

The Essential Role of Prosecution in a CCR
Olga Trujillo and Maren Woods, Praxis International
with Matt Wiese, Rose Thelen
May 6, 2015

Hi, everyone. This is Liz at Praxis International in Duluth, Minnesota. The phone lines have been open, so I'm going to mute them right now so you'll no longer be able to speak to each other. Lines are muted. That way, you won't need to worry about background noise from where you're calling from. I want to take a few moments to welcome you all to this session today. We are very excited and thrilled that you are able to join us in this conversation about the importance of prosecution. This is a customized rural technical assistance webinar that we have designed specifically to fit your needs. And so we're delighted that you could join us. It's one of our favorite topics, and our speakers today, Matt Weissy, prosecutor in Marquette county, Michigan, and rose Teeland, both probably fairly familiar to all of you on the line, are going to be our speakers. Hi, Matt and Rose. Are you there?

Yes, indeed.

Hi, Liz.

Hi, welcome to you both.

The wonders of technology, Liz.

Indeed, yep. Sounds like you're right next door to my office. I wish you were! I wish you were ! Anyway, rose and Matt, before I let you get going with our session today, our content, I want to walk through a couple of brief little starting points to help facilitate your participation in this webinar today. We have just a small bunch of people thus far, and I think that you all are fairly familiar with how this works. But I'm going to just go over these things, nonetheless. And so if there happens to Benin that is participating in this webinar by telephone only, because the phone lines are muted, the best way for you to be able to interact with Matt and Rose will be to send an e-mail note to me, Liz@praxisinternational.org, and I will do my very best to get your questions and your comments integrated into the discussion today. For the rest of us that are connected by webinar, just a couple of quick things. I'll remind you to use the chat that you will find in the lower left-hand portion of your screen and I'll keep an eye on the things that you're chatting in and integrate your comments into Rose and Matt's presentation today. And what we want to do -- good, Kim Bruce did let us know that she has a prosecutor participating from her community. So that's great, in Midland, Michigan, I think. So what we would like to know is if any of the rest of you have a prosecutor joining you today. That would be helpful orientation to us in our presentation. Also, let us know if there's any particular issue or question that you would like us to make sure that we cover and to kind of test out that chat box. Why don't you go ahead right now, if you would, and give us a quick little hello and tell us your role with your program and where you're calling from. So go ahead and do that now while I finish up just a couple of more details about this webinar process. So if you happen to get disconnected at any point, either by telephone or by computer, you will be able to rejoin through your original process so you don't have to worry too much about that. And if you have an issue that you would like to chat with me

privately or Matt or Rose, you will see there's a tab in that chat box that says private. When you open that box, you'll see the list of the leaders and assistants and so forth. Double click on one of those names and that will open up just a private feed between you and that person. That is a possibility to -- okay. JD is not with her today. So her prosecutor isn't there. I was mistaken. It doesn't look as if any prosecutors from the local jurisdictions of our programs are able to join us today. So that is unfortunate, but the session is being recorded. So you'll be able to share it with them and there will be no excuses.

Well, and also, Liz, if they talk to their prosecutor and they want to follow up, they can always follow up with me, too.

And Matt's contact information will be at the end of our session. With that, I feel like I've been talking a lot. I would rather have the two of you talk. Rose, I'm going to turn it over to you.

Thank you, Liz. You sound so calm. We had quite a bit of technological kerfuffle before this started. Welcome, everybody. It's great to be doing this and as you know, you are a select group who has been working on these issues for a while and are at various stages in terms of implementing advocacy-initiated response and other strategies in your coordinated community response. It's a particular delight for me, because I'm -- I know most of you on the line and generally these webinars are so impersonal. So today, I actually have pictures of most of you in my mind and your lovely group. Thank you for joining us and thanks for participating in identifying what you would like to hear us discuss. Without any further ado, I will get into the meat of this. And as you know, here's a little reminder that we are talking about coordinating a community response and what we're talking about is this whole idea of making the system more amenable to the domestic violence crime so what we want to do while we're doing that is to think first and foremost about victim safety. How do we hold offenders accountable while protecting victims and thereby, change the climate of tolerance in the community. And what we are looking for and we're happy to have Matt on the line with us today because he's done so much in this arena. I've worked with Matt for probably 20 years now.

Yes.

And he isn't just a theorist. He prosecutes these cases on a daily basis in Marquette, Michigan and he is their elected county attorney. He wouldn't have to do that. Where I came from, the county attorney didn't necessarily do cases anymore or maybe just the high profile ones. So welcome, Matt. It's so good to have you on the line today. And let's start with some of these principles. Sorry, we had a slide that we wanted to slip over here. We wanted to start with some of the problematic assumptions to talk about and get us into this whole idea of what is the prosecutor to do and what's their role relative to advocates and to a CCR. So on this list, we have a bunch of problematic assumptions. Sounds like you all are -- Matt, maybe these are just yours, but there are some fundamental problems in the way that prosecutors have thought about the crime or maybe it's because they are not used to working on the crime or the system wasn't designed for this crime. But tell us a little bit about what we see on the screen here.

Sure. Yeah, this is kind of a combination of things that I've actually dealt with over the years, going back to 1987 when I first started doing domestic violence prosecution. Some of the

assumptions that I made, assumptions that I saw the prosecutors make, assumptions that law enforcement make quite often, and that's where we develop this list and it's kind of in a way to enlighten us to think about these things because really what we're saying is that these are hindrances or hurdles that we may deal with when we try to meld a domestic violence or a family situation and fit it into the criminal justice system, because it's one of the most unique areas of crime. It's pretty rare that we're prosecuting family members against family members typically. And so the assumptions there are that victims want the system to respond, where if someone steals your car, that's usually a given. But with a domestic violence case, it's not. The police did a good job, that the victim will be able to participate, that conviction is a good result, and all these things that we typically assume when we prosecute cases aren't valid assumptions to make when you're prosecuting a domestic violence case. This is just to get us thinking about kind of the whole nature and prevalence of domestic violence.

Right, right. And so what makes domestic violence unique? I mean, you mentioned something about victims, you know, a person who has their car stolen, they will want the Case case -- they will want that prosecuted. I know victims in their erroneous assumption is I remember from the bad old days that she didn't want to participate in the prosecution. So therefore she must like the violence. But that's, that's a problematic assumption as well. But, you know, let's talk about these unique aspects of domestic violence.

