

MEMORANDUM

THE
PUBLIC
DEFENDER
SERVICE
for the District of Columbia



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

From: Public Defender Service for the District of
Columbia

Date: December 20, 2018

Re: Comments on First Draft of Report 26,
Sexual Assault and Related Provisions

The Public Defender Service makes the following comments on Report #26, Sexual Assault and Related Provisions.

1. RCC § 22A-1301(9) and (11) define the phrases “person of authority in a secondary school” and “position of trust with or authority over.” Rather than creating a limited and precise definition, in these two instances the RCC use the word “includes” to describe the scope of the legal terms. In other instances in this chapter and in other chapters, the RCC uses the word “means” when defining a term or statutory phrase. The use of the word “includes” falls short of Due Process requirements to provide notice of criminal offenses.¹ It also fails to correct existing ambiguity in D.C. Code § 22-3009.03 and 22-3009.04. Precise definitions in these two instances are particularly important because the terms relate to sexual offenses that are criminalized only because of the status of the complainant or the relationship between the complainant and the defendant. In the absence of the prohibited relationship between the defendant and the complainant, these interactions may be consensual and legal.
2. PDS makes several recommendations for the definition of “person of authority in a secondary school” and for other terms in RCC § 22A-1305(a) and (b).

With respect to RCC § 22A-1301(9), person of authority in a secondary school, PDS recommends the following language.

(9) “Person of authority in a secondary school” ~~includes~~ means any teacher, counselor, principal, or coach in a secondary school attended by the complainant or where the complainant receives services or attends regular programming.

¹ See, e.g., *McNeely v. United States*, 874 A.2d 371, 379 (D.C. 2005).

In addition to being more precise, the RCC’s definition should correspond to the harm it seeks to prevent. The term “person of authority in a secondary school is used in RCC § 22A-1305, Sexual Exploitation of an Adult. RCC § 22A-1305(a)(2)(A) and RCC § 22A-1305(b)(2)(A) prohibit sexual acts or contact where the defendant is a person of authority in a secondary school and the complainant is under age 20 and “is an enrolled student in the same school system.” Consent is not a defense to RCC § 22A-1305.

“Same school system” is not defined in RCC § 22A-1305. As such, it appears that it would prohibit otherwise consensual sexual contact between any 19 year old enrolled at a DCPS school and most DCPS employees. It would prohibit a consensual sexual relationship between a 19 year old student at Wilson High School and a 23 year old athletics coach at Brookland Middle School. RCC § 22A-1305 would hold the coach criminally liable, and would likely require ten years of sex offender registration although nothing about the “complainant’s” status as a student in the same school system played a role in the consensual relationship. Across the District, DCPS employs more than 7,000 individuals.² Prohibiting consensual relationships between adults because of the defendant’s status as a DCPS employee goes too far. Under circumstances where the complainant is legally capable of consent, there is no allegation of non-consent, and there is no inherently coercive environment created by the complainant’s status as a student at one school and the defendant’s status as an employee at another, the RCC should not criminalize the conduct.

The term “same school system” may also be under inclusive. Nearly half of the District’s students attend charter schools. Each charter school organization forms its own local education agency. Under this definition a relationship between a coach at one charter school and a student at another unrelated charter school would not fall under RCC § 22A-1305 even if the two charter schools have a close relationship and the student participates in sports at both schools.³ A definition that requires a closer connection between the student and the school employee would resolve this.

RCC §22A-1305(a) and (b) should criminalize consensual relationships between adults, or teens age 16 and older, only where the circumstances are truly coercive because of the defendant’s power within the school. A definition that limits liability to relationships where the student and the defendant are assigned to the same school, not just the same school system, appropriately draws the line at preventing coercion but not being overly broad.

Within the RCC § 22A-1305, the age of consent for sexual conduct with persons of authority in secondary schools should be set at 18 instead of 20, as currently proposed. It makes sense to add protections for youth age 16 and 17 given the potential for coercion in a school setting and the potential for consent derived from the pressures of that setting. However, once a student reaches age 18, he or she should be free to engage in consensual sexual conduct with others, including individuals who may have positions of authority within the school setting. Those relationship may very well violate employee norms and in

² <https://dcps.dc.gov/page/dcps-organization>.

those instances should lead to the serious sanction of job loss, but they should not result in criminal liability. Relationships between students and school personnel can be prosecuted under RCC § 22A-1303(b), second degree sexual assault, when the power differential or other actions taken by the defendant result in the coercion of the student.⁴

3. With respect to RCC § 22A-1301(11), “position of trust with or authority over,” PDS recommends the following changes.

(11) “Position of trust with or authority over” ~~includes~~ means a relationship with respect to a complainant of:

- (A) A parent, sibling, aunt, uncle, or grandparent, whether related by blood, marriage, domestic partnership, or adoption;
- (B) A legal or de facto guardian or any person, more than 4 years older than the ~~victim-complainant~~, who resides intermittently or permanently in the same dwelling as the complainant;
- (C) The person or the spouse, domestic partner, or paramour of the person who is charged with any duty or responsibility for the health, welfare, or supervision of the complainant at the time of the act; and
- (D) Any employee or volunteer of a school, church, synagogue, mosque, or other religious institution where the complainant is an active participant or member, or an educational, social, recreational, athletic, musical, charitable, or youth facility, organization, or program where the complainant is an active participant or member, ~~including~~ meaning a teacher, coach, counselor, clergy, youth leader, chorus director, bus driver, administrator, or support staff that has regular contact with the complainant in the above settings.

These recommendations mirror PDS’s recommendations for RCC § 22A-1305. The term position of trust or authority is used in the RCC provisions that criminalize sexual abuse of a minor and in sentencing enhancements. A position of trust and authority should be more than a label based on the defendant’s employment or status. The definition should capture situations where the defendant’s close relationship to the complainant or minor allow for an abuse of trust or additional harm.

4. PDS makes the following recommendations for revisions to the definition of coercion at RCC § 22-1301(3).

The RCC definition of coercion is employed primarily in second and fourth degree sexual assault, RCC § 22A-1303(b) and (d). As currently drafted the defendant must knowingly cause the complainant to submit to or engage in a sexual act or contact through some coercive conduct as defined in RCC §22-1301(3). While the requirement that the

⁴ RCC § 22-22A-1301(3) defines coercion as threatening, among other things, to take or withhold action as an official, or to cause any harm that is sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the same background and in the same circumstances to comply.

defendant knowingly caused the sexual act or conduct through coercion provides some strength to the offense definition, the RCC definition of coercion allows seemingly minor conduct to qualify as coercion. This will require jurors to decide the causal question of the connection between the alleged coercion and the sexual act rather than more appropriately limiting the charges that may be brought under a coercion theory.

