

GEORGIA



Family Violence Newsletter



Governor's Office for
Children and Families

>>> OUR MISSION

The goal of PAC's Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Program is to effectively assist and be a resource to prosecutors, law enforcement and victim advocates across Georgia, and to improve the effective adjudication of domestic and sexual violence cases and to reduce such crimes across our state.

>>> CONTENTS



2014 Victim Witness Assistance Program Conference
Savannah, Georgia
August 13-15, 2014

The goal of the VWAP Conference was to provide advocates the tools to better serve victims by providing them with innovative training on the issues that affect advocates and victims in Georgia

feature articles	
CaseLaw Update	2
2014 Georgia Domestic Violence Benchbook	4
Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Resources for Prosecutors	5
Upcoming Training Events	6

A PUBLICATION OF THE PROSECUTING ATTORNEYS' COUNCIL OF GEORGIA
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT PROGRAM

2014 Victim Witness Assistance Program Conference

By Sharla D. Jackson, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Resource Prosecutor, Prosecuting Attorneys' Council of Georgia

The Prosecuting Attorneys' Council (PAC) and the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) sponsored a Victim Witness Assistance Program Conference in Savannah, Georgia. More than 150 victims' advocates from prosecutors' offices from throughout the State of Georgia attended the conference, which took place from August 13-15, 2014.

The goal of the conference was to provide advocates the tools to better serve victims by providing them with innovative training on the issues that affect advocates and victims in Georgia. To this end, a training subcommittee composed of prosecution-based advocates and prosecutors collaborated on a curriculum that brought in experts from around the state to provide advocates with the necessary tools to provide excellent victim services. Expert trainers from throughout the state educated and inspired attendees by providing presentations on a variety of topics including "Crime Victim's Compensation," "The Crime Victim's Bill of Rights," "Office Safety," and "Professionalism." Other benefits of the training included opportunities for professional development, improved service delivery to victims and increased morale for advocates.

Chuck Spahos, the Executive Director of the Prosecuting Attorneys' Council of Georgia said, "Networking and sharing of best practices and information between judicial circuits could only be achieved in a conference setting. By providing our advocates with the opportunity to interact with presenters that are experts in

their field as well as with other advocates, our VWAP advocates are better equipped to deliver excellent services to victims of crime in our state."

VWAP advocates have been an underserved part of the prosecution team. Advocate specific training was sorely needed as the last VWAP conference was held in 2005. Since then, budget restrictions limited advocate training opportunities to a track at PAC's Summer Conference in 2009. The Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) grant, as administered by the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, allowed PAC to reimburse travel expenses for attendees, allowing more VWAP advocates to attend this important conference. This statewide training enabled PAC to provide unified, consistent training for all attending VWAP providers in a cost

"Networking and sharing of best practices and information between judicial circuits could only be achieved in a conference setting. By providing our advocates with the opportunity to interact with presenters that are experts in their field as well as with other advocates, our VWAP advocates are better equipped to deliver excellent services to victims of crime in our state."

effective manner. PAC hopes to sponsor a 2015 VWAP Conference if funding is available. For further information or to access conference materials, please visit www.pacga.org.



Victims' Advocates enjoyed networking with their colleagues.

CaseLaw Update

By Sharla D. Jackson, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Resource Prosecutor,
Prosecuting Attorneys' Council of Georgia

Johnson v. State

AI4A0320 (July 15, 2014)

Defendant was indicted on rape and aggravated assault charges. A Chatham County jury convicted the defendant of rape and acquitted him of aggravated assault charges. Defendant appealed the trial court's denial of his motion for mistrial based on alleged discovery violations by the State, the admission of hearsay testimony and the admission of two prior convictions for impeachment purposes.

The defendant lived in the home of his ex-girlfriend R.L. and her daughter L.L. On March 23, 2009, the defendant came out of his bedroom and ordered L.L. to get up from the couch. He then grabbed her by the neck and forced her to go into her mother's bedroom where he pulled down her pants and forcibly had sexual intercourse with her. Afterwards, L.L. went into the bathroom for a short while and then ran to a friend's home nearby where she called her mother screaming, telling her that the defendant had raped her. Her mother called the police who responded to her house. The defendant was arrested and charged with rape and aggravated assault.

The defendant wrote R.L. a letter, apologizing for the rape, explaining that he had blacked out after consuming drugs and alcohol.