Well, one of the things that -- the last one on that last slide was that advocates will always agree with us with what we're doing. And I think to kind of understand the unique nature of the crime, it's real important for public prosecutors to work with the community-based nonprofits who workday in and day out advocating for the safety and protection of domestic violence victims. And basically taking an approach that's best for the victim, whereas my approach may not be best for the victim. You know, the relationship is going to continue in most cases unless there are no children and no -- there's no other ties. Quite often, you're going to have a continuing relationship. That's unique about it. In some cases, she may be safer staying than leaving, and that's an assumption -- that's something that when I first started doing this was kind of beyond my, even my understanding. How could it be possibly safer for the victim to stay? And you talked about traditional crimes, like, say, burglary or theft or auto theft, those types of crimes. People are pretty much saying, hey, you know, there's no relationship there usually and they are more than ready, willing and able to pursue charges. Then you have the whole societal and historical context of men's rights and women's rights and the legal status of women and men and, you know, patriarchy and all that stuff that, you know, we're seeing some fortunate changes now, but we're going back a whole Century here. There's still some of that bias, societal and historical, you know, based upon people's beliefs, values, morals, religions. And just basically bias. Cops are biased. Typically the first time out of the gate, they are very good with wanting to help a victim, but when they go back again and then again, you know, they, they get an attitude. I'm prosecuting a case right now where there's a strangulation and this woman was brutally subjected to two separate incidents of strangulation over the course of about 45 minutes where she blacked out both times. Her eyes are totally bloodied from Pi teak yeah, and there are hardly any ligature marks. And the initial reaction from the first responding officer was that there's no ligature marks, so this couldn't be a strangulation. Fortunately, the other officer -- it was two officers responding. She had been trained on strangulation and what to look for and did follow-up and it corroborated what the victim had to say. You know, in that particular case, too, this particular

victim had been involved with some crack cocaine dealing and had done 18 months in the federal prison and, you know, the other officer who was skeptical, you know, automatically thought, well, she's not a very good victim because she's been in trouble with the law. So we have all kinds of bias that goes on there. Prosecutors have the same problems. You know, when we're dealing with a victim who was a defendant previously, which is not uncommon. And we really need to get away from that and just look at the case individually and look at what happened based upon those facts. And in this particular case I was talking about with the strangulation, that victim who I met with last week, she came in with some trepidation, you know, wondering could she talk to me, would I be judgmental toward her, and we kind of got to that right away and I said, look, you know, I don't care about your history. I care about the fact that you were strangled. You could just see she kind of, like, relaxed. So that type of stuff, stuff that works in our offices, you know, we have biased. Oh, it's so and so again or it's so and so again. We really need to get away from that kind of a sarcastic, edgy type of an attitude that we tend to get in the criminal justice system and just take each case on its own.

Thanks, Matt. I was, I was thinking that when we talk about some of these issues, you know, the unique aspects of domestic violence, one of the things that we see and what you talk about frequently is that, you know, your participation in a CCR where you're sitting down with other people and you have an opportunity to think about these sorts of things makes a difference. So let's go to this can-do list about what, what will you do in a CCR to support it and also to enhance your own capacity to do a good job?

Well, one of the things that we do when we network and communicate is we treat all partners equally. And I think that's on this list. Maybe it's not. But everybody at the table, you know, nobody outranks anybody else. And what we need to do is be open to sharing our information, whether it's, you know, from police to prosecutor to your community-based advocates or police directly to the community-based advocates to be open about sharing the data.

Why? What's important about the data?

Well, there's a number of things about the data that we need to be careful about. We need to make sure that we're comparing apples and apples, which as you know with data you can always manipulate it. So how many domestic violence incidents are we really talking about? Do they get reported to the police? Did the police do an investigation? Did it get referred to the prosecutor? Of those referred to the prosecutor, did they get authorized for charges? Did they result in a disposition, meaning did it go to a guilty plea or a trial and a conviction? So that kind of information's real helpful. What we have done in Marquette County and we started comparing shelter stats to our stats. And there's like a vast chasm of distance between us. So there's a lot of domestic violence services being provided by our community program to people that we're not seeing in the criminal justice system. And so one of the things that they are doing on the shelter side is talking to the women, the victims and asking them, you know, did they want to report, why didn't they want to report, were there hindrances to prosecution, trying to find out information that way that can give us viable feedback that's not disclosing who gave us that information. And the other thing ha I will do is I'll go to the women's support group and talk, you know, at least once a year, but I try to do it more than once a year just to get feedback from them, as to how they felt when they were involved with the system and why they would or would not

call out again for help from the criminal justice system. So we use that data to kind of get a picture of what's going on in the community. And we're open and transparent. And it helps--

Can I ask you, Matt, was that kind of a sensitive issue for you at first? I mean, were you leery to have it so visible perhaps being that there were these many arrests and these many resulted in prosecutions and these many were dismissed? How did you deal with that? I think that's kind of an issue that we see in some places. And of course we're talking about in most places is to get a tracking system. How did you, how did you address your own defensiveness? Or did you come ready-made without any?

I came ready-made with an idea that we needed to change things, but then once people are looking at how you're doing your job, you tend to want to, you know, it's human nature to be defensive. And you don't want to be -- yeah, so what we have done by working closely is developed a level of trust. And we've tried to, we tried to create our roles based upon policies and procedures and practices that we've all agreed upon. So it's not like anyone's pointing a finger at anyone else saying you're a terrible prosecutor, you're a terrible cop, you're a terrible advocate. We say, okay, we seem to think there is a problem here and here it seems to be because this didn't happen and we said this was going to happen. So why did that happen? And how do we fix that so it doesn't happen again.

Right. So your focus is on this is something that probably arises not through the, the bad behavior of the individual, but just how the system is constructed, huh?

Right, exactly. And try to get it away from personality. I mean, it's still -- I won't kid you. I mean, we -- most prosecutors have to get elected. And they don't want to have a bad reputation. And so it can be a soft underbelly issue if you're not doing a good job. You don't really measure from conviction rate necessarily, but you measure from how effective is the intervention and the relationship that you developed to support the coordinated response that you want to have in your community.

Part of it you brought up, when you said everybody's equal at the table, but I think it could be a sensitive issue for advocates to try and be equal or even to coordinate a CCR and with that in mind, I think that you've shown extensive leadership in working with advocates. And backing up just a bit, this whole idea of tracking and monitoring, you mentioned the relationships that are built. There are, of course, model protocols for what you'll do with that information that you collect. So it's not about exposing widely all these gaps. It's about exposing these gaps to those people who are coinvestigators and then exposing or giving huge tribute widely to the, successful strategies for closing some of those gaps, right?

Right.

Let's move to this, this discussion about working with advocates and moving down the road here. We got a late start and so I want to make sure that we keep moving this forward to the substance of the-what you do and charging and all of that sort of thing. Let's start with working with advocates, because most of the people on today's webinar are in some process of developing an advocate-initiated response that is done by an advocate or community-based confidential

advocate, and most of them are also working with some sort of court advocate who is not of course confidential and works with you. Can you tell us how you work with those two advocacy entities to maximize their effectiveness?

