule of court to implement the judicial streamlining.</p>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	Author	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</p>
<a href="#">AB 223</a> (Mureed Rasool)	<p><u><a href="#">AB 223 (Pacheco) Jury selection: acknowledgment and agreement.</a></u></p> <p>As introduced January 9, 2025  The Trial Jury Selection and Management Act requires all persons be selected for jury service at random and from sources inclusive of a representative cross section of the population of the area served by the court. Existing law requires a trial judge to examine the prospective jurors in jury trials. Existing law gives the counsel for each party, after this initial examination, the right to examine any of the prospective jurors, as specified, in order to enable counsel to intelligently exercise both peremptory challenges and challenges for cause. Existing law requires, prior to the examination of prospective trial jurors in the panel assigned for voir dire, a specified perjury acknowledgment and agreement to be obtained from the prospective jurors. Existing law requires, after the selection of the trial jury is completed, another specified acknowledgment and agreement to be obtained from the trial jurors.</p>	<a href="#">Sponsor</a>	Judicial Council	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
	This bill would revise the acknowledgment and agreements obtained from the jury panel prior to the examination of prospective trial jurors assigned for voir dire and after the completion of selection of trial jurors.			
<a href="#">AB 343</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<u>AB 343 (Pacheco) California Public Records Act: elected or appointed officials.</u>  As introduced January 29, 2025 Amends Government Code section 7920.500, which defines elected and appointed officials for the purpose of protecting address confidentiality, to expressly include retired judges, as well as counsel appointed by the court to represent children in family law or dependency matters.	<a href="#">Support</a>	California Judges Association	<a href="#">Status</a>  Assembly Appropriations Committee
<a href="#">AB 387</a> (Mureed Rasool)	<u>AB 387 (Alanis) Juries: voir dire: probation officers.</u>  As introduced February 3, 2025 Exempts probation officers, as defined, from being selected for voir dire in civil or criminal matters.  Current law exempts only certain peace officers from voir dire in civil or criminal matters, including, but not limited to, police officers, sheriffs, marshals of a superior court or county, port wardens of the Harbor Department of Los Angeles, district attorney investigators, Department of Justice special agents and investigators, California Highway Patrol officers, and S.F. Bay Area Rapid Transit District officers. (Code Civ. Proc. § 219(b)(1).) Existing law also exempts University of California Police Department officers and California State University Police Department officers from voir dire in criminal matters only. (Code Civ. Proc. § 219(b)(2).)	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	Unknown at this time	<a href="#">Status</a>  Senate Rules Committee
<a href="#">AB 741</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<u>AB 741 (Ransom) Department of Justice: child abuse reporting.</u>  As introduced, February 18, 2025 Requires the Department of Justice (DOJ) to monitor the Child Abuse Central Index (CACI) and notify the Court Appointed Special Advocate (CASA) program if a child abuse investigation record involving a CASA employee or volunteer is added to the CACI, and allows the DOJ to increase the fee for a CASA candidate's criminal history information sufficient to cover the cost of processing subsequent child abuse investigation notifications from the CACI.	Support	California CASA	<a href="#">Status</a>  Assembly Rules Committee
<a href="#">AB 792</a> (Morgan Lardizabal)	<u>AB 792 (Lee) Court interpreters.</u>  As introduced, February 18, 2025 Amends section 71808 of the Government Code to authorize the union to request multiregional bargaining when more than one interpreter bargaining region is engaged in bargaining within the same calendar year. Requires the courts to accept the request within 30 days unless agreement is reached by all regions except for one.	<a href="#">Oppose, unless amended</a>	California Federation of Interpreters (CFI)	<a href="#">Status</a>  Assembly Appropriations Committee
<a href="#">AB 946</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<u>AB 946 (Bryan) Chief probation officer: designee.</u>  As introduced February 20, 2025 Amends Government Code section 27771, which sets forth the duties of the chief probation officer, to create an exception allowing, in a county with a population of at least 3,500,000 people,	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	Author	<a href="#">Status</a>  Assembly Public Safety Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
	those duties to be performed by the chief probation officer, or by a designee who is appointed by the county board of supervisors and who has jurisdiction over youth development. Like Senate Bill 357, this bill is intended to provide the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors with the authority to delegate some or all the responsibilities of the probation department to its recently created Youth Development Department. Notably Assembly Bill 946 would only impact Los Angeles County directly at this time because it is the only county with a population that exceeds 3.5 million.			
