

Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts

Approved Minutes

Tuesday, February 9, 2016

10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Conference Room 119A/B

1501 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Present: Judge Wendy Million (chair), Judge Keith D. Barth, Judge Marianne T. Bayardi, Judge Carol Scott Berry, Carla F. Boatner, Deborah Fresquez, Gloria E. Full, Patricia George, Esq., Judge Statia D. Hendrix, Rosalie Hernandez (proxy for Dana Martinez), Patricia Madsen, Captain Jeffrey Newnum, Judge Wyatt J. Palmer, Deputy Chief Andrew R. Reinhardt, Shannon Rich, Mary Roberts (proxy for Assistant Chief Sandra Renteria), Amy Jo Robinson, Tracey J. Wilkinson

Telephonic: Ellen R. Brown, Diane L. Culin, Dolores Lawrie-Higgins, Sarah Jimenez-Valdez (proxy for Anna Harper-Guerrero), John R. Raeder III

Absent/Excused: Lynn Fazz, Dorothy Hastings, Rebecca Strickland, Judge Patricia A. Trebesch

Presenters/Guests: Judge Karen Adam (Ret.), Shelley Clemens (AUSA), Aleshia Fessel, Betty McEntire, Judge Ron Reinstein (Ret.), Sharon Sexton (AUSA), Jovana Uzarraga-Figueroa (U.S. Attorney's Office-District of Arizona); and Jennifer Albright, Theresa Barrett, Denise Lundin, Jennifer Mesquita, Kathy Sekardi (Administrative Office of the Courts)

AOC Staff: Kay Radwanski, Julie Graber

I. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The February 9, 2016, meeting of the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts (CIDVC) was called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Judge Wendy Million, Chair. Judge Million welcome members and introduced new members, Dolores Lawrie-Higgins, public member; John R. Raeder, III, Governor's Office for Children, Youth and Families; and Amy Jo Robinson, Maricopa Association of Governments.

B. Approval of Minutes

The draft minutes from the November 17, 2015, meeting of the CIDVC were presented for approval.

Motion: To approve the November 17, 2015, meeting minutes, as presented. **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Judge Keith Barth, **Seconded by** Judge Carol Scott Berry. Motion passed unanimously.

II. BUSINESS ITEMS AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

A. Domestic Violence and the Federal System

Shelley Clemens and Sharon Sexton, Assistant United States Attorneys with the U.S. Attorney's Office-District of Arizona, reviewed federal domestic violence laws and statutes that are available for prosecuting defendants in domestic violence cases and discussed the challenges and issues of domestic violence cases.

- 18 U.S.C. § 922(g) governs the unlawful possession of firearms or ammunition. Prosecution for unlawful possession is not limited to firearms and includes possession of ammunition.
 - § 922(g)(1) – Unlawful possession of a firearm or ammunition by a convicted felon is the most commonly charged and applies to a person convicted in federal and state jurisdictions with felony offenses punishable by imprisonment exceeding one year. In order to prosecute, official court documents of conviction are needed, but the suspect does not need to have served more than one year.
 - § 922(g)(3) – Unlawful possession by a drug user or addict is not commonly charged because it is difficult to prove.
 - § 922(g)(5) – Unlawful possession by an alien is used for a person unlawfully present in the United States whose alien status is confirmed through immigration records after deportation. The defendant's statements can be used.
 - § 922(g)(8) – Unlawful possession while under a restraining order requires a domestic violence relationship and specific language in the court order, including a finding that the defendant is a credible threat to the partner's safety or qualifying language that prohibits the use, attempted use, or threatened use of force against the partner. This language is not always met in standard restraining orders.
 - § 922(g)(9) – Unlawful possession of a firearm with a prior domestic violence conviction does not apply to all domestic violence convictions and requires an element of force.
- Prosecutors can accept a § 922(g) case only if they can establish that it impacts interstate or foreign commerce, also called the "nexus" element. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms will most often establish and confirm the nexus by tracing the weapons in a case to firearms or ammunition manufactured outside of Arizona and provide the required nexus statement to prosecutors.

Ms. Clemens discussed issues in unlawful possession cases and with qualifying prior convictions in tribal courts, prior misdemeanor crime of violence, domestic violence relationship, and adjudicated as mentally defective.

