


MEMORANDUM



To: Richard Schmechel, Executive Director
D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission

From: Laura E. Hankins, General Counsel

Date: March 9, 2017

Re: Comments on First Drafts of Reports 14
through 17, Offenses Against Persons

The Public Defender Service makes the following comments.

Report #14: Recommendations for Definitions for Offenses Against Persons

1. PDS recommends strengthening the definition of “bodily injury.” PDS supports the overall structure of assault and offensive physical contact proposed for the RCC. To reduce unnecessary overlap of offenses and to improve the proportionality of penalties, RCC creates a number of assault gradations and creates a new offense of Offensive Physical Contact. Offensive Physical Contact “punishes as a separate offense ... low-level conduct that was previously not distinguished from more serious assaultive conduct in current law.”¹ The offense “criminalizes behavior that does not rise to the level of causing bodily injury or overpowering physical force.”² PDS heartily endorses that approach. However, that approach becomes hollow when “bodily injury” is defined to include fleeting physical pain. To give real meaning to the distinction between “assault” and “offensive physical contact,” the definition of “bodily injury” must be rewritten to set a higher floor for “assault”, thus creating a more realistic ceiling for “offensive physical contact.” PDS recommends “bodily injury” require at least moderate physical pain. Specifically, the definition should read: “‘Bodily injury’ means moderate physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition.” This proposal creates a more clear progression of criminalized physical touching: offensive physical contact; bodily injury, which requires moderate physical pain; significant bodily injury, which requires a bodily injury that warrants hospitalization or immediate medical treatment to abate severe pain; and serious bodily injury,

¹ Report #15, page 52.

² Report #15, page 50.

which requires a substantial risk of death, protracted disfigurement, or protracted impairment of a bodily member.

2. PDS recommends clarifying in the commentary for the definition of “dangerous weapon” that the issue of whether an object or substance “in the manner of its actual, attempted, or threatened use is likely to cause death or serious bodily injury”³ is a question of fact, not a question of law.
3. PDS notes that the use and definition of the umbrella term “protected person” expands the application of certain enhancements to allow for greater punishment than in current law. For example, under current law the enhancement when the complainant is a minor only applies to offenses that are “crimes of violence,” which does not include simple assault;⁴ however, RCC Fourth Degree Assault would allow for increased punishment for conduct that results in (mere) bodily injury of a protected person.⁵ Similarly, the elderly enhancement in current law does not apply to simple assault,⁶ but bodily injury assault would be punished more severely if committed against a protected person (elderly person). Under current law, there is no law enforcement enhancement for the offense of robbery in contrast with RCC section 1201 for robbery.⁷ PDS does not object to this expansion only because it is included in the proposed restructuring of assaults and robbery that incorporates a number of currently free-standing penalty enhancements, thus preventing stacking of enhancements.⁸

Report # 15: Recommendations for Assault & Offensive Physical Contact Offenses

1. The commentary states that for both Section 1202(a)(4)(A) and (a)(4)(B), the complainant must be a protected person.⁹ However, the statutory language does not specify that the complainant must “in fact” be a protected person. As it is currently written, the “protected person” circumstance element could be read to apply when a person causes the requisite injury reckless as to whether the complainant might be a protected person regardless of whether the complainant actually is. Thus, PDS recommends that wherever the “protected person” circumstance element

³ See RCC § 22A-1001(4)(F).

⁴ See D.C. Code §§ 22-3611, 23-1331, 22-404.

⁵ RCC § 22A-1202(e)(1).

⁶ See D.C. Code § 3601.

⁷ Compare D.C. Code §22- 2801 and RCC § 22A-1201(a)(2)(B), (b)(2)(iii), (c)(2)(iii).

⁸ See e.g., Report #15, page 22.

⁹ See Report #15, page 7. Although the commentary on this point only cites “protected person” for aggravated assault, presumably the requirement that the complainant actually be a protected person extends to each gradation that has a “protected person” circumstance element.

appears, it be rewritten to clarify that the circumstance element requires that the complainant must, *in fact*, have that status. For example, aggravated assault should be rewritten as follows:

“(4) Recklessly, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life, causes serious bodily injury to another person; and

(A) Such injury is caused with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person and the complainant, in fact, is a protected person; or

(B) (i) Such injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the complainant’s status as a:

(i)(I) Law enforcement officer;

(i)(II) Public safety employee;

...

