

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

**GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON
DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE**



**DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FATALITY
REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**NINTH REPORT
OCTOBER 2012**

<http://www.doj.nh.gov/criminal/victim-assistance/domestic-violence-fatality-review-committee.htm>



**Innovation • Partnerships
Safer Neighborhoods**



“This report was supported by Cooperative Agreement No. 2011-WF-AX-0032 awarded by the Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the contributors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.”

“The Judicial Branch data was supported by 2009-EF-S6-0019, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, and several awards under the Violence Against Women Act: No. 2009-WF-AX-0019; No. 2010 WF-AX-0042 and No.2011 No. 2011-WF-AX-0032 awarded by the Office of Violence, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this report are those of the contributors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| Acknowledgments | iii |
| Domestic Violence Fatality Review Committee 2010-2011 Membership | v |
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Domestic Violence Homicides In New Hampshire 2001-2010 Report..... | 2 |
| III. 2011 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOMICIDES | 34 |
| IV. New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence 2011 Crisis Center Data Report | 35 |
| V. New Hampshire Judicial Branch 2011 Violence Against Women Data Report | 43 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"The Domestic Violence Fatality Review Committee would like to acknowledge the hard work and countless hours contributed by a number of people in the effort to produce this data report. Particular gratitude is owed to, Sandra Matheson, Joelle Donnelly, Danielle Snook, Tanya Pitman from the Attorney General's Office, Betsy Paine and Jeannette Bilodeau from the New Hampshire Judicial Branch, Kim France and Maureen McDonald from the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence and the 14 Coalition member crisis center programs.

NEW HAMPSHIRE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FATALITY REVIEW COMMITTEE 2010-2011 MEMBERSHIP

*** Elizabeth Paine, JD, Chair**

Domestic Violence Specialist
NH District Court and Family Division

***Thomas A. Andrew, MD**

Chief Medical Examiner
NH Office of the State Medical Examiner

Detective Jeffrey A. Ardini

NH State Police – Major Crime Unit

Vicki Blanchard

Advanced Life Support Coordinator
Dept of Safety, Bureau of EMS

Lieutenant Mark G. Bodanza

Law Enforcement Training Specialist
NH Police Standards and Training Council

Paula Booth, ACSW, CEAP

Executive Director
State Employee Assistance Program

Alan Cronheim, JD

Sisti Law Offices

Donna Cummings, MS [alt.]

Executive Director
RESPONSE

Jennie V. Duval, MD [alt.]

Deputy Chief Medical Examiner
NH Office of the State Medical Examiner

***Kim France**

Executive Director
NH Coalition Against Domestic and
Sexual Violence

Joanne Fortier

Warden NHSP-Women
NH Department of Corrections

Clyde R.W. Garrigan, JD

U.S. Attorneys Office

Robert Gougelet, MD

Medical Director Emergency Response
Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center

Andrea Goldberg

Family Preservation Manager
NH Division for Children, Youth and
Families

Amanda Grady [alt.]

Public Policy Assistant
NH Coalition Against Domestic
and Sexual Violence

Lieutenant Jill Hamel [alt.]

NH Police Standards and Training Council

***Scott Hampton, PsyD**

Ending the Violence

Debra Hastings, PhD, RN-BC, CNOR

Director of Continuing Nursing Education
Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center,
CCEHS

Christopher Keating, JD

Director
NH Public Defenders Office

Rev. Rebecca Werner Maccini
Congregational Church of Henniker

Rachel Lakin
APS Program Operations Administrator
DHHS, Bureau of Elderly and Adult Services

***Sandra Matheson**
Director, Office of Victim/Witness
Assistance
NH Attorney General's Office

Bernadette Melton-Plante
Senior CASA Supervisor
CASA of NH

Peter A. Michaud
Director, Victim Services
NH Department of Corrections

Deborah J. Mozden
Executive Director
Turning Points Network

Linda Parker
Program Specialist
Bureau of Drug and Alcohol Services

Raymond Perry, Jr., JD
Director
Office of Client and Legal Services
NH Dept. of Health and Human Services

Sergeant Jill C. Rockey
NH State Police

Michelle Rosenthal
DV Intervention Coordinator
NH Division for Children, Youth and
Families ***(Ret.) Chief Timothy Russell**
Henniker Police Department

Rosemary Shannon
Administrator I
Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Treatment
NH Division of Public Health

Honorable Stephen J. Shurtleff
State Representative

Ms. Barbara A. Sweet [alt]
NH Judicial Branch

Erica Ungarelli [alt]
NH Division for Children, Youth and
Families

Danielle Snook
Program Specialist
NH Attorney General's Office
{Administrative Assistant to Committee}

****Executive Committee Members***

I. INTRODUCTION

The Domestic Violence Fatality Review Committee (DVFRC, “Committee”) was created by Executive Order of Governor Jeanne Shaheen in July 1999. Since its inception, the DVFRC has generated recommendations for the state’s three branches of government and the many individuals, agencies, and community organizations which work with domestic violence victims and offenders. These recommendations have generated policies, procedures, and practices to improve New Hampshire's multidisciplinary response to domestic violence.

The DVFRC produces annual reports that include statistical data, recommendations, and responses to the recommendations previously made by the Committee. This year the DVFRC is pleased to release a report which presents 10 years of data on domestic violence-related homicides in New Hampshire from 2001 to 2010. The goal in presenting the data in this way is to improve the understanding of the context of these homicides and to promote the optimal allocation of resources to help prevent future homicides.

Also included in this report are crisis center data from the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence and court system data from the New Hampshire Judicial Branch. These represent two additional, individual sets of data separate from the homicide data, and are each based on a one-year period for 2011. However, all data sets present important and related information about domestic violence in the state.