- A common "defense" is that the defendant did not know it was unlawful to possess ammunition. The prosecutor does not need to prove that the defendant knew it was

unlawful because strict liability applies and it is the defendant's responsibility to know what is prohibited. How does a prosecutor prove knowledge, exclusive use, or possession when a firearm is found in a vehicle or in a home with multiple occupants? The prosecutor can show knowledge, physical control, intention, and ability to control with other evidence, such as firearm accessories, receipts, and gun shop footage.

- There are issues with qualifying prior convictions in tribal courts because of inconsistency in the law. In *U.S. v. First*, misdemeanor convictions in tribal court qualified as prior offenses for misdemeanor firearms possession so long as they received all rights available under the Indian Civil Rights Act; however, *U.S. v. Bryant* held that prior misdemeanor convictions in tribal court could not be used to support a felony charge of domestic assault if the defendant was not provided a 6th Amendment Right to Counsel.
- A prosecutor should narrow down the factual basis to reflect the intentional use of physical force, rather than recklessness, for a prior misdemeanor crime of violence.

The presenters described the writ process from tribal to federal custody. While some tribes have a formal process, others do not. Prosecutors are constantly working with the tribes individually if there is a federal issue.

- The presenters confirmed that the federal definition of co-habiting is more narrow than the state's and must include an intimate partner relationship.

Jovana Uzarraga-Figueroa, Victim Witness Specialist, U.S. Attorney's Office-District of Arizona, discussed issues with victim rights, how victims are helped through the federal justice system, and the resources available. She noted that there are 21 federally recognized tribes in Arizona. She identified challenges for tribal victims with limited resources, transportation, safety planning, extended law enforcement response time, communication, and cultural and language issues.

B. Accounting for Domestic Violence in Custody Decisions

Judge Karen Adam (Ret.) provided background information regarding the [National Child Custody Project](#), which was developed by The Battered Women's Justice Project, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges and the Association of Family and Conciliation Courts. The project was designed as a set of guidelines and curriculum to assist family court practitioners gather, synthesize and analyze information about the context and implications of domestic violence and account for the impact of domestic violence in actions and decisions. The module on taking informed action by accounting for abuse provides direction for judges on the nature, context and implications of abuse; connects domestic violence with parenting skills and best interest factors; and addresses relationships, remediation plans and safety. The training can be done online or as part of a day-long session. Judge Adam is talking with the AOC's Education Services and Court Services Division about providing a training session at the family law bench conference.

C. Implementation of Amendment to ARS § 13-3967 Re: DV Risk and Lethality Assessments

Judge Ron Reinstein (Ret.), chair of the Commission on Victims in the Courts (COVIC), discussed risk and lethality assessments in domestic violence cases and raised concerns about the lack of uniformity and training for law enforcement and judicial officers in implementing amendments to ARS § 13-3967. Judge Reinstein suggested creating a joint workgroup consisting of COVIC and CIDVC members to address these implementation issues and promote training, uniformity, confidentiality and standardized lethality assessments. He invited members to attend the next COVIC meeting on February 26, 2016, at 10:00 a.m.

The committee consensus was to partner with COVIC in a joint COVIC/CIDVC workgroup to discuss risk and lethality assessments. Patricia George, Anna Harper-Guerrero, Judge Wyatt Palmer, John Raeder, Deputy Chief Reinhardt, Shannon Rich, Amy Robinson, Judge Patricia Trebesch, and Tracey Wilkinson volunteered for the workgroup. Denise Lundin and Kay Radwanski will coordinate the workgroup.

D. Workgroup Report: Judicial Education Workgroup

Judge Marianne Bayardi reported that Dr. Neil Websdale, professor at Northern Arizona University, will be presenting two domestic violence topics at the Judicial Conference in June regarding lethality assessments in family law cases and the benefits and limitations of lethality assessments. Judge Million and Kay will be presenting on the revised ARPOP rules.

Judge Million reported that Bench Briefing 7—What’s New with ARPOP and Bench Briefing 8—Modifying and Dismissing Protective Orders have been revised to incorporate the new ARPOP rules.

E. ARPOP Rule Petitions (R-15-0035, R-16-0026)

Kay Radwanski reported on rule petitions that have been filed in the current rule cycle that affect the ARPOP rules. Members were asked to consider whether CIDVC should file formal comments to any of the petitions.

- R-15-0035 – The petitioner noted that the language clarifying that Orders of Protection must allege each specific act that will be relied on at the hearing was not included for Injunctions Against Harassment and Injunctions Against Workplace Harassment. Members agreed that the language should be consistent.