(i)(V) Family member of a District official or employee; and

(ii) the complainant, in fact, has that status;

2. PDS recommends eliminating the use of the mental state “recklessly, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life” where it is used throughout the assault section. The added component of “under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference” means that the various gradations of RCC Assault fail to merge with (become lesser included offenses of) RCC Robbery. For example, Aggravated Robbery requires Third Degree Robbery plus recklessly causing serious bodily injury by means of a dangerous weapon. Aggravated Assault, in contrast, requires recklessly under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life causing serious bodily injury by means of a dangerous weapon. Because each offense has an additional element - aggravated robbery requires 3rd degree robbery and aggravated assault requires “under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life” - they do not merge. PDS recommends replacing the “reckless with extreme indifference” mental state with “knowing” for the more serious gradation and with simple “recklessness” for the less serious gradations. “Knowing” and “reckless” are easier to differentiate from each other and more of the gradations of assault will merge with gradations of robbery.

Specifically, PDS recommends rewriting the four most serious gradations of assault as follows:

“Section 1202. Assault

(a) *Aggravated Assault.* A person commits the offense of aggravated assault when that person:

- (1) Purposely causes serious and permanent disfigurement to another person;
- (2) Purposely destroys, amputates, or permanently disables a member or organ of another person’s body;
- (3) ~~Knowingly Recklessly, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life,~~ causes serious bodily injury to another person by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon; or

- (4) ~~Knowingly Recklessly, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life,~~ causes serious bodily injury to another person; and
- (A) Such injury is caused ~~knowing with recklessness as to whether~~ the complainant is a protected person; or
 - (B) Such injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the complainant's status as a:
 - (i) Law enforcement officer;
 - (ii) Public safety employee;
 - (iii) Participant in a citizen patrol;
 - (iv) District official or employee; or
 - (v) Family member of a District official or employee;
- (b) *First Degree Assault.* A person commits the offense of first degree assault when that person:
- (1) ~~Recklessly, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life,~~ causes serious bodily injury to another person by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon; or
 - (2) Recklessly causes serious significant bodily injury to another person ~~by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon~~; and
 - (A) Such injury is caused with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person; or
 - (B) Such injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the complainant's status as a:
 - (i) Law enforcement officer;
 - (ii) Public safety employee;
 - (iii) Participant in a citizen patrol;
 - (iv) District official or employee; or
 - (v) Family member of a District official or employee;
- (c) *Second Degree Assault.* A person commits the offense of second degree assault when that person:
- (1) Recklessly causes significant bodily injury to another person by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon;
 - (2) Recklessly causes serious bodily injury to another person;
 - (3) Recklessly causes significant bodily injury to another person; and
 - (A) Such injury is caused with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person; or
 - (B) Such injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the complainant's status as a:
 - (i) Law enforcement officer;
 - (ii) Public safety employee;
 - (iii) Participant in a citizen patrol;
 - (iv) District official or employee; or
 - (v) Family member of a District official or employee;
- (d) *Third Degree Assault.* A person commits the offense of third degree assault when that person:
- (1) Recklessly causes significant bodily injury to another person; or

(2) Recklessly causes bodily injury to another person by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon; ...

3. PDS objects to increasing the severity of assault based on strict liability as to whether the object that is the means of causing the requisite injury is a “dangerous weapon.”¹⁰ For example, a person commits RCC Fifth Degree Assault when that person recklessly causes bodily injury to another person;¹¹ a person commits RCC Second Degree Assault when that person recklessly causes bodily injury to another person by means of what, *in fact, is a dangerous weapon*.¹² PDS recommends that the mental state of “negligence” apply to whether the object that is the means by which the requisite injury is caused is a “dangerous weapon.” A series of hypotheticals will illustrate the unfairness of strict liability and the ease with which the prosecution will likely be able to prove negligence in most cases.