During the trial, R. L. produced this letter for the State after the victim testified. The defendant moved for exclusion of the evidence, or for a mistrial on the grounds that the State failed to provide the defense with the letter ten days prior to trial pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 17-16-4(c). The trial court complied with the statute by allowing defense counsel additional time to review the letter and to adjust their trial strategy in light of the newly discovered evidence. The Court held that there was no abuse of discretion in denying the defendant's motion for mistrial where there was no bad faith on the part of the State because it complied with O.C.G.A. § 17-16-4(c) immediately upon receipt of the letter.

The Court found nonreversible error in the trial court's admission of the victim's prior consistent statements to a state trooper where the statements were used to refute the defendant's assertion that the victim fabricated the rape allegation. During the State's examination of the responding officer, the State elicited testimony from the arresting officer about the victim's statements to him about what had happened to her. Overruling the defendant's objection that the witness' response was inadmissible hearsay, the trial court allowed the officer to answer, giving

details of what the victim told him about the rape. The State contended that the statements were admissible to refute the defendant's theory of fabrication. However, the Court found that because the State elicited this testimony on direct examination to bolster the victim's credibility and not to rehabilitate her after the defense attacked her veracity, the Court held the admission of this evidence to be improper. As there was other evidence, establishing the same facts, the court held that the erroneous admission did not require reversal.

The Court also found that the trial court erred in admitting the defendant's prior burglary convictions pursuant to O.C.G.A. § 24-9-84.1, without making a finding on the record that showed that the court had conducted an analysis weighing the probative value of admitting the convictions against their prejudicial effect. Nevertheless, the Court found this error to be harmless because there was sufficient evidence admitted in this case that there was reasonable probability that the admission of the prior convictions would not have changed the outcome of the trial.

State v. Crossen

328 Ga. App. LEXIS 198, (July 10, 2014)

The defendant pled guilty to six counts of sexual exploitation of a child, one count of sodomy, six counts of misdemeanor dissemination of pornography to a minor and one count of interference with custody.

The State appealed the trial court's sentencing order which deviated from the minimum mandatory sentencing requirements under O.C.G.A. § 17-10-6.2(b).

The defendant was involved in a relationship with a 16-year-old girl, where he exchanged sexually explicit pictures and text messages with her. He also engaged in consensual oral sodomy with her in a public park on one occasion.

The trial court requested a presentence investigation and held two presentence hearings at which the State failed to produce any evidence in aggravation of the sentence or any victim impact statements.

At the first sentencing hearing, the trial court sentenced the defendant to seven years to serve five in custody on each of the six sexual exploitation of children counts and on the sodomy count, twelve months to serve on each of the six pornography dissemination counts, and one month to serve on the interference with custody count. After realizing that it had the discretion to deviate from the minimum statutory sentence, the court held the second sentencing hearing. At that hearing, the trial court determined that it had the discretion

under OCGA § 17-10-6.1(c) to sentence the defendant to less than the minimum statutory sentences on all of the charges against him except the sodomy count. The trial court heard arguments and resentenced the defendant, reducing his sentence on the six charges of sexual exploitation from seven years with five to serve in custody to five years with two to serve in custody.

In sentencing the defendant, the trial court considered the six factors enumerated under O.C.G.A. 17-10-6.2(c)(1)(A)-(F) — in imposing the sentence, which are:

(A) The defendant has no prior conviction of an offense prohibited by Chapter 6 of Title 16 or Part 2 of Article 3 of Chapter 12 of Title 16, nor a prior conviction for any offense under federal law or the laws of another state or territory of the United States which consists of the same or similar elements of offenses prohibited by Chapter 6 of Title 16 or Part 2 of Article 3 of Chapter 12 of Title 16;

(B) The defendant did not use a deadly weapon or any object, device, or instrument which when used offensively against a person would be likely to or actually did result in serious bodily injury during the commission of the offense;

(C) The court has not found evidence of a relevant similar transaction;

(D) The victim did not suffer any intentional physical harm during the commission of the offense;

(E) The offense did not involve the transportation of the victim; and

(F) The victim was not physically restrained during the commission of the offense.

The trial court ruled that the statute's requirements were satisfied and it was therefore justified in deviating from the mandatory minimum sentence.

Finally, the trial court held that, contrary to the State's contention, the defendant did not bear the burden of proving his entitlement to the deviation. Instead, the court held, "the statute itself contemplates a failure of proof on the part of the State," and held that placing the burden of proof on the defendant "would be burden shifting and unconstitutional."