Motion: To file a comment to petition R-15-0035 stating that the language should be consistent. **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Judge Bayardi, **Seconded by** Judge Palmer. CIDVC members also authorized Judge Million to file the comment to R-15-0035. Motion passed unanimously.

- R-16-0026 – The purpose of the rule petition is to expedite service of Orders of Protection by clarifying that courts are permitted to transmit orders electronically to cooperating law enforcement agencies. The benefits include saving time for plaintiffs and instant communication between courts and law enforcement. Ms. Radwanski explained why a commitment is needed from courts and law enforcement agencies (or private process servers). The deadline for comments is April 20, 2016.

Motion: To file a comment to petition R-16-0026 stating that CIDVC supports the proposed amendments. **Action:** Approve, **Moved by** Judge Palmer, **Seconded by** Deputy Chief Reinhardt. CIDVC members also authorized Judge Million to file the comment to R-16-0026. Motion passed unanimously.

- R-16-0008 – This petition, filed by the Committee on Time Periods for Electronic Display of Superior Court Case Records, would amend Rule 123, Rules of the Supreme Court, regarding access to court records by requiring courts to remove records from public access websites in accordance with the applicable records retention schedule; and to publish a prominent disclaimer describing the limitations on the case information displayed for courts that maintain public access websites. In superior court, Orders of Protection are retained with the court for 50 years and destroyed after the retention period; they are available on court public access websites for 50 years. In limited jurisdiction courts, OP cases are retained for only three years. The deadline for initial comments is April 20, 2016. The plan is for the amended Rule 123 and the records retention schedule to take effect on January 1, 2017. The committee consensus was not to file a comment.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Good of the Order/Call to the Public

Call to the Public: Morgan Cottrell requested information about domestic violence training for judges.

B. Next Committee Meeting Date

Tuesday, May 10, 2016
10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
State Courts Building, Room 119
1501 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

The meeting adjourned at 11:59 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE COURTS

Approved Minutes

September 13, 2016; 10:00 a.m.

Arizona State Courts Building

Conference Room 119A/B

1501 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Present: Judge Wendy Million (chair), Judge Keith D. Barth, Judge Marianne T. Bayardi, Judge Carol Scott Berry, Carla F. Boatner, Lynn Fazz, Dorothy Hastings, Judge Stacia D. Hendrix, Bonnie Lawrie-Higgins, Kellie MacDonald-Evoy, (proxy for Shannon Rich), Patricia Madsen, Dana Martinez, Judge Wyatt J. Palmer, Assistant Chief Mary Roberts, Amy Jo Robinson, Rebecca Strickland

Telephonic: Patricia George, Deborah Fresquez, Captain Jeffrey Newnum, Judge Patricia A. Trebesch

Absent/Excused: Diane L. Culin, Gloria Full, Anna Harper-Guerrero, John R. Raeder, Tracey J. Wilkinson

Presenters/Guests: Judge George T. Anagnost, John Goodman, Judge Sherri Rollison, Alison Ferrante, Joan Bundy

AOC Staff: Kay Radwanski, Karla Williams

I. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The September 13, 2016, meeting of the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts (CIDVC) was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Judge Wendy Million, chair.

B. Approval of Minutes

The draft minutes from the February 9, 2016, CIDVC meeting were presented for approval.

Motion: To approve the February 9, 2016, meeting minutes, as presented. **Moved by** Judge Keith Barth, **Seconded by** Judge Carol Scott Berry. Motion passed unanimously.

II. BUSINESS ITEMS AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

A. The Link Between Animal Cruelty and Human Violence

Joan Bundy, Esq., and Alison Ferrante, assistant prosecutor, City of Gilbert, presented on the link between animal abuse and domestic violence. Animal cruelty statutes and prosecution of animal cruelty cases were discussed as well as the use of Orders of Protection to protect animal and human victims of domestic violence. An examination of the link between animal cruelty and domestic violence and the manner in which abusers use animals to exert power and control over the human victims were covered. Case studies demonstrating the connection between animal abuse/neglect and human abuse/neglect were presented as well as pet custody agreements.

Ms. Ferrante explained that Arizona Orders of Protection can include adults, children and animals (A.R.S. § 13-3602 (G)(7).) She noted that a victim is more likely to seek shelter and leave the abuser if the animal is included in the Order of Protection. Although animals can be included in the existing petition, deciding ownership of the animal can be difficult for judges.