The DVFRC strives to promote greater awareness of domestic violence in New Hampshire and opportunities for building safer communities for all our citizens. The Committee is hopeful that this report may serve as a valuable resource to those who serve victims of domestic violence, decision-makers, and researchers.

II. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOMICIDES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

III. 2001-2010 DATA REPORT

This report presents data* on domestic violence-related homicides in New Hampshire for a 10-year period from **2001** to **2010**.

The first section compares domestic violence homicides to total homicides as a way of demonstrating the significance of this problem to New Hampshire citizens. For ease of analysis, the data was then grouped into the following categories:

- **OVERVIEW** of the statistics of homicides, domestic violence homicides and homicide/suicides.
- **WHERE** did the homicides occur? (Does the likelihood of a domestic violence homicide vary depending on where the perpetrator and victim are located?)
- **WHEN** did the homicides occur? (Are there higher or lower risk months, days or times for domestic violence homicides to occur?)
- **HOW** was the homicide committed? (Cause of death?)
- **WHO** was involved? (Victim and perpetrator characteristics?)

The goal in presenting the data in this way is to improve the understanding of the context of these homicides and to promote the optimal allocation of resources to help prevent future homicides.

**Data in this report is from the New Hampshire Attorney General's Office of Victim/Witness Assistance Homicide Database.*

SUMMARY OF DATA

Domestic violence is having a profound effect on the citizens of New Hampshire. In the decade from **2001 to 2010** domestic violence has been one of the leading “causes” of death with the domestic violence homicide rate hovering around the **50%** mark. The average domestic violence homicide rate is **.57 per 100,000** residents. New Hampshire has a relatively low homicide rate compared to the national average, however the relationship of the parties can prove to be a fatal factor. Domestic violence is a causal factor in **92%** of the state’s **homicide/suicides**.

WHERE

The highest domestic violence rates are in some of the state’s most **rural counties**, **Sullivan County** had the highest rate per capita at **1.17 per 100K**, almost twice the rate of the state average. Home can be a dangerous place for a domestic violence victim, **84%** of domestic violence homicides occurred in the home while only **15%** of these homicides occurred at some place other than a residence.

WHEN

We are beginning to develop data on when domestic violence homicides occur. In the past decade the highest rate of domestic violence homicides have occurred in the summer months and early autumn, **13%** have occurred in **July** with next highest rates at **12%** in **September** and **October**. **Sunday** was the day of the week with the highest rate of domestic violence. Over **70%** of domestic violence homicides in New Hampshire occur between **six pm and six am**.

HOW

Firearms which include handguns and long guns were involved in **48%** of the cases. Of these cases **handguns** were the cause of death in **42%**. Other causes of death in domestic violence homicides include **stabbing** at **22%** and **blunt force impact** at **21%**.

WHO

Women were the victims in **67%** of the domestic violence homicides. They were killed by their **partners** in **56%** of the cases and by a **family member** in **31%** of the cases. If the victim was killed by a **partner**, in **86%** of the cases she was **female**. If the victim was killed by a family member, **32%** of the victims were **male**.

The **average age** of domestic violence victims was **38** years old, with the youngest victim being **3 months** old and the **oldest** victim was **92**. The **average age** of domestic violence **perpetrators** was **41**, with the youngest being **16** years old and the oldest being **85**.

In the last decade in **53%** of the cases the **perpetrator** had a **known history of domestic violence**. Only **6%** of **victims** had sought **crisis center services** prior to their death and only **4%** had a **protective order** in place when they died. Only **6%** of victims had a **known history of mental illness** and over half had **no known history of substance abuse**.

Perpetrators of a domestic violence homicide defy the stereotype that drugs or mental illness are causal influences. Only **11%** of perpetrators of domestic violence homicide had a **known history of both mental illness and substance abuse**. Just over one quarter of perpetrators had history of mental illness and **43%** had a **history of substance abuse** though **43%** were **not impaired at the time** they committed the murder.

NOTE: The number of homicides equals the number of victims. The number of perpetrators is different from the number of victims because sometimes, more than one perpetrator is involved in the death of a victim and on occasion, one perpetrator might kill more than one victim. Also, the number of perpetrators does not include unsolved cases where a perpetrator has not been identified.

NOTE: The percentages in this report have been rounded up or down so the total percentage may not add up to 100%.

PLEASE NOTE: Figure 1 reflects the 185 total homicides responded to by the Attorney General's Office Homicide Unit. This includes 26 cases which were ruled justified, accidental or other.

This report is based upon data from 159 homicides, which includes the 133 prosecutable homicides and the 26 homicide suicides.

This report does NOT include data on the 26 cases that were ruled to be justified, accidental or other.

Total Domestic Violence Homicides vs. Total Homicides 2001–2010

| Year | Total Homicides (Including those ruled Justifiable, Accidental or Other) | Total Homicides (Not including 26 cases ruled Justifiable, Accidental or Other) | Total Domestic Violence Homicides | Partner Homicides | Family Members Homicides | DV Related Homicides | Total % DV Homicides n-159 |
|--------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| 2001 | 20 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 37% |
| 2002 | 13 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 44% |
| 2003 | 19 | 18 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 50% |
| 2004 | 19 | 19 | 13 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 68% |
| 2005 | 22 | 19 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 53% |
| 2006 | 18 | 16 | 7 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 44% |
| 2007 | 19 | 13 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 39% |
| 2008 | 19 | 15 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 47% |
| 2009 | 18 | 15 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 47% |
| 2010 | 18 | 16 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 63% |
| Total | 185 | 159* | 79 | 44 | 25 | 10 | 50% |

Figure 1

From **2001 to 2010**, the **New Hampshire Attorney General's Office** responded to a total of **185** homicide cases. Of those cases, **26** were found to be justified, accidental or other.

The average number of homicides per year was **19**. The numbers ranged from a low of **13** homicides in **2002**, to a high of **22** homicides in **2005**.