The current RCC definition includes sexual acts coerced by threats of ridicule. Ridicule should not be included within the specific definition of coercion. Without more, there is insufficient reason to believe that the threat of ridicule would cause a complainant to perform or submit to a sexual act. Where the ridicule is serious or where the defendant knows that the complainant is particularly vulnerable due to his or her background or particular circumstances, the conduct will fall within the catchall provision of coercion, RCC § 22A-1301(3)(G). Similarly, a threat to cause hatred or contempt of a deceased person should be considered coercive only when it meets the standard of RCC § 22A-1301(G) and should not be a standalone provision of coercion. A watered down definition of coercion brings the possibility of arrests and pretrial incarceration for circumstances that are not sufficiently serious to compel the submission of a reasonable person in the same circumstances.

PDS also has concerns about how the RCC addresses coercion in the context of controlled substances and prescription medication.⁵ Generally speaking, this sub-definition of “coercion” needs to focus more precisely on what makes the conduct “coercive” or what makes a person feel *compelled* to submit to or engage in a sexual act or sexual contact. The conduct that makes engaging in a sexual act or sexual contact *compulsory* must be as serious as the other conduct proscribed in the definition, such as threatening to commit a criminal offense against the person.⁶ According to the commentary, this sub-definition was modeled on the current definition of “coercion” in the human trafficking chapter of the D.C. Code.⁷ That definition refers to controlling a person’s access to “an addictive or controlled substance.”⁸ PDS recommends that “coercion” should be about restricting access to an addictive substance (that is also a controlled substance), not merely about restricting access to a controlled substance. What makes restricting access to a substance coercive or compelling conduct is that the substance is one to which the person is addicted. It would not be coercive to restrict a person’s access to cocaine *unless the person is addicted to cocaine*. As the Commission notes, limiting a person’s access to alcohol, which is an addictive substance, “is not as inherently coercive as limiting a person’s access to a controlled substance, as it is relatively easy to obtain alcohol by other means.”⁹ PDS agrees with the point but posits that the Commission drew the wrong conclusion from it. Restricting access to alcohol is not “inherently” coercive and, unless one is addicted to it, neither is restricting a person’s

⁵ RCC § 22A-1301(3)(F).

⁶ See RCC § 22A-1301(3)(A).

⁷ Report #26, page 10.

⁸ See D.C. Code § 22-1831(3)(F).

⁹ Report #26, page 10, footnote 40.

access to a controlled substance. More to the point, restricting a person's access to alcohol is not coercive at all *precisely because* it is relatively easy for a person to obtain alcohol by other means. A person faced with the demand, "have sex with me or I won't give you this beer," is unlikely to feel compelled to submit to the sexual act, as the person can easily get beer elsewhere. A person faced with the demand, "have sex with me or I won't give you this heroin," is also unlikely to feel compelled to submit to the sexual act if (A) the person is not addicted to heroin and (B) the person can get heroin from another source. Thus, to be "coercive" restricting access should be about restricting access to a controlled substance to which the person is addicted and should be about more than a mere refusal to sell, exchange, or provide. Finally, PDS asserts that the coercive or compelling conduct involving addictive substances and prescription medication is the same. It is not clear what the difference would be between "limiting access to a controlled substance" and "restricting access to prescription medication" and it is certainly not clear that there should be a difference.

The term "limit access" is too broad to truly reach coercive acts. Limit access would seem to include the defendant not sharing his own controlled substances, to which the complainant has no right. It also criminalizes as second and fourth degree sexual abuse commercial sex where the currency is controlled substances. For instance, it should not be second degree sexual abuse if the defendant requires a sexual act as payment for controlled substances. The conduct of limiting access by refusing to sell drugs unless the complainant performs a sexual act should fall squarely within commercial sex and should not be second or fourth degree sexual abuse. With respect to prescription medication, it should be clear that the coercive conduct is limiting a person's access to their own prescribed medicine. A pharmacist refusing to fill a prescription unless a sexual act is performed in exchange is engaging in prostitution, not attempted sexual assault. Because there are other pharmacies, a person who is unwilling to pay that price for his or her prescribed medication, is not being compelled to engage in the sexual act. However, restricting a person's access to their own medicine would in many circumstances be coercive.

PDS recommends the statutory language below.

- (3) "Coercion" means threatening that any person will do any one of, or a combination of, the following:
 - (A) Engage in conduct constituting an offense against persons as defined in subtitle II of Title 22A, or a property offense as defined in subtitle III of Title 22A;
 - (B) Accuse another person of a criminal offense or failure to comply with an immigration regulation;
 - (C) Assert a fact about ~~another person~~ the complainant, ~~including a deceased person~~, that would tend to subject ~~that person~~ the complainant to hatred, or contempt, or ~~ridicule~~, or ~~to~~ would substantially impair that person's credit or business repute;
 - (D) Take or withhold action as an public official, or cause a public official to take or withhold action;
 - (E) Inflict a wrongful economic injury;

- (F) ~~Restrict~~ Limit a person's access to a controlled substance, as defined in D.C. Code 48-901.02, to which the person is addicted and ~~controlled substance~~ or restrict a person's access to that person's prescription medication; or
- (G) Cause any harm that is sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the same background and in the same circumstances to comply.

In addition to the drafting changes above, PDS recommends that the following language be added to the commentary: Restricting a person's access to a substance to which the person is addicted is not the same as refusing to sell or provide an addictive substance or refusing to fill a person's prescription. Nor is restricting a person's access the same as suggesting a sexual act or sexual contact as a thing of value in exchange for a controlled substance to which the person is addicted or for prescription medication. Such suggestion, and such exchange, may constitute prostitution or soliciting prostitution, but it is not, standing alone, coercion for the purposes of second and fourth degree sexual abuse.


5. PDS recommends a minor modification to RCC § 22A-1303. RCC § 22A-1303(a)(C)(i) prohibits administering an intoxicant without the claimant's effective consent "with intent to impair the complainant's ability to express unwillingness." The RCC should explicitly add: "with intent to impair the complainant's ability to express unwillingness to participate in the sexual act." The above recommendation clarifies the phrase "ability to express unwillingness" and ensures that the motive in providing the intoxicant is connected to the sexual assault.
6. RCC § 22A-1303(f) provides for penalty enhancements for sexual offenses based on the characteristics of the complainant and/or the defendant. PDS objects to the use of enhancements generally. Sexual offenses carry lengthy terms of incarceration. The Sentencing Guidelines provide wide ranges of guidelines-compliant sentences for sex offenses. Given the high statutory maxima and the wide ranges available under the Sentencing Guidelines, sentencing enhancements are not necessary to guide judicial discretion. Judges will examine the facts of each case and sentence appropriately. Defendants convicted of sexual crimes against children younger than 12 will typically receive longer sentences without the effect of any enhancement because the facts of the case will warrant a longer sentence. Sentencing enhancements do not serve a meaningful purpose in guiding judicial discretion and if they are assigned a mandatory minimum or a particular offense severity group on the Sentencing Guidelines they may inappropriately cabin judicial discretion to sentence based on the particular facts of the case.