A. Defendant hits complainant with a light cloth purse. Beading on the purse scratches the complainant and causes a “bodily injury” → Perhaps RCC 2nd degree offensive physical contact. Perhaps RCC 5th degree assault, if the jury finds that the defendant was aware of a substantial risk that hitting someone with a cloth purse would result in a bodily injury. But not a more severe gradation of assault because the cloth purse is not a per se dangerous weapon.¹³ If the offense allowed strict liability, it’s unlikely that the jury would find “in fact” that the cloth purse was a dangerous weapon, that is, that the defendant used it in a manner that was likely to cause death or serious bodily injury. A negligence standard would probably lead to the same result -- it is unlikely that the jury would find that the defendant was negligent in failing to perceive a substantial risk that the cloth purse, “in the manner of its actual use, was likely to cause death or serious bodily injury.”¹⁴

B. Defendant lunges at the complainant with a switchblade, nicks the complainant, causing bodily injury → perhaps 2nd degree assault, if the jury finds that the defendant recklessly caused bodily injury by means of an object -- if strict liability were the standard, the jury would find that “in fact” the switchblade was a per se dangerous weapon;¹⁵ likely the same result if negligence were the standard as the jury would almost surely find that the

¹⁰ This objection and corresponding recommendation applies throughout the Offenses Against Persons Chapter of the RCC, not just to the Assault Section.

¹¹ RCC § 22A-1202(f) at Report #15, page 4.

¹² RCC §22A-1202(c)(1) at Report #15, page 3 (emphasis added).

¹³ See RCC §22A-1001(4)(A) – (E).

¹⁴ See RCC §22A-1001(4)(F).

¹⁵ See RCC §22A-1001(4)(B); (13)(E).

defendant was negligent in failing to perceive a substantial risk that the object in her hand was a switchblade, a per se dangerous weapon.

- C. Defendant swings heavy cloth purse at complainant's derriere, the heavy object inside the purse, a Kindle tablet, causes bodily injury (physical pain) → similar to (A) but more likely than (A) to result in RCC 5th degree assault (versus just RCC 2nd degree offensive physical contact) because the jury might more easily find that the defendant was aware of a substantial risk that swinging a heavy cloth purse would cause bodily injury. But like (A), this would likely not result in a more severe assault gradation. A Kindle tablet is not a per se dangerous weapon. If the standard were negligence, it is unlikely that the jury would find that the defendant was negligent in failing to perceive a substantial risk that the manner in which she used the heavy cloth purse/Kindle tablet would likely result in death or serious bodily injury. It is similarly unlikely that strict liability has a different result; it is improbable that the jury would find, in fact, that the cloth purse/Kindle tablet, in the manner in which it was used was likely to cause death or serious bodily injury.
- D. Defendant swings heavy cloth purse at complainant's derriere, the heavy object inside the purse causes bodily injury (physical pain). The heavy object is a firearm, a per se dangerous weapon.¹⁶ If strict liability were the standard, the defendant in this scenario could be found guilty of RCC 2nd degree assault if the jury found that the defendant was aware of a substantial risk that swinging a heavy cloth purse would cause bodily injury; if the jury found that it was the heavy object in the purse that caused the bodily injury, then "in fact" the heavy object was a firearm, which is a per se dangerous weapon. Thus, the defendant is guilty of recklessly causing bodily injury by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon. However, the negligence standard could lead to a different result, a result more proportionate to the previous hypos. To find the defendant guilty of RCC 2nd degree assault, the jury would have to find, much like in (C), that the defendant was aware of a substantial risk that the conduct of swinging a heavy cloth purse would result in bodily injury. Then, again, if the jury found that it was the heavy object within the cloth purse that caused the bodily injury, the jury would have to find that the defendant failed to perceive a substantial risk that the "heaviness" was a firearm (a per se dangerous weapon) or find that the defendant failed to perceive a substantial risk that the heavy object was used in a manner that was likely to cause death or serious bodily injury. It is possible that there will be evidence to show that the defendant was aware that the heaviness was a "firearm" or, more accurately, there could be evidence that would create a substantial risk that the heaviness is a firearm and the defendant was negligent in failing to perceive that risk. Even though using a firearm as a weight in a cloth purse to hit someone on their derriere is not the intended use of a firearm and is not likely to cause death or serious bodily injury, PDS does not object to applying the per se dangerous weapon to enhance assault in this way. PDS strongly objects however to enhancing

¹⁶ See RCC § 22A-1001(4)(A).

assault to a more severe gradation based on strict liability that the mystery heavy object happens to be a firearm.

PDS recommends the dangerous weapon circumstance element be worded as follows (with modifications as necessary for the various levels of bodily injury): “recklessly causes bodily injury to another person by means of ~~what, in fact, is~~ an object and is negligent as to the object being a dangerous weapon.”

