

AMENDED IN SENATE AUGUST 26, 2013  
AMENDED IN SENATE JULY 8, 2013  
AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 20, 2013  
AMENDED IN SENATE JUNE 10, 2013  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MAY 13, 2013  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY APRIL 17, 2013  
AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY MARCH 19, 2013  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE—2013–14 REGULAR SESSION

**ASSEMBLY BILL**

**No. 633**

---

**Introduced by Assembly Member Salas**  
**(Principal coauthor: Assembly Member Logue)**  
*(Coauthors: Assembly Members Bocanegra, Ian Calderon, Hall,*  
*Jones-Sawyer, Nazarian, Quirk-Silva, Wieckowski, and Yamada)*  
*(Coauthor: Senator Pavley)*

February 20, 2013

---

An act to add Section 1799.103 to the Health and Safety Code, relating to emergency medical services.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 633, as amended, Salas. Emergency medical services: civil liability.

Under existing law, a person who, in good faith and not for compensation, renders emergency medical or nonmedical care or assistance at the scene of an emergency is not liable for civil damages resulting from any act or omission, except as specified. Existing law

further provides that a person who has completed a basic cardiopulmonary resuscitation course that complies with specified standards, and who in good faith renders emergency cardiopulmonary resuscitation at the scene of an emergency is not liable for any civil damages as a result of any act or omission, except as specified. Existing law provides that a health care provider, including any licensed clinic, health dispensary, or health facility, is not liable for professional negligence or malpractice for any occurrence or result solely on the basis that the occurrence or result was caused by the natural course of a disease or condition, or was the natural or expected result of reasonable treatment rendered for the disease or condition.

This bill would prohibit an employer from having a policy of prohibiting an employee from providing voluntary emergency medical services, including, but not limited to, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, in response to a medical emergency, except as specified. *The bill would state that these provisions do not impose any express or implied duty on an employer to train its employees regarding emergency medical services or cardiopulmonary resuscitation.*

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.  
State-mandated local program: no.

*The people of the State of California do enact as follows:*

1 SECTION 1. Section 1799.103 is added to the Health and  
2 Safety Code, to read:  
3 1799.103. (a) An employer shall not adopt or enforce a policy  
4 prohibiting an employee from voluntarily providing emergency  
5 medical services, including, but not limited to, cardiopulmonary  
6 resuscitation, in response to a medical emergency, except as  
7 provided in subdivisions (b) and (c).  
8 (b) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an employer may adopt  
9 and enforce a policy authorizing employees trained in emergency  
10 services to provide those services. However, in the event of an  
11 emergency, any available employee may voluntarily provide  
12 emergency medical services if a trained and authorized employee  
13 is not immediately available or is otherwise unable or unwilling  
14 to provide emergency medical services.  
15 (c) Notwithstanding subdivision (a), an employer may adopt  
16 and enforce a policy prohibiting an employee from performing  
17 emergency medical services, including, but not limited to,

1 cardiopulmonary resuscitation, on a person who has expressed the  
2 desire to forgo resuscitation or other medical interventions through  
3 any legally recognized means, including, but not limited to, a  
4 do-not-resuscitate order, a Physician Orders for Life Sustaining  
5 Treatment form, an advance health care directive, or a legally  
6 recognized health care decisionmaker.

7 *(d) This section does not impose any express or implied duty*  
8 *on an employer to train its employees regarding emergency*  
9 *medical services or cardiopulmonary resuscitation.*

O