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Chapter 205: Including Pets in Domestic Violence
Protective Orders

Regina Cabral Jones

Code Section Affected

Family Code § 6320 (amended).
SB 353 (Kuehl); 2007 STAT. Ch. 205.

I. INTRODUCTION

After years of abuse and control, Susan Walsh knew it was time to leave her husband. She had tried to leave before, but something always kept her from running. What could make her stay with her abuser? It was the fear of returning to her thirty-two acre farm in Maine and finding another one of her beloved animals horribly maimed or killed. When she had threatened to leave in the past, her husband had retaliated “by running over her blind and deaf border collie . . . , shooting two sheep, and wringing the necks of her prized turkeys.” “It wasn’t just the cats and the dogs I had, it was the sheep and the chickens—I was terrified for their welfare,” she said. “I knew if I were to leave, he wouldn’t hesitate to kill them. He had done it before.”

Experts say stories like Susan Walsh’s are not unusual. Research has established that pets are often used as weapons of coercion and control in abusive relationships. Chapter 205 provides victims with a defense to this destructive and cruel manipulation by explicitly allowing courts to extend protective orders over the companion animals of those who have been victimized.

II. LEGAL BACKGROUND

The Family Code currently allows the courts to issue ex parte protective orders against the perpetrators of domestic violence. Protective orders include
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stay-away orders and orders prohibiting specific acts of abuse,11 as well as “other specified behavior.”12 Protective orders can be issued by a court13 or, in the case of an emergency, by a judicial officer over the telephone.14 Courts can also restrict an abuser’s custody and visitation rights to minor children,15 and his or her rights to “use, possess[, and control . . . real or personal property.”16

While protective orders generally cover the victim, a court can extend the order to include “other named family or household members” upon a showing of good cause.17 Prior to Chapter 205, however, the statute fell short of explicitly allowing a court to extend protection to family pets.18

III. CHAPTER 205

The Legislature declares in Chapter 205 that there is a connection “between animal abuse, family violence, and other forms of community violence.”19 This bill amends existing law to add animals to the list of victims that can receive the benefit of a protective order.20

20. CAL. FAM. CODE § 6320(b) (amended by Chapter 205).
Specifically, Chapter 205 allows the court to,

[on a showing of good cause[,...] include in a protective order a grant to the petitioner of the exclusive care, possession, or control of any animal owned, possessed, leased, kept, or held by either the petitioner or the respondent or a minor child residing in the residence or household of either the petitioner or the respondent.21

The court may also “order the respondent to stay away from the animal and forbid the respondent from taking, transferring, encumbering, concealing, molesting, attacking, striking, threatening, harming, or otherwise disposing of the animal.”22 Chapter 205 also requires the Judicial Council to modify its existing protective order forms to comply with the new law by July 1, 2009.23

IV. ANALYSIS OF CHAPTER 205

Abusers commonly use the threat of violence against a beloved pet to wield control over a victim.24 Abusers take advantage of victims’ vulnerability and the bond they have with their pets, just as abusers do with victims’ children.25 Chapter 205 combats this problem by allowing for protective court orders of “any animal owned, possessed, leased, kept, or held.”26 The term “animal” is not
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defined in Chapter 205; however, the language of the statute is broad enough to apply not only to pets but also to animals such as show dogs or race horses.\textsuperscript{27} Some have criticized the potential for misuse of the protective order, such as in retaliation for other issues, to gain control in divorce proceedings, and, in the case of show animals, for financial gain.\textsuperscript{28} However, Chapter 205 specifically calls for a "showing of good cause" before a court can issue such an order, which would give the respondent the opportunity to argue against the order before the judge.\textsuperscript{29}

The only registered opposition to Chapter 205 was the Family Law Section of the California State Bar, which argued that the bill should be amended to require the court to allow "brief and peaceful contact as required for court-ordered visitation with children, unless a criminal protective order says otherwise."\textsuperscript{30} However, the current Judicial Council form for domestic violence protective orders\textsuperscript{31} already includes this language in an optional checkbox and can easily be modified to include pets.\textsuperscript{32} To include such language in the statute could compromise the court's discretion and, according to Chapter 205's supporters, is unnecessary.\textsuperscript{33}