4. PDS objects to Fourth Degree Assault criminalizing negligently causing bodily injury with an unloaded firearm. Criminalizing negligent conduct is severe and should be done rarely. The particular problem with Fourth Degree Assault is applying such a low mental state to conduct that is indistinguishable from conduct that would have the same result. Negligently causing bodily injury by means of an unloaded firearm is indistinguishable from negligently causing bodily injury by means of a cloth purse/Kindle tablet or by means of a rubber chicken. What sets a firearm apart from other objects or even other weapons is its use *as a firearm* (to fire a projectile at a high velocity), not its use as a heavy object or club. For this reason, PDS does not object to criminalizing negligently causing bodily injury by the discharge of a firearm. Fourth Degree Assault should be rewritten as follows: “Negligently causes bodily injury to another person by means of the discharge of what, in fact, is a firearm as defined at D.C. Code § 22-4501(2A), ~~regardless of whether the firearm is loaded;...~~”

Report #16: Recommendations for Robbery

1. PDS recommends rewriting Third Degree Robbery (on which all of the more serious gradations are based) and Second Degree Criminal Menace so that they are not circular. As currently written, one of the ways to commit Third Degree Robbery is to take property of another from the immediate actual possession or control of another by means of committing conduct constituting a Second Degree Criminal Menace.¹⁷ Second Degree Criminal Menace can be committed when a person communicates to another person physically present that the person immediately will engage in conduct against that person constituting Robbery.¹⁸ PDS agrees with the approach that a form of robbery could be committed by taking property of another by means of having made a communication threatening bodily injury and agrees that a form of criminal menacing could be committed by threatening to take property by use of force. Each offense statute however should be rewritten to specify culpable conduct without circular references to other offense statutes.
2. PDS objects to incorporating attempt conduct into the completed Robbery offense. Heretofore, the RCC has adopted the laudable principle of punishing attempts separately from completed

¹⁷ RCC §22A-1201(d)(4)(C).

¹⁸ RCC §22A-1203(b)(2)(B). Note, RCC §22A-1203(b)(2) uses the word “defendant;” this is clearly a typo and should be changed to “person.”

conduct.¹⁹ However, PDS is willing to accept incorporating attempt in this instance on two conditions. One, the commentary must include a concise statement that the attempt only applies to the element of taking or exercising control over the property; attempted or “dangerously close” conduct will not suffice for any other element of Robbery. Two, element (4) must be rewritten to eliminate the “facilitating flight” language.

RCC Robbery does not have a requirement of asportation or movement of the property.²⁰ That makes sense; if a completed robbery no longer requires property to have been taken – indeed, it does not require that there even be property²¹ – then completed robbery cannot require property to have been moved.²² Similarly, flight or facilitating flight is intrinsically tied to taking (controlling) the property. “A thief who finds it necessary to use force or threatened force after a taking of property in order to retain possession may in legal contemplation be viewed as one who never had the requisite dominion and control of the property to qualify as a ‘possessor.’ Hence, it may be reasoned, the thief has not ‘taken’ possession of the property until his use of force or threatened force has effectively cut off any immediate resistance to his ‘possession.’”²³ District case law supports the nexus between taking property and flight. *Williams v. United States*,²⁴ cited in Report #16 to support the notion that force after the taking constitutes “robbery,”²⁵ does hold that the robbery was “still in progress” when the defendant was fleeing. However, *Williams* is clear in basing its analysis on “the asportation of goods” and in examining the particular circumstances that the defendant “was acting as a principal in effecting a robbery *by carrying away the proceeds of that robbery*.”²⁶ Because pursuant to RCC Robbery, the robbery can be completed without having exercised control of the property (or without there being property) and

¹⁹ See e.g., Report #9, page 54, Arson; Report #9, page 70, Reckless Burning; Report #9, page 81, Criminal Destruction of Property; Report # 10, page 6, Fraud; Report # 11, page 5, Extortion.

²⁰ Report #16, page 12.

²¹ See Report #16, page 13, n. 56 (“For example, if a person causes bodily injury to another in an attempt to take property from that person, but finds that other person does not actually possess any property ..., that person could still be found guilty of robbery.”)

²² Compare robbery that requires a taking (“shall take”) and has an asportation requirement, even if minimal with armed carjacking that allows “attempts to do so” and does not require asportation.

