

Date of Hearing: April 8, 2025
Chief Counsel: Andrew Ironside

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY
Nick Schultz, Chair

AB 468 (Gabriel) – As Amended March 24, 2025

As Proposed to be Amended in Committee

SUMMARY: Establishes increased penalties for looting in an evacuation zone and impersonating emergency personnel in an evacuation zone. Specifically, **this bill:**

- 1) Provides that all of the following offenses when committed during and within an evacuation zone or in an evacuation zone are looting and subject to increased punishment as follows:
 - a) First-degree burglary is punishable by imprisonment in the state prison for two, four, or seven years.
 - b) Second-degree burglary is punishable by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years.
 - c) Grand theft, except grand theft of a firearm, is punishable by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years.
 - d) Trespass with the intent to commit larceny is punishable by imprisonment in county jail for one year or for 16 months, two years, or three years.
 - e) Theft from an unlocked vehicle is punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for one year or by imprisonment 16 months, two years, or three years.
- 2) Defines “evacuation zone” as an evacuation area or an area subject to an evacuation warning, as specified.
- 3) Provides that an “evacuation zone” includes a principal residence while it is undergoing reconstruction following damage or destruction caused by an earthquake, fire, flood, riot, or other natural or manmade disaster, after an evacuation order or warning has been lifted.
- 4) Provides that the fact that the structure entered has been damaged by a natural or other disaster, or the extent of that damage, does not preclude conviction.
- 5) Provides that a person who is convicted of looting within an evacuation zone while impersonating emergency personnel, in addition and consecutive to the penalty provided for the felony or attempted felony of which they have been convicted, shall be punished by an additional and consecutive term of one, two, or three years.
- 6) Provides that any person other than emergency personnel who, in an evacuation zone, impersonates emergency personnel is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by one year in

county jail or a felony punishable by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years.

- 7) Defines “impersonating” as willful wearing, exhibiting, or using of an authorized uniform insignia, emblem, device, label, certificate, card, or writing of emergency personnel with the intent of fraudulently inducing the belief that they are a member of emergency personnel.
- 8) Defines “principal residence” to mean a residence, as specified, including the land or building surrounding, contiguous to, or appertaining to the residence.
- 9) Defines “emergency personnel” as a peace officer, an officer or member of a fire department or a deputy state fire marshal, an employee of a public utility or district, state, county, city, or special district, a city and county officer or employee, an officer or member of a governmental agency-managed or –affiliated search and rescue unit or team, an officer or member of the Armed Forces of the United States, the California National Guard, the State Guard, the Naval Militia, the national guard of any other state, or any other reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, or an emergency medical technician, as defined.

EXISTING LAW:

- 1) Provides that a person who commits a specified offense during and within an affected county in a state or local emergency, or under an evacuation order, is guilty of looting and subject to punishment as follows:
 - a) Where the underlying offense is second-degree burglary, by imprisonment up to one year in county jail or by 16 months, two years, or three years. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (a).)
 - b) Where the underlying offense is grand theft, except grand theft of a firearm, by imprisonment in a county jail for one year or by 16 months, two years, of three years. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (b).)
 - c) Where the underlying offense is second-degree burglary or grand theft, a mandatory minimum term of 180 days in county jail for a person who receives probation, except that a court may reduce or eliminate the jail sentence in the interest of justice. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (a) & (b).)
 - d) Where the underlying offense is petty theft, for a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for six months. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (c).)
 - e) Where the underlying offense is petty theft, a mandatory minimum term of 90 days in county jail for a person who receives probation, except that a court may reduce or eliminate the jail sentence in the interest of justice. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (c).)
- 2) Requires the court, if it reduces or eliminates the mandatory jail sentence for a person granted probation for a looting conviction, to specify on the record and enter into the minutes the circumstances indicating that the interest of justice would be served by that disposition. (Pen. Code, § 463, subs. (a)-(c).)