Chapter 205 may have a significant impact on local agencies. Including animals in protective orders will require state agencies to work together to stop the cycle of domestic violence against children and animals.\textsuperscript{34} California is currently the only state that mandates (rather than merely permits) cross-reporting among social welfare agencies.\textsuperscript{35} Animal control and humane society officers are among the mandated reporters listed in the statute.\textsuperscript{36} While mandating cross-reporting is key to stopping domestic violence as soon as the signs are detected, cross-reporting can be time consuming and costly.
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Despite these concerns, Chapter 205 makes strides toward addressing the established connection between animal abuse and family violence, commonly referred to as the "Link." One of the first studies that described this Link found that of a survey of women with pets who had entered a shelter in northern Utah, seventy-one percent reported that their partner had threatened or actually hurt or killed one or more of their pets. Another study of fifty of the largest shelters in the United States found that eighty-five percent of battered women and sixty-three percent of children with pets had experienced incidents of pet abuse. If these figures are extrapolated nationwide, then there are potentially hundreds of thousands of people suffering from this especially twisted form of abuse.

Perhaps the most alarming of these studies’ findings is that a substantial percentage of these victims feel that they cannot leave their abuser because they worry for the safety of their pets. The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) affirms these findings, stating that “domestic violence victims report delaying the decision to go to a shelter or pursue other safety measures out of concern for the pet they would leave behind.” Prior to Chapter 205, even if a victim was able to relocate his or her pet to a safe place...


38. Frank R. Ascione, Battered Women's Reports of Their Partners' and Their Children's Cruelty to Animals, 1 J. EMOTIONAL ABUSE 119, 125 (1998) [hereinafter Ascione, Battered Women’s Reports].
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Caution must be exercised in generalizing from this study’s sample to state and national samples; however, extrapolation of this study’s findings may help estimate the scope of the potential problem. For example, two million is a conservative estimate of the number of U.S. women assaulted by their male partners each year. If half of these women have companion animals (again, a conservative estimate), 71% partner cruelty to animals represents hundreds of thousands of families where companion animal victimization, actual or threatened, is part of the landscape of terror to which some women are exposed.

41. Frank R. Ascione et al., Battered Pets and Domestic Violence: Animal Abuse Reported by Women Experiencing Intimate Violence and by Nonabused Women, 13 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN 354, 364 (2007) (stating that a substantial portion of the women surveyed in shelters did not leave sooner because of their concern for their pets’ welfare); see also Catherine A. Faver & Elizabeth B. Strand, To Leave or to Stay?: Battered Women’s Concern for Vulnerable Pets, 18 J. INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE 1367, 1374 (2003) (stating that over twenty-five percent of battered women surveyed reported that concern for their pets affected their decision to stay or leave their abuser); Ascione, Battered Women’s Reports, supra note 38, at 125 (stating that, in a sample of women with companion animals entering battered women’s shelters, nearly one in five (eighteen percent) reported that they had delayed entering the shelter because of concerns over the welfare of their pet).

42. ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY, COMMITTEE ANALYSIS OF SB 353, at 7 (June 19, 2007).
and secure a restraining order for themselves and their children, the danger still remained that the abuser might hurt or kill the animal to punish the victim for leaving. As one new counselor at a battered women’s shelter related,

What I wasn’t prepared for were the pictures my first client brought to show me, apologetically, to explain why she had to return home. The pictures were of her “loving” husband cutting her beloved dog’s ears off with a pair of garden shears. He had sent the ears along, too . . . .

These studies, numerous other anecdotal reports, and news stories of actual or threatened animal abuse in violent households comprise a large and disturbing body of evidence demonstrating that the need for Chapter 205 is very real. The ability of victims to ensure that their pet is included in a protective order is an essential step toward eliminating the cycle of domestic violence.

