

August 26, 2025

Submitted via email

Assembly Member Buffy Wicks
Chair, Committee on Appropriations
California State Assembly
1021 O Street, Suite 8140
Sacramento, CA 95814

Assembly Member Kate Sanchez
Vice Chair, Committee on Appropriations
California State Assembly
1021 O Street, Suite 4340
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Call to Support AB 67

Dear Chair Wicks and Vice Chair Sanchez:

The Center for Inquiry (CFI) writes to urge the Committee on Appropriations to vote in favor of AB 67. This legislation would authorize the state Attorney General to bring enforcement action against an individual who interferes with another person's right to reproductive choice, as protected under California law.

CFI is a national nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing science, reason, and secularism in American law and policy. We have numerous supporters in California.

Key Elements of the Bill

AB 67 provides: "If it appears to the Attorney General that a person has engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice constituting a violation of the Reproductive Privacy Act, the Attorney General may, in their discretion, bring an action in the name of the people of the State of California in the superior court to enjoin the acts or practice or to enforce compliance with the Reproductive Privacy Act. Upon a proper showing, a permanent or preliminary injunction, restraining order, or writ of mandate shall be granted by the court."

Additionally, the bill authorizes the Attorney General to include claims for ancillary relief, including restitution or damages.

Under AB 67, the Attorney General is authorized to subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance, take evidence, and require the production of documents or records "[f]or the purpose of any investigation or proceeding pursuant to the Reproductive Privacy Act."



CFI's Analysis

CFI supports this legislation because it protects the right of reproductive choice for women in California—a right that not only is vital to women's bodily self-autonomy but must be supported by any governing body that is pro-science and attentive to public health needs.

Events from within the past year illustrate why it is necessary to give the Office of the Attorney General the power to enforce the reproductive rights of Californians. In October 2024, Attorney General Rob Bonta issued a stipulated judgment with the City of Beverly Hills regarding its mistreatment of an abortion provider that sought to open a clinic in the city. Even though the provider (DuPont Clinic) had applied for the required city permits and spent \$2.5 million to renovate a leased medical suite, an investigation by the state Department of Justice found that the city “unlawfully interfered with DuPont’s opening by improperly delaying the issuance of approved building permits.”¹

Furthermore, the DOJ discovered that the city “actively engaged in a pressure campaign against the property owner and manager,” resulting in the termination of DuPont’s lease.² For instance, the city claimed without evidence that the abortion clinic would cause violence and security threats against the building’s other tenants and further argued that it would be unable to provide public safety protections for the building’s occupants.³ The October 2024 stipulated judgment required the city to train its officials about upholding Californians’ right to, and access to, reproductive health care, as well as to develop procedures for handling potential violations of state and federal law pertaining to reproductive rights.⁴

In another illustrative case, Attorney General Bonta filed a lawsuit against Providence St. Joseph Hospital in Eureka, California, in September 2024. The lawsuit concerned Providence’s refusal to provide emergency abortion care to a woman whose water broke when she was fifteen weeks pregnant with twins, posing an immediate risk to her life and health.⁵ **In that case, Providence informed the patient that her twins would not survive but that hospital policy prevented Providence from providing emergency care as long as one of the twins had a “detectable heartbeat.”**⁶

Providence discharged the patient with instructions to drive to a small community hospital approximately twelve miles away, with one staff member giving her a bucket and towels “in case something happens in the car.”⁷ By the time the patient was on the operating table at the other hospital, she was actively hemorrhaging.⁸ The Attorney General’s lawsuit alleged multiple violations of California law, including the Emergency Services Law, and sought a

¹ <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-holds-beverly-hills-accountable-preventing-reproductive>

² *Id.*

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-draconian-hospital-policies-deny-emergency-abortion-care>

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.*



court order “to guarantee that patients receive prompt emergency medical care including abortion care.”⁹

These and other news stories counsel in favor of giving the Office of the Attorney General the necessary tools at their disposal to protect and defend Californians’ right to reproductive care.

Secondly, there is a wide base of support in California for AB 67, ranging from policymakers to advocates to the Attorney General himself. Attorney General Bonta, for instance, declares: “I want to make it unequivocally clear: California will remain a safe haven for reproductive rights and access to abortion care, no matter who is in the White House. **We have been preparing for this moment, and today’s legislation doubles down on our commitment to protect those seeking reproductive healthcare, including access to medication abortion.**”¹⁰

Likewise, Assemblymember Rebecca Bauer-Kahan (D-Orinda), one of the cosponsors of AB 67, states: “The fundamental right to reproductive healthcare is non-negotiable in California. No individual should face barriers to accessing care due to the deliberate actions of anyone. **By empowering the Attorney General to enforce the Reproductive Privacy Act, this legislation ensures that our laws are more than words on paper—they are protections in practice.**”¹¹

Among the many state and local advocates to support AB 67, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California (PPAC) President and CEO Jodi Hicks declares: “As we prepare for the challenges ahead, PPAC is committed to working alongside our state, legislative, and organizational partners to fiercely defend reproductive freedom in California, including the right of all patients to access their preferred care, when and where they need it.”¹²

Lastly, AB 67 is consistent with the fact that Californians overwhelmingly support the right to reproductive choice. As of June 12, 2025, the Pew Research Center reports that **72 percent of California residents believe abortion should be legal in all or most cases.**¹³ In November 2022, roughly 66.9 percent of California voters supported Proposition 1, which amended the state constitution to explicitly grant the right to an abortion and contraceptives (making California among the first states in the country to codify this right).¹⁴ As a result, California is ranked as “most protective” in terms of abortion policies by the Guttmacher Institute, its highest possible classification for any state.¹⁵

Conclusion

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-california-will-remain-ironclad-protecting-reproductive>

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/06/12/americans-views-on-abortion-differ-by-state>

¹⁴ <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2022/11/08/us/elections/results-california-proposition-1-constitutional-right-to-reproductive-freedom.html>

¹⁵ <https://states.guttmacher.org/policies/california/abortion-policies>



For the reasons set forth in this testimony, CFI urges your committee to vote in favor of AB 67. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Azhar Majeed', written in a cursive style.

Azhar Majeed
Director of Government Affairs

cc:
Members, Committee on Appropriations