If the RCC retains sentencing enhancements, PDS recommends re-evaluating the purpose of RCC § 22A-1303(f)(4)(E) which provides for a penalty enhancement where "the actor recklessly disregarded that the complainant was age 65 or older and the actor was in fact, under 65 years old." If the intent is to focus on the unique vulnerabilities of the complainant, the age should be raised to over age 75. If the intent of the RCC is to punish young defendants who may take advantage of an individual who is over age 65, then the enhancement should also provide for an age gap. In that instance, RCC § 22A-1303(f)(4)(E) should read: "the actor recklessly disregarded that the complainant was age 65 or older and the actor was in fact, at least ten years younger than the complainant."

RCC § 22A-1303(C) adds a sentencing enhancement for instances where the “actor recklessly disregarded that the complainant was under 18 years of age and the actor was, in fact, 18 years of age or older and at least two years older than the complainant.” PDS objects to this sentencing enhancement in particular. It does not address a particular harm and draws lines that may be entirely arbitrary. A sexual assault of a 17 year old by a 19 year old may be no different than a sexual assault of an 18 year old by a 21 year old. The age distinction drawn in the RCC in many instances will have no correlation to the particular harm of this conduct as opposed to other similar conduct. Sexual assault has devastating consequences for all and arbitrarily drawing this additional age-based line does not enhance the proportionality of punishment or meaningfully distinguish between the harms inflicted. As stated above, judges will have sufficient sentencing discretion to appropriately consider the particular harms caused and the circumstances of the defendant.

7. RCC § 22A-1306, sexually suggestive contact with a minor, prohibits instances where “with the intent to cause the sexual arousal or sexual gratification of any person knowingly... (D) [the actor] touches the actor’s genitalia or that of a third person in the sight of the complainant.” As written the RCC criminalizes a minor’s incidental viewing of sexual activity as a result of sharing a room or a home with others. RCC § 22A-1306(a)(2)(D) would criminalize a sibling masturbating or parents engaging in consensual sex in a room shared with a minor. The unintentional result is to criminalize typical conduct that occurs in households without private space for each individual. RCC § 22A-1306(a)(2)(D) should include an intent element that is related to the minor child. PDS proposes: “[the actor] touches the actor’s genitalia or that of a third person in the sight of ~~complainant~~ a minor child with the intent to gratify the actor’s sexual desire with respect to the minor child or to humiliate or degrade the minor child.”

MEMORANDUM



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

From: Laura E. Hankins, General Counsel

Date: December 20, 2018

Re: Comments on First Draft of Report No. 27,
Human Trafficking and Related Statutes

PDS has the following comments about RCC human trafficking and related offenses.

1. PDS recommends making the same changes to the definition of “coercion” as the term is used in the human trafficking chapter that PDS proposed for “coercion” for the sexual assault chapter.
2. PDS objects to the term “harbor” where it is used in Trafficking in Labor or Services,¹ Trafficking in Commercial Sex,² Sex Trafficking of Minors,³ and Sex Trafficking Patronage.⁴ Although it is used in the current D.C. Code,⁵ that use is grammatically incorrect; the Revised Criminal Code should not perpetuate the misuse of the term. A “harbor” is a place of refuge. “To harbor” means to provide shelter or sanctuary. While we may speak of “harboring a fugitive” or “harboring a criminal,” that is not an incorrect use of the term. Harboring a fugitive means to provide shelter for a fugitive. From the fugitive’s perspective, the shelter is a “place of refuge;” it is simply that society does not want fugitives or criminals to have a place of refuge. In contrast, society likely supports persons and organizations that provide places of refuge to victims of trafficking.⁶ PDS recommends replacing “harbor” with the term “house.”

¹ RCC § 22A-1605(a)(1).

² RCC § 22A-1606(a)(1).

³ RCC § 22A-1607(a)(1).

⁴ RCC § 22A-1610(c)(2).

⁵ For example, it is used at D.C. Code § 22-1833, Trafficking in labor or commercial sex acts, and at D.C. Code § 22-2704, Abducting or enticing a child from his or her home for purposes of prostitution, harboring such a child.

⁶ See e.g., “Apple wins Stop Slavery Award, touts new initiative to hire human trafficking victims at retail stores,” <https://appleinsider.com/articles/18/11/14/apple-wins-stop-slavery-award-touts-new-initiative-to-hire-human-trafficking-victims-at-retail-stores>.

3. PDS recommends changing the offense titles so the title better conveys the relative seriousness of the conduct. Forced labor or services and forced commercial sex make liable the person or the accomplice who, by means of coercion or debt bondage, causes another to engage in labor or services or in commercial sex. Whether or not the forced labor or services or forced commercial sex is part of a larger criminal enterprise, this conduct is at the core of the offense and is the most serious. The public perception of “trafficking” is that it is particularly serious, a form of modern-day slavery. Labeling the core offense as “forced commercial sex” and the supporting conduct as “trafficking” is precisely backwards. Thus, PDS recommends that “Forced Labor or Services” should be retitled to “Labor or Services Trafficking” and “Forced Commercial Sex” should be retitled to “Commercial Sex Trafficking.” Further, “Trafficking in Labor or Services,” “Trafficking in Commercial Sex,” “Sex Trafficking of Minors” should be retitled to “Assisting Labor or Services Trafficking,” “Assisting Commercial Sex Trafficking,” and “Assisting Sex Trafficking of Minors” respectively.

4. PDS recommends rewriting RCC § 22A-1605, Assisting Labor or Services Trafficking (formerly Trafficking in Labor or Services), and RCC § 22A-1606, Assisting Commercial Sex Trafficking (formerly Trafficking in Commercial Sex). The offenses criminalize conduct performed in aid of forced labor or services or forced commercial sex. As the Advisory Board discussed extensively with the Commission at the December 19, 2018 public meeting, there is a great danger that the offense will be written too broadly and criminalize persons who contribute minimally to the crime and have no vested interest in the success or outcome of the crime. Examples we discussed include the cab driver who drives someone he knows is a “trafficking victim” to the grocery store; the cab driver who one time drives someone she knows is being trafficked to a brothel; a pizza delivery person with a standing order to deliver pizza to a place the person knows houses trafficking victims; a hotel maid who cleans the room knowing it was a place where commercial sex trafficking took place. PDS strongly argues for a narrow offense and has a number of drafting recommendations. First, PDS agrees with the suggestion made during our Advisory Board discussion that the greatest concern is with persons who assist trafficking by housing, hoteling,⁷ transporting, recruiting, and enticing. PDS therefore recommends narrowing the offense to criminalize only that conduct. Second, the offenses, including the penalties, and the commentary should make clear the seriousness of the offense and the culpability of the actors relative to each other. As stated above at PDS comment (3), labor or services trafficking or commercial sex trafficking, that is actually causing a person to engage in labor, services, or commercial sex by means of coercion or debt bondage, is the most serious conduct. A person who engages in conduct, such as transporting a person, *with the purpose* of assisting in the commission of the trafficking is liable as an accomplice and may be punished accordingly. Less serious, but still culpable, is an actor who knowingly recruits, entices, houses, hotels, or transports a person *with the intent* that the person be caused to engage in labor, services or commercial sex by means of coercion or debt bondage. “With intent” requires purpose or knowledge so it allows for a conviction based on a lower mental state than accomplice liability would require. But it solves the problem discussed at the December 19, 2018 Advisory Board meeting that the assisting offenses as currently drafted allow for criminal liability for an actor

⁷ Though not commonly used as a verb, the Oxford English Dictionary confirms that “hotel” can be a verb.

who transports a person and who is aware of a substantial risk (or even knows) that the person is being trafficked, but the transportation does not aid the commission of the trafficking.

