

## EXHIBIT 2

### RESET STATE POWER TO DEFUND AND OBSTRUCT REGULAR OPERATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT & STRENGTHEN FINANCIAL & POLITICAL STATUS OF PUBLIC HEALTH ENTITIES

- 1. AB-2223. Legalize Homicide, Killing of Viable Fetuses and Human Beings in the Perinatal Period (Up to 7 Days or 1 Month After Birth); Legalize Infant Death by Neglect; Prohibit Investigation and Prosecution on Cause of Viable Fetus Death and Perinatal Death; and Impose Civil Fines for Investigating Cause of Viable Fetus Death and Perinatal Death.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Legislators Buffy Wicks, Kevin Mullin, Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Marc Berman, Cristina Garcia, Matt Haney, Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Ash Kalra, Lena Gonzalez, and Scott Wiener.

Voted to pass by Legislators Anna M. Caballero, Maria Elena Durazo, Robert M. Hertzberg, John Laird, Henry I. Stern, Thomas J. Umberg, Bob Wieckowski, Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Joaquin Arambula, Richard Bloom, Tasha Boerner Horvath, Mia Bonta, Isaac G. Bryan, Lisa Calderon, Wendy Carrillo, Sabrina Cervantes, Jim Cooper, Mike Fong, Laura Friedman, Jesse Gabriel, Eduardo Garcia, Mike A. Gipson, Chris R. Holden, Jacqui Irwin, Alex Lee, Marc Levine, Evan Low, Brian Maienschein, Jose Medina, Al Muratsuchi, Adrin Nazarian, Cottie Petrie-Norris, Bill Quirk, Sharon Quirk-Silva, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Luz Rivas, Robert Rivas, Freddie Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Miguel Santiago, Mark Stone, Philip Y. Ting, Christopher M. Ward, Akilah Weber, Lori D. Wilson, Jim Wood, Anthony Rendon, and Kevin McCarty.

AB-2223 adds Health & Safety Code section 123467(a) to prohibit investigation and prosecution of death of viable fetuses and “perinatal death due to causes that occurred in utero.” Perinatal death includes death occurred shortly after birth. From various sources, a perinatal period varies from the time of birth up to seven (7) days or (1) month after birth. Some sources even define this period to be up to (1) year after birth. This bill does not specify the length of a perinatal period, leaving up to lay people to decide and encouraging them to practice medicine without license.

This bill violates the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments (the right to life, due process, and equal protection) and California Penal Code sections 187 and 192 (homicide law), which state, “[m]urder is the unlawful killing of a human being, or a fetus, with malice aforethought” and “[m]anslaughter is the unlawful killing of a human being without malice.”

The initiating legislators erroneously assert that the law is “clear” that ending or losing a pregnancy is not a crime. (Page 5 of the Senate Judiciary Committee SB-2223 Bill Analysis dated May 19, 2022.) Under the current law, ending a pregnancy can be a crime when a fetus becomes viable. (California Penal Code section 187 and California Health & Safety Code section 123468.) They also reason that this bill will protect women who suffer from pregnancy loss against excessive prosecution and from unjustifiable jail time but fail to understand that the problem here is not death of viable fetuses and infants in the perinatal period; the problem is the overly zealous prosecution by the government on a few women. They should legislate bills

against this issue instead of legislating this unconstitutional bill which would not address the issue. Moreover, buying and selling of body parts of viable fetuses for profit is a serious concern. This bill would create a protected class of murderers and their aiders and abettors in violation of the equal protection clause, encourage the growth of this illegal trade, and encourage the start of a new illegal trade, buying and selling body parts of infants who die in the perinatal period. (See relevant online resources: <https://www.cosmopolitan.com/politics/news/a56200/fetal-tissue-research-donation/>; <https://www.centerformedicalprogress.org/>; <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-truth-about-fetal-tissue-research/>; and [https://www.icandecide.org/ican\\_press/cdc-spends-your-money-culturing-producing-and-selling-cell-lines-from-human-fetus-body-parts/?fs=e&s=cl](https://www.icandecide.org/ican_press/cdc-spends-your-money-culturing-producing-and-selling-cell-lines-from-human-fetus-body-parts/?fs=e&s=cl).)

## **2. AB-1608. Separation of Sheriff's and Coroner's Offices.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Legislators Richard Pan, Mark A. Gipson, Akilah Weber, Cristina Garcia, Mia Bonta, Isaac G. Bryan, Josh Becker, and Bob Wieckowski.