- 3) Provides that, for purposes of a looting involving second-degree burglary, the fact that the structure entered has been damaged by the earthquake, fire, flood, or other natural or manmade disaster shall not, in and of itself, preclude conviction. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (a).)
- 4) Authorizes the court to require any person granted probation following a looting conviction to perform community service in any program deemed appropriate by the court, including any program created to rebuild the community. (Pen. Code, § 463, subds. (a)-(c).)
- 5) Makes willfully wearing, exhibiting, or using the authorized uniform, insignia, emblem, device, label, certificate card, or writing, of a peace officer, a member of the fire department, an employee of a public utility or district, a government officer or employee, or search and rescue personnel, with the intent of fraudulently impersonating them or of fraudulently inducing the belief that the defendant is one of them, a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in county jail for up to six months, by a fine of \$1,000, or both. (Pen. Code, §§ 538d, subd. (a); 538e, subd. (a); 538f, subd. (a); 538g, subd. (a); 538h, subd. (a); Pen. Code, § 19.)
- 6) Makes willfully wearing, exhibiting, or using the badge of any of the above personnel, except that of a government employee or an employee of a public utility or district, with the intent of fraudulently impersonating them or of fraudulently inducing the belief that the defendant is one of them, a misdemeanor punishable by up to one year in county jail, a fine of up to \$2,000, or both. (Pen. Code, §§ 538d, subd. (b)(1); 538e, subd. (b)(1); 538h, subd. (b)(1).)
- 7) Provides that any person who willfully wears or uses any badge that falsely purports to be authorized for the use of one who by law is given the authority of any of the above personnel, or which so resembles the authorized badge of the above personnel as would deceive any ordinary reasonable person into believing that it is authorized for the use of one who by law is given that authority, for the purpose of fraudulently impersonating them or of fraudulently inducing a belief that they are one of them, is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in county jail for up to one year, by a fine of \$2,000, or by both. (Pen. Code, §§ 538d, subd. (b)(2); 538e, subd. (b)(2); 538g, subd. (b)(2); 538h, subd. (b)(2).)
- 8) Provides that any person who impersonates a peace officer during the commission of a felony shall receive an additional one-year term of imprisonment to be imposed consecutive to the term imposed for the felony, in lieu of the penalty that would have been imposed for impersonating a peace officer.” (Pen. Code, § 667.17.)
- 9) Provides that any person who makes or sells a badge falsely purporting to be that of a peace officer, fire fighter, or government official as described above is subject to a fine up to \$15,000. (Pen. Code, §§ 538d, subd. (c)(1); 538e, subd. (c); 538g, subd. (b).)
- 10) Provides that any uniform vendor who sells a uniform identifying a law enforcement agency or firefighting agency, without verifying that the purchaser is an employee of the agency, is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable by up to six months in county jail or by a fine of up to \$1,000. (Pen. Code, §§ 538d, subd. (e)(2); 538e, subd. (e)(3).)
- 11) Defines burglary as entering a specified structure, vessel, or vehicle with the intent of committing theft or any felony therein. (Pen. Code, § 459.)