PDS recommends rewriting the offense elements of Assisting Labor Services Trafficking and Assisting Commercial Sex Trafficking as follows:

- (1) Knowingly recruits, entices, ~~harbors, houses, hotels, or~~ transports, ~~provides, obtains, or maintains by any means,~~ another person;
- (2) With intent that the person be caused to provide [labor or services][commercial sex];
- (3) By means of coercion or debt bondage.

For the same reasons, PDS recommends rewriting the offense elements of RCC § 22A-1607, Assisting Sex Trafficking of Minors, as follows:

- (1) Knowingly recruits, entices, ~~harbors, houses, hotels, or~~ transports, ~~provides, obtains, or maintains by any means,~~ another person;
- (2) With intent that the person be caused to engage in a commercial sex act;
- (3) With recklessness as to the complainant being under the age of 18.

5. With respect to the RCC offenses of Commercial Sex Trafficking (formerly Forced Commercial Sex), Assisting Commercial Sex Trafficking (formerly Trafficking in Commercial Sex), and Assisting Sex Trafficking of Minors (formerly Sex Trafficking of Minors), PDS recommends clarifying that the provision or promise of something of value necessary to make the sex act “commercial” must be provided or promised by someone other than the actor who is “forcing” the commercial sex by coercion or debt bondage. This is necessary to distinguish those offenses from sexual assault. To understand how the offenses could currently overlap, imagine the following scenario: Actor restricts complainant’s access to complainant’s insulin by hiding it. Actor says, “I’ll give you your insulin back if you have sex with me.” If complainant complies, that would be second degree sexual assault by coercion.⁸ PDS is concerned that, as currently drafted, the RCC forced commercial sex statute could be interpreted to also criminalize that conduct because the actor would be causing the complainant, by means of coercion, to engage in a sexual act that was made “commercial” by being in exchange for the insulin, a thing of value. The difference between sexual assault and forced commercial sex is that it is a third person who is giving something of value in exchange for the sexual act or sexual contact and that thing of value is different from that which is being used to coerce the complainant’s compliance. PDS recommends rewriting Forced Commercial Sex as follows:

⁸ See RCC § 22A-1303(b)(2)(A).

~~A person~~ An actor or business commits the offense of commercial sex trafficking ~~forced commercial sex~~ when that ~~person~~ actor or business:

- (1) Knowingly causes a person to engage in a commercial sex act with another person;
- (2) By means of coercion or debt bondage.

Assisting Commercial Sex Trafficking and Assisting Sex Trafficking of Minors should be rewritten similarly. For the same reason, Sex Trafficking Patronage should be modified to distinguish it from sexual assault. First Degree Sex Trafficking Patronage should be written as follows:

~~A person~~ An actor commits the offense of first degree sex trafficking patronage when that ~~person~~ actor:

- (1) Knowingly engages in a commercial sex act;
- (2) When coercion or debt bondage was used by another person or a business to cause the person to submit to or engage in the commercial sex act;
- (3) With recklessness that the complainant is under 18 years of age.


Second and third degree sex trafficking patronage should be rewritten similarly.

6. With respect to RCC § 22A-1608, Benefitting from Human Trafficking, the RCC Commentary states that the offense “criminalizes knowingly obtaining any benefit or property by participating, other than through the use of physical force, coercion or deception, in an association of two or more persons...”⁹ PDS questions where in the offense elements it is clear that the participation must be “other than through the use of physical force, coercion or deception.” PDS recommends rewriting the offense to state more clearly the exclusion of the use of physical force, coercion or deception.
7. PDS recommends rewriting RCC § 22A-1608, Benefitting from Human Trafficking, to allow for greater differentiation between offender culpability. The only distinction between the two degrees of benefitting is whether the group, in which the actor participates, is engaged in forced commercial sex (first degree) or forced labor or services (second degree). Thus, the person who is a “kingpin” in a group and who gains significant benefits from their participation is treated the same as the person whose participation in the group is sufficiently marginal that they are only disregarding a substantial risk that the group participates in the forced commercial sex or labor or services. PDS recommends increasing the mental state for first and second degree to knowing that the group has engaged in conduct constituting forced commercial sex (first degree) or forced

⁹ Report #27, page 49. The report also says “Subsection (a)(2) [of RCC § 22A-1608] specifies that the accused must have obtained the property or financial benefit through participation other than through the use of physical force, coercion, or deception in a group of two or more persons.” *Id.*

labor or services (second degree). PDS further proposes creating a third degree benefitting from human trafficking offense that encompasses both forced commercial sex and forced labor or services and that has the mental state of “recklessness” with respect to the forced conduct in which the group engages.

MEMORANDUM



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

From: Laura E. Hankins, General Counsel

Date: December 20, 2018

Re: Comments on First Draft of Report No. 28,
Stalking

PDS has the following comments about the RCC offense of stalking.

1. PDS objects to the negligence mental state in the proposed stalking offense.¹ As currently proposed, a person commits stalking if the person purposely engages in a pattern of conduct directed at an individual and does so either (A) with intent to cause the individual to fear for his or her safety or with intent to cause the individual to suffer significant emotional distress or (B) negligently causing the individual to fear for his or her safety or to suffer significant emotional distress. Particularly because the purpose of the person's conduct (necessary to establish it as a pattern) need not be nefarious – for example, “a person might persistently follow someone with the goal of winning their affection”² – a negligence mental state standard is too low. Increasing the mental state to “recklessly,” as PDS recommends, makes the second way of committing the offense on par with the first way. That a person's conduct is done with an awareness of a substantial risk that her conduct is causing the individual to fear for his safety is of similar seriousness as a person's conduct being done with the intent to cause such fear (whether or not it actually does). Allowing a conviction based only on proof that the person, who may otherwise have a benign or beneficent purpose, *should have been* aware that her conduct was causing the individual to fear for his safety would allow a conviction based on conduct that is of significantly lower culpability than the intentional conduct, yet the offense does not define them as different degrees.
2. PDS recommends increasing the separate occasions of conduct required to establish a pattern from two to three.³ As the commentary explains, stalking concerns “longer-term apprehension,” in contrast to breach of the peace statutes like disorderly conduct, rioting, and public nuisance

¹ See RCC § 22A-1801(a)(2)(B).