Voted to pass by Legislators Anna M. Caballero, Maria Elena Durazo, Robert M. Hertzberg, Scott D. Wiener, Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Joaquin Arambula, Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Marc Berman, Richard Bloom, Tasha Boerner Horvath, Isaac G. Bryan, Lisa Calderon, Wendy Carrillo, Sabrina Cervantes, Ken Cooley, Tom Daly, Mike Fong, Laura Friedman, Jesse Gabriel, Eduardo Garcia, Timothy S. Grayson, Matt Haney, Chris R. Holden, Jacqui Irwin, Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Ash Kalra, Alex Lee, Marc Levine, Brian Maienschein, Kevin McCarty, Jose Medina, Kevin Mullin, Patrick O'Donnell, Bill Quirk, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Luz Rivas, Robert Rivas, Miguel Santiago, Mark Stone, Christopher M. Ward, Akilah Weber, Buffy Wicks, Lori D. Wilson, and Anthony Rendon.

Existing law requires coroners to determine the manner, circumstances, and cause of death in the following circumstances: sudden infant death syndrome, criminal abortion, violent, sudden, unattended, or unusual deaths, known or suspected homicide, drowning, stabbing, cutting, starvation, strangulation, and deaths reported by physicians and other knowledgeable persons.

Current law allows each of the 58 counties to choose from multiple models of county office consolidation or separation. Counties have adopted procedures to address perceived conflicts with how death investigations are undertaken. 48 counties currently have chosen the sheriff-coroner approach because they reap the benefit of operational and budgetary efficiency. Separating their offices of the coroner and sheriff will remove investigative efficiencies and drastically increase county costs unnecessarily for them. This bill includes no funding for them to separate but demands it be done without regard to the massive costs it will create. Even if funding were provided, this bill does not acknowledge the long-standing constitutional state police power vested to the state's counties. It is best left to the sound discretion of local officials to choose a model that works best for each county. (See Bill Analysis by the Senate Committee on Public Safety dated April 7, 2022, Pages 2 and 7.)

**3. SB-1464. Require Law Enforcement to Enforce Public Health Guidelines or Else Lose and Relocate Funds to County Public Health Departments.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Senator Richard Pan.

This bill prohibits the release of pandemic response related state funds to any law enforcement agency should the agency publicly announce that it will not follow public health order and will relocate funds to public health departments.

This bill shifts law enforcement's state police power to public health departments through an irrational financial allocation scheme. It is unreasonable to shift funds from the law enforcement which has a workload of a 24-7 daily schedule whereas county public health departments have a workload of a 9 to 5 weekday schedule. Centralizing power in the public health arena makes it easier to implement unconstitutional health care mandates on individuals. Changes on public health guidelines are ongoing and the law enforcement's duties to uphold the constitution may be compromised if being asked to enforce unconstitutional public health guidelines.

**PRIOR RESTRAINT ON FREE SPEECH (CONTENT & VIEWPOINT CONTROL); PROMOTE AND SUPPORT HATECRIME; REMOVAL OF MEDICAL PRIVACY WITHOUT DUE PROCESS**

**4. AB-2098. Doctors Giving "Misinformation" and "Disinformation" Related to COVID-19 Commit Unprofessional Conduct Subject to License Revocation or Probation for Years.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Legislators Richard Pan, Evan Low, Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Akilah Weber, Buffy Wicks, and Scott D. Wiener.

Voted to pass by Legislators Joaquin Arambula, Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Richard Bloom, Tasha Boerner Horvath, Mia Bonta, Isaac G. Bryan, Lisa Calderon, Wendy Carrillo, Sabrina Cervantes, Jim Cooper, Tom Daly, Mike Fong, Laura Friedman, Jesse Gabriel, Cristina Garcia, Eduardo Garcia, Mike A. Gipson, Adam C. Gray, Matt Haney, Chris R. Holden, Jacqui Irwin, Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Ash Kalra, Alex Lee, Marc Levine, Brian Maienschein, Kevin McCarty, Jose Medina, Kevin Mullin, Al Muratsuchi, Cottie Petrie-Norris, Bill Quirk, Sharon Quirk-Silva, James C. Ramos, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Luz Rivas, Robert Rivas, Freddie Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Rudy Salas, Jr., Miguel Santiago, Mark Stone, Philip Y. Ting, Carlos Villapudua, Christopher M. Ward, Lori D. Wilson, Jim Wood, Anthony Rendon, Isaac G. Bryan, Lori D. Wilson, and Marc Berman.