The Court ruled that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in construing the statute to place the burden of establishing the absence of factors to permit a downward departure from the statute's sentencing scheme on the state, as well settled law construes the ambiguous language of a criminal statute in favor of the defendant.

Shields v. State

328 Ga. App. 100 (2014)

A jury convicted the defendant of multiple counts of aggravated battery (family violence) and aggravated assault (family violence). He appealed the convictions, contesting the trial court's denial of his motion in limine to prevent reference to his status as a parolee. He further asserted that the trial court erred in considering a prior conviction when sentencing him as a recidivist.

The victim married the defendant while he was in prison. Upon his release on parole, after five months of living together, they began an argument during which the defendant threw a chair at her, causing injuries. She went to the doctor and reported the incident to the defendant's parole officer. The parole officer attempted to arrest the defendant but was unable to locate him. When the victim returned home, the defendant was there waiting for her. He attacked the victim, stabbing her in the chest with a pair of scissors, attacked her with a table; broke her wrist and sprayed her with mace. When the defendant learned that the victim had been speaking to his parole officer, he attacked her again, hitting her with a lamp and threatened to kill her by holding a knife to her throat.

At trial, the State presented evidence that the defendant became enraged when he learned that the victim had been in contact with his parole officer. The Court affirmed the trial court's admission of this evidence, specifically the court held that evidence that the defendant was on parole did not place his character in issue, because it was used to prove his motive for attacking the victim.

The defendant also contested the trial court's consideration of a contested conviction when sentencing him as a recidivist. According to the defendant, the plea upon which the conviction was based was not voluntary and the State did not meet its burden in proving it so. The Court held that once the State admitted a certified copy of the conviction, which was signed by the defendant and his counsel at the time of the plea, the burden of proof shifted to the defendant. As the defendant did not produce any evidence disputing the voluntariness of the plea, the admission of a prior conviction was upheld.

Young v. State

327 Ga. App. 852 (2014)

The defendant was convicted by a jury of violating the Computer or Electronic Pornography and Child Exploitation Prevention Act of 2007, Computer Child Exploitation, and attempting to commit the felonies of aggravated child molestation and child molestation.

The defendant argued that the trial court erroneously excluded his expert's testimony that he was not predisposed to commit the crimes as charged, the denial of his right to

be present during bench conferences, the trial court gave improper jury instructions and his sentencing on multiple counts.

The defendant visited Craigslist, seeking sexual companionship. He responded to an ad placed by a police investigator working on an FBI task force who was posing as a male, "wishing to teach the finer aspects of life to a young female friend of his." After learning more about his potential child partners, aged 12 and 14 years old, the defendant negotiated a time and place to meet with the "girls." The defendant agreed to meet them at a hotel, where he was arrested. In his car was a pack of condoms and some wine coolers.

The defendant sought to support his sole defense of entrapment through admitting the testimony of an expert who would testify that he was not predisposed to have sexual contact with underage children. The trial court refused to allow this testimony. The Court affirmed, holding that in general, expert testimony that a defendant does not have the psychological characteristics of a person who is predisposed to having sexual contact with underage children is inadmissible as it invades the province of the jury as to the ultimate issue. "... [T]he jury must make the journey from evidence to conclusion without the aid of expert testimony." As this testimony would have addressed the ultimate issue, defendant's guilt or innocence, it was properly excluded.

The Court also held because the defendant failed to object to his not being present during bench conferences and his attorney shared with him what was happening he waived appellate review of this issue.

The Court found that there was sufficient evidence to support the guilty verdict. Following *State v. Cosmo*, which held that O.C.G.A. 16-12-100.2 does not require direct communication with a child, the Court stated that, "[j]ust as solicitation of prostitution can be made through a third party pimp, solicitation of a child to commit the acts prohibited by O.C.G.A. § 16-12-00.2(d)(1) may be conducted through an adult intermediary who is believed to be in a position of trust or authority with respect to the child."

In addition, the defendant appealed the trial court's refusal to give an instruction on "mere preparation." The Court held that the trial court's jury charges were not erroneous as the evidence showed that the defendant did more than just prepare, by using the computer to respond to the Craigslist ad, sending emails and arranging a meeting with the purported victims. This made the issue of the defendant's intent to commit the crime undisputed and the charge was factually inapplicable.

