

March 23, 2026

The Honorable Rebecca Bauer-Kahan
California State Assembly
1021 O Street
Sacramento, CA 95814



Dear Assembly Woman Bauer-Kahan:

On behalf of tens of thousands of constituents, allied organizations, and more than 2,000 churches across California, California Family Council strongly opposes AB 2164.

AB 2164 would shield individuals from extradition and legal accountability for actions taken in other states, specifically those related to abortion procedures and so-called gender transition interventions, so long as such actions align with California law. This directly conflicts with the constitutional framework governing interstate legal cooperation under Article IV, Section 2 of the U.S. Constitution. States are obligated to honor one another's lawful legal processes. Selectively nullifying extradition based on ideological alignment sets a dangerous precedent for interstate legal disintegration.

This concern is not hypothetical. Interstate legal conflict is already unfolding. In 2025 and 2026, Texas has brought lawsuits against a California physician for mailing abortion drugs into Texas in violation of its laws, seeking significant damages and injunctive relief. At the same time, Ken Paxton has initiated legal action against California-based providers and telehealth networks for distributing abortion pills across state lines. These cases represent a direct legal clash between states and underscore the constitutional tensions AB 2164 would intensify. Rather than resolving conflict, this bill would entrench California in ongoing interstate disputes.

The bill expands existing protections to cover abortion-related conduct, including the distribution and use of abortion drugs such as mifepristone and misoprostol—drugs that are currently under active federal and multi-state legal scrutiny. Ongoing litigation involving multiple states and federal agencies continues to challenge the regulation, safety oversight, and distribution of these drugs. By extending safe harbor protections to providers and intermediaries operating across state lines, AB 2164 effectively makes California a refuge for conduct that other states have lawfully regulated or restricted, circumventing those states' sovereign authority over their own public health frameworks.

The bill's protections also extend to those facilitating sterilizing hormone therapies and sex change surgeries on minors, procedures that public health authorities in countries such as Sweden, Finland, and the United Kingdom have restricted following systematic evidence reviews raising concerns about long-term risks and uncertain benefits. California law shielding out-of-state providers of these procedures from accountability in their home states places vulnerable children at measurable risk and disregards a growing international trend toward caution.

Numerous states have enacted laws affirming that parents—not clinicians operating across state lines—hold primary authority over their minor children's medical decisions. AB 2164 enables providers and third parties to circumvent those parental authority protections by routing care through California's legal shield. Courts have long recognized parental rights as a fundamental liberty interest under the Fourteenth Amendment. This bill undermines that principle for families far beyond California's borders.

Legal scholars have noted that sanctuary-style extradition shields are constitutionally vulnerable and likely to provoke reciprocal responses. Indeed, the current wave of litigation between states over abortion pill distribution demonstrates how quickly such conflicts escalate. Rather than protecting Californians, AB 2164 risks exposing them to increasing legal uncertainty as other states adopt countermeasures, potentially limiting cooperation on unrelated legal matters. The *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* decision explicitly returned abortion regulation to the states. AB 2164 does not operate within that framework—it attempts to override it by insulating conduct that other states have chosen to regulate differently. The Constitution does not grant any state the authority to nullify another state's laws in this manner. By eliminating legal accountability pathways for providers operating across state lines, AB 2164 removes the very mechanisms by which patients—including minors harmed by irreversible interventions or women injured by improperly prescribed abortion drugs—can seek legal recourse. Consumer protection, medical accountability, and informed consent standards exist to safeguard patients. This bill weakens all three.

For these reasons, California Family Council respectfully opposes AB 2164 and urges the committee to reject it.

Respectfully,



Greg Burt
Vice President
California Family Council

References

- ¹ Various Legal Scholars, "Interstate Shield Laws and Constitutional Conflict Post-*Dobbs*," legal commentary, 2022–2024. See generally academic commentary on *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022).
- ² Dr. Hilary Cass, "Independent Review of Gender Identity Services for Children and Young People: Final Report," *Cass Review*, April 2024. <https://cass.independent-review.uk/home/publications/final-report/>
- ³ National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), "Evidence Review: Gonadotrophin Releasing Hormone Analogues and Cross-Sex Hormones," *NICE*, 2020.
- ⁴ Movement Advancement Project, "Bans on Best Practice Medical Care for Transgender Youth," tracking legislation in states restricting gender-transition procedures for minors, updated 2024. <https://www.mapresearch.org>