

DISCLAIMER: The following analysis is a professional staff recommendation and does not necessarily represent the formal opinion of all the members of the Senate Republican Caucus.

MEDIA CONTACT: For media inquiries, please contact Maxie.Holmberg-Douglas@sen.ca.gov or at, 916-651-1521.

Public Safety

**SB 1105 (Pérez)
Oppose**

Vote requirement: 21
Version Date: 04/08/2026

Summary

Prohibits local and state law enforcement from participating in or agreeing to interagency agreements/ cooperation with any out of state entity, including the federal government, that involves "racial or identity profiling", criminalization of specified protected rights, use of "military" weapons, or the furtherance of the objectives in the September 26, 2025, National Security Presidential Memorandum No. 7 (i.e. Countering Domestic Terrorism and Organized Political Violence). Reduces the ability of federal law enforcement officers to make arrests for violations of California law, except as specified.

Vote History

Senate Public Safety: 5-1 (04/07/2026)

(NO: Seyarto)

Senate Appropriations: 5-2 (05/14/2026)

(NO: Dahle, Seyarto)

Support & Opposition Received

Support: ACLU California Action; Alianza Coachella Valley; Alliance For A Better Community; Alliance San Diego; American Friends Service Committee; Anti Police-Terror Project; Bend The Arc: Jewish Action California; Berkeley Friends Meeting; CAIR California; California Attorneys For Criminal Justice; California Black Power Network; California Coalition For Sheriff Oversight (CCSO); California Community Foundation; California Faculty Association; California Immigrant Policy Center; California Public Defenders Association; Californians For Safety And Justice; Cancel The Contract; Center For Policing Equity; Central American Resource Center Of California (CARECEN-LA); Check The Sheriff; Chispa, A Project Of Tides Advocacy; Coalition For Humane Immigrant Rights (CHIRLA); Courage California; Drug Policy Alliance; Electronic Frontier Foundation; Ella Baker Center For Human Rights; Friends

Committee On Legislation Of California; Initiate Justice; Justice2Jobs Coalition; La Defensa; Latino Community Foundation; League Of Women Voters Of California; Local 148 Los Angeles County Public Defender's Union; Loyola Law School Anti-Racism Center; Multi-Faith Action Coalition; National Police Accountability Project; Oakland Privacy; Orange County Rapid Response Network; Peace And Justice Law Center; Pilipino Workers Center Of Southern California; Privacy Defense Alliance; Prosecutors Alliance Action; Public Counsel; Restoring Hope California; Rubicon Programs; Santa Barbara Women's Political Committee; Santa Monica Democratic Club; Sister Warriors Freedom Coalition; Smart Justice California; Solano County Democratic Central Committee; South Asian Network; The Gathering For Justice; The W. Haywood Burns Institute; Western Center On Law & Poverty; Women's March Action

Opposition: Arcadia Police Officers' Association; Association For Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs (ALADS); Brea Police Association; Burbank Police Officers' Association; California Narcotic Officers' Association; California Police Chiefs Association; California Reserve Peace Officers Association; California State Sheriffs' Association; Claremont Police Officers Association; Corona Police Officers Association; Fullerton Police Officers' Association; Los Angeles Police Protective League; Murrieta Police Officers' Association; Newport Beach Police Association; Palos Verdes Police Officers Association; Peace Officers Research Association Of California (PORAC); Placer County Deputy Sheriffs' Association; Pomona Police Officers' Association; Riverside County Sheriff's Office; Riverside Police Officers Association; Riverside Sheriffs' Association

Fiscal Effect

POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT STATE COSTS

- > Unknown litigation costs, potentially greater than \$150,000 (Motor Vehicle Account) for the California Highway Patrol (CHP) to defend against legal actions alleging non-compliance of CHP's interagency agreements with this bill's provisions.
- > Unknown one-time costs (Motor Vehicle Account) for CHP to review, and potentially amend, existing contracts with federal agencies to include this bill's limitations on racial or identity profiling.
- > The California Constitution requires the state to reimburse local agencies for costs mandated by the state. Requiring local law enforcement agencies to amend existing interagency agreements with federal agencies to include this bill's limitations on racial or identity profiling would result in new local costs that could be subject to reimbursement by the state. The magnitude of reimbursable costs is unknown, but potentially in excess of \$150,000 General Fund, statewide.