² Report #28, page 5, footnote 2.

³ See RCC §22A-1801(d)(3).

which create “momentary fear of an immediate harm.”⁴ Requiring three occasions to establish a “pattern of conduct” does more to assure that the harm being punished is “longer-term apprehension” and better distinguishes between conduct that constitutes stalking and conduct that would constitute a breach of the peace.

3. PDS recommends rewriting the definition of “financial injury” to limit “attorney’s fees” at subsection (F) to only those attorney’s fees “incurred for representation or assistance related to” the other forms of financial injury listed at (A) through (E). This is consistent with the objection and proposal PDS made on the definition of “financial injury” in its November 3, 2017 comments on Report #8, Recommendations for Property Offense Definitions, Aggregation, and Multiple Convictions.
4. PDS appreciates the effort to protect the conduct of attorneys and private investigators acting within the reasonable scope of their official duties from prosecution pursuant to the revised stalking statute.⁵ The list of excluded professionals is inadequate, however, to cover investigators employed by the Public Defender Service or by private attorneys appointed to represent indigent defendants pursuant to the Criminal Justice Act. PDS and CJA investigators are not “licensed private investigators.” In addition, PDS and law school programs rely on college and law student interns to perform investigative tasks. PDS strongly urges rewriting the excluded professions list as follows: “(A) The person is a journalist, law enforcement officer, licensed private investigator, attorney, person acting as an agent of an attorney, process server, *pro se* litigant, or compliance investigator...”
5. PDS agrees with the explanation of “physically following” that is in the commentary.⁶ PDS recommends including the term in the definitions subsection of the statute and using the explanation from the commentary. Specifically, PDS recommends adding to subsection (d) the following: “The term ‘physically following’ means to maintain close proximity to a person as they move from one location to another.”
6. PDS suggests deleting footnote 10.⁷ The Do Not Call Registry is not a good example of a government entity that might be the indirect source of notice to the actor to cease communications with the complainant. The Do Not Call Registry is for telemarketing calls only; it does not restrict calls from individuals.⁸
7. PDS recommends that the commentary clarify that the actor must know that the notice to cease communication is from the individual, even if the notice is indirect. The commentary should be clear that if the actor does not know that the person delivering the message to cease communicating with the individual is authorized to deliver such message on the individual’s

⁴ Report #28, page 10, footnote 40.

⁵ See RCC § 22A-1801(e)(3).

⁶ Report #28, pages 5-6.

⁷ Report #28, page 6.

⁸ Incidentally, the Registry does not restrict calls from charities or debt collectors either.

behalf, then the message does not qualify as the “notice” required by the offense. For example, the former paramour receives a message from the new paramour to stop calling and texting the individual will not satisfy the requirement that the actor (former paramour) “knowingly received notice from the individual” unless the actor knows that the new paramour is authorized to deliver the message to cease communications.

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: December 21, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #26, Sexual Assault and Related Provisions

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 #26 - Sexual Assault and Related Provisions.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

RCC § 22A-1301 (2), definition of bodily injury.

RCC § 22A-1301 (2) states that bodily injury “means significant physical pain, illness, or any impairment of physical condition.” It is unclear from the text and the Commentary if the word “significant” is meant to modify only physical pain or whether it is meant to modify illness as well. Because of the wording of the definition of “bodily injury” in D.C. Code § 22-3001 (2), OAG assumes that the drafter’s meant that bodily injury “means illness, significant physical pain, or any impairment of physical condition.” OAG makes this assumption because the phrase “bodily injury”, in DC Code § 22-3001(2), is defined as and “... injury involving loss or impairment of the function of a bodily member, organ, or mental faculty, or physical disfigurement, disease, sickness, or injury involving significant pain.” Note that there are no modifiers that apply to the words “disease” or “sickness” in the current law. However, if the drafter’s meant the word “significant” to modify both words, then the definition should be

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.

rewritten to say that it “means significant physical pain, significant illness, or any impairment of physical condition.” The Commentary should then explain why it made that choice.

RCC § 22A-1301 (8), definition of effective consent, and, RCC § 22A-1301 (3), definition of coercion.

As written, an actor who threatens a complainant that they will expose or publicize a fact, whether true or false, that will subject the complainant to embarrassment cannot be charged with a sexual assault if the complainant acquiesces. In order to determine if a person has given “effective consent” in this context, we need to determine if the person was coerced. RCC § 22A-1301 (8) states that effective consent “means consent obtained by means other than physical force, coercion, or deception.” RCC § 22A-1301 (3) defines coercion. One way that a person may be coerced is if the actor threatens the complainant that they will “assert a fact about another person, ... that would tend to subject that person to hatred, contempt, or ridicule, or to impair that person’s credit or repute...”² The word “embarrassment” is notably missing from that list. However, the Council, as recently as December 4, 2018 recognized that persons may submit to unwanted sex rather than have something embarrassing made public when it passed the Sexual Blackmail Elimination and Immigrant Protection Amendment Act of 2018. In the legislation, a person commits the offense of blackmail if they threaten to “[e]xpose a secret or publicize an asserted fact, whether true or false, tending to subject another person to hatred, contempt, ridicule, embarrassment, or other injury to reputation... or distribute a photograph, video, or audio recording, whether authentic or inauthentic, tending to subject another person to hatred, contempt, ridicule, embarrassment or other injury to reputation...” [emphasis added]³

The definition of “coercion” in paragraph (G) includes “Cause any harm that is sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the same background and in the same circumstances to comply.” For clarity, this phrase should explicitly

² The full definition of coercion is much broader. RCC § 22A-1301 (3) states that coercion “means threatening that any person will do any one of, or a combination of, the following:

- (A) Engage in conduct constituting an offense against persons as defined in subtitle II of Title 22A, or a property offense as defined in subtitle III of Title 22A;
- (B) Accuse another person of a criminal offense or failure to comply with an immigration law or regulation;
- (C) Assert a fact about another person, including a deceased person, that would tend to subject that person to hatred, contempt, or ridicule, or to impair that person’s credit or repute;
- (D) Take or withhold action as an official, or cause an official to take or withhold action;
- (E) Inflict a wrongful economic injury;
- (F) Limit a person’s access to a controlled substance as defined in D.C. Code 48-901.02 or restrict a person’s access to prescription medication; or
- (G) Cause any harm that is sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the same background and the same circumstances to comply.”

³ See lines 24 through 32 of the engrossed original of the Sexual Blackmail Elimination and Immigrant Protection Amendment Act of 2018 and the accompanying committee report.