²³ Report #16, page 16, n. 80 (Quoting 4 Charles E. Torcia, Wharton's Criminal Law § 463, at 39-40 (15th ed. 1996))(emphasis added).

²⁴ 478 A.2d 1101 (D.C. 1984).

²⁵ Report #16, page 16, n. 82.

²⁶ *Williams*, 478 A.2d at 1105. (“The asportation under our analysis continues so long as the robber indicates by his actions that he is dissatisfied with the location of the stolen goods immediately after the crime...” (emphasis added)).

because there is no “carrying away” requirement, District law does not, in fact, support extending the duration of robbery to include flight. Thus, “robbery” should complete when the person takes, exercises control over, or attempts to take or exercise control over, the property of another from the immediate actual possession or control of another by means of [physical force that overpowers]. This construction does not mean that the intent to take the property must be formed before the force is used nor does it mean that the force must be used with the purpose of creating an opportunity to take property.²⁷ It does mean, however, that the force necessary to elevate the conduct from a theft from the person to a robbery must occur before or simultaneous to the taking of the property; the force must create the opportunity to take or exercise control or the attempt to take or exercise control of the property. If the force occurs after the property is taken, then it is not a robbery. The taking is a theft from person and the force might separately be an assault.

3. As noted above, PDS supports the intent embodied in the structure of proposed RCC Chapter 12 to reduce unnecessary overlap of offenses and to improve the proportionality of penalties. Though the offenses are obviously meant to stack and build on each other, various “stray” elements mean that the offenses will not merge using a strict elements analysis. In addition, the way robbery is written, a more serious gradation could be charged based on an injury to someone other than the “victim” of the robbery (the robbery victim being the person in actual possession or control of the property).²⁸ It would not reduce overlap of offenses nor improve the proportionality of penalties to allow a conviction of a more severe gradation of robbery based on injury to a non-robbery victim and also allow an assault conviction for injury to the non-robbery victim when if the force were used against only the robbery victim, the assault or offensive touching or menacing conduct would merge.

To further carry out the intent of the proposed structure, PDS strongly recommends that the RCC include a section that limits convictions for multiple related offenses against persons. Modeled on RCC § 22A-2003,²⁹ PDS proposes the following language be added to Chapter 12 of the RCC.

RCC § 22A-1206. Limitation on Convictions for Multiple Related Offenses Against Persons.

(a) *Robbery, Assault, Criminal Menacing, Criminal Threats, or Offensive Physical Contact Offenses.* A person may be found guilty of any combination of offenses

²⁷ See Report #16, page 12, n. 17.

²⁸ An example would be a person who knocks Bystander out of the way in order to take wallet sitting on table in front of “robbery victim.” The overpowering force used against Bystander would raise this taking to a robbery even though the property was in the control of the “robbery victim.” See also Report #16, page 6, n. 14.

²⁹ See Report #8, First Draft at page 49.

contained in Chapter 12³⁰ for which he or she satisfies the requirements for liability; however, the court shall not enter a judgment of conviction for more than one of these offenses based on the same act or course of conduct against the same complainant or based on the same act or course of conduct when the offense against one person is used to establish a gradation for an offense against another person.

- (b) *Judgment to be Entered on Most Serious Offense.* Where subsection (a) prohibits judgments of conviction for more than one of two or more offenses based on the same act or course of conduct against the same complainant, the court shall enter a judgment of conviction for the offense, or grade of an offense, with the most severe penalty; provided that, where two or more offenses subject to subsection (a) have the most severe penalty, the court may impose a judgment of conviction for any one of those offenses.

Report #17: Recommendations for Criminal Menace & Criminal Threats Offenses

PDS recommends that the RCC omit the words “criminal” in the titles of criminal threats and criminal menace language. The language is redundant and could cause the offenses to be judged more harshly in the contexts of employment, housing, and education.