Arguments in Support

1) According to the author, "SB 1105, the Protect CA Rights Act, prohibits local and state law enforcement from assisting federal agents in operations that involve racial or identity profiling, the criminalization of protected speech, or the use of unauthorized military-style weapons against Californians. Californians have rights — and it is our duty to protect them. Existing California law already prohibits racial profiling, and our Constitution guarantees the right to peacefully assemble without being met with militarized responses. But the Federal Administration is attempting to erode those rights in real time. Through their words, actions, and executive orders, the Federal Administration has made clear that its enforcement campaign extends beyond undocumented immigrants. Across California, we are increasingly seeing federal agents rely on local law enforcement to facilitate their operations. ICE has called upon local police to block legal observers and rapid responders from documenting enforcement actions, creating barriers that limit public visibility into federal immigration operations. While such actions may not violate existing law, since local officers are not the ones carrying out the immigration arrests, they are still providing operational support to ICE. American citizens who speak out against ICE have been targeted, and minority communities are being scrutinized regardless of immigration status. This bill makes one thing clear: California's law enforcement resources cannot be used to undermine California law or constitutional rights."

2) According to the ACLU, the sponsor of this measure, "Over the past decade, the Legislature has passed a number of civil rights protections – our laws prevent police from singling people out based on race, shield our resources from being used to tear apart immigrant families, and safeguard our right to peacefully assemble and protest without being subjected to militarized attacks... Federal agents have violated our laws and brutalized countless Californians. As many have seen firsthand, DHS agents have been terrorizing communities through 'roving patrols' that illegally stop, kidnap, and disappear someone based on their race. When brave Californians have taken to the street to protest ICE's abuses, they have been met with outright violence. Two Californians were recently shot in the face with 'less lethal' ammunition, leaving them permanently blind. Others have chosen to protect their communities by serving as legal observers in their neighborhoods, only to find themselves the targets of ICE surveillance operations..."

"Trump is trying to commandeer state and local police departments to carry out his assault on our civil rights. To make matters worse, Trump is augmenting his campaign against our freedoms by trying to commandeer local and state police to implement his agenda – diverting local law enforcement's limited resources to victimize their communities, target political opponents who disagree with the federal Administration, and intimidate people into silence. Through joint task forces, state and local police have been ordered to support racially discriminatory immigration enforcement activities, to investigate people and civil organizations demonstrating against these actions, and to target Americans who are documenting ICE's abusive actions. For example, National Security Presidential Memorandum-7 explicitly orders joint task forces to investigate individuals and entities for expressing 'anti-Americanism, anti-capitalism, and anti-Christianity' views as well as for disagreeing with the Administration's views on 'family,

religion, and morality'. This flagrant attack on First Amendment rights is meant to silence Californians and stop them from exercising their right to hold government accountable. Unfortunately, in California, we've seen a dangerous rise in local law enforcement acting at the federal police force's beck and call to harass protestors and others who are recording ICE activities to hold them accountable. Trump's harmful agenda is directly endangering Californians' public safety. While demanding that local police participate in these programs is at odds with California law, the Trump Administration is also diverting the federal agencies and taskforces leading these programs away from existing investigations into child abuse, trafficking, and terrorism, to instead serve its racial profiling dragnet and suppression of dissent..."

"The Legislature must not allow this Administration to also pull state and local resources away from California priorities in service of Trump's disruptive agenda. Moreover, the Administration's push to blur the lines between local and federal law enforcement has eroded community trust in their local police departments. When people fear law enforcement, they are less likely to report crimes, seek help, or cooperate with police... the bill will:

- Prohibit local and state law enforcement from assisting federal agents in operations that involve racial or identity profiling, criminalization of speech, or use of unauthorized weapons of war against Californians.
- Ensure that our state doesn't give federal law enforcement officers acting beyond their federal jurisdiction the power to stop and arrest Californians, except during times of emergency and with the Governor's approval."

