



February 13, 2026

The Honorable Kay Ivey
Governor of Alabama
600 Dexter Avenue
Montgomery, AL 36130

Re: HB 161 – "Consumer protection, app store providers and developers required to take certain actions related to age verification and parental consent, Attorney General authorized to bring action for violations as deceptive trade practice, parents authorized to bring civil action" (Veto Request/Executive Amendment)

Dear Governor Ivey:

On behalf of the Computer & Communications Industry Association (CCIA), I write to respectfully request a veto of HB 161, but barring that, urge an executive amendment to extend the effective date of HB 161 by six months to July 1, 2027. CCIA is an international, not-for-profit trade association representing a broad cross-section of communications and technology firms.¹ Proposed regulations on the intrastate provision of digital services therefore can have a significant, nationwide impact on CCIA members.

CCIA firmly believes that children are entitled to safety, data security, and privacy online. Our members have designed and developed parental tools to individually tailor younger users' online use to their developmental needs. For example, various services allow parents to set time limits, provide enhanced privacy protections by default for known child users, and other tools allow parents to block specific sites entirely.² This is also why CCIA supports implementing digital citizenship curricula in schools, to not only educate children on proper social media use but also help teach parents how they can use existing mechanisms and tools to protect their children as they see fit.

Unfortunately, HB 161 retains many of the concerns CCIA raised regarding HB 317 last year,³ including proposed age verification and parental consent requirements for covered app store providers and developers. The bill risks subjecting businesses to vague compliance requirements and arbitrary enforcement, while jeopardizing consumer privacy. We appreciate the opportunity to raise these concerns as you consider this proposal.

Texas and Utah recently enacted legislation similar to HB 161 that would implement age verification and estimation requirements. Both laws are currently facing a legal challenge by CCIA and affected internet users raising several constitutional concerns. Therefore, CCIA

¹ For more than 50 years, CCIA has promoted open markets, open systems, and open networks. CCIA members employ more than 1.6 million workers, invest more than \$100 billion in research and development, and contribute trillions of dollars in productivity to the global economy. A list of CCIA members is available at <https://www.ccianet.org/members>.

² Competitive Enterprise Institute, *Children Online Safety Tools*, <https://cei.org/children-online-safety-tools/> (last updated June 10, 2025).

³ See CCIA Comments Opposing AL HB 317 (Feb. 28, 2025), <https://ccianet.org/library/al-hb-317-comments/>.



recommends that lawmakers permit this issue to be more fully examined by the Judiciary in these ongoing challenges before burdening businesses with legislation that risks the passing on of expensive litigation costs to taxpayers as well as being invalidated by a federal court.

The U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly struck down laws containing speech restrictions intended to prevent harm to minors.

In 1997, the Supreme Court held that “the First Amendment does not tolerate” laws that “reduce[] the adult population ... to reading only what is fit for children.”⁴ Yet HB 161 effectively does exactly this: in order to restrict access to content potentially harmful to children, the proposed bill would restrict both children and adults’ access to such content. The First Amendment applies to teens as well as adults.⁵ Nor do states have the authority to require parental consent for viewing such content — the Court has likewise rejected the argument that “the state has the power to prevent children from hearing or saying anything without their parents’ prior consent.”⁶ HB 161 runs afoul of this settled precedent; it unconstitutionally undermines established free speech protections for users of all ages.