³⁰ At this time, PDS is proposing this section to apply to robbery, assault, criminal menacing, criminal threats, and offensive physical contact. PDS anticipates proposing expanding this section or proposing another one to limit multiple related offenses for those offenses and homicide, sexual assaults, and kidnapping.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Public Safety Division



MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Schmechel
Executive Director
D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission

FROM: Dave Rosenthal
Senior Assistant Attorney General

DATE: March 9, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #14 Recommendations for Definitions for Offenses Against Persons

The Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (OAG) and the other members of the Code Revision Advisory Group of the D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission (CCRC) were asked to review the First Draft of Report #14 Recommendations for Definitions for Offenses Against Persons. OAG reviewed this document and makes the recommendations noted below.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

RCC § 22A-1001. Offense Against Person’s Definition

RCC § 22A-1001 (3) defines the word “Coercion.” When the lead in language is read with many of the subparagraphs it is not clear which person must be affected. For example, the lead in language when read with the first subparagraph states, “‘Coercion’ means causing another person to fear that, unless that person engages in particular conduct, then another person will...” (A) Inflict bodily injury on another person...” It would be clearer if (A) stated, “Inflict bodily injury on that person or someone else.” All other paragraphs that are phrased like (A) should be similarly amended.

¹ This review was conducted under the understanding that the structure of the code revision process allows the members of the Code Revision Advisory Group an opportunity to provide meaningful input without limiting the position that the members may take at any subsequent hearing that the Council may have on any legislation that may result from the Report.

RCC § 22A-1001 (11) defines the term “Law enforcement officer.” Unlike D.C. Code § 22-405(a), this definition does not include District workers who supervise juveniles. A sentence should be added that states that a law enforcement officer also means “Any officer, employee, or contractor of the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services.”² In addition, neither this section nor the corresponding assault offenses address the jurisdictional provision contained in current law. D.C. Code § 22-405(a) includes a provision within the definition of a law enforcement officer that includes “any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia charged with the supervision of juveniles being confined pursuant to law in any facility of the District of Columbia regardless of whether such institution or facility is located within the District.” RCC § 22A-1001 (11) must include such a statement or the District would lose jurisdiction to prosecute offenses that occur at New Beginnings.

RCC § 22A-1001 (15) defines the term “Protected person.” Within the class of people who are protected are: a law enforcement officer, public safety employee, transportation worker, and District official or employee, but only “while in the course of official duties.” See RCC § 22A-1001 (15) (D)-(G). It is unclear, however, whether one of these people would fall under this definition if they were assaulted, as a direct result of action they took in their official capacity, after they clocked out of work or whether they must be working at the time of the assault. A person may be assaulted or threatened at home for actions that they took on the job. In other words, what are the limits of the term “while in the course of official duties.” To clarify, this definition should be expanded to say, “while in the course of official duties or on account of those duties.”

RCC § 22A-1001 (17) defines the term “Serious Bodily injury.” It includes within its definition “... obvious disfigurement.” The question that must be clarified is obvious to whom? For example, if a person shoots off some else’s big toe, depending on what shoe the victim wears the toe being missing may – or may not – be obvious. Similarly, if someone is shot on the inner thigh and has a scar, that scar may be obvious to the victim’s spouse or other family members, but not to the general public. The Commission should consider either addressing this issue in the definition itself or in the Commentary.

RCC § 22A-1001 (18) defines the term “Significant bodily injury.” It is unclear, however, if the government just fails to prove serious bodily injury, RCC § 22A-1001 (17), whether it would necessarily prove significant bodily injury. To improve proportionality, etc., the definition of significant bodily injury should always include the subset of offenses that are included in the definition of serious bodily injury. To use the example from the previous paragraph, if the government proves that the person was disfigured, but doesn’t prove that it was obvious, then the disfigurement should qualify as a significant bodily injury.

² As many Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services facilities are staffed by contractors, as opposed to employees, the proposed language is a slight expansion of current law.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Public Safety Division



MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Schmechel
Executive Director
D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission

FROM: Dave Rosenthal
Senior Assistant Attorney General

DATE: March 9, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #15 Recommendations for Assault & Offensive Physical Contact Offenses

The Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (OAG) and the other members of the Code Revision Advisory Group of the D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission (CCRC) were asked to review the First Draft of Report #15 Recommendations for Assault & Offensive Physical Contact Offenses. OAG reviewed this document and makes the recommendations noted below.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

RCC § 22A-1202. Assault²

¹ This review was conducted under the understanding that the structure of the code revision process allows the members of the Code Revision Advisory Group an opportunity to provide meaningful input without limiting the position that the members may take at any subsequent hearing that the Council may have on any legislation that may result from the Report.