Arguments in Opposition

1) According to a coalition of law enforcement groups, "[SB 1105] would broadly restrict local participation in joint law enforcement operations and create major barriers to critical public safety partnerships. In practice, SB 1105 would force California agencies to withdraw from federal task forces whenever an agency simply has information suggesting a federal partner may engage in conduct prohibited by the bill. Specific concerns include:

- *Threatens Critical Public Safety Partnerships:* SB 1105 extends far beyond immigration enforcement and could impact terrorism, gang, fentanyl, human trafficking, and fugitive task force operations.
- *Creates a De Facto Ban on Joint Operations:* The bill restricts participation whenever agencies have information that a federal partner may engage in prohibited conduct, without requiring a court finding or proven violation.
- *Creates Operational Uncertainty:* Local agencies would be forced to make real-time legal determinations involving complex constitutional issues.
- *Defines Assistance Too Broadly:* Routine activities such as intelligence sharing, perimeter security, communications support, tactical coordination, and officer safety assistance could become restricted.
- *Jeopardizes Longstanding Task Force Agreements:* A single allegation involving one

federal participant could place regional partnerships and interagency agreements at risk.

- *Chills Information Sharing and Coordination*: Agencies may avoid lawful operations due to concerns regarding liability exposure and future allegations.

“San Diego Human Trafficking Task Force has helped over 100 victims, arrested more than 100 traffickers, and seized over \$2 million in illegal weapons. LA IMPACT has seized more than 2,000 pounds of methamphetamine, 650 kilograms of cocaine, 19 kilograms of fentanyl, and secured over 700 felony arrests and convictions in the last three years alone. SB 1105 places both operations in jeopardy.”

“SB 1105 also ignores existing Sanctuary State laws that already restrict California law enforcement’s engagement in task force operation. As drafted, this bill is a step backward for public safety coordination and risks weakening critical law enforcement operations as we prepare for major worldwide events, including the 2028 Olympics and Paralympic games.”

2) This bill is completely unnecessary and likely harmful to the residents and visitors to this state. First and foremost, participation by law enforcement in task forces/ cooperative agreements with immigration as their main purpose is already prohibited and has been since the enactment of SB 54. Under that measure/ statute, the AG produces an annual report on all task forces (again without immigration as their primary focus) and it reported in 2025 that out of 16,613 arrests by joint task forces only 300 (.018%) were for immigration related violations. That is to say that data provided by the DOJ appears to show that law enforcement is not engaging with task forces that generally make significant arrests related to immigration. So the general premise of this bill, that state and local law enforcement is regularly assisting in immigration enforcement, is not supported by the statistics.

The terms of this bill would likely prohibit California law enforcement from participating in most, and perhaps all, inter agency agreements for cooperation and assistance with the federal government or other states. The reason is that the bill requires the agency to avoid any agreement that may involve any "racial profiling" (which is already prohibited for CA peace officers); any constitutionally protected expressive conduct; any focus on domestic terrorism or political violence (i.e. the main focus of National Security Presidential Memorandum No. 7), any use of kinetic weapons against a assembly, protest, or demonstration in violation of CA Law (despite the fact that federal agencies are not bound or required to operate under CA law); or the any use of military equipment prohibited by any participating local government (again, the feds are not required to adopt the policies of CA localities). The point here is that the FBI, DHS, ATF or any other federal agency is not going to agree to these terms, adopt the equipment policy of a random city or county in California or agree to limit information sharing regarding domestic terrorism. As a result, this is basically a roadblock/ ban on cooperation for agreements to cooperate with the federal government, particularly for agreements around cooperation regarding multinational entities, domestic terrorism or political violence. This could be a significant issue for the state going forward and is

particularly troubling given the upcoming Olympic Games in Los Angeles.