<a href="#">AB 1073</a> (Heather Resetarits)	<u>AB 1073 (Fariás) Judicial officers: disqualification.</u>  As introduced February 20, 2025 Amends Code of Civil Procedure section 170.6 to authorize a motion for disqualification to be brought, following reversal by the California Supreme Court, to disqualify one or more members of the panel whose decision was reversed. Requires, following a reversal by the California Supreme Court and remand to a court of appeal for further proceedings, other than of a ministerial nature, the presiding justice of the court of appeal to assign the case to a panel of three justices and to notify the parties of the assignment within 30 days of the issuance of the remittitur to the court of appeal. Limits the disqualification to the members of the panel who authored or concurred in the opinion that was reversed. Provides that for cases reversed on or after January 1, 2026, a motion must be made within 15 days of the attorney being notified of the assignment of the appellate panel, and for cases reversed prior to January 1, 2026, which are still pending, the motion must be made by January 16, 2026. Authorizes, upon presentation of a motion directed to one or more justices of a court of appeal, the presiding justice to, at the presiding justice's discretion, assign up to three new justices, regardless of the number of justices to whom the motion is directed. Directs the California Law Revision Commission to deliver a study regarding the recusal of judicial officers for prejudice and conflict of interest by September 30, 2028.	Oppose	Unknown at this time	<a href="#">Status</a>  Assembly Judiciary Committee
<a href="#">AB 1084</a> (Heather Resetarits)	<u>AB 1084 (Zbur) Change of name and gender and sex identifier.</u>  As introduced February 20, 2025 This bill, for an adult, would eliminate the mechanism to file an objection to an adult petitioner's change of name to conform to the petitioner's name to the petitioner's gender identity. The bill would require the court to enter an order granting the petition without a hearing within two weeks of the petition's filing.  The bill, for a minor, would require, for a change of name to conform a minor petitioner's name to their gender identity signed by all living parents of the minor, the court to enter, within two weeks of the filing of the petition and without a hearing, an order that the change of name is granted. The bill would require, if the petition is not signed by all living parents of the minor, the court to make an order reciting specified information, and require the petition and the order to be served on any parent who did not sign the petition. The bill would require that no hearing date be set unless an objection is timely filed and shows good cause for opposing the name change.  This bill would take effect immediately as an urgency statute.	Oppose, unless amended	Equality California	<a href="#">Status</a>  Assembly Health Committee

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
<a href="#">AB 1099</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u>AB 1099 (Bryan) Developmental services: initial intake: assessment.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 20, 2025 Creates specific procedures for foster children who are being assessed by a regional center. Specifically, if a regional center cannot determine eligibility within 15 days, it must proceed with additional assessment. Moreover, a decision not to conduct additional assessment cannot be based solely on a lack of documentation. Additionally prioritizes additional assessments for foster children requiring that they be completed within 60 days as is the case under current law for clients at elevated risk. It also requires that the assessments and eligibility determinations meet these timelines regardless of documentation availability, with regional centers tasked to help gather necessary documents to expedite the process.</p>	<a href="#">Support</a>	Disability Rights California, the Children's Law Center and Public Counsel	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Assembly Human Services Committee</p>
<a href="#">AB 1375</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u>AB 1375 (Hoover) Consideration when determining child custody: human trafficking.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 21, 2025 Adds a new section to the Family Code to require a court, before making any order granting custody of a child, to make independent findings relating to whether a parent or the child are victims of human trafficking or whether a parent has been convicted of, or caused the child or other parent to be a victim of human trafficking. AB 1375 would require a court, if the court found that a child or parent has been the victim of human trafficking, to include in an order granting custody how the order provides the necessary protections to the child.</p>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	Author	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Assembly Judiciary Committee</p>
<a href="#">AB 1384</a> (Heather Resetarits)	<p><u>AB 1384 (Nguyen) Summary proceedings for obtaining possession of real property: procedural requirements.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 21, 2025 This bill would instead limit the court's authority to set a later hearing date for a noticed motion to cases involving a residential tenancy, even for good cause. In other words, this bill would amend existing law to specify that the court's discretion to set a later date, for good cause shown, only applies to actions involving residential tenancies.</p>	Oppose	California Business Properties Association	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>
<a href="#">SB 59</a> (Heather Resetarits)	<p><u>SB 59 (Wiener) Change of gender and sex identifier.</u></p> <p>As amended March 20, 2025 This bill would expand that confidentiality to apply to all filed petitions, regardless of the age of the petitioner, and any papers associated with a proceeding for a change of gender and sex identifier, for a single petition for change to the petitioner's name and to recognize the change to the petitioner's gender and sex identifier, or for a change of name to conform the petitioner's name to the petitioner's gender identity, as specified. This bill would make these confidentiality requirements retroactive and require the Judicial Council to ensure that all courts have implemented a method to ensure the court maintains the confidentiality of these petitions and associated papers that were filed prior to the effective date of this act. The bill would require the court to immediately take steps to make a record confidential if a person, entity, or the court discovers that a court record is not being kept confidential. The bill would prohibit those records from being posted publicly on the internet or otherwise, by anyone other than the petitioner.</p>	Oppose, unless amended.	Equality California	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