- 12) States that burglary of an inhabited dwelling is first degree burglary, and that all other kinds of burglary are of the second degree. (Pen. Code, § 460.)
- 13) Provides that, for the purposes of burglary, “inhabited” means currently being used for dwelling purposes, whether occupied or not. A house, trailer, vessel designed for habitation, or portion of a building is currently being used for dwelling purposes if, at the time of the burglary, it was not occupied solely because a natural or other disaster caused the occupants to leave the premises. (Pen. Code, § 459.)
- 14) Provides that the punishment for first-degree burglary is imprisonment in the state prison for two, four, or six years. (Pen. Code, § 461, subd. (a).)
- 15) Provides that the punishment for second-degree burglary is either confinement of up to one year in the county jail or imprisonment for 16 months, two, or three years. (Pen. Code, §§ 18, subd. (a); 461, subd. (b).)
- 16) Divides theft into two degrees, petty theft and grand theft. (Pen. Code, § 486.)
- 17) Defines grand theft as when the money, labor, or real or personal property taken is of a value exceeding \$950 dollars, except as specified. (Pen. Code, § 487.)
- 18) Defines petty theft as obtaining any property by theft where the value of the money, labor, real or personal property taken does not exceed \$950 and makes it a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not exceeding \$1,000, by imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or both, except as specified. (Pen. Code, § 490.)
- 19) Makes petty theft with two or more prior theft convictions, or other specified offenses, an alternate felony-misdemeanor punishable by up to one year in county jail or imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years. (Pen. Code, § 666.1, subd. (a).)
- 20) Defines “state of emergency” as conditions that, by reason of their magnitude, are, or are likely to be, beyond the control of the services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of any single county, city and county, or city and require the combined forces of a mutual aid region or regions to combat. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (d)(1).)
- 21) Defines “local emergency” as conditions that, by reason of their magnitude, are, or are likely to be, beyond the control of the services, personnel, equipment, and facilities of any single county, city and county, or city and require the combined forces of a mutual aid region or regions to combat. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (d)(2).)
- 22) Provides that a “state of emergency” shall exist from the time of the proclamation of the condition of the emergency until terminated, as specified, and that a “local emergency” shall exist from the time of the proclamation of the condition of the emergency by the local governing body until terminated, as specified. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd. (d)(3).)
- 23) Defines “evacuation order” as an order from the Governor, or a county sheriff, chief of police, or fire marshal, under which persons subject to the order are required to relocate outside of the geographic area covered by the order due to an imminent danger resulting from an earthquake, fire, flood, riot, or other natural or manmade disaster. (Pen. Code, § 463, subd.

(d)(4.)

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

- 1) **Author's Statement:** According to the author, “Assembly Bill 468 will provide a sense of security and better protect communities that have been devastated by wildfires. This legislation responds to recent criminal activity in communities devastated by the Palisades and Eaton Fires. Looters – particularly those who impersonate emergency personnel – create chaos and confusion, endanger residents and first responders, undermine public trust in evacuation orders, divert critical emergency resources, and victimize communities that already have suffered devastating harm. AB 468 will close existing loopholes, provide stronger deterrence, and better protect communities during the recovery and rebuilding process.”
- 2) **Existing Criminal Penalties for Looting:** Existing law defines looting as the commission of specified crimes during a state or local emergency, or in a county that is under an evacuation, and creates penalties in addition to the underlying offense for looting. (Pen. Code, § 463.) Specifically, where the underlying offense is burglary or grand theft, the punishment for looting is an alternate felony-misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in county jail for up to one year or by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years. (Pen. Code, § 463, subs. (a) & (b).) Unlike the punishment for the underlying crime, a person granted probation for a looting conviction under the above circumstances must also serve a mandatory minimum county jail term of 180 days. (*Ibid.*) Where the underlying crime is petty theft, looting is a misdemeanor punishable by up to six months in county jail, and a person granted probation must serve a mandatory minimum jail term of 90 days. (Pen. Code, § 463, subs. (a) & (b).)

This bill would increase the penalty for looting in an evacuation zone. The bill defines “evacuation zone” as an evacuation area or an area subject to an evacuation warning, and it includes a principal residence while it is undergoing reconstruction following damage or destruction caused by an earthquake, fire, flood, riot, or other natural or manmade disaster, after an evacuation order or warning has been lifted. When committed in an evacuation zone, this bill increases the high-term for looting where the underlying offense is first-degree burglary from six to seven years; and the penalty for looting where the underlying offense is second-degree burglary or grand theft from an alternate felony-misdemeanor to a straight felony punishable by imprisonment in county jail for 16 months, two years, or three year.

Existing law also punishes false impersonation of emergency personnel as a misdemeanor. (Pen. Code, §§ 538d, 538e, 538f, 538g, & 538h.) This bill would increase the penalty for false impersonation of emergency personnel in an evacuation zone to an alternate felony-misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment in county jail for up to one year or for 16 months, two years, or three years.

This bill also creates two new crimes: trespass with the intent to commit larceny, punishable by imprisonment in county jail for one year or for 16 months, two years, or three years; and theft from an unlocked vehicle, punishable by imprisonment in a county jail for one year or

by imprisonment 16 months, two years, or three years. Notably, grand theft and petty theft with two or more priors are already wobblers. As a result, in practice, theft of an unlocked vehicle would only apply to persons who commit petty theft (theft of under \$950) who are first- or second-time offenders. If committed somewhere other than an “evacuation zone,” as defined in this bill, the punishment for these offenders would be six months in county jail.