In regard to the specific prohibition on the September 26, 2025, National Security Presidential Memorandum No. 7, it is understandable that some groups, like the sponsor, may not like many of its declarations and directions. That is understandable. However, the main directive of the order is to investigate and prevent "political violence, terrorism, or conspiracy against rights" and "the violent deprivation of any citizen's rights". So if we pass a law stating that law enforcement cannot participate in any task force that works in "furtherance of the objectives of that memorandum" can law enforcement assist the federal government on any issue related to domestic terrorism or political violence at all?

Realistically, there is no good reason for this change. It does not affect how ICE will operate and local law enforcement will still have to deploy in order to maintain the peace. The feds can still detain and arrest people under federal law and on occasion state law. So basically, this just limits the ability of our state to work with agencies like the FBI, ATF, DHS, etc. in their efforts to prevent or disband multinational or multistate crime rings. At the end of day, this appears to be an angry response by the author and sponsor who don't like how one administration is using a single federal department and their response is to stop all cooperation with every federal agency. It is an irrational response and doesn't really solve the underlying problem they have nor will it benefit the state or country.

Digest

Makes the following findings and declarations:

(a) Article I of the California Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution guarantee equal protection of the law and the right to be free from unreasonable seizures. California law prohibits racial profiling and other forms of discrimination on the basis of protected personal characteristics including race, national origin, ethnic group identification, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, color, or disability.

(b) In enacting the California Racial and Identity Profiling Act of 2015, the Legislature declared all of the following:

(1) Racial or identity profiling is a practice that presents a great danger to the fundamental principles of our Constitution and a democratic society.

(2) Profiling is abhorrent and cannot be tolerated.

(3) Profiling alienates people from law enforcement, hinders community policing efforts, and causes law enforcement to lose credibility and trust among the people whom law enforcement is sworn to protect and serve.

(c) The rights to privacy and free expression, including the expression of dissenting political viewpoints, are guaranteed by Article I of the California Constitution and the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. These are fundamental rights essential to a free society.

(d) It is the intent of the Legislature to act within the state's legal authority to prevent the

use of California resources, personnel, property, or partnerships to facilitate unlawful discrimination or support programs that criminalize protected personal characteristics and constitutionally protected expression in violation of the California and United States Constitutions and state law.

(e) Entangling state and local agencies with federal operations that target civil society groups based on protected expression or that rely on racial profiling diverts already limited resources and blurs the lines of accountability between local, state, and federal government.

(f) It is the intent of the Legislature to protect safety, well-being, and constitutional rights of the people of California, and to direct the state's limited resources to matters of greatest concern to state and local governments.

(g) The state has both the authority and the responsibility, pursuant to its police powers, to uphold its laws and protect the safety, well-being, and fundamental rights of all people within its jurisdiction.

(h) Interagency agreements that provide for state and local agencies to participate in operations that involve racial or identity profiling, law enforcement targeting of constitutionally protected expressive conduct, indiscriminate or unnecessary deployment of crowd control weapons, or unauthorized use of military weapons are contrary to the express provisions and underlying policies of existing California law. It is the intent of the Legislature to expressly declare that those interagency agreements are against public policy, and to affirm the requirements of existing law.

Federal Peace Officers:

Removes or modifies the authority of federal criminal investigators and law enforcement officers to exercise the powers of arrest for specific circumstances including:

- 1) Any circumstances specified in Section 836 of this code (when witnessing a crime, for a felony, for domestic violence) or Section 5150 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (i.e. involuntary commitment for mental health) for violations of state or local laws.
- 2) When these investigators and law enforcement officers are engaged in the enforcement of federal criminal laws and exercise the arrest powers only incidental to the performance of these duties.
- 3) Replaces "When probable cause exists to believe that a public offense that involves immediate danger to persons or property has just occurred or is being committed." with "an immediate threat of great bodily injury"
- 4) Duly authorized federal employees who comply with the training requirements when they are engaged in enforcing applicable state or local laws on property owned or possessed by the United States government, or on any street, sidewalk, or property adjacent thereto, and with the written consent of the sheriff or the chief of police, respectively, in whose jurisdiction the property is situated.

Limits federal peace officers enforcing state law in emergency operations unless it is the request of the Governor.