This bill violates 1st Amendment free speech (viewpoint and content control), 5th and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments liberty to employment and practice medicine and due process of law, and 14th Amendment equal protection under law.

This bill does not define the terms "misinformation," "disinformation," "standard of care," and "contemporary scientific consensus." It suppresses liberty by censoring discussions and views held by licensees when they interact with their patients one on one, particularly on new and frontline medical issues when open discussions on facts and analysis are needed the most. The bill also encourages mass submission without questions and discourages innovation and

whistleblowing messages. It attacks the foundation of the U.S. and state constitution of liberty for all. The Administrative Procedural Act and current case law already have well established procedure and ways to handle cases when licensees act unprofessionally and negligently so this bill is unnecessary, and it would restrict written and verbal free speech.

The anti-SLAPP statute gives Californians the ability to file motions to strike or to dismiss accusations/complaints that infringe on protected speech activities. This bill would open the floodgates of litigation.

Also, the pursuant to Penal Code section 422.6, no person shall willfully injure, intimidate, interfere with, oppress, or threaten any other person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution of laws of this state or by the Constitution or laws of the United States in whole or in part because of one or more of the perceived characteristics of the victim listed in Penal Code section 422.55(a)(7) as such the [a]ssociation with a person or group with one or more of these actual or perceived characteristics. This bill can easily help create a hostile environment of hate crime, targeting and intimidating doctors for advising his patients and the public to use, for example, a method to treat Covid-19 other than getting the Covid-19 shot. These doctors can now be considered giving out “misinformation.” This year, the Medical Board of California has already started to investigate many doctors who have given “misinformation” to their patients. The Attorney General, under this situation, shall direct local law enforcement agencies to report to the Department of Justice any information that may be required relative to hate crimes. (Penal Code section 13023(a).)

**5. SB-1018. Require Social Media Platforms with Over 1 Million Users to Report Annually to The Public With Product and Service Descriptions and Statistics on Undefined Content Policy Violation to Avoid Civil Penalty of \$100,000 Per Occurrence.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Legislator Richard Pan.

Voted to pass by Legislators Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Marc Berman, Jordan Cunningham, Mike Fong, Jesse Gabriel, Jacqui Irwin, Buffy Wicks, Lori D. Wilson, Benjamin Allen, Bob Archuleta, Toni G. Atkins, Josh Becker, Steven Bradford, Anna M. Caballero, Dave Cortese, Bill Dodd, Maria Elena Durazo, Susan Talamantes Eggman, Steven M. Glazer, Lena Gonzalez, Ben Hueso, Melissa Hurtado, Sydney Kamlager, John Laird, Connie M. Leyva, Monique Limón, Mike McGuire, Dave Min, Josh Newman, Anthony J. Portantino, Richard D. Roth, Susan Rubio, Nancy Skinner, Henry I. Stern, Thomas J. Umberg, Bob Wieckowski, Scott D. Wiener, Pat Bates, Brian W. Jones, Anna M. Caballero, Robert M. Hertzberg.

This bill requires social media platforms with over 1 million users to make annual reports to “the public” to include product descriptions and their content policy violation related statistics. The attorney general may impose civil penalty of \$100,000 per occurrence if they don’t report. The bill does not define “content policy.” It violates 1st Amendment free speech (viewpoint and content control), 5th Amendment liberty and due process of law, 14th Amendment liberty, due process, and equal protection of laws.

The anti-SLAPP statute gives Californians the ability to file motions to strike or to dismiss accusations/complaints that infringe on protected speech activities. This bill would open the floodgates of litigation.

**6. SB-920. Authorize Medical Board of California (MBC) Unfettered Discretion to Enter Work Locations of Doctors and Psychiatrists to Search Private Patients' Medical Records Without Consent of Patients.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Melissa Hurtado.

This bill permits MBC to search records of unlimited scope without the consent of medical professionals and patients for the sole purpose of deciding whether good cause exists to issue subpoenas for records to further investigate and accuse doctors and physician assistants.