Yeah, the -- let's start with -- you've heard my dumb joke before, calling the prosecutors advocate an in-house advocate and then of course calling the community-based advocate an out-of-house advocate.

You lost everybody on the line.

The point is we shouldn't treat them like they are in the outhouse. That's the whole point of it. By bringing -- so some of that is done by sharing information openly and we've dealt with this. I know there's someone from Montana here, and when we're in Montana we have these discussions about can you give the community-based program information, can you give them police reports. And I think that most states recognize that the information that the prosecutor has is public information. And if it doesn't compromise the case or the investigation, it can be shared. So figuring out a way to share that information openly and then figuring out a way to have the advocate-initiated response introduced into your process or your procedures. With rape cases, it's real seamless that we get the rape advocates involved with the case early on and nobody has an issue with that. And it works well. You know, then it becomes where do you try to integrate the community-based advocate into what's going on? So we give them the information. They know about the case. They know what's going on so that, you know, we even would give them the opportunity to come out, you know, if they have an oncall person once a situation is safe and secure. Then when we initially have a case, we make sure that our advocate who works for the prosecutor gets in contact with the victim, ideally within 24 to 48 hours, and we have a screening tool that we use to find out some context to the violence, history of the violence, the severity of the violence, where the victim is at as far as what she would like to see done on the case, you know, talk about bond and bond conditions, should there be bond conditions such as no drinking, no contact. You know, try to get a quick snapshot of what's going on in her world and then getting her in to talk to the prosecutor as soon as possible. And then when that appointment is made, the community-based advocate, or as we call it on this slide, the -- yeah, community-based advocate, they are invited to our office. They are not invited. They are told we have an appointment with this victim on this date at this time and they show up. And we usually make sure that they are linked up there and everyone's given a copy of the investigation. Then we sit down and we talk about what's going on, what are we going to do here. And--

Matt, let me ask you this. Now, the advocates are contacted also by law enforcement, right?

Yes.

But you also let them know of every appointment you're having and invite them to the table, right?

Right. And so, you know, in full disclosure here, our weakest component of this is the, getting the advocates involved with the case the day it happens. And then part -- we're working on revising that so that our advocates -- so that we have like with our rape cases an advocate that

can call out. And we do have them come out. It's just not consistently done. So that's an area of weakness that we have in our community, in our response program. And, you know, we're working on that. But as far as the police, they are all really comfortable with talking to our community-based program. We bring them in to do trainings with the law enforcement so that they are familiar with them. It's not, you know, those women that work at that shelter. They actually know who they are and try to build some of those relationships up so that they are more than comfortable reaching out to them. And the police all know that they can reach out to them for emergency shelter and everything else.

You know, Matt, let me ask you this, or let me land on this particular piece because this has come up across, in my work with people across the country, which is that there's this thing where you ask, you ask the victims their wishes regarding contact with the offender. And in fact, let's spend some time talking about that. You don't -- you used to require victims to go meet with advocates, right? And that's no longer a practice that you engage in. Can you talk about that some?

Yeah, I mean, it's not -- it's very common, as I think everyone who is participating today knows, that if there's a standard condition of no contact put on a case right away when it starts, many victims will want it lifted. We used to have a requirement that they go to the community-based program and, you know, participate in a women's support group or talk to one of their advocates before we would agree to lift it. And that's -- we're going back 20 years now. We have not done that in a long, long time. Then we kind of evolve to it was still mandatory that it is put on the case and our judges were trained by the state judicial training group that you should always have a no-contact order and you should never lift it until the case goes to disposition. And then we've had to kind of change our thinking on that because there are times where that no-contact condition should be lifted because it's probably in her best interest. You know, it can create -- there could be economic hardships. There could be familial hardships for child care, all kinds of issues that come up, or just for them to figure out where they are going to go with this relationship. So we don't require them to go to classes, to go to therapy. We do get her input right away when we first talk to her about what do they think about what should be done for her safety, do they need the no contact, should he be in some sort of substance abuse treatment, should he be in a batterer's group, things of that nature. Because it -- the thing that I talked to you about previously is that prosecutors are all afraid that if we agree to lift a no contact, what if that case goes really bad? What if there is violence and somebody gets killed? Then it's going to be why did the prosecutor agree to that? So it's hard for us in this system because we're aware of the lethality and risk factors to agree to something like this, because what if it goes bad? You know, that's -- I think for most systems people, that's an issue they have, that they struggle with.

Right, right, because it, because the evidence also that some of the research shows that this doesn't make her more safe or this false -- you know, often batterers will take that as a separation, which is one of the most dangerous times for her. It's kind of a. I don't know. It's an interesting phenomena this sense that she's safe regardless. Of course you can't put an armed guard on her at all times. So anyway nrtle, I know what you're saying as you're tinkering with it. In most cases where you see there is an extreme risk and she's hooked up with an advocate, she's not going to want that contact.

Right.

That's one of the ways that the system moves away from this one-size-fits-all, who are you dealing with and what is the likelihood that there's going to be, you know, a homicide, let's say, whether she stays or whether she leaves. I think it's really good to, to adjust that somewhat. The other thing you mentioned was, it was taking a look at the fact that it was fairly unusual to require the criminal justice system require the victim to do something, to court order the victim to something.

Right, right.

I mean, this is--

Well, first of all, they don't have any authority to order a victim to do anything. But of course we can say if you want this, you will have to do this, you know. And that's how that was accomplished. And getting that mindset away -- it goes back to putting it back on the victim, blaming the victim, judging the victim, you know, all those things start getting kicked up again into people's thinking, and again, you know, it's -- what -- she knows what it best for her. She knows what's going to keep her safe. And, you know, that's the approach that we try to take, to get--

Right. But it does kind of feed into some assumptions that the community has that, well, if she's not with them, she's safer. Of course she goes back to him, then she's stupid. It feeds into this women are stupid idea. So we'll keep working on this one, I'm assuming.

Yeah, and there's -- we'll talk more about it. There's some other slides down the way that we talk about some assumptions that we make along the way.

Right, right. So part of this trying not to make the system so onerous for victims is about this victim engagement. I think of myself if somebody came to the door today and said, okay, Rose, you can't see Chuck anymore. I know you got a house, I know you've lived together for 20-some years, I know that your finances are tied up, but that's it. You're done, right? I mean, that would be -- I wouldn't be very open to that sort of a process intervening in my life. And so that's one of the key features of a CCR, is to take a look at how -- first of all, knowing that victims are going to see them more than once likely and then how do you keep them engaged in this process? How do you keep them from feeling like you're an adversary? Looking at this slide very quickly, I want to move to the next one, because we get into the charging issues. But these are some of the things you've talked about, this input into the process, bringing advocates in, asking them what they -- what they need in the process, would they like to see them go to treatments, et cetera, you know.