For these reasons, the vast majority of lower courts that have ruled on the issue have held that the First Amendment does not permit states to require age verification to access protected speech.⁷ Most recently, a Texas federal court recently blocked a similar mandate on First Amendment grounds, noting that since “nothing suggests Texas’s interest in preventing minors from accessing a wide variety of apps that foster protected speech (such as the Associated Press, the Wall Street Journal, Substack, or Sports Illustrated) is compelling,”⁸ such a law “fails strict scrutiny” and “would fail intermediate scrutiny as well.”⁹

The court further held that “[b]ecause the Act ‘defin[es] regulated speech by particular subject matter’ and ‘singles out specific subject matter for differential treatment,’ it is subject to strict scrutiny.”¹⁰ Moreover, “even if the coverage definition did not distinguish based on content, [the Texas bill] specifically sought to shield minors from certain speech the State deems objectionable or harmful . . . which is a content-based justification and would still warrant strict scrutiny.”¹¹

The bill unconstitutionally undermines the free speech rights of covered providers and developers as well: HB 161 requires both app stores and app developers to verify individuals’ ages upon account creation. For users identified as minors, the Act further requires app stores

⁴ *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 888 (1997) (cleaned up).

⁵ See, e.g., *id.* at 855-56.

⁶ *Brown v. Ent. Merchs. Ass’n*, 564 U.S. 786, 795 n. 3 (2011).

⁷ See, e.g., *CCIA v. Paxton*, No. 25-cv-01660, 2025 WL 3754045 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 23, 2025); *SEAT v. Paxton*, No. 25-cv-01662, 2025 WL 3731733 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 23, 2025); *NetChoice v. Griffin*, No. 5:25-CV-5140 (W.D. Ark. Dec. 15, 2025); *NetChoice v. Murrill*, No. 25-231, 2025 WL 3634112 (M.D. La. Dec. 15, 2025); *NetChoice v. Carr*, 789 F. Supp. 3d 1200 (N.D. Ga. 2025); *NetChoice v. Yost*, 778 F. Supp. 3d 923 (S.D. Ohio 2025); *NetChoice v. Griffin*, No. 23-cv-05105, 2025 WL 978607 (W.D. Ark. Mar. 31, 2025); *NetChoice v. Reyes*, 748 F. Supp. 3d 1105 (D. Utah 2024); *CCIA v. Paxton*, 747 F. Supp. 3d 1011 (W.D. Tex. 2024).

⁸ *CCIA v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3754045 at *12; *SEAT v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3731733 at *11.

⁹ *CCIA v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3754045 at *14-15; *SEAT v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3731733 at *14.

¹⁰ *CCIA v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3754045 at *10; *SEAT v. Paxton*, 2025 WL 3731733 at *9.

¹¹ *Id.*

to affiliate that account to a parent’s account and then both app stores and app developers must obtain verifiable parent consent for all app downloads, purchases, or in-app purchases. These requirements amount to a direct burden and restraint on the First Amendment rights of app stores, app developers, and users. For app stores, the requirements insert a barrier between speech shared through app stores and users entitled to receive that speech. The Supreme Court has ruled that the First Amendment protects app stores’ right to disseminate such speech,¹² and that app stores have First Amendment protection for “presenting a curated compilation of speech originally created by others”.¹³ For app developers, these requirements impose an unconstitutional “parental veto” between developers and users.¹⁴

Age verification and parental consent requirements undermine user privacy for users of all ages.

HB 161 contains many requirements that intrude upon the privacy for all mobile device users. While well-meaning, age verification mandates inherently require collecting sensitive data about users and adults. Such policies run contrary to the data minimization principles underlying federal and international best practices for privacy protection.¹⁵ Requiring individuals to share sensitive personal information with third parties, including IDs or biometrics, can make recipients a prime target for identity theft, cyberattacks, or other data breaches.¹⁶

Such dangers are far from hypothetical: several of the most devastating data breaches in recent years are directly attributable to age verification requirements.¹⁷ Furthermore, government officials could access this sensitive data through enforcement inquiries and processes. Compounding these problems, the bill requires covered online services to retroactively verify the ages of existing users as well as prospective ones, which unnecessarily increases the risk of malicious actors accessing the data submitted.

The more data a service is forced to collect, the greater risk it poses to consumer privacy and small business sustainability.¹⁸ A recent Digital Trust & Safety Partnership (DTSP) report, *Age Assurance: Guiding Principles and Best Practices*, found that “smaller companies may not be able to sustain their business” if forced to implement costly age verification methods, and that

¹² See *Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.*, 564 U.S. 552, 557 (2011).