B. Protective Order Petition

Judge George T. Anagnost, presiding judge, Peoria Municipal Court, proposed an alternate version of the protective order petition and asked for CIDVC support of its use in a pilot project. The pilot would test whether the alternate is a potential improvement over the existing form. This same form was presented to the Committee on Limited Jurisdiction Courts (LJC). LJC passed a motion supporting a possible CIDVC decision to use the form as a pilot in one or two of Arizona's limited jurisdiction courts.

Judge Anagnost noted that:

1. This proposed form is universal and meets the margin requirements for both superior courts and limited jurisdiction courts.
2. It uses the same text, with minor changes, and the same sequence of paragraph numbers. In essence, it double spaces the caption and opens up the paragraphs. It does replace the "black box" with a more explanatory phrase.
3. This is still a one-page document.
4. This proposed form is fully consistent with objectives to improve readability and understanding for pro per litigants. It also comports with suggested format under the Americans with Disabilities Act.
5. The actual protective order is unaffected. All data captured is the same.

Judge Sherri Rollison, presiding judge, Wickenburg Town Court, and pro tem judge in Peoria, added that current forms are not user friendly, particularly for petitioners under stress. She supported Judge Anagnost's proposal as she deals with these forms on a daily basis. John Goodman, victim assistance coordinator for the City of Peoria Prosecutor's Office, commented that the proposed forms are easier for victims to navigate.

During the summer, Kay Radwanski, AOC, met with the CIDVC Forms Workgroup to review an earlier version of Judge Anagnost's proposal. The workgroup developed another version that was shared with CIDVC members. Ms. Radwanski explained that Dave Byers, AOC administrative director, is authorized by ACJA § 5-207 to approve changes to the protective order forms. Courts may not change or alter the protective orders without AOC permission. Mr. Byers relies on recommendations from standing committees like CIDVC and LJC in making changes to the forms. The decision on Peoria's pilot project lies with him.

Member Comments

- The font on the Peoria version would be easier for persons with limited vision to read.
- A suggestion was made to proceed with the pilot and actively seek input from users.
- Judge Anagnost was asked to gather public feedback from Mr. Goodman and Judge Rollison.
- Parents who are applying on behalf of minors are sometimes granted injunctions instead of Orders of Protection. The current petition does not have the option to identify the minor as the victim, only as a protected person.
- Judge Anagnost said he is willing to report more frequently than 12 months as originally proposed.

Motion: To support the pilot project presented by Judge Anagnost with amendments to paragraphs 3, 4 and 5. **Moved by** Lynn Fazz. **Seconded by** Judge Statia D. Hendrix. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Proposed Amendments to ACJA § 5-207: Orders of Protection and Injunctions Against Harassment

Ms. Radwanski discussed ACJA § 5-207, which authorizes the AOC administrative director to approve changes to the mandated protective order forms that are used statewide. In its current form, ACJA § 5-207 contains a hyperlink that is no longer functional. The Forms Workgroup proposes that the link be removed and general directions to the forms be provided to the courts and the public. Also, the code refers to two court identification numbers that must appear at the top of each form; however, the templates for the Plaintiff's Guide Sheet and the Defendant's Guide Sheet do not indicate where these numbers should appear. As these forms are for the parties' use and are not part of the official case record, it is proposed that exceptions should be made for them. Other minor changes—such as changing “shall” to “must”—are proposed to improve clarity and readability.

Motion: To recommend that CIDVC file a petition to amend ACJA § 5-207 as proposed. **Moved by** Amy Jo Robinson **Seconded by** Judge Wyatt J. Palmer. Motion passed unanimously.

D. Workgroup Reports

1. *Judicial Education:* The Judicial Education Workgroup discussed potential speakers for the 2017 Judicial Conference. Among the suggested presenters are Judge Karen Adam (Ret.), Pima County, who spoke to CIDVC in February 2016 about domestic violence and child custody decisions, and Judge Jerry Bowles, a retired judge from Kentucky who speaks about lethality assessments and risk factors. Ms. Radwanski reported that CIDVC sponsored three domestic violence sessions at the Judicial Conference this past June. Attendance at the three sessions was 178.
2. *Orders, Enforcements and Access:* Judge Berry informed that the workgroup has been working on a protocol and guide for conducting ex parte protective order hearings by video. The process would require secure electronic transmissions between a location (a shelter, for example) and a court. Guidance regarding confidentiality of the petition should be included for advocates and the courts.
3. *Training and Education:* Judge Keith D. Barth reported on a five-step bench card on protective order procedures that is being developed for new judges. Judge Million suggested that it be ready for distribution at the Judicial Conference next June. Additionally, firearms bench cards have been created to assist in determining when a person may be a prohibited possessor under Arizona law and under federal law. About 150 firearms bench cards were handed out at the 2016 Judicial Conference.