Right.

The risk factors we'll be getting into, the safety plan. This is something that people are doing who have contact with her throughout, the advocates and yourself as well. You know, working

with that victim with your advocate to prepare the victim for court. And then the vertical prosecution, which is about keeping the same prosecutor on the case, right?

Right, right.

And so let's get to this, the case, because we've got about -- I don't know how much time left, but looks like we've got about if I could add in my head, about 50 minutes. We're doing pretty good on time. We wanted to save time at the end. Let's talk about the prosecution charging decisions. And on this slide, you'll see a few of these are highlighted in red. So let's look at some of the ones that are in black first and then we'll move this on. I mean, anything that you think needs explanation here? And by the way, if any of you have questions about what Matt is saying, feel free to type in your question and we'll either handle it as it comes up or maybe we'll bring it up in a slide that relates to your particular question. Okay. Anything you want to highlight in the black ones? There's -- some of them are pretty, you know, pretty easy to understand, right?

Right.

Matt, what do you want to highlight of the black ones?

And just to kind of talk about victim engagement, we skipped over that, I can't stress enough that it's always better to, on any case, but especially on domestic violence cases, to be real straight-up with the victim when you talk to her about the case. You know, just -- it's always better to be straight-up and it tends to really help. Well, factors related to victim relatability, we'll talk about that a little bit with Crawford and how we can use the evidence, so I can skip that. Consider options in declining cases, you know, we initially start out by saying every case needs to be charged. And we've learned from looking at other communities that, you know, they kind of do an assessment of their cases. What cases need to be brought into the criminal justice system? And so try to have some consistency if you're going to decline a case as to why you're declining it. The last thing you want to see is a victim uncooperative. That should never be a reason to decline a case, in my opinion. Because what we really know is they are not uncooperative necessarily, or they may appear to be uncooperative, but that is because they are incapable of participating. And if you start digging down underneath, drilling into what's going on, you find out that they are unable to for a Myriad of reasons, that we didn't know about before. So I think that's important.

You know, I see Amy Throm, hi, Amy, wants to know about victim defendants. We'll be getting to that in a little bit here. But that's one of the considerations as well. And I should probably mention that you're using pretty much the language he for defendants and she for victims. Is that -- that will come up also when we talk about victim defendants down the road. I mean, mostly what you see is cases where the victim -- the defendant is able to use violence to really establish power and control over the victim, right?

Right.

There's a context and a severity. So that's one of your prosecution charging decisions. What -- how you evaluate the history, the context and the severity, or what do you know about that?

Well, what we're finding more and more with our access to databases and records is we're able to track information on perpetrators. It's not uncommon to have a three or four-time defendant end up being a victim. That could be for any number of reasons. One is because he's figured out if I call 911 first, the best defense is a good offense. It also may be that because her options are limited, she either stays, she leaves, or she fights back. And she chose to fight back. You know, then you get into the whole predominant aggressor or maybe a self defense analysis to figure out what was really going on there when you look at that. So you have to be careful about that. And the other thing is, yeah, I am saying he and she and whatnot because that's the most common thing. Yeah, there's always exceptions. You may have a male victim. You may have a same-sex relationship. But predominantly, my numbers bear out what all the national numbers bear out, that domestic violence, if we're talking about a relationship where one person can control the other with the use of violence, it's usually a man doing that against a woman. And that's the woman who is in an intimate relationship with them.

Very good. Okay. Well, let's move on and talk about some, about risk. We've got a couple of slides related to that. I'll just address this one and then we'll get into the one that you use in Marquette County. But this is, of course, some of the information that comes from the Jackie Campbell research on lethality, and if you've got these things in place, this is a heightened risk for lethality and you've got the ones that are double asterisks in red, that makes a risk, what, five times more likely that the violence will become fatal. So we do know these things. And it's interesting. When you were talking about history, this is where domestic violence is distinctly different from other crimes in that it is this pattern crime. I mean, there's other pattern crimes. But this is a case where she's going to be probably the victim -- she will be the victim of violence more than once. And maybe it's the first time you show up and you can assume that she's been the victim before. And, you know, I think this can be hard for some jurisdictions who think that they, you know, because they are so organized, the incident-focused, just get to the scene of the domestic, look at this incident, evaluate the injuries, look at some other legal factors and then you leave. But this is, this is one of the things that I think is probably the most hopeful changes that I've seen across the country, is that there are -- there is more attention to the fact that, you know, some guys are going to be slappers and some guys may end up killing her. And in fact some guys may be slapping her and you show up for that incident, but they are actually going to be the guys who ultimately kill her. So you have to kind of go after some of these things that aren't so immediately visible, right?

Right.

I mean, in order for the prosecution to know what they are doing, they should be able to have these things sorted out. So you use the risk questions that you see on this slide, which are the open-ended risk questions. Tell us something about this, Matt. Who uses this? Is this what you -- office--

Everyone. Everyone. We've trained our police to ask these questions. Our advocates ask these questions. When the victim is contacted initially by the prosecutors advocate, they are asked these questions. And that's part of our assessment tool. It's, it's simply just a form we've developed that we ask these questions. And I ask these questions when I meet with them. The

woman I was talking about with the strangulation last week, she told me all kinds of stuff about previous law enforcement contacts where the police didn't do something and previous incidents that she didn't report to the police and we were able to corroborate a lot of those things.

Why do you prefer the open-ended questions as opposed to like the check list? The one that we just looked at, the lethality assessment, or the longer list here.

Right.

In some places they are using an abbreviated form kind of a check list thing and then triaging in some of those that come up high. Do you have a preference? Or is there any--

Well, I think that combination of the two are good, but I think it's good to get that -- rather than going down, saying has he ever used gun violence? No. Check. You know, is he estranged from the relationship? No. Does he have a job? Yes. That doesn't really tell you much. But when you ask the open-ended questions, a lot of the things that are on the check list will come out. Like the first one, do you think, do you think he -- she -- he will seriously injure or kill you or your children? What makes you think this? How frequently and seriously does he intimidate, threaten or assault you? Number two is where we get most of our information quite frankly. And number three, the time you were most frightened, you know. We find out that there were incidents that happened that may never have been reported to the police. We may find out that they went and received treatment from a doctor or a dentist and it never got referred to the police for whatever reason, and all those types of information helps corroborate your current case. And we'll talk about using other evidence in a while, but that's kind of the seeds that plant, that can grow into good evidence on a case, especially when you are dealing with a case where you may have history where the victim doesn't want to be involved with the criminal justice system or can't be involved with the criminal justice system. All of those kind of things help you build a stronger case. And then you start finding this information out and you're saying, well, this is serious. We better do something here, you know, whereas if you never ask those questions, you don't get that information, you're making decisions without knowing all the information and that's not helpful to her and that's not helpful to your response.

