

LFC Requester:	Scott Sanchez
-----------------------	----------------------

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS
2026 REGULAR SESSION**

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO:

AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov

{Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF}

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}

Check all that apply:
Original **Amendment**
Correction **Substitute**

Date January 29, 2026
Bill No: HB 9-HJC/a

Sponsor: Chavez, Rubio, Romero, Anaya, Cervantes
Short Title: Immigrant Safety Act

Agency Name and Code LOPD-280
Number: _____
Person Writing Adrienne Turner
Phone: 505.490.1933 **Email** adrienne.turner@lopdnm.us

SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY25	FY26		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY25	FY26	FY27		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY25	FY26	FY27	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total	-					

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis:

House Bill 9 prohibits New Mexico public bodies from using public resources or property to detain individuals for federal civil immigration violations and requires the termination of existing immigration detention contracts.

The HJC amendment expands these restrictions by prohibiting agreements that deputize state or local officials to perform federal immigration enforcement functions, including 287(g) agreements, and requires any existing deputization agreements to be canceled.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

No fiscal impact to LOPD.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

Agreements authorized under 8 U.S.C. § 1357(g), commonly known as 287(g) agreement, allow the federal government to deputize state and local law enforcement officers to perform certain federal civil immigration enforcement functions. HB 9, as amended, would prohibit public bodies from entering into, extending, or maintaining these agreements and would require the termination of any existing agreements entered into pursuant to this authority.

The scope of 287(g) agreements varies, but the types of activities prohibited under HB 9 as amended that directly affect LOPD clients and our ability to represent them include:

- The deputization of state and local law enforcement officers to make civil immigration arrests without a judicial warrant, including arrests in the community or at courthouses;
- The service and execution of ICE administrative warrants or detainers in jails or correctional facilities, resulting in the transfer of LOPD clients to federal immigration custody; and
- The interrogation of individuals regarding immigration status while they are incarcerated on state criminal charges

The HJC amendment's explicit prohibition of 287(g) and related agreements clarifies the limits of

state and local authority and reduces the likelihood that state law enforcement and custodial resources will be used as to enforce federal immigration policies.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

HB 9, as amended, is unlikely to have a significant impact on LOPD's ability to represent clients in state criminal proceedings. However, the bill's establishment of clear, uniform statewide standards governing the relationship between state and local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities is likely to support effective representation. By reducing the risk that clients will be transferred to federal immigration custody or questioned by deputized officers while state cases are pending, the bill promotes more consistent access to clients and greater predictability in court scheduling. These conditions support LOPD attorneys' ability to advise clients, investigate cases, and provide meaningful representation without disruption caused by overlapping or inconsistent immigration enforcement practices.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

As noted above.

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

None noted.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

None noted.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

None noted.