Figure 1 depicts that from **2001 to 2010** there were a total of **159*** homicides. This number represents **prosecutable homicides** and **homicide/suicides**.

**This report is based on data from these 159 homicide cases*




Figure 2

Figure 2 reflects that of the total of **159** homicides, **50%** or **79**, involved domestic violence.

The average number of domestic violence homicides per year was **8**. The numbers ranged from a low of **4** domestic violence homicides in **2002**, to a high of **13** domestic violence homicides in **2004**.

Homicide Suicides vs. Domestic Violence Homicide Suicides

| Year | Total Prosecutable Homicides | Homicide/Suicides | Domestic Violence Homicide/Suicides | % of DV Homicide Suicides |
|---------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 2001 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 100% |
| 2002 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0% |
| 2003 | 13 | 5 | 5 | 100% |
| 2004 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| 2005 | 15 | 4 | 3 | 75% |
| 2006 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| 2007 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 100% |
| 2008 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 100% |
| 2009 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 100% |
| 2010 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 100% |
| Totals | 133 | 26 | 24 | 92% |

Figure 3

Figure 3 reflects that of the total **159** homicides there were **26 homicide suicides**. It should be noted that of the **26** homicide suicides, the vast majority, **92%** or **24** were **domestic violence (DV) related**. Except for **2002** and **2005**, **100%** of the homicide suicides each year were domestic violence homicides.




Figure 4

Figure 4 reflects that in the majority of the **24** domestic violence homicide/suicides, **92%** or **22** of the perpetrators were **male** and **8%** or **2** were **female**.

Where?

Domestic Violence Homicides and Total Homicides by County

| <u>County</u> | <u>Total Homicides</u> | <u>Domestic Violence Homicides</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Hillsborough | 40% or 64 | 40% or 35 |
| Rockingham | 17% or 17 | 22% or 17 |
| Grafton | 9% or 14 | 5% or 4 |
| Strafford | 7% or 11 | 5% or 4 |
| Belknap | 6% or 9 | 8% or 6 |
| Merrimack | 6% or 9 | 4% or 3 |
| Sullivan | 5% or 8 | 6% or 5 |
| Carroll | 5% or 8 | 1% or 1 |
| Coos | 4% or 6 | 3% or 2 |
| Cheshire | 2% or 3 | 3% or 2 |
| Total | 159 | 79 |

Figure 5

Figure 5 and Figure 6 reflect that for both the **159 total homicides** and the **79 domestic violence homicides**, **Hillsborough County**, the county with the **greatest population**, had the **largest number of total homicides**, as well as the **largest number of domestic violence homicides**.

Cheshire County had the **lowest number of total homicides** and **Carroll County** had the **lowest number of domestic violence homicides**.




Figure 6

**Total Homicides
By County per 100K Population**

| <u>County</u> | <u>Rate per 100K</u> | <u>Homicides</u> |
|---------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Coos | 1.87 | 6 |
| Sullivan | 1.87 | 8 |
| Carroll | 1.68 | 8 |
| Grafton | 1.62 | 14 |
| Hillsborough | 1.59 | 64 |
| Belknap | 1.46 | 9 |
| Strafford | .90 | 11 |
| Merrimack | .60 | 9 |
| Cheshire | .38 | 3 |
| Total | 1.29 | 159 |

Figure 7

To more accurately reflect the areas of the state where homicides occur most frequently per capita, **Figure 7** reflects the total number of homicides broken down by the number of homicides per **100K population**,

Coos and **Sullivan Counties** had the highest rate of homicides, each with **1.87** per 100K, followed by **Carroll County** with **1.68**. At the other end of the spectrum was **Cheshire County**, which had the lowest rate of homicides per capita with **.38**.

It should be noted that the counties with the highest per capita homicide rate are three of the most rural counties in the state.

According to the *CP Press Annual State Crime Rankings*, New Hampshire has been rated as one of the safest states in the nation, with an average of **1.29** homicides per 100K population.

**Domestic Violence Homicides
By County per 100K Population**

| <u>County</u> | <u>Rate per 100K</u> | <u>Homicides</u> |
|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Sullivan | 1.17 | 5 |
| Belknap | 0.98 | 6 |
| Hillsborough | 0.87 | 35 |
| Coos | 0.63 | 2 |
| Rockingham | 0.57 | 17 |
| Grafton | 0.47 | 4 |
| Strafford | 0.33 | 4 |
| Cheshire | 0.26 | 2 |
| Carroll | 0.21 | 1 |
| Merrimack | 0.20 | 3 |
| Total | 0.57 | 79 |

Figure 8

Figure 8 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicides, **Sullivan County** had the highest rate of domestic violence homicides at **1.17** per 100K, followed by **Belknap County** at **.98**.

As with the total homicides, the highest rate of domestic violence homicide occurred in two of the most rural counties.

On average there were **.57** domestic violence homicides per 100K population.




Figure 9

Figure 9 reflects that of the **159** homicides, **32%** or **51** occurred at a location **other** than at a residence or workplace, **29%** or **46** occurred at the **victim's residence**, **26%** or **42** occurred at a **shared residence**, **11%** or **17** occurred at the **perpetrator's residence** and **2%** or **3** occurred at the **victim's workplace**.




Figure 10

Figure 10 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicides **84%** or **67** occurred at a residence and **15%** or **12** occurred at a location other than a residence.

The majority, **51%** or **40**, occurred at a **shared residence**, followed by **18%** or **14** at the **victim's residence** and **16%** or **13** at the **perpetrator's residence**.

When?




Figure 11

Figure 11 reflects that the greatest number of the **159** homicides occurred in **October** with **14%** or **23**, followed by **July** with **12%** or **19**.

The greatest number of the **79** domestic violence homicides occurred in **July** with **13%** or **10**, followed by **September** and **October** with **12%** or **9**.