All right. You can see I've slipped ahead with this slide here.

I see that.

You know, got a little twitchy with my finger there. But okay. Again, we're -- this takes us away from what we were just seeing at the incident and talks about these prior incidents. I mean, what do you say to somebody who says, well, it's not my job to, you know, to look at anything besides what I see when I walk in the door? I mean, is there a principle? Is that some sort of rule of evidence? Is that -- where does that notion come from?

No. Well, you know, I heard you say that to me previously. And I've never had a cop point blank tell me when I ask them to go find out this information that's going to make our case stronger say no, I'm not going to do that. That's not my job. If he or she did, I would be talking to their supervisor. So I can understand that their attitude might be I can't help you out with what

happened a month and a half ago. Here, just to get the stuff tonight. But for follow-up is where I think it's really critical. You know, if there are prior incidents that come to light, you know, as you build the case, as you talk to the victim and get information, you should consider whether or not that is evidence that you can use, whether you might even want to add a charge, as long as it's within a reasonable period of time or not beyond the statute of limitations. So I, I can see where a police officer may have that bias or might have that kind of attitude. But if--

It's an attitude. It's not a principle of police work that now is changing?

Well, it may be a principle. I wouldn't even say it's principle. I would just say it's more they have been trained to evaluate the incident that they are called to. And they are not trained to evaluate, you know, something that happened historically. And typically they don't, you know, follow up with that. They may note it in the police report and they will pull the criminal history and you can see there's a history. But most of this here comes into play on the slide on the screen right now for what I would consider follow-up either by, you know, a good domestic violence prosecutor or by a good investigator or detective or an officer that needs to be trained. We need to strengthen our case. Can you follow up on this stuff? So they may not get this the night in question, but they would get it after.

Super. Okay. So thank you for that. Now, let's talk about these charging, tangible charging considerations. I know that you talk about both tangible and intangible. And so obviously here's a list and these are the things you would want from law enforcement then or from a follow-up investigation? I see on here you have something about jail calls. Let's have at this one, Matt. I think this is where we get to it, huh?

Yeah, exactly. I mean, you're going to have -- if it's a push or a slap versus there's blood or broken bones, that's going to make a difference, if there's injuries or not. It's not to say you wouldn't charge where there's no injuries. You know, do you have witnesses that can support the case? Were there statements taken? I don't need to read the whole list, but one area that we really focus on is when they are incarcerated is monitoring those jail calls and see what they are saying on those jail calls. And that can often lead to a witness tampering charge, an obstruction of justice charge. It can lead to a phone harassment charge, a stalking charge. Because even though there's a big sign where they make their calls, it's phone calls that are recorded, they still talk and say dumb things. So that can -- I can't tell you the number of times that we've had a case that was kind of on the fence and we listened to the jail house calls or jail house interviews or visitation because those are recorded, too, where we find some real good evidence that will tip the case to lead to a disposition. So monitoring that stuff is really good. And then--

But you know, let me ask you something here, Matt. Last week I was in Colorado with Liz and one of the things that came up about recording calls and the jailer thought, wow, that's a huge paradigm shift because they weren't recording calls because they thought for public safety they didn't want him to be, have the opportunity to commit a crime, you know, tamper with a witness. And at the same time when we were discussing forfeiture by wrongdoing, which we'll get to in a minute here, but we heard from one of the prosecutors that in order to bring it in under Crawford or, you know, to bring in a jail call threat under Crawford, you need the defendant to say very specifically, okay, if you testify at the hearing tomorrow at 5:42 in Judge Weis' Chambers, I'm

going to hurt you. They were thinking they had to be superspecific about that. Now, so what, what's your response to that? I -- for one thing, I think that one of the issues for me as an advocate is that I think that people think that it's like the no contact thing, that the victim is safer because he's not calling her, when I know in reality that she may need to know what he's thinking and what he's up to. And with him not being able, with the calls being blocked on the note here, with the calls being blocked, she doesn't know where he's at, doesn't know what he's thinking, she can't prepare. So it's maybe a faulty assumption again that she's safer. But you suggest that that can be of great use to you to get those, the recorded calls and use that in your case.

Absolutely. And prosecutors are going to vary. It's just like everything else. Everyone's going to have a different opinion. I've never encountered that specific requirement like you just outlined earlier. That's never happened to me. And I don't want to say the prosecutor's wrong, but that just to me seems a little bit beyond what is required for us to do. And so, you know, you can -- victims can block calls. They don't have to accept the call. We can have the call blocked so they can't make that call to her house, but I've had recordings where he's talking to his friend and he's telling his friend to go tell her to come to your house, bring her to your house so I can talk to her. Then they talk to her and he's saying if you testify against me, here's the bad things that are going to happen. And that's witness intimidation plain and simple. Or if you cooperate, this is going to happen and -- or just bold-faced you need to go to the prosecutors office and tell him you're not going to cooperate. You want the charges dropped. I mean, all of those things would qualify..

Right.

They should qualify.

Right, right. I'm glad you mentioned that if people have any follow-up questions, sometimes you might be stymied by a judge who says not in my courtroom, right?

Right, and I've had that happen. I've been appointed to handle prosecutions and ran into judges that aren't accustomed to these types of approaches and will not follow the rules of evidence the way they should be followed. You're stuck with that. Your options are for an appeal and take it up to a higher court and get a higher court judge. If you're certain they are not following the rules, you can get them reversed. But then you got to go back before the same judge you just got reversed and have to deal with that judge for a while. So it makes for a tough working relationship.

It's tricky, huh.

Yeah. You know, what's -- on an important enough case or a serious enough case, you would take that up and you would be willing to take it even all the way to your state court of appeals or state supreme court, which we and other jurisdictions in Michigan have done.

So then you get case law on it?