This bill violates the principle of separation of power, giving MBC, an executive office, judicial power to determine whether good cause exists to bypass the first round of subpoenaing process. Under normal operation, a court of law would determine whether good cause exists. This bill also violates the physician and patient relationship, equal protection, due process, the privacy right of doctors, psychiatrists, and their patients, and federal and state medical privacy law, including HIPPA.

**7. SB-1390. Prohibit Social Media Platforms from Spreading "Misinformation" on Health and Vaccine Related Topics.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and by Legislator Richard Pan.

This bill prohibits social media platforms from spreading health & vaccine related "misinformation" in violation of the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment right to free speech (viewpoint and content control). "Standard of care" and "contemporary scientific consensus" are not defined so the public has no way of predicting how "misinformation" and "disinformation" will be defined. These bills place a chilling effect on the public to provide goods and services on Covid related topics out of fear of losing their businesses/activities through the use of online platforms. The public must feel safe to speak their minds in order to continue a free society to discover innovative solutions and to address frontline issues and whistleblowing messages. This is a most crucial time to speak up on Covid related issues because we now start to have more facts and statistics about them. Bills enacted to suppress protected speech are unconstitutional. No facts and statistics have been offered as evidence by the bill authors to prove harms having been done to the public by Covid related speech. The bills also attack the foundation of the U.S. and state constitution on not to infringe on liberty for all. Platform users' liberty is infringed.

The anti-SLAPP statute gives Californians the ability to file motions to strike or to dismiss accusations/complaints that infringe on protected speech activities. This bill would open the floodgates of litigation.

## SEGREGATION BASED ON SOCIAL STANDING

### **8. SB-866. Authorize Minors to Receive Vaccines Without Parental Consent.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Legislators Richard Pan, Scott D. Wiener, Buffy Wicks, Josh Newman, Cecilia Aguiar-Curry, Evan Low, Philip Ting, and Akilah Weber.

Voted by Maria Elena Durazo, Lena Gonzalez, John Laird, Mike McGuire, Thomas J. Umberg, Bob Wieckowski, Toni G. Atkins, Josh Becker, Steven Bradford, Dave Cortese, Bill Dodd, Susan Talamantes Eggman, Steven M. Glazer, Robert M. Hertzberg, Sydney Kamlager, Monique Limón, Josh Newman, Anthony J. Portantino, Nancy Skinner, Richard Bloom, Matt Haney, Ash Kalra, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Robert Rivas, David Alvarez, Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Marc Berman, Mia Bonta, Lisa Calderon, Wendy Carrillo, Sabrina Cervantes, Mike Fong, Laura Friedman, Jesse Gabriel, Cristina Garcia, Eduardo Garcia, Mike A. Gipson, Matt Haney, Chris R. Holden, Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer, Sr., Alex Lee, Marc Levine, Jose Medina, Kevin Mullin, Adrin Nazarian, Bill Quirk, Luz Rivas, Blanca Rubio, Miguel Santiago, Mark Stone, Christopher M. Ward, Lori D. Wilson, Jim Wood, and Anthony Rendon.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia recently ruled in *Booth, et al. v. Bowser, et al.* (2022) (Case Nos. 21-cv-01857 and 21-cv-01782) that states are free to encourage children to get vaccines but they cannot transgress on the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 (“the Program”) passed by the Congress and trample on the Constitution. A key component of the Program is to compensate vaccine injuries. A minor cannot be a petitioner under the Program. Instead, the minor’s legal representative must petition on the minor’s behalf. Because of time limits set by the Program, petitioners must quickly identify vaccine-related injuries to qualify for the Program. D.C.’s Minor Consent Vaccination Act (MCV) subverted the protections of the Program. “MCV tries to conceal a child’s vaccination status from his parents.” (*Id.* at p.13.) The Supremacy Clause establishes that federal law “shall be the supreme Law of the Land... any Thing in the Constitution of Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.” U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2. “[T]he NCVIA shows Congress did not intend for minors take control of their own vaccination decisions. The [state’s] interpretation of “child” cuts parents out of the vaccination process and so deviates from Congress[’] intent.” (*Id.* at 26.)