Finally, the defendant also contested his sentencing on charges related to the fictitious victims. The defendant was indicted on computer child exploitation, attempted aggravated child molestation and attempted child molestation for each of the two victims. The Court held that because the evidence showed that each charge was a separate and

distinct crime, the sentences did not merge. The Court also held that because the defendant was convicted of attempting to commit the crimes as charged, the fact that he did consummate them did not "decriminalize his conduct." Where there was sufficient evidence to show that the defendant took substantial steps toward his goal of molesting the victims and he believed while he was communicating via computer that the victims were children, there was no need for the involvement of actual minors and the trial court's sentence was appropriate.

Mowoe v. State

2014 Ga. App. LEXIS 499 (July 10, 2014)

The defendant was indicted on charges of rape, false imprisonment and burglary. The jury deadlocked on the burglary and false imprisonment charges and convicted the defendant of rape. The defendant moved for a new trial alleging that the State, while conducting a demonstration during its closing argument, improperly admitted facts not in evidence. The Court of Appeals reversed the trial court's denial of defendant's motion for new trial.

The defendant and the victim lived on different floors in the same apartment building. The defendant lived with another man, whom the victim dated for a brief time. On the September 12, 2008, the victim left her home to go to a nearby restaurant. As she left, she saw the defendant sitting in the stairway. After passing him, the defendant ran up behind her. The defendant grabbed her and tried to pull her into his apartment. After a brief struggle, she was able to run into her apartment. The defendant forced his way inside her apartment and then into her bedroom, where he forced her onto the floor while holding her hands. He then removed her underwear and had forcible intercourse with her. A physical exam revealed bruises and fresh abrasions on her back and swelling in the area around her vagina, which was consistent with rape.

The defendant alleged that he had consensual sex with the victim and that she received the bruises on her back a day earlier after falling from the top of a car while dancing on it.

During closing arguments, the State identified the defendant's girlfriend, Wise who was sitting in the courtroom gallery and had not testified as a witness. The State asked her to stand up and inferred that if she had any testimony that was helpful to the defendant, she would have been called to testify.



Don't forget to visit our Training Web page to register for our domestic violence-related conferences and training courses.

At the motion for new trial, defense counsel asserted that Wise's testimony would have helped his case because she would have testified that she witnessed the victim falling off the car and hurting her back the day before the rape. She would also have testified that she was on the phone with the defendant when he was in the room with the victim, corroborating defendant's story that he had consensual sex with the victim.

Finding this improper closing argument, the Court held that the defendant was entitled to a new trial where, "a reasonable probability existed that the demonstration affected the jury's consideration of the witnesses' credibility and thus affected the outcome at trial."

Rodriguez-Nova v. State

S14A0808, (September 22, 2014)

Defendant Rodriguez-Nova was convicted by a jury of murder and false imprisonment for the death of his girlfriend on June 28, 2008.

The victim lived in an apartment with the defendant and danced at a club where he also worked as a security guard. On the date of the murder, the victim got a ride home from a customer, rather than taking a taxi home that the defendant arranged for her.

Later that morning, the defendant confessed to his brother that he killed the victim. The defendant called the police, who found the victim's body. Her wrists and ankles were bound with duct tape and there was a phone cord knotted around her neck. According to the medical examiner, she had been strangled to death.

Earlier that night, the defendant allegedly stated that he saw the victim dancing suggestively with the customer and kissing him. When he arrived home, he saw someone leaving their apartment who he believed to be the customer. "Having no consideration"

for the victim, he entered the apartment and grabbed a knife to stab her. The victim begged him not to kill her, asking him to think about her children and his. He bound her feet and hands and she told him that she loved him and that they were going to get married and that if he stopped, she would not call the police. He told her that he was going to kill her anyway and turn himself in if he did not kill himself. He sprayed her with pepper spray, choked her with his hands and when he saw that she was still breathing, he tied a cord around her neck, and choked her to death with it.

The defendant contested the trial court's admission of a 911 recording, his attorney's failure to subpoena a forensic biologist from the Georgia Bureau of Investigation and the court's charge to the jury.

The defendant objected to the trial court's admission of a 911 recording of his call. He argued, that the recording was not properly authenticated. In laying its foundation, the State called the 911 operator who answered the call but did not call the Spanish interpreter. The Court held that as the 911 operator listened to the tape, identified it as a fair and accurate reproduction of the call with no additions or deletions, that she recognized her own voice and that of the interpreter, that the call was properly authenticated.