Correct. There's some really good case law on talking about the 404 B history, which is the other ex evidence. And Michigan has a unique statute that allows prior incidents of domestic violence

to be brought in in your case in chief, even if it's not against the same victim. And when that law got passed, of course local judges didn't want to follow the law, so various prosecutors' offices appealed the judge and we have some pretty good court decisions now that say, look, the prosecutor, all they have to do is show notice and bring in that evidence. And we don't even have to bring in the victim. We can bring in a cop that dealt with the case four years ago, or we can bring in a record of conviction. So that's one aspect. A lot of states are passing laws like that. The other one is just the 404 B rule, which models the federal rule of evidence, which most states follow, which says that any acts that are of common scheme, design, purpose can be brought in to show conformity therewith. If you've been violent to other victims, you can bring in evidence that you were violent -- you know, that's a tendency of their character to show they are violent, which is more likely to prove that they did what you're saying they did on this case.

Very good. I'm thinking now we got Jackie Morris from the Colorado Coalition on the line. She works obviously some of these things are the role of coalitions to be able to get some laws, too, to assist, the extra local solutions.

Absolutely.

It's always a good idea for them to take a look at what's out there and contact you for that possibility.

Right. It's right in front of you. Ironically, you asked about the cops having an attitude. I'm doing block training, which is continuing Ed training for law enforcement around the upper peninsula of Michigan four times in May and June and two are sessions on the topic that I'm teaching on is using these other acts of domestic violence and how you go about finding that evidence and also a similar statute for sexual assault against minors. If you once perpendicularly on a minor and you're charged with perpetrating on a minor sexually, that prior history comes in, too. The statutes are identical.

You know, I'm looking at the time. We want to have some time at the end, although that time is reduced, is waning. So I'm going to skip over the intangible, or philosophical charging considerations. But I wanted to also give a plug for the fact we'll be doing the Colorado coalition conference happening in June in Vail. So I don't know, Jackie, if you can put in a link or something where people can look at that, because we'll be doing a full day on some of these things as part of their work out there, working with local programs through a grant, OVW grant. Let's move ahead and talk about strategies, other strategies for holding offenders accountable, because I mean, clearly charging somebody and then charging them enough so that you don't have to dismiss all but the, you know, dismiss all the domestic violence and end up with a disorderly as part of the way to hold offenders accountable, the research shows that the more you can pile it up, I guess, if that's the right terminology, the more likely the offender is to say, oh, guess we're taking this seriously, you know. It's not just as bad as like I used to say riding your bike on the downtown mall. It's serious. They are taking this -- they are not minimizing it this time. Let's talk about some of these other strategies to hold offenders accountable. I wanted you to spend just a bit of time on this, shortening the length of time, because everywhere I go, that seems to be an issue, that the time from arrest through case disposition is very long. And as I

think about victim engagement, I mean, they want them to stop. They don't want to be -- they don't want to show up in court a year and a half later.

Right.

They want to, you know, the shorter it is, the shorter the length of time, the more likely to get a conviction, right?

Right.

How do you shorten up this time? I know -- what -- how long does it take you at this particular juncture from arrest through disposition, meaning into batterer's group?

Right. Just so we're all clear, disposition means there's a conviction, whether it's trial or plea. On misdemeanor cases, we're typically turning the case around within a month if it goes to plea. And if it goes to trial, it's two to three months at the longest. We have pretty -- most states have pretty tight standards on moving cases along. And the longer, as you said, a case is out there, the weaker it tends to become. People's memories fade. Evidence gets, you know, misplaced. Attention gets focused on the newest cases. So it's always better to move them faster. So misdemeanors on a plea, about a month or less. Felonies on a plea, probably about four to six weeks, because we want to move that case into the felony level court as soon as we possibly can. For trials on felonies, it's a little more problematic because there's more process involved. You're talking about six months if it's going to go to a trial.

But for misdemeanors, that's a really remarkably short length of time. Did you -- I mean, when you talk about plea, you're not pleading everything down to disorderly. You're--

No, no, no, no.

Okay.

No.

So you're still making these cases stick--

And what we're doing is we're charging a lot -- I mean, a lot of our DV's, we have enhancements we can add to enhance the charge to make it something more serious. Like ironically, if you beat up your wife in Michigan and then she tries to call 911 and you interfere with that telephone call, the beating up your wife is typically a 93-day misdemeanor. But the disrupting her phone call is a two-year felony. So we'll enhance that every chance we can get. And of course that's a good -- we can get a plea to a misdemeanor easily even if it is domestic violence if we agree to drop the phone charge. Or if there's history and we charge, you know, repeat offender for domestic violence, if you're a two or more prior offenses, that's a five-year felony in Michigan. You can easily get a plea to a one-year domestic violence by dropping it down from a third offender to a second offender. You know, there's things you can do there by building a stronger case to basically get people to accept their medicine, that they got to stand up and take this.

Talk some about this diversion idea. This is coming up in some places. And in fact, there's a, there's kind of a new philosophy now that you got to love them better or something, and it's coming up in the batterer's intervention world.

Right.

Where we want to, we want to give these guys a break, it's part of the bonding with them and--

They are going to lose their gun rights.

Yeah, all of that. I mean, what -- you don't do diversion, do you?

Well, no. No, and diversion is where you divert the case from the criminal justice process. Almost every state has what's called a delayed or deferred sentencing scheme, which allows for a defendant to go through the process to be on probation to be required to go to services. And that, that type of a scheme is not terrible, especially if that's something the victim wants to see done to give them a chance so that they don't have a permanent record. But I never engage in diverting cases because I'm not equipped to monitor compliance and accountability, and so just so we're clear, diversion is where you don't put it into the system. And a deferral or delayed sentence is where you put it into the system, but the people in the system who are set up to monitor compliance and accountability still, you know, they are there to make sure they go to the programing.

A guilty plea on the delayed one, right?

There's a guilty plea, yeah.

Okay, all right.

And it's required they plead guilty to get that. That's part of the philosophy, that they have to do that. So, like, you know, on a lower level offense where the victim wants to reconcile, where the victim doesn't want him to get a conviction that's going to stay on his record forever, you know, where he may have a job and it could be impacted, but they are still going to batterer's intervention services. They are still having alcohol assessments and drug assessments, if that's appropriate. They are still on probation. So I'm not opposed to that type of a thing happening if it's their first time into the system and all things being equal, the victims, the victim--

-- first time it's into the system, but you identify there's really high risk?

Well, then that's different. I would -- I would say, you know, I have said to defense attorneys, no, I won't agree to that. Most states require that the prosecutor consent to that happening. So I'll just say I won't agree to that because of these factors that are there. But you always have to balance that. Because if you have a victim and she is not able to participate in the process for whatever reason and you don't have evidence, then your option is either you do that or you dismiss it.

Right, right.

Sometimes you have to make a decision that you can't -- you don't really want to stomach, but you have to.

Right. So you're talking about the whole range then of kinds of cases and evidence and risk and all of these things you put into the hopper and figure out.