- 3) **New Enhancements for False Impersonation:** In addition to the increased criminal penalties described above, this bill also creates two new enhancements for false impersonation in an evacuation zone. The first is an enhancement of up to three years for a person convicted of looting within an evacuation zone while impersonating emergency personnel, but this appears to be inconsistent and incongruent with existing sentencing enhancements. For example, existing law provides that impersonating a peace officer in the commission of a felony is a one-year enhancement. (Pen. Code, § 667.17.) A person who uses a deadly or dangerous weapon in the commission of a felony or attempted felony is also subject to a one-year enhancement; so is a person who commits a felony while armed with a firearm. (Pen. Code, §§ 12022, subd. (a)(1) & (b).) The vulnerable victim enhancement for committing specified crimes, including first-degree burglary, against a person who is 65-years-old or older, a person who is blind, deaf, developmentally disabled, a paraplegic, or a quadriplegic, or against a person who is under 14-years-old may also receive a one-year enhancement. (Pen. Code, § 667.9, subd. (a).)

Conversely, crimes that carry a sentencing enhancement of three years or up to three years include, for example, carjacking with a deadly or dangerous weapon (Pen. Code, § 12022, subd. (b)); the commission or attempted commission of a felony while armed with an assault weapon; (Pen. Code, § 12022, subd. (a)(2)); inflicting great bodily injury in the commission or attempted commission of a felony (Pen. Code, § 12022.7, subd. (a)); and, administering a controlled substance to another against their will by means of force (Pen. Code, § 12022.75, subd. (a)).

Enhancements have been widely used in California.¹ More than half of currently incarcerated women and more than two-thirds of currently incarcerated men have at least one sentence enhancement.² Sentence enhancements increase an individual’s prison sentence, increasing the size of our prison population.³ Studies show that sentence enhancements are applied disproportionately to Black men.⁴ A 2023 study found, “Black people are over-represented among the currently incarcerated with sentence enhancements while Hispanic people are slightly under-represented. Among those *without* a sentence enhancement, 49% are Hispanic while 19% are Black. Individuals serving a sentence with an enhancement are overwhelmingly male.”⁵

Sentence enhancements increase the average sentence by nearly 2 years for all admissions.⁶ Confinement length for those with a sentence enhancement is approximately 5 years longer

¹ Bird, et al., *Sentence Enhancements in California*, Cal. Policy Lab (Mar. 2023) <<https://www.capolicylab.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/Sentence-Enhancements-in-California.pdf>> [as of Feb. 25, 2025].

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*

compared to those without an enhancement.⁷ Approximately 40% of prison admissions since 2015 have sentences lengthened by a sentence enhancement.⁸

- 4) **Longer Sentences’ Impact on Recidivism and Deterrence:** Research shows that increasing the severity of the punishment does little to deter the crime.⁹ According to the National Institute of Justice, “Laws and policies designed to deter crime by focusing mainly on increasing the severity of punishment are ineffective partly because criminals know little about the sanctions for specific crimes. More severe punishments do not ‘chasten’ individuals convicted of crimes, and prisons may exacerbate recidivism... Studies show that for most individuals convicted of a crime, short to moderate prison sentences may be a deterrent but longer prison terms produce only a limited deterrent effect.”¹⁰ Rather, increasing the perception that an individual will be caught and prosecuted is a vastly more effective deterrent than increased punishment. Studies also show that custodial sanctions have no effect on recidivism or slightly increase it when compared with the effects of noncustodial sanctions such as probation.¹¹
- 5) **County Jail Impact:** In January 2010, a 9th Circuit three-judge panel issued a ruling ordering the State of California to reduce its prison population to 137.5% of design capacity because overcrowding was the primary reason CDCR was unable to provide inmates with constitutionally adequate healthcare. (*Coleman/Plata v. Schwarzenegger* (2010) No. Civ S-90-0520 LKK JFM P/NO. C01-1351 THE.) The United States Supreme Court upheld the decision, declaring that “without a reduction in overcrowding, there will be no efficacious remedy for the unconstitutional care of the sick and mentally ill” inmates in California’s prisons. (*Brown v. Plata* (2011) 131 S.Ct. 1910, 1939; 179 L.Ed.2d 969, 999.)