Interagency Agreements/ participation:

Except as required by federal or state law, a California law enforcement agency shall not enter into an interagency agreement unless the agreement is in writing and

expressly provides that any California law enforcement agency that is a party to the agreement shall not engage in the following conduct:

- 1) Racial or identity profiling, as defined and prohibited by Section 13519.4. (see background for definition)
- 2) Investigation, arrest, use of force, or imposition of civil or criminal liability or other penalties upon a person or entity based on constitutionally protected expressive conduct, including, but not limited to, either of the following: A) Requests made by federal authorities or other out-of-state authorities to obtain data or conduct surveillance or investigation in furtherance of the objectives in the September 26, 2025, National Security Presidential Memorandum No. 7 (i.e. domestic terrorism and anti-political activities – see background), including, pursuant to a joint law enforcement task force request or agreement made in furtherance of the objectives of that memorandum; B) Deployment of kinetic energy projectiles and chemical agents against an assembly, protest, or demonstration that does not meet the requirements of Section 13652 (no use by LE unless trained and after intermediate action- see background).
- 3) Use, deployment, or acquisition of military equipment that has not been authorized pursuant to Section 7071 of the Government Code (local limitation on use of military equipment – see background).

Provides that if a California law enforcement agency enters into an interagency agreement (not to exceed four years), the agreement shall be in writing and include the limitations set forth above.

Provides that except as required by federal or state law, a California law enforcement agency shall not use agency or departmental resources or personnel to assist an operation executed in whole, or in part, by a federal or other out-of-state law enforcement agency when it has information that a federal or out-of-state law enforcement agency has engaged in, or intends to engage in, the actions described above in that operation.

Provides an interagency agreement in existence on January 1, 2027, is presumptively valid and may remain in effect until July 1, 2027. On or before July 1, 2027, the interagency agreement shall be amended to include the limitations above. An interagency agreement that does not expressly include the limitations above is contrary to law and public policy, and is void and unenforceable.

The following shall be deemed a violation of this section: (1) The California law enforcement agency has engaged in the conduct described above under the auspices of an interagency agreement.(2) The California law enforcement agency did not otherwise comply with the requirements of this section.

Definitions:

Defines a “Joint law enforcement task force” as at least one California law enforcement agency collaborating, engaging, or partnering with at least one federal or other out-of-state law enforcement agency in investigating a violation of federal or state crimes, including, but not limited to, the United States Department of Homeland Security task

forces established by Executive Order 14159, dated January 20, 2025, the Federal Bureau of Investigation Joint Terrorism Task Forces referenced in the September 26, 2025, National Security Presidential Memorandum No. 7 and the temporary Immigration and Customs Enforcement Protection task forces established by the Attorney General memorandum dated September 29, 2025.

Defines “Constitutionally protected expressive conduct” as activities protected by the First Amendment of the United States Constitution or Section 1 to 4 of Article I of the California Constitution, including, but not limited to, all of the following: A) Assembly; B) Petitioning; C) Speech; D) Expression of political and religious opinions; E) Recording government officials engaged in their duties in public places; F) Publication of opinions or recordings.

Defines “assist” to include, but is not limited to, providing personnel for backup or perimeter control.

Severability:

Provides that the provisions of this act are severable. If any provision of this act or its application is held invalid, that invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications that can be given effect without the invalid provision or application.

Background

Existing law relating to this measure:

Existing law (SB 54/ California Values Act) defines a “Joint law enforcement task force” means at least one California law enforcement agency collaborating, engaging, or partnering with at least one federal law enforcement agency in investigating federal or state crimes. (Government Code § 7284.4)

Existing law (SB 54/ California Values Act) provides that California law enforcement agencies shall not, among other things, conduct enforcement or investigative duties associated with a joint law enforcement task force, including the sharing of confidential information with other law enforcement agencies for purposes of task force investigations, if the task force primary purpose is not immigration enforcement, as defined in Section 7284.4. Further, if a California law enforcement agency chooses to participate in a joint law enforcement task force, for which a California law enforcement agency has agreed to dedicate personnel or resources on an ongoing basis, it shall submit a report annually to the Department of Justice. The law enforcement agency shall report the following information, if known, for each task force of which it is a member: A) The purpose of the task force; B) The federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies involved; C) The total number of arrests made during the reporting period; D) The number of people arrested for immigration enforcement purposes. (Government Code § 7284.6)