Right. Yeah, at the end of the day, we have to put our money where our mouth is, you know. And maybe try the case. That's the other thing that helps hold defenders accountable on a systemic-wide approach, is that if your defense bar knows you will try these cases and you try some of them, you know, they can go to their clients and say, look, prosecutor's not just going -- we can delay it to a trial, but you're going to go to trial and here's the risk. If you get convicted, these are all the bad things that can happen to you. Right now we're talking about minimizing your, your damage here, you know, if you agree to these things in a plea. So trying some cases is really key, I think, to getting the players in your system to understand that, yeah, there will be accountability and sometimes that accountability is that you got to go to trial.

So defense attorneys are watching and going, okay, you know, they drop these things--

We had a DV prosecutor years ago that every case got set for trial and more than half of them got dismissed on the day before trial. And everyone knew that. So they -- yeah.

Mm-hmm. You know, I see a note here that Jackie from Colorado is wondering about the criminal no-contact orders. And we did discuss that. So I'm not exactly sure what portion of that is a question, because we -- Matt did discuss that he doesn't require victims to do any kind of, you know, go to classes or go meet with anybody. In fact, right up front, his court advocate, and you yourself, Matt, you will ask the victim what are your wishes for contact, right?

Right.

And so that's -- you know, you don't require any sorts of extracurricular movement on her part. She doesn't have to do a signed statement about why she's going back, doesn't have to do an extensive safety plan with anybody. It's just a question of what she knows about her experience and what are the hardships posed. So is there anything else in that, Jackie, that you want to know? You're in there too, Liz, if you think of something we didn't cover.

And we can go on and give Jackie time to type in on that, too.

So with that in mind, let us do go on. We don't have the, we don't -- this is not a strategy for holding an offender accountable, but it's an issue that comes up, and that is, you know, about guns. So I don't know, that's a real tough one in Minnesota, probably Michigan, too. Just about everywhere I've been in the rural area, somebody's got to kill something in the fall. So that's an extreme impediment to I think batterers admitting guilt, let's say, or getting on with their lives and doing something different in regard to their domestic violence when it's, when the court's

involved. I mean, what do you -- do you have any words of wisdom on that and let's say make that like a two-sentence answer?

I don't know I can make that a two-sentence answer.

Okay. Well, let's just move on and you'll think about it and maybe we'll have time at the end. Maybe it's not something we need to discuss, right. But I wanted to talk about this piece making sure we had enough time to talk about how do we -- I mean, because this is where -- this is the crux of the biscuit. Usually women that had to say in front of their batterer, I want him arrested, and we all knew that was wrong because of course you didn't do it for obvious reasons because she would have to pay for that and yet we got this bottleneck in the criminal justice system now where there's all these cases that fail to be prosecuted because she doesn't want to get up there in open court and say I'll talk about all these bad things that happened to her for the same reasons, you know. It's risky for her. So you have been doing a lot of cases that have reduced reliance on her direct testimony. So I think this is some of the things -- this is where advocates perk up because we all know this is a very onerous thing for her to have to do. Talk to us about this, these cases and building a case which reduces reliance on the victim having to confront her abuser.

Sure. The -- well, like I talked about before, the jail calls and the jail visitation that's recorded, if we can show that there's been wrongdoing by the defendant that's aimed at the victim, we can file a motion to have the defendant's rights forfeited because of their wrongdoing. And I just did this in February and on my last domestic violence jury trial, where I brought in evidence of what this defendant had said. He made statements to the victim such as, you know, I look forward to you testifying in court because I'm going to bury you in court. I'm going to bring in 25 people who make you out to be a liar. And the judge agreed that that was, you know, witness tampering and intimidation to the witness. So the other area that some prosecutors I know in Michigan and I think in other states are doing also is that they are kind of parsing the Crawford decision down to the bare bones. And some interpretations of it are that the Fifth Amendment right to confront your witness only requires that they be produced to testify. So in other words, if I have a victim that I'm working with and she -- I explain to her I'm going to call you and I can't force you to talk, but I expect that you will and I produce her for trial and she doesn't want to or can't participate, an interpretation of Crawford is that then those statements that may be here say exceptions that were said on the night of the investigation could be admitted through the testimony of your officers. The other thing is that the courts are looking at is this a testimonial or a non-testimonial statement, and things that are said to dispatchers are often found to be non-testimonial. So her call for help as to what's going on at the time don't fall under Crawford one said to a radio dispatcher. There's ways to get evidence in that way.

What about gone on arrivals? If, if -- what I mean by that is the cops show up and he's gone and so they are not really doing -- taking her -- not really investigating or getting statements from her, but testimonial, still the ongoing emergency.

Right.

Can you bring those in on Crawford, too?

I think you could. I've not had that circumstance arise specifically. I think that's probably something that other jurisdictions are seeing and you might be seeing more in larger jurisdictions. But I would be willing to make that argument. It's always kind of dicey. When you're getting to trial, if your victim is -- I hate using the word "cooperative." I'll just say on board or not on board. You know, you really have to make an assessment, what's the best thing here? Why is she not on board and we're going all the way to a trial? And try to balance out victim safety versus the accountability. When I prosecuted a lot of cases without victim testimony before Crawford, and I got a lot of anecdotal feedback from advocates and victims that they were not disappointed that I prosecuted the case and they weren't disappointed that they didn't have to participate. You know, and I don't have any real scientific evidence that says, yeah, we should take this approach or not take this approach. And that to me is a tough call when you could get your case to the jury, but you don't have a victim who is on board so to speak. And I don't want to -- I mean, I'm not using that in a negative way toward her.

Yeah, yeah.

So that's -- you know, that kind of gets a little dicey. I think prosecutors struggle with that idea. A lot of prosecutors, if she's not on board, not even going to contemplate going to a jury trial.

Right, right.

So that's where--

Do you use expert witnesses?

Yes, yeah.

Okay. -- or not?

It's pretty common. It's not uncommon. You know, I probably used expert witnesses six to 12 times in my career on domestic violence cases or domestic violence and sexual assault, avengement partner cases over the years. We used to think that we had to get, you know, the MSW who works for the women's studies at the university of Michigan. And what we found is that some of our best expert witnesses are when we get an advocate from another jurisdiction who has a wealth of experience to come in and talk about domestic violence dynamics. Those seem to work the best, because they are--

You know, I'm -- sorry, about to end here, but I'm looking at the time again.

Yeah, go ahead.

And I know that we could probably do a whole webinar on this whole, this slide right here. So I'm thinking in fact, Liz, that we should see if people want something like that. And we'll talk some about that, too, next time. Because when Marcus comes on, who is law enforcement, he'll be talking about what cops do and can do to help you to, you know, to achieve these kinds of factors in bringing in a case, right? So let's -- couple more slides. One of them is about who does

what to whom with what impact and strategies with victim defendants. And before we do, I just wanted to say that Jackie got back and said she--

Yeah, I saw that.