Homicides seem to be evenly distributed throughout the months and there does not appear to be a pattern or trend that can be discerned from this information.




Figure 12

Figure 12 reflects that the greatest number of the **159** homicides occurred on **Sunday** with **18%** or **29**, followed by **Monday** with **16%** or **26**.

The greatest number of the **79** domestic violence homicides also occurred on **Sunday** with **20%** or **16**, followed by **Tuesday** with **18%** or **14**.

In regards to the **159** homicides, the data reflects that the homicides are evenly distributed between days.

When looking at the **79** domestic violence homicides the homicides are evenly also distributed, except for **Saturday** when there are very few occurrences of domestic violence homicides.




Figure 13

Figure 13 reflects that the highest number of both total homicides and domestic violence homicides occurred between **6 pm** and **12 midnight** with **38%** or **60** of the total homicides and **42%** or **33** of the domestic violence homicides.

The data shows the next most dangerous time of day in total homicides was between **12 midnight** to **6 am** with **24%** or **38**, while in domestic violence cases it was between **12 noon** to **6 pm** with **29%** or **22**.

The **8%** or **12** of unknown cases reflect the cases where no time of death has been determined.

HOW?




Figure 14

Figure 14 reflects that of the **159** homicides, the majority, **44%** or **69**, were a result of a **firearm***, followed by **cutting or stabbing** with **22%** or **35**, **blunt force impact** with **21%** or **34** and **strangulation** with **6%** or **10**.

**A firearm for the purpose of this report is defined as either a hand gun or a long gun.*




Figure 15

Figure 15 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicides, the majority, were the result of a **firearm** with **48%** or **38**, followed by **cutting** or **stabbing** with **22%** or **17**, **blunt force impact** with **18%** or **14** and **strangulation** with **6%** or **5**.




Figure 16

Figure 16 reflects that of the **159** homicides, **36%** or **57** were the result of a **handgun**.




Figure 17

Figure 17 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicides, **42%** or **33** were the result of a **handgun**.

Who?




Figure 18

Figure 18 reflects that **56%** or **44** of the **79** domestic violence homicides involved **partners**, **31%** or **25** involved **family members** and **13%** or **10** were **domestic violence related**.

Domestic violence homicide relationships are defined as follows:

- **Partner** homicides are defined as those where the victim and perpetrator have or have had an intimate relationship, spouse or former spouse, or are unmarried persons who have or are cohabitating.
- **Family member** homicides are those where the victim and perpetrator are NOT intimate partners but are family members. (e.g., when a child kills a parent.)
- **Domestic violence related** homicides are those where the victim and perpetrator are neither intimate partners nor family members, but the homicide has some relationship to domestic violence. (E.g., estranged husband kills wife's current intimate partner.)*




Figure 19

Figure 19 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicides, **67%** or **53** of the victims were **female** and **33%** or **26** were **male**.




Figure 20

Figure 20 reflects that of the **75** perpetrators, the majority, **84%** or **63** were **male**, while **16%** or **12** of the perpetrators were **female**.

These numbers are consistent with national data regarding the gender breakdown for perpetrators of domestic violence homicide.




Figure 21

Figure 21 reflects that of the **44** of the **partner** domestic violence homicides, the majority, **86%** or **38 victims** were **female** and **14%** or **6 victims** were **male**. .

Of the **25 family member** homicides, **52%** or **13** were **male** with and **48%** or **12** were **female**.

Of the **10 domestic violence related** homicides, **70%** or **7** victims were **male** and **30%** or **3** victims were **female**.




Figure 22

Figure 22 reflects that of the **75** domestic violence homicide perpetrators, **84%** or **63** were **males** and **16%** or **12** were **female**.

Of the **44 partner** domestic violence homicides, **86%** or **38** perpetrators were **male** and **14%** or **6** were **female**.

Of the **21 family member** domestic violence homicides, **81%** or **17** perpetrators were **male** and **19%** or **4** were **female**.

Of the **10 domestic violence related** homicides, **80%** or **8** perpetrators were **male** and **20%** or **2** were **female**.

In all of the domestic violence homicides, the majority of the perpetrators were **male**.




Figure 23

Figure 23 reflects that of the **159** homicide victims, **30%** or **47** were **over 50** years of age followed by **23%** or **37** who were **between 20 and 29**.

Of the **159** total victims the **average age** was **39**, with the youngest being **3 months old** and the oldest being **92**.

Of the **164** total homicide perpetrators, **35%** or **58** were **between 20 and 29** years of age followed by **20%** or **32** who were **between 30 and 39**.

Of the **164** total **perpetrators** the **average age** was approximately **33**, with the youngest being **16** and the oldest being **85**.




Figure 24

Figure 24 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicide victims, **29%** or **23** were **over 50** years of age followed by **20%** or **16** who were **under 20**.

Of the **79** domestic violence homicide **victims** the **average age** was **38**, with the youngest being **3 months old** and the oldest being **92**.

Of the **75** domestic violence homicide **perpetrators**, **24%** or **18** were between **30** and **39** and **24%** or **18** were also **over 50**, followed by **21%** or **16** who were **under 20** and also **21%** or **16** who were **between 30** and **39**.

Of the **75** domestic violence perpetrators the **average age** was **41**, with the youngest being **16** years old and the oldest being **85**.

**Domestic Violence Homicides
Perpetrators History of Domestic Violence
2001-2010**




Figure 25

Figure 25 reflects that of the **75** domestic violence homicide **perpetrators**, **53%** or **40** had a **known history of domestic violence** as a perpetrator.