<http://lims.dccouncil.us/Legislation/B22-0472?FromSearchResults=true>

refer to another person. In other words, the phrase “same background and in the same circumstances” should have an object to which it refers. We suggest that the paragraph be rewritten to say, “Cause any harm that is sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the same background and in the same circumstances as the complainant to comply”

RCC § 22A-1303, Sexual assault.

RCC § 22A-1303, and many of the other related provisions, ascribes the mental state of “knowingly” to many of the elements of the offense. As noted on page 58 of the Report, a consequence of using this mental state is that there will be a change in District law such that a person would be able to use self-induced intoxication as a defense.⁴ While understanding why the Commission chose to use the mental state of knowingly in these offenses, a person should not be able to decide to rape, or otherwise sexually abuse, someone; consume massive amounts of alcohol to get up the nerve to do it; consummate the rape; and then be able to argue, whether true or not, that at the time of the rape he lacked the mental state necessary to be convicted of the offense. If the Commission is going to use this mental state, then the Commission should create an exception that accounts for this situation. This exception would be similar to what the Commission is already proposing in § 22A-208 (c) concerning willful blindness.⁵

⁴ The relevant portion of this discussion is found on pages 58 and 59 of the Report. There it states:

Second, as applied to first degree and third degree of the revised sexual assault statute, the general culpability principles for self-induced intoxication in RCC § 22A-209 allow an actor to claim that he or she did not act “knowingly” or “with intent” due to his or her self-induced intoxication. The current first degree and third degree sexual abuse statutes do not specify any culpable mental states. DCCA case law has determined that first degree sexual abuse is a “general intent” crime for purposes of an intoxication defense, and similarly logic would appear to apply to third degree sexual abuse. This case law precludes ~~preclude~~ an actor from receiving a jury instruction on whether intoxication prevented the actor from forming the necessary culpable mental state requirement for the crime. This DCCA case law would also likely mean that an actor would be precluded from directly raising—though not necessarily presenting evidence in support of—the claim that, due to his or her self-induced intoxicated state, the actor did not possess any knowledge or intent required for any element of first degree or third degree sexual abuse. In contrast, under the revised sexual assault statute, an actor would both have a basis for, and would be able to raise and present relevant and admissible evidence in support of, a claim that voluntary intoxication prevented the actor from forming the knowledge or intent required to prove the offense. Likewise, where appropriate, the actor would be entitled to an instruction which clarifies that a not guilty verdict is necessary if the actor’s intoxicated state precludes the government from meeting its burden of proof with respect to the culpable mental state of knowledge or intent at issue the revised sexual assault statute. [internal footnotes omitted] [strikeout added for clarity]

⁵ RCC § 22A-208 (c) states “IMPUTATION OF KNOWLEDGE FOR DELIBERATE IGNORANCE. When a culpable mental state of knowledge applies to a circumstance in an offense, the required culpable mental state is established if ... The person was reckless as to whether the circumstance existed;

RCC § 22A-1303 (a)(2) makes it a first degree sexual assault when a person causes someone to submit to a sexual act “... (A) By using a weapon or physical force that overcomes, restrains, or causes bodily injury to the complainant.” It is unclear whether the drafters meant for the phrase “force that overcomes, restrains, or causes bodily injury to the complainant” to modify “physical force” or also modifies the use of “a weapon.” OAG believes that when a person uses a weapon to cause a victim to engage in a sexual act it should be a first degree sexual assault, without having to prove the effect of the use of the weapon on the complainant; it should be assumed. For the sake of clarity, paragraph (A) should be redrafted.⁶

RCC § 22A-1303 (a)(2)(C)(ii) makes it a first degree sexual assault when a person causes someone to submit to a sexual act by drugging the complainant when the substance in fact renders the complainant “... (ii) Substantially incapable, mentally or physically, of appraising the nature of the sexual act; or (iii) Substantially incapable, mentally or physically, of communicating unwillingness to engage in the sexual act.” There are two issues with the way that this is phrased. First, it is unclear in subparagraph (ii) what the word “physically” adds. In other words, after a person has been drugged, what is the difference between a person being substantially incapable “mentally” of appraising the nature of the sexual act and a person being substantially incapable “physically” of appraising the nature of the sexual act? The second issue is that these two statements do not reach the situation where a victim is drugged, can still appraise the nature of the sexual act and can communicate that he or she is unwilling to engage in a sexual act, but is physically unable to move anything but their mouth. The provision should clarify that first degree sexual assault covers a person who has sex with a victim after administering a drug that physically incapacitates the victim, though allowing the victim to think and speak.

RCC § 22A-1305, Sexual Exploitation of an Adult.

In paragraph (a)(2)(C) the subparagraph criminalizes sexual acts between a complainant and “member of the clergy” under specified circumstances. The phrase “member of the clergy” is not defined. To improve clarity and avoid needless prosecutions and litigation the Commission should define this term. The Commission could base its definition of “member of the clergy” on the list of clergy that appears in D.C. Code § 22-3020.52. This is the Code provision that requires “any person” to report information concerning child victims of sexual abuse but exempts “a priest, clergyman, rabbi, or other duly appointed, licensed, ordained, or consecrated minister of a given religion in the District of Columbia, or a duly accredited practitioner of Christian Science in the District of Columbia” when those persons are involved in a confession or penitential communication.

and ...The person avoided confirming or failed to investigate whether the circumstance existed with the purpose of avoiding criminal liability.”

⁶The Commission could redraft subparagraph (A) so that it follows the basic structure of subparagraph (B). It would look as follows:

“(A) By using:

(i) A weapon; or

(ii) Physical force that overcomes, restrains, or causes bodily injury to the complainant...”

RCC § 22A-1307, Enticing a minor.

One way that a person can commit the offense of enticing a minor is to knowingly persuade or entice, or attempt to persuade or entice, “the complainant to go to another location in order to engage in or submit to a sexual act or conduct.” RCC § 22A-1307(a)(1)(B). As written, it is unclear if the phrase “in order to” refers to the actor’s motivations or is part of what the actor must communicate to the complainant. The Commentary should clarify that “in order” refers to the actor’s motivation for the communication to get the complainant to go to another location, not that the actor has to communicate to the complainant that a sexual act or contact is the reason for going to another place.

Pursuant to RCC § 22A-1307 (a)(2) a person can commit this offense when “The actor, in fact, is at least 18 years of age and at least four years older than the complainant, and ... (C) The complainant, in fact, is a law enforcement officer who purports to be a person under 16 years of age, and the actor recklessly disregards that complainant purports to be a person under 16 years of age.” There is a problem, however, with how this subparagraph is structured. Paragraph (C) is still subject to the overarching lead in language, so this law-enforcement language still doesn’t apply unless the actor is 4 years older than the complainant. If the intent is to include any situation where an actor tries to entice a law enforcement officer who purports to be under 16 the provision should be restructured. For example, the Commission could redraft this provision to read:

(2)(A) The actor, in fact, is at least 18 years of age and at least four years older than the complainant, and:

- (1) The actor recklessly disregards that the complainant is under 16 years of age; or
 - (2) The actor recklessly disregards that the complainant is under 18 years of age and the actor is in a position of trust with or authority over the complainant; or
- (B)(1) The actor, in fact, is at least 18 years of age,
- (2) The complainant, in fact, is a law enforcement officer who purports to be a person under 16 years of age; and
 - (3) The actor recklessly disregards that complainant purports to be a person under 16 years of age.