Also, SB-866 elevates children above their parents’ authority to create family conflicts and disorders in our society. It is in direct conflict of Family Code section 7505 so it must not pass. “The authority of a parent ceases on any of the following: (a) [t]he appointment, by a court, of a guardian of the person of the child. (b) The marriage of the child. (c) The child attaining the age of majority.” (*Id.*) It also removes the liberty and due process of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments for parents to exercise their fundamental rights to direct care, bring up, and educate their children. Also, vaccine inserts are not available on the market or in schools and medical issues are too complex for children to evaluate safety and risk factors. This bill also invades the privacy (tort law) of families to create conflicts between parents and children, increase peer pressure, and promote improper school incentives for vaccination as testified in the May 5<sup>th</sup> senate hearing.

## **9. SB-1419. Prohibit Parents from Inspecting Medical Records of Minor Children.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys by Legislators Josh Becker.

Voted to pass by Legislators Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Dr. Joaquin Arambula, Wendy Carrillo, Ash Kalra, Brian Maienschein, Kevin McCarty, Adrin Nazarian, Miguel Santiago, Akilah Weber, Jim Wood, Benjamin Allen, Toni G. Atkins, Steven Bradford, Dave Cortese, Bill Dodd, Maria Elena Durazo, Susan Talamantes Eggman, Steven M. Glazer, Lena Gonzalez, Ben Hueso, Melissa Hurtado, Sydney Kamlager, John Laird, Connie M. Leyva, Monique Limón, Mike McGuire, Dave Min, Josh Newman, Richard Pan, Anthony J. Portantino, Richard D. Roth, Susan Rubio, Nancy Skinner, Henry I. Stern, Thomas J. Umberg, Bob Wieckowski, Scott D. Wiener, Josh Newman, Anna M. Caballero, Robert M. Hertzberg, and Henry I. Stern.

This bill prevents parents from inspecting “certain” minors’ medical records and it is unconstitutional as discussed in the analysis immediately above for SB-866. Therefore, we demand that you rescind this bill immediately.

## **10. SB-1479. Testing in Schools; COVID-19 Testing Plans.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and by Legislators Richard Pan, Josh Newman, Scott D. Wiener, Cecilia Aguiar-Curry, Evan Low, Akilah Weber, and Buffy Wicks.

Voted to pass by Legislators Joaquin Arambula, Wendy Carrillo, Brian Maienschein, Kevin McCarty, Adrin Nazarian, Luz M. Rivas, Freddie Rodriguez, Miguel Santiago, Jim Wood, Benjamin Allen, Toni G. Atkins, Steven Bradford, Dave Cortese, Bill Dodd, Maria Elena Durazo, Susan Talamantes Eggman, Steven M. Glazer, Lena Gonzalez, Ben Hueso, Melissa Hurtado, Sydney Kamlager, John Laird, Connie M. Leyva, Monique Limón, Mike McGuire, Dave Min, Anthony J. Portantino, Richard D. Roth, Susan Rubio, Nancy Skinner, Henry I. Stern, Thomas J. Umberg, and Bob Wieckowski.

This bill creates indefinite Covid testing plans and reporting of test results to the public health department in violation of the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment prohibition to unreasonable government searches and federal and state medical privacy laws without due process. It also removes the protection afforded by the subpoenaing process and the rights of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendments to have liberty to withhold medical results. Further, this bill promotes administrators to practice medicine without license by handling and opining on medical issues. “Covid testing” plans are not defined and there is no rational basis to create plans for “Covid” as the virus has evolved.

The Department of Public Health ("DPH") does not have a proposed plan on how Covid testing is to be implemented so delegating the authority for the department to implement an unknown plan is arbitrary. This bill also removes each public and private school’s choice of appropriate protocols. DPH would implement a set of one-size-fits-all testing protocols which may not be suitable and practical to certain or many schools which are located in different geographic regions in the state. Currently, Covid testing is not necessary. Putting DPH in charge while there is no need for it is a plan to centralize power for control. It is proven that individual school districts and private schools are capable to handle their own testing and to tailor protocols according to their own needs.

**11. AB-1797. Establish Vaccine Tracking System and Authorize All State Agencies to Review Medical/Vaccine Records of Children and Adults Without Patient Consent.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and by Legislators Akilah Weber, Richard Pan, Evan Low, Buffy Wicks, Josh Newman, and Scott Wiener.