Domestic Violence Homicides Protective Orders and Crisis Center Services

| 79 | Domestic Violence Homicides |
|----|---|
| 5 | Victims accessed Crisis Center Services |
| 3 | Protective Orders in Place at the Time of Homicide |
| 2 | Victims had a Protective Order and Accessed Crisis Center Services |

Figure 26

Figure 26 reflects that of the **79** victims of domestic violence homicides, only **6%** or **5** of the victims sought crisis center services. Of the **79** victims of domestic violence homicides only **4%** or **3** of the victims had **protective orders** in effect at the time of the homicide. Of the **3** victims that had a protective order in effect, **67%** or **2** sought services from a **crisis center**. This is consistent with national research. (See below)

New Hampshire Lethality Assessment Program

The New Hampshire Attorney General's Office has adopted the research/evidence based* Maryland **Lethality Assessment Program (LAP)** as a model response for domestic violence cases.

The LAP is an 11 question lethality screening tool and an accompanying response and referral protocol designed to identify high risk domestic violence victims who are at the greatest risk of being seriously injured or killed and to immediately connect them with crisis center services for safety planning, information and resources.

The goal of LAP is to prevent domestic violence homicides, serious injury and re-assault by encouraging more victims to use the services of domestic violence crisis centers.

Studies have shown that the support services of crisis centers can save lives and reduce-re-assaults, yet these programs continue to be under-utilized. There is a **60%** reduction in risk of severe assault when victims utilize domestic violence services. Studies show that abused women who used domestic violence services are much less likely to be the victim of murder or attempted murder. A comprehensive, nationwide, domestic violence study found that **only 4%** of actual or attempted intimate partner homicide victims utilized domestic violence services

**Research of Dr. Jacquelyn Campbell, Johns Hopkins University*




Figure 27

Figure 27 reflects that of the **159** total homicides victims, the majority, **74%** or **118** did not have a history of mental illness, **6%** or **9** had a known history of mental illness and **20%** or **32** were unknown.




Figure 28

Figure 28 reflects that similar to the total **159** homicides, the majority, **79%** or **62** of the victims of domestic violence homicides did not have a history of mental illness, **6%** or **5** victims had a known history of mental illness and **15%** or **12** were unknown.




Figure 29

Figure 29 reflects that of the total **164** homicide perpetrators, the majority, **53%** or **87** did not have a history of mental illness, **20%** or **33** had a known history of mental illness and **27%** or **44** were unknown.




Figure 30

Figure 30 reflects that of the **75** perpetrators of domestic violence homicides, the majority, **48%** or **36** did not have a history of mental illness, **28%** or **21** had a known history of mental illness and **24%** or **18%** were unknown.




Figure 31

Figure 31 reflects that of the **159** total homicide victims, the majority, **50%** or **79** did not have a known history of substance abuse, **34%** or **54** had a known history of substance abuse and **16%** or **26** were unknown.




Figure 32

Figure 32 reflects that of the **79** domestic violence homicide victims, **59%** or **47** had no history of substance abuse, **28%** or **22** victims had a known history of substance abuse and **13%** or **10** victims had an unknown history.




Figure 33

Figure 33 of the **164** homicide perpetrators, the majority, **49%** or **81** had a known history of substance abuse, **29%** or **47** did not have a known history of substance abuse and **22%** or **36** were unknown.




Figure 34

Figure 34 reflects that of the **75** perpetrators of domestic violence homicides, **42%** or **32** had a known history of substance abuse, **43%** or **32** had no known history of substance abuse and **15%** or **11** were unknown.




Figure 35

Figure 35 reflects that of the **159** total homicide victims, the majority, **60%** or **96** were not impaired at the time of the homicide, **18%** or **29** were known to be impaired and **21%** or **34** were unknown.




Figure 36

Figure 36 reflects that of the **79** victims of domestic violence homicide, the majority, **67%** or **53** were not impaired at the time of the homicide, **19%** or **15** were impaired and **14%** or **11** were unknown.




Figure 37

Figure 37 reflects that of the **164** total perpetrators, the majority, **43%** or **70** were not impaired at the time of the homicide, **24%** or **40** were impaired and **33%** or **54** were unknown.




Figure 38

Figure 38 reflects that of the **75** perpetrators of domestic violence homicides, the majority, **55%** or **41** were not impaired at the time of the homicide, **25%** or **19** were impaired and **20%** or **15** were unknown.




Figure 39

Figure 39 reflects that of the **79** victims of domestic violence homicides, the majority, **95%** or **75** did not have a known history of **both** mental illness and substance abuse and only **5%** or **4** victims had a known history of **both** mental illness and substance abuse.




Figure 40

Figure 40 reflects that of the **75** perpetrators of domestic violence homicides, the majority, **85%** or **67** did not have a known history of **both** mental illness and substance abuse and only **11%** or **8** had a known history of **both** mental illness and substance abuse.

II. 2011 DOMESTIC VIOLENCE HOMICIDES

In **2011** there were **8** domestic violence homicides, out of a total of **22** homicides. Of the **8** domestic violence homicides, **4** were partner homicides and **4** involved family members. The **8** domestic violence homicides comprised **36%** of the total homicides. As compared to the prior calendar year (2010), the total number of homicides increased, but the percentage of domestic violence homicides decreased from **63%** to **36%**.

AGE OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR

Of the **8** domestic violence homicides, the **victims** ranged in age from **6 to 91**, with an **average age of 44**. The **perpetrators** ranged in age from **18 to 60**, with an average age of **39**.

GENDER OF VICTIM AND PERPETRATOR

Of the **8** domestic violence **victims**, **5** were **female** and **3** were **male**. Of the **8** domestic violence **perpetrators**, **2** were **female** and **6** were **male**.

COUNTY OF DEATH

Of the **8** domestic violence homicides, **2 each** occurred in **Hillsborough County, Rockingham County and Merrimack County** and **1 each** occurred in **Grafton County and Strafford County**.

