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Elon Musk’s X sued [California](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/california) on Friday, challenging the constitutionality of a state law establishing new transparency requirements for social media companies, including how they police disinformation, hate speech and extremism.

X, the social media platform once called Twitter, said the law, known as Assembly Bill 587, violates its free speech rights under the US constitution’s first amendment and California’s state constitution.

In a complaint filed in federal court in Sacramento, California, X said the law’s “true intent” was to pressure social media companies into eliminating content the state found objectionable.

By doing so, California is forcing companies to adopt the state’s views on politically charged issues, “a form of compelled speech in and of itself”, X said.

Musk, a self-described “free speech absolutist” and the world’s richest person, bought Twitter for $44bn last October. He also runs the electric car company Tesla and space exploration company SpaceX.

Civil rights groups including the Anti-Defamation League and the Center for Countering Digital Hate have identified increases in the volume of hate speech on X targeting Jews, Black people, gay and trans persons since Musk took over.

The office of California attorney general Rob Bonta, which enforces state laws, did not immediately respond to requests for comment on the lawsuit.

AB 587 requires larger social media companies to issue semiannual reports that describe their content moderation practices, and provide data on the numbers of objectionable posts and how they were addressed.

The law also requires companies to provide copies of their terms of service. Failure to comply risks civil fines of up to $15,000 for each violation a day.

Gavin Newsom, California’s Democratic governor, signed the law last September, saying the state would not let social media be “weaponized” to spread hate and disinformation. Jesse Gabriel, an assembly member and author of the bill, said in a statement that “if Twitter has nothing to hide, then they should have no objection to this bill”.

“Assembly Bill 587 is a pure transparency measure that simply requires companies to be upfront about if and how they are moderating content. It in no way requires any specific content moderation policies – which is why it passed with strong, bipartisan support,” he said.

---

The [first-of-its-kind legislation](https://apnews.com/article/technology-california-gavin-newsom-d044d21d28176f5c5010fccf78f0697c) was signed into law a year ago by California Gov. Gavin Newsom. In a lawsuit filed Friday against state Attorney General Robert Bonta, X Corp. challenges the “constitutionality and legal validity” of the law,

saying it violates the First Amendment.

The law’s author, Democratic Assemblyman Jesse Gabriel, said it is a “a pure transparency measure that simply requires companies to be upfront about if and how they are moderating content. It in no way requires any specific content moderation policies – which is why it passed with strong, bipartisan support.”

“If Twitter has nothing to hide, then they should have no objection to this bill,” he added.