

March 30, 2026

The Honorable Ash Kalra, Chair  
Assembly Judiciary Committee  
1020 O Street, Room 104  
Sacramento, CA 95814



Dear Chair Kalra:

On behalf of tens of thousands of constituents, allied organizations, and more than 2,000 churches across California, the California Family Council strongly **opposes** AB 1930.

AB 1930 would prohibit California individuals and entities from complying with out-of-state or federal legal requests, including subpoenas, court orders, and regulatory process, related to abortion and gender transition interventions for minors, unless strict conditions are met. It empowers the Attorney General to penalize those who cooperate with such requests. While framed as a patient privacy measure, AB 1930 erects unprecedented legal barriers that obstruct accountability, conflict with federal law, and shield providers from legitimate oversight when children are harmed.

**The Bill Conflicts with Federal Supremacy.** AB 1930 imposes civil penalties on parties who comply with lawful federal legal process. This creates a direct conflict with federal authority and implicates the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution (Article VI, Clause 2). States cannot nullify federal investigative and judicial process by statute. Courts have consistently held that state laws obstructing the enforcement of federal legal obligations are preempted. Article IV, Section 1 of the U.S. Constitution requires each state to give full faith and credit to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state. By penalizing compliance with lawful sister-state subpoenas and court orders, AB 1930 places California in direct conflict with this constitutional mandate and with 28 U.S.C. § 1738, which implements it. No state may unilaterally immunize its residents from the judicial authority of other states.

**Shields Providers from Accountability for Harm to Minors.** Among the "legally protected health care activities" covered by this bill are sterilizing, hormone therapies, and sex change surgeries performed on minors. A landmark peer-reviewed report released by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services found that evidence for the benefits of these interventions in pediatric patients is of "very low certainty," while documented harms, including infertility, cardiovascular risk, and long-term psychological harm, are significant<sup>1</sup>. By insulating California providers from out-of-state and federal legal process, AB 1930 functionally eliminates a key avenue of accountability when these interventions cause serious injury to children.

Multiple European nations, including Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway, and the United Kingdom, have recently restricted or halted pediatric gender transition interventions after systematic reviews found insufficient evidence of benefit and meaningful evidence of harm<sup>2</sup>. Rather than following this international trajectory toward greater caution, AB 1930 would entrench California as a destination jurisdiction where providers face no external scrutiny. The Legislature should not be erecting legal walls to protect a medical practice that leading health systems worldwide are now questioning.

**The Bill Undermines Parental Authority.** Parents in other states who believe their minor child was harmed by a California provider, or whose child traveled to California for these interventions without parental consent, may have no practical legal recourse if AB 1930 becomes law. The bill's barriers to subpoenas and information sharing would prevent parents and courts from obtaining records necessary to pursue claims on behalf of injured children. Parental authority to protect children from medical harm is a fundamental right recognized under federal constitutional doctrine, and AB 1930 erodes that authority.

**The Bill Raises Serious First Amendment Concerns.** Penalizing individuals and entities for responding truthfully to lawful legal process compels silence and raises significant First Amendment free speech concerns. Statutes that punish cooperation with judicial or governmental proceedings, particularly where they reach federally-initiated processes, face heightened constitutional scrutiny.

For these reasons, California Family Council respectfully **opposes** AB 1930. We urge the Committee to vote no and decline to advance legislation that obstructs legitimate legal accountability, conflicts with federal and constitutional law, and shields from scrutiny those who perform irreversible procedures on minors.

Respectfully,



Greg Burt  
Vice President  
California Family Council

---

#### References

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Population Affairs, "Gender Dysphoria in Minors: A Review of Evidence," *HHS.gov*, 2025. <https://opa.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/2025-11/gender-dysphoria-report.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, "HHS Releases Peer-Reviewed Report Discrediting Pediatric Sex-Rejecting Procedures," *HHS.gov*, 2025. <https://www.hhs.gov/press-room/gender-dysphoria-report-release.html>