<a href="#">SB 357</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u>SB 357 (Menjivar) Juveniles: delinquency.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 12, 2025 The Welfare and Institution Code assigns numerous responsibilities concerning the juvenile court and the oversight of the youth under its jurisdiction to the probation officer, including, among others, the responsibility to investigate and report to the court on any youth for whom a juvenile justice petition has been filed, as well as to supervise minors placed on probation and to manage juvenile halls and other juvenile detention facilities. Would authorize the board of supervisors of any county to delegate all or part of these duties to another county department.</p> <p>As amended April 10, 2025 Delegation authority would only apply in a county with a population of at least 3.5 million people and would expand to include youth subject to transition jurisdiction of the juvenile court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 450.</p>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	Author	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Public Safety Committee</p>
<a href="#">SB 552</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u>SB 552 (Cortese) Juveniles: wards: case plans.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 20, 2025 Requires a case plan to be developed and included in the social study of the minor in cases in which the probation officer recommends wardship and either does not recommend removal of the minor from their parent or guardian or recommends commitment of the minor to a juvenile home, ranch, camp, forestry camp, or juvenile hall. The case plan would need to be provided with the social study at disposition and specified information. The bill also requires the court to order a minor to comply with any case plan that is developed and to review the ward's progress toward meeting the goals in a case plan at a hearing no less than once every 6 months</p>	Support	Juvenile Court Judges of California	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>
<a href="#">SB 589</a> (Tracy Kenny)	<p><u>SB 589 (Alvarado-Gil) Spousal support: factors.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 20, 2025 Family Code section 4324.5 currently prohibits a court from awarding spousal support to a party who has been convicted within five years of the filing of the petition for dissolution of a sexually violent or domestic violence felony perpetrated against the other spouse, and provides that the injured spouse is entitled to 100 percent of the community property interest in the injured spouse's retirement and pension benefits. It additionally allows the injured spouse to request that the court set the date of separation as the date of the incident giving rise to the conviction and provides that if an award of attorney's fees is to be made that it be made from community funds and not from the injured spouse's separate property.</p> <p>SB 589 would extend these provisions to cases in which "the family court finds that a violent sexual felony has, in fact, been perpetrated by one spouse against the other" and the incident occurred within five years of the filing of the petition.</p>	<a href="#">Oppose</a>	Author	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Judiciary Committee</p>
<a href="#">SB 808</a> (Heather Resetarits)	<p><u>SB 808 (Caballero) Civil Actions: writs: housing development projects.</u></p> <p>As introduced February 21, 2025 This bill establishes an expedited judicial review process for a local agency's decision to deny a permit for a new housing development or residential unit. The bill's procedure allows a party to</p>	Oppose	Attorney General Rob Bonta	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Appropriations Committee</p>

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Judicial Council Position	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
	<p>seek judicial review of a housing permit denial through a writ of mandate and requires the court to hear the matter and issue a decision within set timeframes. The bill would lastly require the temporary assignment of judicial officers to ensure the timelines are met.</p> <p>Specifically, the bill requires local agencies, upon the request of an applicant for a permit, to compile a record of its proceedings as they occur and to certify the record within 15 days of the service of a writ. The bill further requires that a hearing be set no later than 45 days after the filing of the writ and that the court issue a decision no later than 30 days after the matter is submitted or 75 days after the writ was filed, whichever is earlier. If the presiding judge of the court in which the action is filed determines that, as a result of either the press of other court business or other factors, the court will be unable to meet any of the deadlines required, the presiding judge shall request the temporary assignment of a judicial officer to hear the petition and render a decision within the time limits required; the request "shall be entitled to priority."</p>			



**Appendix**  
**Status of 2025–2026 Judicial Council-Sponsored Legislation**

Bill No. (Advocate)	Bill No. (Author) Description and Updates	Sponsor	Status as of April 28, 2025
<a href="#">AB 223</a> (Mureed Rasool)	<p><u>AB 223 (Pacheco) – Jury selection: acknowledgment and agreement.</u></p> <p>As introduced January 9, 2025</p> <p>The Trial Jury Selection and Management Act requires all persons be selected for jury service at random and from sources inclusive of a representative cross section of the population of the area served by the court. Existing law requires a trial judge to examine the prospective jurors in jury trials. Existing law gives the counsel for each party, after this initial examination, the right to examine any of the prospective jurors, as specified, in order to enable counsel to intelligently exercise both peremptory challenges and challenges for cause. Existing law requires, prior to the examination of prospective trial jurors in the panel assigned for voir dire, a specified perjury acknowledgment and agreement to be obtained from the prospective jurors. Existing law requires, after the selection of the trial jury is completed, another specified acknowledgment and agreement to be obtained from the trial jurors.</p> <p>This bill makes plain language revisions to the juror and prospective juror oaths obtained from the jury panel prior to the examination of prospective trial jurors assigned for voir dire and after the completion of selection of trial jurors.</p>	<a href="#">Judicial Council</a>	<p><a href="#">Status</a></p> <p>Senate Rules Committee</p>