E. Full Faith and Credit and “Registration” of Orders of Protection

Ms. Radwanski discussed full faith and credit regarding protective orders. When a court issues a protective order, the order is enforceable by law enforcement in other states and jurisdictions as if it had been issued in that state.

ARS § 13-3602(S) provides full faith and credit to protective orders issued by other states. This statute directs Arizona law enforcement to enforce an out-of-state protective order as if it had been issued by an Arizona court, as long as the order is still effective in the issuing

state. The statute also provides law enforcement with immunity if, in fact, the order is no longer valid in the issuing state.

Ms. Radwanski reported some instances where plaintiffs have been sent to Arizona courts by law enforcement to register out-of-state orders. There is no process in Arizona courts for registering out-of-state protective orders because of the existing full faith and credit statute. Despite this statutory provision, some law enforcement agencies believe that out-of-state plaintiffs must first register their orders in Arizona superior courts before law enforcement can intervene and protect the plaintiff from the defendant. Arizona superior courts do not have a procedure to "register" foreign protective orders, which results in confusion, with a plaintiff being sent back and forth between a police department and a court.

It was suggested that law enforcement be trained on the full faith and credit provisions. Amy Robinson, Maricopa Association of Governments, said that MAG has grant funding that may be able to be used for this purpose.

F. Report: Visit with Nepal Judiciary Representatives (taken out of order)

Judge Million reported on a recent visit with Nepal Judiciary representatives. The Nepalese delegation had specifically requested a meeting with Judge Million to discuss the issue of domestic violence. They were primarily interested in the projects that CIDVC works on and how the committee functions. They were given a presentation, and it was very well received.

G. ARPOP Rule Petitions (R-15-0035, R-16-0026)

Ms. Radwanski reported on decisions regarding two petitions to amend the Arizona Rules of Protective Order Procedure. Petitions R-15-0035 and R-16-0026- were filed in the 2016 rules cycle. The Supreme Court justices met on August 29, 2016, to make decisions regarding all petitions that were filed in the current cycle.

R-15-0035 requested amendment of ARPOP 25(b) and 26(b), the rules affecting the contents of petitions for Injunctions Against Harassment and Injunctions Against Workplace Harassment. CIDVC supported this petition but proposed alternate rule language. The court adopted this language.

CIDVC also supported R-16-0026, filed by AOC Administrative Director Dave Byers. The proposal would authorize a court, at a plaintiff's request, to transmit a protective order for service on a defendant to a cooperating law enforcement agency or a private process server under contract with the court. The Supreme Court approved this with a slight change. Instead of being sent for service "at the plaintiff's request," the order can be transmitted for service "with the approval of the plaintiff."

Both of these two rule changes will take effect January 1, 2017.

H. Case Law Update

Ms. Radwanski presented updates on two recent court cases. In State v. Haskie, a Coconino County case, a witness testified as a "cold expert" on the counterintuitive behaviors of domestic violence *victims* and why a victim might recant. The Arizona Court of Appeals found that the expert's testimony was not offender profiling or impermissible vouching of the victim's credibility.

Voisine v. United States, a U.S. Supreme Court case, affirms that a "reckless" domestic assault qualifies as "misdemeanor crime of domestic violence" under Lautenberg. In U.S. v.

Castleman, a 2014 case, the Supreme Court held that a knowing or intentional assault qualifies but did not address a “reckless” assault.

III. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Good of the Order/Call to the Public

The following persons addressed the committee during the Call to the Public:

Deborah Giannecchini
Ursula Johnston
Michael Manola

B. Next Committee Meeting

November 1, 2016; 10:00 a.m.
Arizona State Courts Building, Room 119A/B
1501 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

The meeting adjourned at 1:47 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON THE IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND THE COURTS

Approved Minutes

November 1, 2016; 10:00 a.m.

