

April 2, 2026

The Honorable Blanca Pacheco
California State Assembly, District 64
Sacramento, CA 95814



Dear Assembly Member Pacheco:

On behalf of tens of thousands of constituents, allied organizations, and more than 2,000 churches across California, California Family Council strongly **opposes** AB 2563.

AB 2563 rewrites the legal definition of "sex discrimination" across virtually every California civil rights statute simultaneously. The new definition adds gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, intersex status, reproductive health decisions, and "degree of conformity to sex or gender stereotypes." That final phrase means any policy treating a biological male as male could constitute unlawful discrimination if that person self-identifies otherwise.

This sweeping redefinition applies to both the Unruh Civil Rights Act and FEHA, covering businesses, public accommodations, employers, housing providers, and schools. In practice, it provides legal teeth to compel biological males' access to women's restrooms and sports teams, and creates civil liability for anyone who declines to use preferred pronouns. Unruh violations carry \$4,000 in statutory damages per offense plus attorney fees; FEHA complaints may yield compensatory damages and injunctive relief.

Concerns for Families, Women, and Faith Communities

The bill contains no carve-out for female-only spaces, meaning women's shelters, locker rooms, and girls' sports programs face discrimination liability for enforcing biological sex distinctions. School staff who defer to parents on gender identity questions could face civil exposure, undermining parental authority over their children's formation.

We are particularly concerned that religious schools, churches, and faith-based nonprofits are not explicitly exempt from this bill's expanded definitions. Because no religious exemption language appears in AB 2563, these institutions face real uncertainty and potential litigation risk simply for operating according to their beliefs about biological sex. As CFC has documented, this incremental legal pressure on faith communities follows a troubling pattern in California policy.¹ Alliance Defending Freedom has similarly documented the erosion of parental and religious conscience protections under California's expanding SOGI framework.² A local preview of this logic appeared in San Diego County's 2022 proposal to redefine "women and girls" to include men and boys.³

Conclusion

AB 2563 does not close a gap in California law. It permanently encodes gender ideology into the foundational layer of civil rights statutes, with no limiting principle and no conscience protection for those who recognize biological reality. For these reasons, California Family Council respectfully **opposes** AB 2563 and urges a no vote.

Respectfully,



Greg Burt
Vice President, California Family Council

References

- ¹ Amy Haywood, "New California Curriculum Seeks to Transform How Children View Gender and Their Sexual Identity," *California Family Council*, November 30, 2017. <https://www.californiafamily.org/2017/11/new-california-curriculum-seeks-to-transform-how-children-view-gender-and-their-sexual-identity/>
- ² Alliance Defending Freedom, "ACLU and CA Dep. of Education Mislead Parents on Opt-Out Rights for Gender and Sexual Orientation Lessons," *California Family Council*, December 10, 2019. <https://www.californiafamily.org/2019/12/aclu-ca-dep-of-education-mislead-parents-on-opt-out-rights/>
- ³ California Family Council, "San Diego Board of Supervisors to Vote on Ordinance that Redefines 'Women and Girls' to Include Men and Boys," *California Family Council*, April 25, 2022. <https://www.californiafamily.org/2022/04/san-diego-board-of-supervisors-to-vote-on-ordinance-that-redefines-women-and-girls-to-include-men-and-boys/>