CAUSE OF DEATH

Of the **8** domestic violence homicides, **4** involved **firearms** and **1 each** involved **cutting/stabbing, blunt force impact, suffocation and arson**.

PARTNER HOMICIDES

Of the **4 partner** homicides, **3 victims** were **female** and **1** was male. **3 perpetrators** were **male** and **1** was **female**. **3** were in **current relationships** and one was a **former partner**. **No protective orders** were in effect for any of the victims. **3** of the homicides involved **firearms** and **1** involved **arson**. **2** of homicides occurred in **Merrimack County** and **1 each** occurred in **Grafton County and Strafford County**.

*** The New Hampshire Attorney General's Office responded to a total of 27 homicides in 2011, including 5 officer involved deaths, which were ruled justified.**

IV. NEW HAMPSHIRE COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE 2011 CRISIS CENTER DATA REPORT

The New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (“Coalition”) and its 14 member programs – crisis centers and emergency shelters throughout the state – provide victims and their children of domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking with lifesaving intervention, direct services, support, and advocacy. The Coalition’s prevention initiatives, outreach, and education are part of proactive efforts to stop the violence before it occurs. The Coalition partners with law enforcement, prosecution, state and local agencies, and social service and community-based support systems to promote safety and well-being in New Hampshire communities.

The following data was compiled by the Coalition, derived from its victim database.




Figure 1

In **2011**, **16,496** individuals turned to the 14 member programs of the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence for services, a **3% increase** from **2010**.

11,795 individuals sought support who were the primary victim domestic violence, sexual assault, and/or stalking.

3,567 individuals known as secondary victims sought support. These individuals did not directly experience the violence however they are supporting a friend or a loved one who has.

1,134 third party referrals were handled. This is typically an outside agency seeking services on behalf of an individual they are working with (e.g. School, law enforcement, DCYF, or a hospital.)




Figure 2

In **2011, 8,941** individuals sought **services for domestic violence**, an **increase of 4.3%** over **2010**.

Of the **8,352 adults** who sought **services for domestic violence**, **375** were **male**, and **7,977** were **female**.

A total of **256 children** received support for child abuse and **333 children** received support after witnessing domestic violence in their home.

Advocates report that they continue to see an increase in the frequency and the severity of the violence that victims are experiencing.




Figure 3

In **2011, 2,111** individuals sought services for sexual assault, a **decrease of 1.2%** over **2010**.*

Of the **894 adults** that sought services for sexual assault **58** were **male**, and **836** were **female**. In addition **165 adults** sought support for **victimization they experienced as a child**.

A total of **998 children** received support for **sexual assault**.

A total of **54** individuals received support for sexual harassment.

**Note: The number of adult sexual assault victims and child sexual assault victims did increase slightly, however the number of adults who were seeking support for the victimization they experienced as a child dropped sharply. This is likely due to limited availability of support groups because of staffing cuts.*




Figure 4

In **2011**, **743** individuals sought services for stalking, a **6.4% increase** over **2010**. Of those seeking support **117** were **male** and **626** were **female**.




Figure 5

In **2011, 8,942** victims sought services for domestic violence, childhood exposure to domestic violence, or child abuse.

Of the **children** seeking support, **419** were **under the age of 12**, and **170** were **between the age of 13 and 17 years old**.

Of the **adults** seeking support, **1,177** were between the age of **18 and 25**, **2,357** were between the age of **26 and 40**, **1,447** were between the age of **41 and 60**, and **182** people were **over the age of 61**.

3,189 individuals did not provide their age.




Figure 6

2,111 victims sought services for sexual assault and/or sexual harassment.

Of the young people seeking support, **576** were **under** the age of **12**, and **435** were between the age of **13** and **17** years old.

Of the adults seeking support, **316** were between the age of **18** and **25**, **296** were between the age of **26** and **40**, **207** were between the age of **41** and **60**, and **15** people were **over** the age of **61**.

266 individuals did not provide their age.




Figure 7

In **2011**, **743** victims sought services for stalking.

Of the young people seeking support, two were under the age of **12**, and **38** were between the age of **13** and **17** years old.

Of the adults seeking support, **130** were between the age of **18** and **25**, **200** were between the age of **26** and **40**, **186** were between the age of **41** and **60**, and **38** individuals were **over** the age of **61**.

149 individuals did not provide their age.

SHELTER

Shelters are often full, and families are staying for several months, much longer than in past years. This has greatly impacted the number of people who were able to receive shelter in 2011. The result is fewer people receiving shelter services, while the number of nights spent in shelter skyrocketed.




Figure 8




Figure 9

The number of women staying in shelter was **327**, an increase of **3.5%**, while the number of actual nights these women spent in shelter was **22,500**, an increase of **40.8%**.

The number of children staying in shelter was **256**, an increase of **20.8 %** while the number of actual nights these children spent in shelter was **19,215**, an increase of **51.6%**.

In addition **4** men received shelter for a total of **437** nights

V. NEW HAMPSHIRE JUDICIAL BRANCH 2011 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN DATA REPORT

Summary

The data presented in **Figure 3 through Figure 11** and **Figure 13 through Figure 21** reflects information from civil domestic violence or civil stalking protective order cases. A civil protective order case is created when a **plaintiff** (person requesting relief) comes to the court during regular business hours to request immediate relief from abuse (RSA 173-B) or stalking (633:3-a). The plaintiff files a **petition** describing what occurred to cause them fear for their safety, then waits while the judge reviews the request. The judge may or may not speak with the plaintiff before issuing a decision.

The decision may be to either:

- Grant a **temporary order** of protection (valid until the final hearing is held within 30 days);
- Deny temporary orders but schedule a hearing at which both parties may present their case to the court; or
- Deny the request completely.