AB 109, the Criminal Justice Realignment Act, was implemented in 2011 in response to prison overcrowding. In part, it shifted to county jails the responsibility for incarcerating lower-level offenders previously incarcerated in state prison. (Pen. Code, § 1170, subd. (h).) This, however, increased the pressure on county jails to house larger populations and to make difficult decisions about how to manage their growing jail populations. These pressures manifest differently by county based on a number of factors including jail capacity and whether the county jail system is operating under a court-mandated population cap. Such caps have been in place in some counties long before *Brown v. Plata* addressed state prison overcrowding. (Sarah Lawrence, Court-Ordered Population Caps in California County Jails (Dec. 2014).)¹²

This bill creates six new felonies that require imprisonment to be served primarily in county jail.

- 6) **Immigration Consequences:** A conviction of the new crimes created by this bill poses potential immigration consequences for noncitizen defendants. A theft offense is an

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ National Institute of Justice, *Five Things about Deterrence* <<https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/247350.pdf>> [accessed Mar. 26, 2025].

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ D.M. Petrich, et al., *Custodial Sanctions and Reoffending: A Meta-Analytic Review* (2021).

¹² Located at https://law.stanford.edu/search-sls/?q_as=california%20county%20jails [last visited March 26, 2024].

aggravated felony for immigration purposes if a one-year sentence is imposed. (8 USC § 1101(a)(43)(G) & (U).) Thus, if a term of one-year or more is imposed for this new offense, it will be a theft-related “aggravated felony” for immigration purposes. This triggers a host of immigration consequences, including deportability. (8 USC § 1227(a)(2)(A)(iii).) By contrast, a Ninth Circuit case has held that auto burglary under Penal Code section 459 is not a theft-related aggravated felony because it is an indivisible statute which can be violated by entering the locked vehicle with the intent to commit theft *or any felony*. (*Rendon v. Holder* (9th Cir. 2014) 764 F.3d 1077, 1084.)

The new looting offenses created by this bill may be considered a crime of moral turpitude for immigration purposes which can pose consequences for noncitizen defendants. (*United States v. Esparza-Ponce* (9th Cir. 1999) 193 F.3d 1133, 1136 [theft is a crime of moral turpitude for immigration purposes].) Among other possible consequences, a crime of moral turpitude can render a noncitizen inadmissible (8 USC § 1182(a)(2)(A)(i)(I)) or deportable (8 USC § 1227(a)(2)(A)(i) & (ii)).

In the 2010 U.S. Supreme Court case of *Kentucky v. Padilla*, the Court ruled that criminal defense lawyers must advise their clients of the potential immigration consequences of a criminal conviction. Failure to advise a client on the immigration consequences of a criminal conviction could constitute ineffective assistance of counsel under the Sixth Amendment. (*Kentucky v. Padilla* (2010) 559 U.S. 356.) In California, a defendant may seek to withdraw a plea if a defendant did not know and understand the immigration consequences of their crimes. (See Pen. Code, § 1473.7.)

- 7) **Argument in Support:** According to the *Office of the District Attorney for Ventura County*, “In Ventura County we have seen firsthand how much pain looters bring to victims of devastating fires such as the Thomas Fire, the Woolsey Fire, and the Mountain Fire. For example, even when some evacuees were fortunate enough to have time to select items to spare from the flames, looters during the Thomas Fire broke into the evacuees' vehicles to steal their most precious possessions. After the more recent Mountain Fire, opportunistic looters picked through rubble and ash looking for scraps of copper pipe. During the Woolsey Fire, a registered sex offender entered homes that were unoccupied due to evacuations to steal women's lingerie.

“AB 468 helps address crimes like the ones described above by providing updated definitions of relevant terms and graduated penalties for more serious looting offenses. AB 468 would enhance penalties for burglaries and for trespassing in an evacuation zone and will discourage thieves from entering evacuated homes as well as from picking through the ashes of destroyed homes. AB 468 also provides additional penalties for those who impersonate first responders in order to commit looting and other crimes against victims of natural disasters.