² In OAG’s Memorandum concerning the First Draft of Report #14, Recommendations for Definitions for Offenses Against Persons, we noted that the proposed definition did not include the grant of jurisdictional authority that exists in current law. D.C. Code § 22-405(a) contains a provision that includes within the definition of a law enforcement officer, “any officer or employee of the government of the District of Columbia charged with the supervision of juveniles being confined pursuant to law in any facility of the District of Columbia regardless of whether such institution or facility is located within the District.” If the jurisdictional issue is not resolved in RCC § 22A-1001 (11) then it needs to be resolved here, and in other substantive provisions.

RCC § 22A-1202 defines the offense of “Assault.” Paragraph (a) establishes the elements for aggravated assault. Paragraph (A)(4) addresses protected persons in two contexts. RCC § 22A-1202 states, in relevant part, “A person commits the offense of aggravated assault when that person...:

- (4) Recklessly, under circumstances manifesting extreme indifference to human life, causes serious bodily injury to another person; and
 - (A) Such injury is caused with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person; or
 - (B) Such injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the complainant’s status as a:
 - (i) Law enforcement officer;
 - (ii) Public safety employee;
 - (iii) Participant in a citizen patrol;
 - (iv) District official or employee; or
 - (v) Family member of a District official or employee;

This provision raises the question of what, in practice, it means to be reckless as to whether the complainant is a protected person. The definition of “protected person” includes a person who is less than 18 years old ...and a person who is 65 years old or older.³ As the Commentary notes, recklessly is a culpable mental state, defined in RCC § 22A-206, means that the accused must disregard a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the complainant is a “protected person.” So, if a perpetrator sees a person who is 67 years old, looks her over, and decides that she looks to be in her early 60s, and then assaults the woman, is the perpetrator disregarding a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the complainant is a “protected person”? Clearly, it is inappropriate to penalize a 67-year-old victim by taking her out of the class protected persons for looking like she is in better health than her age would otherwise indicate. People who attack persons in their 60s and 70s should bear the risk that they are assaulting a protected person and will be committing an aggravated assault.

There are two ways that the Commission can clarify, or correct, this issue. The first is to directly address this issue in the Commentary making it clear that in this situation assaulting the 67-year-old woman would be an aggravated assault. The second is to change the mental state that is associated with age related offenses. To do this, the phrase “with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person” would be split into two phrases. The first would be “when the person is, in fact, a protected person as defined in RCC § 22A-1001 (15) (A) and (B)” and the other would be “with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person as defined in RCC § 22A-1001 (15) (C) through (H).” This would preserve the mental state of

³ See RCC § 1001 (15) generally. The definition of “protected person” further requires that if the victim is a person who is less than 18 years old that the defendant must, in fact, be at least 18 years old and be at least 2 years older than the victim.

recklessness as an element for all non-age related protected persons, while establishing an “in fact” requirement for age related protected persons.

The elements of second degree assault are established in RCC § 22A-1202 (c). It states that:

A person commits the offense of second degree assault when that person:

- (1) Recklessly causes bodily injury to another person by means of what, in fact, is a dangerous weapon;
- (2) Recklessly causes significant bodily injury to another person; and
 - (A) Such injury is caused with recklessness as to whether the complainant is a protected person; or
 - (B) Such injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the complainant’s status as a:
 - (i) Law enforcement officer;
 - (ii) Public safety employee;
 - (iii) Participant in a citizen patrol;
 - (iv) District official or employee; or
 - (v) Family member of a District official or employee; [emphasis added]

RCC § 22A-1202 (c)(1) enhances the penalty over third, fourth, and fifth degree assault because the perpetrator causes bodily injury by using a dangerous weapon. It addresses society’s interest in discouraging the use of weapons during an assault. RCC § 22A-1202 (c)(2) enhances the penalty provision when the perpetrator causes significant bodily injury to any protected person or to certain protected persons when the injury is caused with the purpose of harming the complainant because of the person’s government affiliation. It addresses society’s interest in discouraging assaults against law enforcement personal, government workers, and others involved in public safety or citizen patrols, as well as family members of a District official or employees. RCC § 22A-1202 (c)(1) and (c)(2), therefore, serve different societal interests.

