

**ALLIANCE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL SEX OFFENSE LAWS**  
2110 K Street  
Sacramento, CA 95816  
(805) 896-7854

June 2, 2026

Chairman Jesse Arreguin  
Vice Chairman Kelly Seyarto  
Assembly Committee on Public Safety  
1020 N Street, Room 545  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Assembly Bill 1568 – STRONGLY OPPOSE

Dear Chairman Arreguin and Vice Chairman Seyarto:

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the Alliance for Constitutional Sex Offense Laws (ACSOL) strongly opposes Assembly Bill 1568. ACSOL therefore requests that you and all members of the Senate Public Safety Committee vote “no” on that bill.

If enacted into law, SB 1568 would defeat the purpose of the Tiered Registry Law (SB 384) which was approved by the legislature and enacted into law in 2017. The purpose of that law was to reduce a bloated and ineffective registry that was costly and failed to increase public safety.

During the four years in which the Tiered Registry Law has been effective, more than 10,000 individuals who do not pose a current danger have been removed from the sex offender registry by state superior courts. However, AB 1568 could harm the future progress of the Tiered Registry Law for at least three reasons.

First, the current language of AB 1568 requires individuals to show proof of successful completion of a sex offender treatment program in order to petition for removal from the sex offender registry. This requirement could block groups of individuals, including those convicted out of state, in federal court, or in a military court from petitioning for removal from the registry even though they are otherwise eligible. In addition, individuals placed on summary probation could become ineligible to petition because they are not required to participate in a sex offender program.

Second, the current language of AB 1568 requires that petitioners personally appear at their petition hearings in court. This requirement could preclude individuals who are physically or mentally disabled from having their petitions heard if a district attorney objects to their petition. In all such cases, an attorney would appear in court representing the disabled person and therefore there is no need for the disabled person to attend the hearing.

Third, the current language of AB 1568 requires courts to consider whether the offender was in a position of trust or authority at the time the offense occurred. The seven factors a court must consider during a petition hearing are established in Penal Code Section 290.5(a)(3). One of those factors, whether the victim was a stranger, includes this information and therefore this language is not necessary.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request. We strongly request that all members of the Senate Public Safety Committee vote "no" on AB 1568.

Sincerely,

  
Attorney Janice M. Bellucci  
Executive Director