“I understand the language will be amended to clarify that those who target evacuees' vehicles will receive no break in the law simply because the car was unlocked. This is important as evacuees are often forced to abandon their vehicles to flee for safety on foot. With this planned amendment, AB 468 sends a strong message to would-be looters that California will not tolerate such despicable crimes.”

- 8) **Argument in Opposition:** According to *Vera Institute of Justice*, “**AB 468 is alarmingly broad and invites prosecutorial abuse.** The bill’s harsher penalties for property crimes would apply to *any* theft, burglary, or trespassing in an area under evacuation order or warning, even when an evacuation *never* occurred or *after* the evacuation order is lifted. The bill is also open-ended because it includes residences undergoing reconstruction for an indeterminate time. Further, AB 468 severely limits pretrial release for people *arrested for* (not charged with) a misdemeanor, disproportionately harming low-income people who cannot afford bail. During the COVID-19 State of Emergency, for example, prosecutors misused looting laws to sidestep California’s bail policies, and AB 468 invites similar abuses.

“**AB 468 will worsen racial disparities in the criminal legal system.** The bill creates a harsh felony for “trespass with intent to commit larceny,” punishable by up to four years in jail, for a person’s mere presence in a specified location based on their alleged intent. This invites racial profiling, which people in historically Black communities like Altadena experienced during the recent Los Angeles fires. Research shows that media coverage often reinforces a harmful and racialized double standard in the wake of natural disasters, depicting Black people as “looting” goods and white people as simply “finding” items. By perpetuating this double standard, AB 468 will place already vulnerable communities at even greater risk under the guise of safety.

“**Instead of responding to the expressed needs of people impacted by the fires, AB 468 prioritizes a costly criminal legal response.** The Essie Justice Group surveyed 137 Altadena residents impacted by the Eaton Canyon Fire and not a single person mentioned looting and theft. Instead, Altadena residents want public officials to provide timely cash assistance, reconstruction, and improved emergency preparedness. With the state spending more than \$130,000 per year to incarcerate one person, increasing penalties and higher court costs ultimately divert critical funds away from disaster relief. Lawmakers should focus on providing services to fire victims, not counterproductive policing in recovering communities.

“All Californians deserve safe communities, especially during emergencies. **AB 468, however, is overly broad, and puts Black and low-income Californians at risk with short-sighted and wasteful measures that fail to address the immediate needs of victims in Los Angeles.** As we face the increased impacts of climate change, we need to strengthen our state’s emergency preparedness and work with communities to rebuild public trust.”

9) **Related Legislation:**

- a) AB 271 (Hoover) would make looting a straight felony and would create a two-year enhancement for any looting conviction in which the defendant impersonated a first responder, as specified. AB 271 is pending a hearing in this committee.
- b) SB 265 (Valladares) would make looting where the underlying crime is second-degree burglary a straight felony. SB 265 is pending a hearing in the Senate Public Safety Committee.
- c) SB 571 (Archuleta) would make impersonating a first responder an alternate felony-misdemeanor punishable by up to one year in county jail or by imprisonment for 16 months, two years, or three years; would extend looting to include within 180 days of the

termination of a state or local emergency, or an evacuation order; and would eliminate court discretion to reduce or eliminate mandatory minimum jail sentences for persons granted probation following a looting conviction, except where the underlying offense was petty theft. SB 571 is pending referral in the Senate Rules Committee.

10) Prior Legislation:

- a) SB 905 (Weiner), Chapter 170, Statutes of 2024, created a new alternate felony-misdemeanor for any person who forcibly enters a vehicle, with the intent to commit a theft or any felony therein.
- b) AB 3078 (Gallagher), Chapter 132, Statutes of 2018, expanded the crime of looting to include theft which occurs while an area is under an evacuation order.
- c) AB 2820 (Chiu), Chapter 671, Statutes of 2016, revised the definition of state of emergency and local emergency for purposes of criminal price gouging.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

>

Opposition

>

Analysis Prepared by: Andrew Ironside / PUB. S. / (916) 319-3744