Voted to pass by Legislators Susan Talamantes Eggman, Lena Gonzalez, Connie M. Leyva, Monique Limón, Richard D. Roth, Susan Rubio, Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Dr. Joaquin Arambula, Rebeca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Richard Bloom, Tasha Boerner Horvath, Mia Bonta, Isaac G. Bryan, Lisa Calderon, Wendy Carrillo, Sabrina Cervantes, Jim Cooper, Tom Daly, Mike Fong, Laura Friedman, Jesse Gabriel, Cristina Garcia, Eduardo Garcia, Mike A. Gipson, Thomas S. Grayson, Matt Haney, Chris R. Holden, Jacqui Irwin, Reginald Byron Jones-Sawyer. Sr., Ash Kalra, Alex Lee, Marc Levine, Brian Maienschein, Chad Mayes, Kevin McCarty, Jose Medina, Kevin Mullin, Al Muratsuchi, Cottie Petrie-Norris, Bill Quirk, Sharon Quirk-Silva, James C. Ramos, Eloise Gomez Reyes, Luz Rivas, Robert Rivas, Freddie Rodriguez, Blanca Rubio, Rudy Salas Jr., Miguel Santiago, Mark Stone, Philip Y. Ting, Carlos Villapudua, Christopher M. Ward, Lori D. Wilson, Jim Wood, Anthony Rendon, Isaac G. Bryan, Mike Fong, Marc Levine, Robert Rivas, Lori D. Wilson, Steve Bennett, Patrick O'Donnell, Cecilia M. Aguiar-Curry, Dr. Joaquin Arambula, Freddie Rodriguez, and Jim Wood.

This bill creates an indefinite vaccine tracking system and give access to records to all state agencies of all persons. It violates the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment prohibition to unreasonable government searches and medical privacy laws and removes the protection from the subpoenaing process. It also removes the right of 5<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment liberty to withhold private vaccine records without due process of law. It promotes administrators to practice medicine without license by handling and opining on medical issues. It also serves to centralize power of vaccine mandates in derogation of bills of rights endowed to individuals.

The disclosure of race, ethnicity, and vaccination personal information will also create a platform for discrimination based on race, ethnicity and whether people of a certain group comply with or not with future vaccine protocols. The bill does not state how this disclosure would enhance public safety. The registry extends to include "adults, and clients" and the bill could easily target a group with certain preferences of healthcare protocols, reducing liberty to certain groups, treating them unequally under the law.

**12. SB-1184. Authorize Health Care Providers to Disclose Patients' Records to School-Linked Services Without the Consent of Patients**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Legislators Dave Cortese and Susan Rubio.

Voted to pass by Legislators Richard Pan, Rebecca Bauer-Kahan, Steve Bennett, Marc Berman, Jordan Cunningham, Mike Fong, Jesse Gabriel, Jacqui Irwin, and Buffy Wicks, Lori D. Wilson, Benjamin Allen, Toni G. Atkins, Josh Becker, Steven Bradford, Maria Elena Durazo, Susan Talamantes Eggman, Steven M. Glazer, Lena Gonzalez, Ben Hueso, Melissa Hurtado, Sydney Kamlager, John Laird, Connie M. Leyva, Monique Limón, Mike McGuire, Dave Min, Josh Newman, Anthony J. Portantino, Richard D. Roth, Nancy Skinner, Thomas J. Umberg, Bob Wieckowski, Scott D. Wiener, Anna M. Caballero, Robert M. Hertzberg, Henry I. Stern, Aguiar-



Curry, Arambula, Carrillo, Maienschein, Mayes, McCarty, Nazarian, Luz Rivas, Rodriguez, Santiago, Akilah Weber, and Jim Wood.

Under this bill, health care providers can disclose patients' records to school-linked services in violation of the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment prohibiting unreasonable government searches and medical privacy laws and removes the protection against unreasonable search from the long-standing subpoenaing process. It also promotes administrators to practice medicine without license by handling and opining on medical issues as non-doctors.

**13. AB-2539. COVID-19 Vaccination and Proof of Status by Showing Paper or Digital Medical Record.**

Initiated by Unidentified Legislative Attorneys and Assembly Members Steven Choi, Heath Flora, Tom Lackey, Devon Mathis, and Randy Voepel.

This bill would require a public or private entity that requires a member of the public to provide documentation regarding the individual's vaccination status for any COVID-19 vaccine as a condition of receipt of any service or entrance to any place to accept a written medical record or government-issued digital medical record in satisfaction of the condition.

It segregates people based on vaccination status in violation of the equal protection clause of the U.S. and California constitutions. It also infringes on the rights to liberty, pursuit of happiness, medical privacy, and due process.