



## 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 21, 2026

Hon. Maria Elena Durazo  
Member of the Senate, 26th District  
1021 O Street, Suite 7530  
Sacramento, California 95814

**Subject: Senate Bill 1160 (Durazo), as amended March 23, 2026—Oppose**

Dear Senator Durazo:

The Judicial Council regrettably must oppose Senate Bill 1160 requiring courts to collect and submit specified information related to unlawful detainer cases to the Judicial Council for posting on the council's website for public access. Due to the workload and cost associated with collection and aggregation efforts for additional data all courts do not have readily available, the council must oppose the bill.

We understand the argument that this data could help drive services to the most impacted ZIP codes across the state, however, this would require significant additional funding to the judicial branch both for necessary case management system updates and substantial additional workload for court clerks. The council recommends considering a pilot program with the Superior Court of Los Angeles County who has worked with local partners and Stanford University to extract this data from their case management system and has indicated they could provide this data for their county.

As written, the SB 1160 requires all 58 courts to provide monthly unlawful detainer data points, specifically: cases filed, cases subject to default, stipulation, or other types of pretrial judgment, cases that went to trial and which cases were bench or jury trial, and cases that were dismissed. While Los Angeles currently has systems in place to extract this information aggregated by ZIP

Hon. Maria Elena Durazo

May 21, 2026

Page 2

code, the remaining courts do not. Until the costly system updates could be implemented statewide, court clerks would be required to manually track each unlawful detainer case and keep updating the tracking method each time a change in the case occurs—requiring multiple touch points throughout each case. Valuable court clerk time spent tracking this information takes clerk time away from processing other important cases.

The bill also remains problematic for smaller counties or smaller ZIP codes where there are few unlawful detainer cases. As noted with prior versions of the bill, there may also be the legal issue of being unable to anonymize case information. Such sensitive data could not be included in a public-facing data set, as intended.

As the courts' case management systems are not currently designed to extract data at the ZIP code level, the council estimates \$2.65 million in one-time costs to work with case management system vendors to provide this capability, in addition to \$3.47 million increased workload costs to manually collect and report this data until the systems are updated. The council currently estimates these upgrades will take a minimum of two years given competing priorities and current vendor schedules which would necessitate a delayed implementation. Once in place, ongoing costs are estimated at \$5.43 million for secure data storage and ongoing court workload.

For these reasons, the Judicial Council must oppose SB 1160.

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

Sincerely,



Cory T. Jaspersen

Director

Judicial Council Governmental Affairs

CTJ/ML/ad

cc: Bethany Renfree, Legislative Director, Office of Senator Durazo  
Matthew Fleming, Deputy Legislative Secretary, Office of the Governor  
Michelle Curran, Administrative Director, Judicial Council of California