



February 26, 2026

Honorable Assemblymember Nick Schultz
Chair, Assembly Committee on Public Safety
1020 N Street, Room 111
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: ASSEMBLY BILL 1568 (Alanis) – **OPPOSE**

Dear Assemblymember Schultz, Chair Assembly Committee on Public Safety.

[Legal Services for Prisoners with Children](#) regrets to inform you that we must oppose Assembly Bill 1568 (“AB 1568”) as amended by Assemblymember Alanis which would place unnecessary and costly obstacles in the path of removing nondangerous and, in some cases, quite elderly, or poor individuals from the sex offender registry.

LSPC organizes communities impacted by the criminal justice system and advocates to release incarcerated people, to restore human and civil rights, and to reunify families and communities. We build public awareness of structural racism in policing, the courts, and the prison system, and we advance racial and gender justice in all our work.

The tiered Sex Offender Registration Act (SB 384) was enacted in 2017 to both redeploy law enforcement resources from spending countless hours on paperwork registering nondangerous sex offenders to monitoring dangerous sex offenders in the field and to provide relief to individuals who had registered for 10-20 years while demonstrating good behavior in the community.

AB 1568 would add unnecessary and costly hurdles for individuals convicted of the least serious offenses who are required to register for 10 years in the sex offender registry removal petition process by requiring that the individual be present regardless of whether it would be helpful to the court in considering the petition and by allowing the court to order expensive risk assessments for the individual without any provision for the court to pay for them. This is not rationally related to public safety because individuals convicted of more serious offenses or who are required to register for 20 years are not required to be present and the court is not authorized to order current risk assessments.

Under existing law individuals who are required to register as sex offenders following conviction of lower-level, non-violent, or misdemeanor offenses (Penal Code section 290(d)(1)(A)) may request their removal from the sex offender registry after a 10-year mandatory minimum registration period has expired. If the district attorney opposes the petition, they may request a hearing. There is no requirement that the individual be present and expensive risk assessments are considered *only if* they are already available. (Penal Code section 290.5(a)(3)).

4400 Market Street
Oakland, CA 94608

Phone: (415) 255-7036
Fax: (415) 625-7035

www.prisonerswithchildren.org



At the hearing, the judge shall consider a number of relevant factors including time elapsed from the registrable offense, the individual's relationship to the victim, the individual's criminal and non-criminal behavior before and after the conviction and any risk assessment scores, *if available*, in determining whether "community safety would be significantly enhanced by requiring continued registration."

By requiring the petitioner to be present, AB 1568 would impose significant hardship and expense on some indigent and elderly individuals who might not have transportation to get to court in rural counties or in large urban counties where all of the petitions are heard in one courthouse. Some elderly individuals may be quite infirm and unable to drive or navigate public transportation. Not every county has robust public transportation. Additionally, the court should retain discretion to decide if it is helpful to their decision making to have the individual present. If the court decides that the individual should be present, then they should be allowed to appear remotely if they waive their right to be personally present.

AB 1568 would make it impossible for nondangerous indigent individuals ordered to obtain risk assessments to be removed from the registry. The cost of obtaining risk assessments conducted by psychologists or psychiatrists would be prohibitive. Risk assessments are usually conducted as part of court ordered or parole ordered sex offender treatment programs. While the costs of participation in the program may be the responsibility of the individual, no individual may be denied probation or parole for inability to pay. AB 1568 would deny the individual the ability to be granted relief based on indigency thus discriminating on the basis of wealth. Simply put, wealthy individuals could hire psychologists and obtain court ordered risk assessments while poorer individuals could not.

Because AB 1568 is unfair and discriminates on the basis of poverty, we respectfully urge you to vote "NO" vote when it comes before you in the Assembly Public Safety Committee. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Samuel Fishman
Staff Attorney, Legal Services for Prisoners with Children
samuel@prisonerswithchildren.org

cc: Assemblymember Alanis

4400 Market Street
Oakland, CA 94608

Phone: (415) 255-7036
Fax: (415) 625-7035

www.prisonerswithchildren.org