The California Constitution provides, among other things, that: 1) All people are by

nature free and independent and have inalienable rights. Among these are enjoying and defending life and liberty, acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and pursuing and obtaining safety, happiness, and privacy; 2) The state shall not deny or interfere with an individual's reproductive freedom in their most intimate decisions, which includes their fundamental right to choose to have an abortion and their fundamental right to choose or refuse contraceptives; 3) Every person may freely speak, write and publish his or her sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of this right. A law may not restrain or abridge liberty of speech or press; 4) A publisher, editor, reporter, etc. shall not be adjudged in contempt by a judicial or any other body having the power to issue subpoenas, for refusing to disclose the source of any information procured while so connected or employed for publication or for refusing to disclose any unpublished information obtained or prepared in gathering, receiving or processing of information for communication to the public; 5) The people have the right to instruct their representatives, petition government for redress of grievances, and assemble freely to consult for the common good; 6) The people have the right of access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business, and, therefore, the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny; 7) A statute, court rule, or other authority shall be broadly construed if it furthers the people's right of access, and narrowly construed if it limits the right of access 8) In order to ensure public access to the meetings of public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies, each local agency is hereby required to comply with the California Public Records Act and the Ralph M. Brown Act; 9) Free exercise and enjoyment of religion without discrimination or preference are guaranteed. This liberty of conscience does not excuse acts that are licentious or inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. The Legislature shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion; 10) A person is not incompetent to be a witness or juror because of his or her opinions on religious beliefs. (California Constitution, Article I, §§ 1,2,3,4)

Existing law provides that "Racial or identity profiling," is defined as the consideration of, or reliance on, to any degree, actual or perceived race, color, ethnicity, national origin, age, religion, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, or mental or physical disability in deciding which persons to subject to a stop or in deciding upon the scope or substance of law enforcement activities following a stop, except that an officer may consider or rely on characteristics listed in a specific suspect description. The activities include, but are not limited to, traffic or pedestrian stops, or actions during a stop, such as asking questions, frisks, consensual and nonconsensual searches of a person or any property, seizing any property, removing vehicle occupants during a traffic stop, issuing a citation, and making an arrest. (Penal Code § 13519.4)

Existing law limits the use of kinetic energy projectiles (such as rubber bullets, beanbag rounds, or similar less-lethal devices) and chemical agents (including tear gas, pepper spray, or pepper balls) and provides that they may only be used by properly trained peace officers for crowd control when their deployment is objectively reasonable to defend against an imminent threat to life or serious bodily injury, or to safely and effectively control a dangerous and unlawful situation. Prior to deployment, officers must first attempt de-escalation or alternatives to force when feasible, issue repeated audible

warnings in multiple languages from various locations announcing the intent and type of munition, provide reasonable time for people to disperse, target only individuals actively engaged in violent acts rather than firing indiscriminately into crowds, use these tools proportionally with minimized impact on bystanders, journalists, medical personnel, or others, make reasonable efforts to aid those in distress, and promptly provide or obtain medical assistance for the injured when safe. Kinetic projectiles must never be aimed at the head, neck, or vital organs, and neither projectiles nor chemical agents may be used solely for curfew violations, verbal threats, or mere noncompliance with directives. For tear gas specifically, only a commanding officer at the scene may authorize its use. Authorizes local agencies to adopt stricter policies. (Penal Code § 13652)