RCC § 22A-1308, Arranging for sexual conduct of a minor.

While in general, OAG does not object to RCC § 22A-1308, the limitation on this offense is that “The actor and any third person, in fact are at least 18 years of age and at least four years older than the complainant” conflicts with the requirement that the actor recklessly disregards that the “complainant purports to be a person under 16 years of age, while, in fact, the complainant [is] a law enforcement officer.”

The relevant part of the provision is as follows:

“(a) Arranging for Sexual Conduct with a Minor. An actor commits the offense of arranging for sexual conduct with a minor when that actor:

(1) Knowingly arranges for a sexual act or sexual contact between:

(A) The actor and the complainant; or

(B) A third person and the complainant; and

(2) The actor and any third person, in fact, are at least 18 years of age and at least four years older than the complainant; and

(3) The actor recklessly disregards that:

(A) The complainant is under 16 years of age;

(B) The complainant is under 18 years of age, and the actor knows that he or she or the third person is in a position of trust with or authority over the complainant; or

(C) The complainant purports to be a person under 16 years of age, while, in fact, the complainant a law enforcement officer.

The following example demonstrates the problem. Say the Actor is 20 years old and the complainant is an undercover police officer pretending to be 14 years of age. Notwithstanding that there is a mental state in subparagraph (3)(c) that requires that “The actor recklessly disregards that... The complainant purports to be a person under 16 years of age, while, in fact, the complainant [is] a law enforcement officer...”, arguably we never get to that mental state. That’s because the mental state concerning the law enforcement officer is never reached because we can’t jump the hurdle, in paragraph (a)(2) that “The actor and any third person, in fact, are at least 18 years of age and at least four years older than the complainant...”

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: December 21, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #27, Human Trafficking and Related Statutes

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 First Draft of Report #27 - Human Trafficking and Related Statutes.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

RCC § 22A-1601 (2)(D), definition of Coercion.

RCC § 22A-1601 (2)(D) states that the definition of the word “coercion” includes when a person “Take[s] or withhold[s] action as an official...” The word “official” is not defined in the text nor is it specifically addressed in the Commentary. OAG assumes that the word was chosen to refer to government action and not to the official action of a corporation or other organization. It is unclear, however, whether the term should be read broadly as “takes or withholds government action” or more narrowly as “takes or withholds District government action.” Because all government action is “official, we recommend that the definition be rewritten to refer to “government action” rather than “official action.” We believe that this will aid clarity.

RCC § 22A-1602, Limitations on liability and sentencing for RCC Chapter 16 offenses.

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.

Paragraph (b) lists the “Exceptions to Liability.” It states:

Any parent, legal guardian, or other person who has assumed the obligations of a parent who requires his or her child under the age of 18 to perform common household chores under threat of typical parental discipline shall not be liable for such conduct under sections 22A-1603, 22A-1605, and 22A-1609 of this Chapter, provided that the threatened discipline did not include:

- (1) Burning, biting, or cutting;
- (2) Striking with a closed fist;
- (3) Shaking, kicking, or throwing; or
- (4) Interfering with breathing.

There are a few problems with this formulation. As drafted, the paragraph implies that burning, biting, or cutting, etc. are typical forms of parental discipline.² Second, the term “typical” is not defined. Surely it should not mean that merely because a number of people do something harmful that it would qualify as an exception for liability. For example, just because it may be “typical” in some places for parents to neglect their child, see D.C. Code § 16-2301(9), those neglectful actions should not be an exception to liability when they are used as parental discipline. Finally, subparagraphs (1)-(4) are stated as an exclusive list. There are, however, other harms, including neglect, that a parent may typically inflict on a child that should also be excluded.³

RCC § 22A-1603, Forced labor or services.

Paragraph (b) establishes the penalties for the offense of forced labor or services. Though businesses can be convicted of this offense, the penalty structure is the same as for offenses that can only be charged against a person. As businesses cannot be subject to incarceration and as their collective motivation for this offense is financial, there should be a separate fine penalty structure for businesses that is substantial enough to act as a deterrent.

Paragraph (c) provides for a penalty enhancement when it is proven that “The complainant was held or provides services for more than 180 days.” This sentence should be redrafted to make it clear that the enhancement should apply when the combined period of time that a person is held

² The paragraph can be read to say “Any parent... who requires his ... child ... to perform common household chores under threat of typical parental discipline shall not be liable for such conduct provided that the threatened discipline did not include... [b]urning, biting, or cutting...;” [emphasis added]

³ Similarly, in RCC § 22A-1603 (e) the drafters use the word “ordinary.” It is unclear what that term means in the context of that paragraph.

and forced to provide services – together – total more than 180 days.⁴ The same comment applies to the penalty enhancement for RCC § 22A-1603 Forced commercial sex.

RCC § 22A-1607, Sex trafficking of minors.

It is unclear how the penalty provision in paragraph (b) should be read with the offense penalty enhancements in paragraph (c).⁵ For example, in determining the penalty for a repeat offender who holds the complainant for more than 180 days, do you apply the penalty enhancement in RCC §§ 22A-805 and then go to up one class or do you go up one class and then apply the enhancement in RCC §§ 22A-805?⁶

RCC § 22A-1608, Benefiting from human trafficking.

RCC § 22A-1608 (a)(2) states that the offense of first degree benefiting from human trafficking includes, as an element, “By participation in a group of two or more persons.” It is unclear if whether this element is met when a business of two people are engaged in human trafficking. In other words, because its two people that participate is this element met? Or, because it is one business, albeit with two people, is this element not met?⁷

The Commentary to RCC § 22A-1608 (a)(2) states, “Subsection (a)(2) specifies that the accused must have obtained the property or financial benefit through participation other than through the use of physical force, coercion, or deception in a group of two or more persons.” Subsection (a)(2) does not contain this limitation. See text in previous paragraph.

RCC § 22A-1609, Misuse of documents in furtherance of human trafficking.

RCC § 22A-1609(a)(2) includes as an element of the offense that the person or business acted “With intent to prevent or restrict, or attempt to prevent or restrict, without lawful authority, the person’s liberty to move or travel in order to maintain the labor, services, or performance of a commercial sex act by that person.” [emphasis added] OAG recommends deleting the phrase “without lawful authority.” The inclusion of the “without lawful authority” clause assumes that there are situations that it would be justified to, “With intent to prevent or restrict, or attempt to prevent or restrict the person’s liberty to move or travel in order to maintain the labor, services,

⁴ For example, the enhancement should apply to someone who holds a person in their basement for 90 days “while training them” and then forces them to provide services for the next 91 days.