Yeah, and I think there was some confusion when we were in Colorado that they have an automatic criminal protection order, which can include no contact. So it's not automatic no contact orders as in their law. But a lot of them are doing these automatic no contact orders anyway and then requiring victims to do these sorts of extracurricular, you got to go and meet with an advocacy program three times or you got to do a safety plan and all that sort of thing. But there's -- you know, there is obviously leeway even within the Colorado statute, but there is nothing that I have known, except maybe Oregon where they absolutely have to -- it's in the law, no contact.

Yeah, and full disclosure so that we're clear, I think I can do this real short. No contact conditions are put on all the bonds on all of our cases when they are first authorized. But it's within the 24 to 48 hours that we are having this conversation with the victim, which is then on our say so, the court will change it if that's what we want to do on behalf of the victim.

And that's at first appearance, right?

Well, they are charged today, we're talking to the victim tomorrow, and then, you know, tomorrow if we agree that it's valid to lift it, then we'll let the judge know tomorrow. So it's going to be lifted as soon as a day, you know. But it is automatically put on at the front end. When the case is authorized by the court, when the prosecutor issues the warrant, it's pretty automatic. And it's -- in the interim situation, the guy gets arrested last night, he's lodged, his interim bond says no contact. And that's the default.

Yeah, yeah.

But we address it right away.

Okay. Super. So let's -- I'm looking at this prosecution strategies with victim defendants. And Amy asked the question about that back when. And I know that this is one of the things that we could bring up and talk about more thoroughly next time, too, when we have got Marcus from law enforcement on the line, because I mean, I think partly you rely on law enforcement sorting some of these things out, too, that they go in and do -- obviously they look at self defense and predominant aggressor stuff. But it is an issue with, with a lot of places, where we're seeing a lot of, lot of women being arrested and when we look -- when we talk to these women, we find out a lot of them, the majority are victims in domestic violence cases. We know when she's arrested, we don't end the battering that she's the victim of. In fact, we probably increase it. So, you know, if you -- do you do some sort of -- will be using violence that is illegal and you can't just drop it just because she's not -- do you do any kind of specialized prosecution strategy with defendants? And you have a minute to answer.

The answer is yes, we do. Right now we have a case where I have a Filipino woman who is a mail order bride who we suspect may be a sex slave and may be part -- may fall under human trafficking. And she used a knife. She didn't stab him, but she used a knife against him. She got charged with felony level assault. And we're assessing that case right now and we're going to sit down and do an interview with her and her attorney to find out the history because we've been told there's a history of violence by him against her and possibly human trafficking for sex.

Yeah, what was your first clue, right?

Yeah, even us up here figure these ones out.

Yeah, yeah, right? So okay, good. And again, let's talk some more on that next time. And then we have a slide here about what you need from others. You will be talking about this and have discussed this somewhat already with dispatch, jail, law enforcement advocate. We haven't discussed probation much or judges. Got a couple comments on that. Then we just have about 4 minutes to see if there's any outstanding questions. And again, tune in next time or let us know in advance and say, okay, I want some more on this. Because pretty generally what you're talking about is going to have some association with law enforcement. I mean, you and law enforcement, prosecutor and law enforcement is like the bass player and a drummer in a band, aren't you?

Yeah. Well, most people don't realize but your prosecuting attorney is the chief law enforcement official for the district. We are integrally related and we often give training and advice to the police and, you know, the police love it when we tell them this is what we want, what we think you should do so that we can have a better case so that we can get convictions. You know, and just hearing what they have to say and communicating with them is almost as important as communicating with your community-based programs.

All right. So judges, sentence?

Judges get educated over time.

Okay. That's your sentence. Next, probation?

Probation, probation, probation departments, once they understand the issue and the need for batterers intervention services, not anger management, they are usually on board. They want to see people be held accountable and to change their behavior.

Now, really, I gave such short shift to judges and I'm sorry for that, but we don't have the time. But the national council on juvenile and family court judges has information about judges. And I know what you're saying about educating judges over time because one of the things that they talk about is that judges learn by having a lot of stuff in front of them that talks about risk and history and all these other things we've been talking about. So it's part of this integrated, coordinated response where, you know, you don't -- they don't sit there with nothing in front of them. You know, they sit with all the information about what they are dealing with.

Can I say something real quick?

Yeah, yeah.

My best judge is a judge who is a real big time defense attorney previously. He's been on the bench about 10 years now. And he started out and we had a steep learning curve. But he's now the best judge that I've ever practiced in front of for not buying into the games and for holding these kind of cases, these offenders accountable.

All right. Super. Okay. It doesn't look like there's any outstanding questions. And so again, if you have them, let us know in advance, if it's something we can weave into the call with Matt next time on the 19th, we'll do that. And I think that there is really only a few things left to do, a few slides. Here's our contact info. And then Liz, did you have any closing statements?

I do, just a couple. So I have sent out a few PDF versions of this presentation to people who have requested it. If there are still some of you in this webinar that would like a copy to take back to your team or share with your prosecutor or whatever the case may be, it's not too late. Send an e-mail to me, Liz@praxisinternational.org, and I'll be happy to pass that on. As Rose has referenced, the next time we will be together for part 2 of this customized TA, like mini webinar series is Tuesday, May 19, when as she said, Marcus Bruneing will be with us to talk about the essential role of law enforcement and a coordinated community response and our presenters will be Matt and Rose from today, in addition to Marcus. If you haven't registered for that session yet, it's not too late. Just simply go to the publicity that you got a week ago and you will find the registration link there. And remember, we strongly encourage you to participate with your local kind of systems people to invite them to the session or perhaps forward this publicity on to them to encourage them to join. The last thing I have to say besides great thanks to Matt and Rose that was really instructive and helpful, is to let you know that when you disconnect from the webinar you'll be routed to a very brief evaluation and of course as we just so value your input, so if you can spare just two minutes, jot down your thoughts and let us know how helpful this was to you in terms of getting what it was that you really need for your own communities. So if you have other ideas or topics, don't be shy. So Rose and Matt, I will look forward to being with the two of you again on May 19, Tuesday the 19th. And we hope that all of you from all of these various CCR communities will be back with us at that time too.

Thank you, Liz. Thank you, Matt.

Thank you, everybody. Take good care.

Bye-bye.

Bye-bye.

[event concluded]

This project is supported by Grant #2011-TA-AX-K103 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed during this webinar are those of the author/presenter(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Justice.