As these two sets of elements are both penalized as second degree assault, there is no additional penalty for a person using a gun while causing significant bodily injury to a law enforcement officer, public safety employee, participant in a citizen patrol, District official or employee, or a family member of a District official or employee. In other words, if the perpetrator plans on causing significant bodily injury, they may as well use a dangerous weapon. To make the penalties proportionate, a person who uses a dangerous weapon against a person listed in RCC § 22A-1202 (c)(2)(B) and causes significant bodily injury should be subject to a higher penalty than if they use a dangerous weapon in assaulting one of those persons and only cause bodily injury. The Commission should create a new degree of assault that comes between the current first and second degree assaults to accommodate this offense.⁴

⁴ A similar argument can be made concerning the need to amend aggravated assault under RCC § 22A-1202 (a).

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Public Safety Division



MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Schmechel
Executive Director
D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission

FROM: Dave Rosenthal
Senior Assistant Attorney General

DATE: March 9, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #16 Recommendations for Robbery

The Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (OAG) and the other members of the Code Revision Advisory Group of the D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission (CCRC) were asked to review the First Draft of Report #16 Recommendations for Robbery. OAG reviewed this document and makes the recommendations noted below.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

RCC § 22A-1201. Robbery

OAG would like to memorialize an observation that it discussed with the Commission. The Commission is charged with using clear and plain language in revising the District’s criminal statutes.² We believe that the idea is to make the Code more understandable. We have described the problem as multi-step nesting. For example, in order to determine the elements of robbery (including which degree is appropriate in a given circumstance), one has to look up the elements of criminal menacing, and in order to determine the elements of criminal menacing, one must look up the elements of assault. While there are many sound drafting principles for using this approach to criminal code reform, it does leave proposals that may not be “clear” to a person who is trying to understand the elements of this offense.

¹ This review was conducted under the understanding that the structure of the code revision process allows the members of the Code Revision Advisory Group an opportunity to provide meaningful input without limiting the position that the members may take at any subsequent hearing that the Council may have on any legislation that may result from the Report.

² See D.C. Code § 3-152 (a)(1).

OAG would like the Commission to clarify the amount of force that is necessary to complete a robbery. OAG understands from conversations with the Commission that a person who grabs a purse out of someone's hand or from out from under someone's arm would be guilty of third degree robbery. Specifically, the force that is needed merely to take the purse would meet the requirement in Section 1201 (d) (4)(A) that it was accomplished by "Using physical force that overpowers any other person present..." On the other hand, the force that is necessary to complete a pick pocket (where the victim is unaware of the taking), would not be sufficient to convert the taking to a robbery. To ensure that the proposal is interpreted as intended, the Commission should consider adding more hypotheticals to the Commentary.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia

Public Safety Division



MEMORANDUM

TO: Richard Schmechel
Executive Director
D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission

FROM: Dave Rosenthal
Senior Assistant Attorney General

DATE: March 9, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #17 Recommendations for Criminal Menace & Criminal Threat Offenses

The Office of the Attorney General for the District of Columbia (OAG) and the other members of the Code Revision Advisory Group of the D.C. Criminal Code Reform Commission (CCRC) were asked to review the First Draft of Report #17 Recommendations for Criminal Menace & Criminal Threat Offenses. OAG reviewed this document and makes the recommendations noted below.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

Both RCC § 22A-1203 and RCC § 22A-1204. Criminal Menace and Criminal Threat

OAG would suggest that that the titles to Sections 1203 and 1204 be changed to drop the word “Criminal.” Instead of calling them “Criminal Menacing” and “Criminal Threats”, we believe that they should simply be called “Menacing” and “Threats.” By adding the word “criminal” to the name it unnecessarily raises the question what a non-criminal menacing and non-criminal threat is. The words “menacing” and “threat” meet the requirements of D.C. Code § 3-152(a) that the Criminal Code to “Use clear and plain language.”

¹ This review was conducted under the understanding that the structure of the code revision process allows the members of the Code Revision Advisory Group an opportunity to provide meaningful input without limiting the position that the members may take at any subsequent hearing that the Council may have on any legislation that may result from the Report.

In addition, the Commentary should make clear that the effective consent defense in both offenses,² is the consent to being menaced or threatened, not consent to the underlying conduct constituting the offenses of homicide, robbery, sexual assault, kidnapping, and assault (and for criminal threats, the offence of criminal damage to property).³

² See RCC § 22A-1203 (e) and RCC § 22A-1204 (e).

³ See RCC § 22A-1203 (a)(3) and (b)(2) and RCC § 22A-1204 (a)(2) and (b)(2).