If a final hearing is scheduled, the **defendant** (person against whom the order is issued) is given notice by the police department regarding the allegations and temporary order. At the final hearing the judge hears arguments from both parties, and then typically issues a **final order** either dismissing the case or a granting a final order of protection (which will expire in one year). The plaintiff may file a **request to withdraw** the petition at any time during this process. Withdrawal or dismissal of a petition does not prevent a plaintiff from filing a new petition should new incidents occur.

NOTE: County locations are determined by the case's current location. In most circumstances this will also be the location where the case was originally filed, but for a minor number of transferred cases, this will reflect only the court to which the case was transferred.

Merrimack County data include cases from the 6th Circuit Court in Franklin. This court's jurisdiction extends to Tilton and Sanbornton, towns physically located in Belknap County.

Rate data reflected in figures 2, 4, 14, & 23 were calculated utilizing county population data obtained from the 2010 U.S. Census. <http://2010.census.gov/2010census/popmap/>




Figure 1

At times when courts are closed, victims may request a civil **emergency protective order** through the police department. These orders remain in effect until the end of the next court business day, at which time a plaintiff may file a civil domestic violence petition to request continued protection. The court typically only receives copies of the orders that have been granted by an on call judge; data regarding those that may have been requested and denied are not available.

Figure 1 identifies the number of emergency domestic violence orders granted by county.




Figure 2

Figure 2 represents the rate at which these orders are issued per 100,000 people. The red line in represents the statewide rate (44).

Figure 2 indicates that, per capita, **Belknap County** tends to utilize these orders most frequently. It should be noted that, in addition to this civil option for protection, a criminal bail protective order may also be issued following a domestic violence incident. This may account for the low number of emergency orders in **Hillsborough County**, a county which appears to most frequently utilize criminal bail protective orders (see **Figure 23**).




Figure 3

Figure 3 reflects the number of civil domestic violence petitions (cases) filed in each county in 2011.




Figure 4

Figure 4 reflects the rate at which these petitions were filed per 100,000 people in each county. The red line in figure 4 represents the statewide rate of **351 petitions filed per 100,000 people**.

2011 Domestic Violence Petitions Filed by Plaintiff and Defendant Gender

N = 4,602*




Figure 5

Figure 5 reflects the gender of the plaintiff and defendant in civil domestic violence petitions (cases). *Plaintiff and/or defendant gender identity was unavailable for 0.3% of the 4,616 petitions.

RSA 173-B:1 defines qualifying relationships as "a family or household member or by a current or former sexual or intimate partner."

"Family or household member" means:

- (a) spouses, ex-spouses, persons cohabiting with each other, and persons who cohabited with each other, but who no longer share the same residence, and
- (b) parents and other persons related by consanguinity or affinity, other than minor children who reside with the defendant.

"Intimate partners" means persons currently or formerly involved in a romantic relationship, whether or not such relationship was ever sexually consummated.

2011 Petitions Filed by Plaintiff and Defendant Age
N = 4,555 Plaintiffs / 4,448 Defendants*




Figure 6

Figure 6 identifies the age of the plaintiff and defendant at the time of filing in civil domestic violence petitions (cases). *The plaintiff's date of birth was unavailable in 1%, and the defendant's date of birth was unavailable in 4%, of the 4,616 petitions. Birth date information is primarily provided by the plaintiff. The percentage of cases in which the defendant age was unknown is slightly higher because in some circumstances the plaintiff may not know the defendant's birthdates.

2011 Domestic Violence Temporary Orders
N = 4,604




Figure 7

As reflected in **Figure 7**, **79%** of the civil domestic violence petitions filed in 2011 were granted a temporary order of protection. Of the **21%** of petitions which were denied temporary orders, **45%** were offered a final hearing and **55%** were denied completely. After a temporary order has been granted, a final hearing is held within 30 days to determine if the order should remain in effect. The defendant may also request a sooner final hearing within 3-5 days.




Figure 8

Figure 8 indicates that, of all of the civil domestic violence cases containing a final order, **45%** were granted a final order of protection for one year. It should be noted that reasons for denial of a final order vary, and are not yet able to be distinguished electronically. Possible reasons include parties' non-appearance at the final hearing and failure to find that abuse occurred as defined by RSA 173-B, among others.

This figure does not take into account whether the case had a temporary order in place at the time the final order was granted, nor does it reflect the cases that may be withdrawn prior to a final hearing. For a more detailed examination of case outcomes, see **Figure 9** and **Figure 10**.




Figure 9

Figure 9 and **Figure10** outline what occurred in civil domestic violence cases after an initial ruling (granting or denying a temporary order) was made. Data were obtained from cases that closed in 2011.

Figure 9 displays outcomes of cases in which a temporary order of protection was granted.




Figure 10

Figure 10 displays outcomes of cases in which a temporary order of protection was denied, but a final hearing was offered. In this second circumstance, the court typically advises the plaintiff that the defendant will be served with notice of the petition and that no protective order is in place. Plaintiffs are given the opportunity to withdraw their petition at that time if they do not wish to continue to a final hearing without a temporary order in place.

It should be noted that reasons for denial of a final order vary, and are not yet able to be distinguished electronically. Possible reasons include parties' non-appearance at the final hearing and failure to find that abuse occurred as defined by RSA 173-B, among others.

*An outcome will be counted as "Other" if the case contains neither a final order nor a withdrawal. The most common reasons for this include: case was closed after judge approved parties' stipulated agreement; case was manually transferred to another court prior to a final order or withdrawal; and data entry error/omission.




Figure 11

Figure 11 indicates that **12%** of the plaintiffs who filed a civil domestic violence petition were represented by an attorney at some point during the court process.




Figure 12

At times when courts are closed, victims may request a civil emergency protective order through the police department. These orders remain in effect until the end of the next court business day, at which time a plaintiff may file a civil stalking petition to request continued protection. The court typically only receives copies of the orders that have been granted by an on call judge; data regarding those that may have been requested and denied are not available.