⁵ Paragraph (b) states, “Subject to the general penalty enhancements in RCC §§ 22A-805 - 22A-808 and the offense penalty enhancement in subsection (c) of this section, trafficking in commercial sex is a Class [X] crime subject to a maximum term of imprisonment of [X], a maximum fine of [X], or both.” Paragraph (c) states, “The penalty classification for this offense may be increased in severity by one class when, in addition to the elements of the offense, the complainant was held or provides commercial sex acts for more than 180 days.”

⁶ This may be a global issue that applies to all penalty provisions where there are both general enhancements and offense specific enhancements.

⁷ The same questions apply to element (b)(2) in the offense of second degree benefiting from human trafficking.

or performance of a commercial sex act by that person.” We submit that that would never be the case. The Commentary does not explain why the phrase “without lawful authority” is necessary.

RCC § 22A-1609, Forfeiture.

It is unclear whether the forfeiture clause in RCC § 22A-1609 follows the holding in *One 1995 Toyota Pick-Up Truck v. District of Columbia*, 718 A.2d 558 (DC 1998). In that case, the government sought forfeiture of a vehicle valued at \$15,500 that was owned by a person who was arrested for solicitation of a prostitute. The Court held that “the Constitution prevents the utilization of civil forfeiture as a penalty for the commission of an offense where the value of the property forfeited stands in gross disproportion to the gravity of the offense. Such a disproportion exists in the case at bar and the attempted forfeiture therefore violates the Excessive Fines Clause of the Eighth Amendment.”

RCC § 22A-1613. Civil Action.

RCC § 22A-1613 permits victims of offenses prohibited by § 22A-1603, § 22A-1604, § 22A-1605, § 22A-1606, § 22A-1607, § 22A-1608, or § 22A-1609 may bring a civil action in the Superior Court. The provision should explicitly state that the defendant in the civil action must be a person who can be charged as a perpetrator of one of those offenses.

RCC § 22A-1613 (b) contains the following provision. “(b) Any statute of limitation imposed for the filing of a civil suit under this section shall not begin to run until the plaintiff knew, or reasonably should have known, of any act constituting a violation of § 22A-1603, § 22A-1604, § 22A-1605, § 22A-1606, § 22A-1607, § 22A-1608, or § 22A-1609 or until a minor plaintiff has reached the age of majority, whichever is later.” OAG believes that a person who was a minor should have an opportunity to sue on their own behalf. As written, just as the minor was able to sue, because they reached the age of majority, they would be precluded from suing because they reached the age of majority. Instead, OAG suggests that the Commission adopt the language used in the engrossed original of B22-0021, the Sexual Abuse Statute of Limitations Amendment Act of 2018. That bill provides, “for the recovery of damages arising out of sexual abuse that occurred while the victim was less than 35 years of age— the date the victim attains the age of 40, or 5 years from 40 when the victim knew, or reasonably should have known, of any act constituting sexual abuse, whichever is later;”

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: December 21, 2018

SUBJECT: First Draft of Report #28, Stalking

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 #28 - Stalking.¹

COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT

RCC § 22A-1801, Stalking.

RCC § 22A-1801(d)(4) contains the following definition, “The term “financial injury” means the reasonable monetary costs, debts, or obligations incurred as a result of the stalking by the specific individual, a member of the specific individual’s household, a person whose safety is threatened by the stalking, or a person who is financially responsible for the specific individual and includes:” [emphasis added] As written, the term “specific individual” refers to the person who is doing the staking. However, the lead in language to the stalking offense contains the sentence “Purposely engages in a pattern of conduct directed at a specific individual that consists of any combination of the following...” [emphasis added] See RCC § 22A-1801(a)(1). Using the term “specific individual” to refer to both the perpetrator and victim would be confusing. However, given the context, OAG believes that what The Commission meant in RCC § 22A-1801(d)(4) is, “as a result of the stalking of the specific individual.”

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-1801(d)(8) states that the term “significant emotional distress” means “substantial, ongoing mental suffering that may, but does not necessarily, require medical or other professional treatment or counseling.” On page 10 of the Commentary it clarifies the government’s obligation by stating, “The government is not required to prove that the victim sought or needed professional treatment or counseling.” OAG believes that that for the sake of clarity and to avoid needless litigation. The sentence in the Commentary should be in the text of the substantive provision in RCC § 22A-1801(d)(8).

RCC § 22A-1801(e) contains the exclusions from liability. Subparagraph (e)(3) states:

- (e) A person shall not be subject to prosecution under this section for conduct, if:
 - (A) The person is a journalist, law enforcement officer, licensed private investigator, attorney, process server, pro se litigant, or compliance investigator; and
 - (B) Is acting within the reasonable scope of his or her official duties.

While it may be intuitive to understand what the official duties of a law enforcement officer, licensed private investigator, process server, and compliance investigator is within the context of this offense, it is unclear what the official duties of a pro se litigant is. Since a pro se litigant does not appear to have “official duties” (or “professional obligations,” to borrow the phrase used on page 12 of the report) in the ordinary meaning of that phrase, OAG believes that the subparagraph needs to be redrafted. In addition, there are questions as to whether an attorney or journalist necessarily has “official duties” as opposed to professional obligations. Therefore, OAG recommends that this provision be redrafted as follows:

- (A) The person is a law enforcement officer, licensed private investigator, or compliance investigator and is acting within the reasonable scope of his or her official duties; or
- (B) The person is a journalist, attorney, or pro se litigant and is acting within the reasonable scope of that role.

RCC § 22A-1801(f) provides for the parental discipline affirmative defense. This defense is available to “A parent, legal guardian, or other person who has assumed the obligations of a parent engaged in conduct constituting stalking of the person’s minor child...” However, there are situations when this defense should not be given to a parent or legal guardian. For example, a parent or legal guardian may abuse their child and lose visitation rights or be subject to court orders limiting the person’s contact with the child. The actions of these people in violating the provisions of RCC § 22A-1801 (a) may actually constitute stalking and, as such, these people should be subject to this offense.² RCC § 22A-1801(f) should be redrafted to ensure that

² RCC § 22A-1801(a) provides that a person commits stalking when that person:

“(1) Purposely engages in a pattern of conduct directed at a specific individual that consists of any combination of the following:

- (A) Physically following or physically monitoring;
- (B) Communicating to the individual, by use of a telephone, mail, delivery service, electronic message, in person, or any other means, after knowingly having

parents, legal guardians, or other people who have assumed the obligations of a parent can only avail themselves of this offense when they are exercising legitimate parental supervision and not when their rights are limited or nonexistent.

received notice from the individual, directly or indirectly, to cease such communication; or

(C) In fact: committing a threat as defined in § 22A-1204, a predicate property offense, a comparable offense in another jurisdiction, or an attempt to commit any of these offenses...”