



Judicial Council of California

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

Telephone 916-323-3121 · Fax 916-323-4347

PATRICIA GUERRERO

*Chief Justice of California
Chair of the Judicial Council*

MICHELLE CURRAN

Administrative Director

May 19, 2026

Hon. Mike A. Gipson
Member of the Assembly, District 65
1021 O Street, Suite 6210
Sacramento, California 95814

Subject: Assembly Bill 2524 (Gipson), as amended April 27, 2026 – Oppose unless amended,
neutral if amended

Dear Assembly Member Gipson:

I regret to inform you that the Judicial Council has taken an oppose unless amended position on Assembly Bill 2524 (Gipson), which authorizes a work permit to be issued by a juvenile court to minors who are under the jurisdiction of the juvenile court because it would delegate to the court a duty that is not judicial in nature and should be undertaken by an executive branch entity. Under current law, the authority to grant a minor a work permit is provided to educational institutions only, and as recently amended, AB 2524 retains the primary role of schools in exercising this authority by giving the school district, charter school, or private school the power to unilaterally revoke a work permit issued by a judicial officer.

The council appreciates the merit of the underlying objective of the bill to ensure that youth subject to juvenile court jurisdiction have an opportunity to seek gainful employment when it benefits their rehabilitation, but does not believe that directing the court to take in this workload is the appropriate or most effective way to address this challenge. One alternative option might be to provide the authority to grant a work permit to the youth's probation or child welfare case worker. The case worker is more informed about the specific situation of the youth at the point they are seeking permission to work and thus in the best position to determine whether a work permit should be issued. Such an approach would also be more responsive to the needs of the youth as it would not be dependent on getting time on crowded court calendars before obtaining authorization to work.

Hon. Mike A. Gipson

May 19, 2026

Page 2

Another approach might be to provide clearer statutory direction to schools to evaluate the request for a work permit from a youth who is under juvenile court jurisdiction using modified criteria. Education Code section 49120 provides that a work permit “shall not be denied on the basis of a pupil’s grades, grade point average, or school attendance if the pupil is applying for the work permit in order to participate in a government-administered employment and training program that will occur during the regular summer recess or vacation of the school that the pupil attends.” A similar provision might be included for youth who are in the foster care and juvenile justice systems to prohibit denial of a work permit for grades or attendance when the work permit is to allow work that will further the youth’s case plan or rehabilitation. Such an approach would address the problem identified with current law and practice without creating a separation of powers issue or granting executive branch personnel the authority to abrogate a judicial action.

Ensuring that the judicial branch is an independent, separate, and co-equal branch of state government is one of the key strategic goals of the council. Without the proposed amendments, AB 2524 would undermine that goal by placing the juvenile court in an executive role and then subjugating its authority to another branch.

For these reasons, the Judicial Council opposes AB 2524 unless it is amended to remove this conflict and place this authority with an executive branch entity.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at 916-323-3121.

Sincerely,



Tracy Kenny
Supervising Attorney
Judicial Council Governmental Affairs

cc: Christine Aurre, Legislative Affairs Secretary, Office of the Governor
Michelle Curran, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California