Figure 12 identifies the number of emergency stalking orders granted by county.




Figure 13

Figure 13 reflects the number of civil stalking petitions (cases) filed in each county in 2011.




Figure 14

Figure 14 reflects the rate at which these petitions were filed per 100,000 people in each county. The red line in figure 14 represents the statewide rate (123 petitions filed per 100,000 people).




Figure 15

Figure 15 reflects the gender of the plaintiff and defendant in civil stalking petitions (cases).

*Plaintiff and/or defendant gender identity was unavailable for 2% of the 1,624 petitions. Unlike the domestic violence statute, the stalking statute (RSA 633:3-a) does not require a particular relationship between parties in order to qualify for a civil stalking protective order.

2011 Stalking Petitions Filed by Plaintiff and Defendant Age
N = 1,556 Plaintiffs / 1,306 Defendants*




Figure 16

Figure 16 identifies the age of the plaintiff and defendant at the time of filing in civil stalking petitions (cases). *The plaintiff's date of birth was unavailable in 4%, and the defendant's date of birth was unavailable in 20%, of the 1,624 petitions. Birth date information is primarily provided by the plaintiff. The percentage of cases in which the defendant age was unknown is particularly high because in many circumstances the plaintiff may not know the defendant's birth date. This is especially true in stalking cases, as the parties may be less intimately acquainted than in a domestic violence case.

2011 Stalking Temporary Orders
N = 1,623




Figure 17

As reflected in **Figure 17**, 64% of the civil stalking petitions filed in 2011 were granted a temporary order of protection. Of the 36% of petitions which were denied temporary orders, 48% were offered a final hearing and 52% were denied completely. After a temporary order has been granted, a final hearing is held within 30 days to determine if the order should remain in effect. The defendant may also request a sooner final hearing within 3-5 days.




Figure 18

Figure 18 indicates that, of all of the civil stalking cases containing a final order, **36%** were granted a final order of protection for one year. It should be noted that reasons for denial of a final order vary, and are not yet able to be distinguished electronically. Possible reasons include parties' non-appearance at the final hearing and failure to find that stalking occurred as defined by RSA 633:3-a, among others.

This graph does not take into account whether the case had a temporary order in place at the time the final order was granted, nor does it reflect the cases that may be withdrawn prior to a final hearing. For a more detailed examination of case outcomes, see **Figure 19** and **Figure 20**.




Figure 19

Figure 19 and **Figure 20** outline what occurred in civil stalking cases after an initial ruling (granting or denying a temporary order) was made. Data were obtained from cases that closed in 2011.

Figure 19 displays outcomes of cases in which a temporary order of protection was granted.

**2011 Outcomes of Stalking Cases with Final Hearing Offered
but No Temporary Order Granted**

N = 265




Figure 20

Figure 20 displays outcomes of cases in which a temporary order of protection was denied, but a final hearing was offered. In this second circumstance, the court typically advises the plaintiff that the defendant will be served with notice of the petition and that no protective order is in place. Plaintiffs are given the opportunity to withdraw their petition at that time if they do not wish to continue to a final hearing without a temporary order in place.

It should be noted that reasons for denial of a final order vary, and are not yet able to be distinguished electronically. Possible reasons include parties' non-appearance at the final hearing and failure to find that abuse occurred as defined by RSA 173-B, among others.

*An outcome will be counted as "Other" if the case contains neither a final order nor a withdrawal. The most common reasons for this include: case was closed after judge approved parties' stipulated agreement; case was manually transferred to another court prior to a final order or withdrawal; and data entry error/omission.




Figure 21

Figure 21 indicates that **4%** of the plaintiffs who filed a civil stalking petition were represented by an attorney at some point during the process.




Figure 22

Figure 22 reflects the number of criminal bail protective orders (CBPOs) issued in each county in 2011.




Figure 23

Figure 23 reflects the rate at which these orders were issued per 100,000 people in each county. The red line in figure 4 represents the statewide rate of **442 orders issued per 100,000 people**. Criminal bail protective orders, unlike civil domestic violence protective orders, are initiated by a bail commissioner or judge (rather than by the victim) following an arrest for a domestic violence-related crime. The order becomes "final" when adopted by a judge at arraignment. The order remains in effect until vacated or the criminal case is disposed.

| 2011 Violation of Protective Order - Charges | |
|---|------------|
| Felony | 14 |
| Misdemeanor | 980 |
| Violation | 1 |
| Total | 995 |

Figure 24

Figure 24 reflects the number of violation of protective order (RSA 173-B:9) charges filed in the District Division of the Circuit Court in 2011. Criminal charges are filed by a police department following a violation of a civil domestic violence protective order. Typically, one charge is filed for each unique incident or offense. For example, if a defendant violated the order by contacting the victim three times, three charges may be filed. Incidents occurring within close proximity (ex: numerous text messages) may, at times, be filed as one charge.

| 2011 Violation of Protective Order - Dispositions | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| | Acquittal | Bindover | Conviction | Dismissed | Nolle Prossed | Other* |
| Felony N = 11 | - | 55% | - | - | 45% | - |
| Misdemeanor N = 943 | 2% | - | 40% | 9% | 38% | 12% |
| Violation N = 3 | - | - | 100% | - | - | - |
| Total N = 957 | 2% | 1% | 40% | 9% | 38% | 11% |

Figure 25

Figure 25 reflects dispositions made in 2011 on violation of protective order (RSA 173-B:9) charges filed in the District Division of the Circuit Court. Each charge receives a unique disposition. *

Other dispositions include: Placed on File without a Finding (n = 107), Underlying Charges Filed (n = 1), Default (n = 1).

The reader may note that number of dispositions (957) is not equal to the number of charges (995) in **Figure 24**; this is because charges are not always disposed in the same calendar year in which they are filed.