Existing law provides that law enforcement agencies must secure approval from their governing body—via an ordinance adopting a military equipment use policy at a regular public meeting prior to requesting or acquiring federal “military” equipment or grants from the federal government. For equipment acquired before January 1, 2022, agencies had to initiate the approval process by May 1, 2022, and cease use if not approved within 180 days of submitting a proposed policy. Agencies must submit their proposed policy publicly on their website at least 30 days before hearings, with the governing body considering it in open session allowing public comment. Approval is granted only if the governing body finds the equipment necessary (i.e. when no reasonable alternative for officer/civilian safety), the policy safeguards public welfare, safety, civil rights, and liberties, it's cost-effective, and any prior use complied with policies. Approved policies must remain publicly available online while equipment is in use. Governing bodies review approvals annually based on required reports, renewing or modifying/revoking authorization if compliance standards aren't met. Cities contracting for law enforcement services may adopt policies based on local needs. (Government Code § 7071)

[California Values Act Report by DOJ 2026 report regarding 2025 data \(per SB 54\) found at: data-openjustice.doj.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-02/sb-54-values-act-report-2025.pdf:](https://data-openjustice.doj.ca.gov/sites/default/files/2026-02/sb-54-values-act-report-2025.pdf)

All identified California LEAs participated in reporting for 2025. The total number of arrests reported by joint law enforcement task forces in 2025 was 16,613. The total number of arrests reported for the purpose of immigration enforcement by task force participants in 2025 was 300.

September 26, 2025, National Security Presidential Memorandum No. 7:

The White House memorandum “Countering Domestic Terrorism and Organized Political Violence” (Sept. 25, 2025) establishes a national strategy directing federal agencies to investigate, disrupt, and prevent domestic terrorism and politically motivated violence in the United States. It instructs law enforcement and national security agencies to coordinate efforts—particularly through the Joint Terrorism Task Force—to identify individuals and networks involved in violent political activity, including acts such as riots, assaults, property destruction, threats, and conspiracies to deprive people of their rights. The directive also focuses on identifying organizations, donors, and other entities that may fund or support such violence and calls for stronger interagency coordination to prevent attacks before they occur. Overall, the memorandum aims to strengthen federal enforcement and intelligence efforts to deter political violence and

protect public safety and democratic institutions. The full text can be found at: www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/09/countering-domestic-terrorism-and-organized-political-violence/

Related Legislation

SB 54 (De Leon) (Chapter 495, Statutes of 2017.) Provides that no state or local law enforcement agency, other than the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, shall use any moneys or personnel to investigate, interrogate, detain, detect, or arrest persons for immigration enforcement purposes, as specified. This includes actions such as inquiring into an individual's immigration status, responding to immigration hold or detainer, providing any non-public information regarding release dates or personal information, participating in arrests based on civil immigration warrants, transferring an individual to immigration authorities without a judicial warrant, and many other interactions. The measure provides exemptions to the limitations for two specific actions by allowing law enforcement to provide release date information and transfer an individual to federal authorities without a warrant if the arrested individual meets the following criteria: 1) has been convicted of a felony crime listed in the Trust Act within the prior 15 years; 2) has been convicted of a misdemeanor that could have been charged as a felony (i.e. a wobbler) within the past 5 years; 2) has committed one of the crimes defined as "serious" or "violent" felony and specifically listed in Penal Code 667.5 or 1192.7 at any time; 3) the individual has been arrested for a "serious" or "violent" felony and specifically listed in Penal Code 667.5 or 1192.7 and has been brought before a judge for a probable cause determination; 4) the individual has previously been deported for criminal activity, returned to the country, and been arrested on an unrelated charge as specified in the Trust Act.; and 5) the action does not violate a more restrictive local policy. The bill would also authorize law enforcement to participate in joint task forces if the main purpose of the task force is not immigration enforcement. However, they would be required to report specified information annually regarding these activities. The Attorney General would also be required to create a model privacy policy by October 1, 2018 limiting assistance with immigration enforcement "to the fullest extent possible consistent with federal and state law" for any at public schools, public libraries, health facilities, law enforcement agencies, and other public entities within the state. It passed the Assembly 41-26 (NO: Assembly Republicans; except ABS: Chavez) and the Senate 27-11 (NO: Anderson, Bates, Cannella, Fuller, Moorlach, Morrell, Nguyen, Nielsen, Stone, Vidak, Wilk; ABS: Berryhill, Gaines).