Chapter 205 is also conducive to improving victims’ perception of law enforcement. Some victims of domestic violence report that the lackluster police response to complaints of animal abuse have contributed to their feelings of “isolation and helplessness.” When a domestic violence victim reaches out to law enforcement for help only to be confronted by a lackluster response, the victim may in turn come to marginalize his or her own abuse, allowing the abuser to capitalize upon the victim’s resulting sense of powerlessness. Chapter 205 addresses this by statutorily recognizing the seriousness of animal abuse, affirming its inherent connection to domestic violence and child abuse, and providing a legal remedy for victims to pursue.

While Chapter 205 is a step towards helping people leave violent relationships, it does not explicitly address what actually happens to the animal when a victim is finally able to flee his or her abuser. One study found that only
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51. See CAL. FAM. CODE § 6320(b) (amended by Chapter 205); Ascione et al., The Abuse of Animals
27.1 percent of domestic violence shelters ask about pets in the home on their intake forms.52 Many emergency housing shelters are not able to accommodate animals at all and those that are may be able to shelter animals for only a short period of time.53 The ability to secure a restraining order for a pet is an important first step, but without the accompanying public support infrastructure, it may not be enough.

One solution may be to develop a “Safe Havens for Animals” program in the community.54 These programs provide those who advocate against domestic violence with the framework and resources to assist victims with safety planning for their companion animals, particularly with respect to referring the animals to local shelters, clinics, and foster families who elect to participate.55 There are currently eight such programs in California.56 Another program in Columbus, Ohio takes victims’ pets and places them in a women’s prison, where the inmates care for them.57 This program has the dual benefit of encouraging more victims to leave their abusers, knowing that their animals will be safe, and of rehabilitating prisoners, who get the positive experience of responsibility and animal companionship.58 As the founder of the Ohio program recently stated, “I think

---

52. Ascione et al., The Abuse of Animals and Domestic Violence, supra note 39, at 212.

53. In an informal survey the author conducted of emergency shelters in the Sacramento area, two shelters stated that they do not accept pets and noted that no shelters they knew of in the area accepted animals. River City Community Services (RCCS) offers motel vouchers for those without shelter, but the motel does not accept pets. RCCS mentioned that although they are not a domestic violence-specific shelter, they do indeed see many cases of families trying to escape domestic violence. The Sacramento Area Emergency Housing Center (SAEHC) does not accept pets. does not inquire about pets on their intake forms, and does not collaborate with animal shelters except to refer individuals to the Animal Emergency Services program at Loaves and Fishes. According to SAEHC, the Loaves and Fishes program is the only facility in the Sacramento area that will take care of pets. This program is a dog and cat daycare kennel program, offering pet food, vaccinations, urgent medical care, and spay and neuter programs for the pets of homeless people. However, as it is only a day service, the pet’s owner must pick them up in the evening, which may not be an option for victims seeking shelter.


55. Id. at 2, 4.


57. Belluck, supra note 1.

everywhere there’s a woman’s safe house there needs to be a safe pets program. 59 For victims who are experiencing incredible anxiety and fear over their own abuse, the knowledge that their pet will be taken care of could be the tipping point toward freeing them from the bonds of their abusive relationship. 60

Regardless of whether the Legislature opts to pursue these programs, one thing is certain: these issues require close collaboration between law enforcement, domestic violence shelters, and animal welfare organizations. 61 For instance, in Baltimore, Maryland, the police department requires its officers to look for signs of animal abuse every time a domestic violence incident is reported. 62 It will take the concerted efforts of all social service agencies to implement such collaborative policies for California to stem the epidemic of violence against adults, children, and their animals. 63

V. CONCLUSION

Chapter 205 will give back some of the power taken from the individuals and families who are struggling with the decision to leave their abuser. It allows California courts to make very clear that animal abuse, and its heinous effects on families, children, and the animals themselves, will not be tolerated. 64 The thousands of victims who are today weighing the decision to leave, aware of the potentially devastating effects upon their pets and their families, now have an opportunity to take that important step with the assurance that their pets will enjoy the same protection as their children and their property. 65 Hopefully, California social service agencies will respond to this important development by collaborating with each other, with private individuals, and with other organizations to create a network within which victims and their beloved pets may be kept safe. Maybe then there will be fewer stories like Susan Walsh’s. 66
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