Arizona State Courts Building

Conference Room 119A/B

1501 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Present: Judge Wendy Million (Chair), Judge Keith D. Barth, Judge Marianne T. Bayardi, Dorothy Hastings, Bonnie Lawrie-Higgins, Patricia Madsen, Captain Jeffrey Newnum, Assistant Chief Mary Roberts, Rebecca Strickland, Judge Patricia A. Trebesch, Tracey J. Wilkinson

Telephonic: Kelsy Dolman (on behalf of Deborah Fresquez)

Absent/Excused: Judge Carol Scott Berry, Carla F. Boatner, Diane L. Culin, Lynn Fazz, Patricia George, Esq., Anna Harper-Guerrero, Judge Statia D. Hendrix, Dana Martinez, Judge Wyatt J. Palmer, John R. Raeder, Shannon Rich, Amy Rebenar

AOC Staff: Kay Radwanski, Karla Williams, Patrick Scott

I. REGULAR BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Opening Remarks

The November 1, 2016, meeting of the Committee on the Impact of Domestic Violence and the Courts (CIDVC) was called to order at 10:05 a.m. by Judge Wendy Million, chair. A quorum of members was not present.

Judge Million noted the passing of CIDVC member Gloria Full on October 4, 2016. Ms. Full had been a CIDVC member for the past six years. She was a devoted member who made significant contributions to the committee, and her presence will be missed. Sympathy cards were sent to her family by Judge Million, on behalf of CIDVC, and by Dave Byers, administrative director, on behalf of the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC).

B. Approval of Minutes

The draft minutes from the September 13, 2016, CIDVC meeting were presented for approval. As there was no quorum, the draft minutes from September 13, 2016, will be presented for approval at the next meeting.

II. BUSINESS ITEMS AND POTENTIAL ACTION ITEMS

A. Train the Trainer Proposal

A proposal was made to offer a full day of training on the Arizona Rules of Protective Order Procedure (ARPOP) and firearms laws for CIDVC members. This training would be provided by Judge Million and Kay Radwanski. The trainees then would be available to train their peers when various groups or agencies are looking for training in that area. Suggestions were made to have a multi-disciplinary team approach training that includes attorneys, the courts, advocates, and law enforcement. Committee members agreed to participate, and they are

encouraged to send ideas to Judge Million and Ms. Radwanski so they can start working on a plan.

B. Protective Order Guide Sheets; Peoria Pilot

Dave Byers, AOC administrative director, has approved a pilot project in the Peoria Municipal Court. Peoria will be testing an alternate version of the general petition for protective orders. The requirements are outlined in Administrative Directive 2016-05. Peoria is required to report feedback back to this committee and the Committee on Limited Jurisdiction Courts (LJC) not later than May 31, 2017. Ms. Radwanski reviewed statistics for Peoria City Court, which showed that the court issues around 300-350 protective orders each fiscal year. She discussed some of the differences between the current approved forms and the Peoria version.

With increased interest in the need to improve access to protective orders, the following materials were discussed: Plaintiff's Guide Sheet, the Defendant's Guide Sheet, and the booklet, "Things You Should Know about Protective Orders." The materials will be referred to the Forms Workgroup for review.

A list of CIDVC workgroups were distributed for members to review. CIDVC currently has five workgroups:

1. Judicial Education Workgroup, which consists of all the CIDVC judges
2. Orders, Enforcement and Access Workgroup, chaired by Judge Carol Scott Berry, Phoenix City Court
3. Training and Education Workgroup, chaired by Judge Keith Barth, Santa Cruz County
4. Law Enforcement Workgroup
5. Forms Workgroup

Judge Marianne Bayardi briefly updated members on proposals for the 2017 Judicial Conference. The workgroup is hoping to secure speakers who will focus on family law and lethality.

Judge Million asked the Orders, Enforcement and Access Workgroup to provide material on remote protective order hearings by the next meeting as it has been requested by the Access to Justice Commission. The workgroup was to look into Internet security for transmitting protective order documents between a court and a law enforcement agency.

C. APAAC Lethality Assessment Working Group Report (This agenda item will be discussed at the next meeting.)

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Announcements/Call to the Public. The following persons addressed the committee: Michael Espinoza, David Alger, Richard Cassalata, and Alfred Trujillo.

B. Next Committee Meeting

February 14, 2016; 10:00 a.m.
Arizona State Courts Building, Room 119A/B
1501 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85007

The meeting adjourned at 10:58 a.m.