¹³ *Moody v. NetChoice*, 603 U.S. 707, 728 (2024).

¹⁴ *Brown v. Ent. Merchs. Ass’n*, 564 U.S. 786, 795 n. 3 (2011).

¹⁵ See, e.g., *Fair Information Practice Principles (FIPPs)*, Fed. Privacy Council, <https://www.fpc.gov/resources/fipps/>; *Principle (c): Data Minimisation*, U.K. Info. Comm’r Off., <https://ico.org.uk/for-organisations/uk-gdpr-guidance-and-resources/data-protection-principles/a-guide-to-the-data-protection-principles/data-minimisation/>.

¹⁶ Shoshana Weissmann, *Age-Verification Legislation Discourages Data Minimization, Even When Legislators Don’t Intend That*, R St. Inst. (May 24, 2023), <https://www.rstreet.org/commentary/age-verification-legislation-discourages-data-minimization-even-when-legislators-dont-intend-that/>.

¹⁷ See, e.g., Mark Tsagas, *Online Age Checking Is Creating a Treasure Trove of Data for Hackers*, *The Conversation* (Nov. 11, 2025), <https://theconversation.com/online-age-checking-is-creating-a-treasure-trove-of-data-for-hackers-268586>.

¹⁸ Engine, *More Than Just a Number: How Determining User Age Impacts Startups* (Aug. 2024), <https://static1.squarespace.com/static/571681753c44d835a440c8b5/t/66ad1ff867b7114cc6f16b00/1722621944736/More+Than+Just+A+Number+-+Updated+August+2024.pdf>.



“[h]ighly accurate age assurance methods may depend on collection of new personal data such as facial imagery or government-issued ID.”¹⁹

The Commission Nationale de l’Informatique et des Libertés (CNIL) analyzed several existing online age verification solutions but found that none of these options could satisfactorily meet three key standards: 1) providing sufficiently reliable verification; 2) allowing for complete coverage of the population; and 3) respecting the protection of individuals’ data, privacy, and security.²⁰ Though the intention to keep kids safe online is commendable, this bill undermines that initiative by requiring more data collection about young people.

Additionally, Section 5’s real-time data access requirement would undermine privacy and make children less safe, as developers would be forced to collect sensitive personal information identifying an app store provider’s users, including parents of their underage customers.

Moreover, the bill undermines user privacy without impacting younger users’ ability to access most of the apps in question. Verifying age only for operating system and application store users overlooks access to websites via other means. Numerous applications are designed for web browsers, which this method does not cover. While application store age verification might seem like a comprehensive bulwark against certain content deemed undesirable for younger users, in reality, it falls short of achieving that goal.

Requirements under HB 161 are not administrable or well defined, creating serious compliance questions for businesses and users.

HB 161 contains vague definitions that would impose significant requirements and restrictions on app store providers and developers and fail to make children safer. The bill contains overly broad knowledge standards that would hold covered entities liable for “knowing or reckless violations,” with punitive damages available for “a consistent pattern of knowing or reckless conduct”, leaving businesses without any concrete guidelines as to what constitutes compliance.

* * * * *

We appreciate your consideration of these issues and stand ready to provide additional information as the Legislature considers proposals related to technology policy.

Sincerely,

Tom Mann
State Policy Manager, South
Computer & Communications Industry Association

¹⁹ *Age Assurance: Guiding Principles and Best Practices*, Digital Trust & Safety Partnership (Sept. 2023) at 10, https://dtspartnership.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/09/DTSP_Age-Assurance-Best-Practices.pdf.

²⁰ *Online Age Verification: Balancing Privacy and the Protection of Minors*, CNIL (Sept. 22, 2022), <https://www.cnil.fr/en/online-age-verification-balancing-privacy-and-protection-minors>.