The defendant also asserted that his trial lawyer was ineffective in that he failed to subpoena a forensic biologist from the Georgia Bureau of Investigation to testify that sperm was found in the victim's body. The Court held that the defendant's trial lawyer was not ineffective where defendant could not show a reasonable probability that the result of the trial would have been different where the trial lawyer demonstrated his decision not to call the biologist to introduce evidence about the sperm was a strategic decision. The attorney asserted that he did not call the biologist because he did not want the jury to perceive it as an "unnecessary direct attack on

the victim." The State did not dispute that the victim's unfaithfulness may have motivated the defendant to kill her, making the presentation of that evidence unnecessary.

Next, the Court affirmed the trial court's charge to the jury. The defendant claimed that the trial court erred when it refused to charge the jury regarding circumstantial evidence. The Court held that no charge on circumstantial evidence was necessary. The court in its charge on presumption of innocence and the State's burden of proof included the language that "[t]o warrant a conviction on circumstantial evidence, the proven facts must not only be consistent with the theory of guilt but also exclude every other reasonable theory other than the guilt of the accused." The Court also held that, as the defendant's admissions of guilt were direct evidence of his guilt, that the State's case was not based solely on circumstantial evidence and the charge was not necessary.

The Court also upheld the trial court's refusal to instruct the jury that pursuant to the holding in *Harrell v. State*, 108 Ga. App. 295 (1963), "[w]here the State must rely upon the defendant's admission alone for an essential element of its case, and where the defendant's inculpatory statement is coupled with exculpatory matter, you cannot accept the inculpatory statement and reject the exculpatory matter." The *Harrell* rule did not apply to the facts of this case since in countering the defense of voluntary manslaughter; the State presented other evidence of an element of the charge of murder that contradicted the exculpatory part of the defendant's statement. The facts showed that the defendant's attack on the victim rather than being a result of provocation was sustained, deliberate and involved various acts; including multiple and strangulations, threats and spraying her with pepper spray. The State's evidence also showed an interval between the provocation and the killing, which attributed the killing to revenge, not provocation.

Finally, the Court upheld the trial court's instruction on provocation. The defendant alleged that the instruction was not supported by the evidence and complicated issues for the jury. The trial court charged the jury that, "[p]rovocation by words alone will, in no case, justify such excitement of passion sufficient to free the accused from the crime of murder or to reduce the offense to manslaughter when the killing is done solely in resentment of such provoking words." The instruction was therefore included in the statutory definition of voluntary manslaughter, which was given to the jury. It was also consistent with the defendant's theory that the murder was provoked by the victim's conduct with the customer from the club; the instruction clarified the law of voluntary manslaughter for the jury and was a correct and objective statement of the law. **GFV**

2014 Georgia Domestic Violence Benchbook

The latest edition of the Georgia Domestic Violence Benchbook is now available through the Institute of Continuing Judicial Education. The Domestic Violence Benchbook was initially published in 2005 to serve as a resource for practitioners in the field of domestic violence throughout the state. Authored by Joan Prettie and Nancy Hunter, the benchbook is a collaborative effort of judges, attorneys, social workers and others. A comprehensive resource, it is designed to provide practitioners with necessary information on civil and criminal legal issues, the dynamics of domestic violence, lethality assessments and other important topics. The benchbook also has several appendices that provide useful forms and checklists. The Eighth Edition of the Georgia Domestic Violence Benchbook can be accessed at : <http://icje.uga.edu/documents/2014DVBenchbookFinal.pdf>

Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Resources for Prosecutors

24/7 Domestic Violence Hotline:

1.800.33.HAVEN (1.800.334.2836) V/TTY

Websites:

Governor's Office of Children and Families:

<https://children.georgia.gov/crisis-assistance>

Georgia Criminal Justice Coordinating Council:

<http://cjcc.georgia.gov/>

Georgia Care Connection:

<http://www.gacares.org>

Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault:

<http://gnesa.org>

Battered Women's Justice Project:

<http://www.bwjp.org>

Georgia Commission on Family Violence:

<http://www.gcfv.org>

Provides Georgia domestic violence statistics, domestic violence protocols.

Georgia Coalition Against Domestic Violence:

<http://gcadv.org>

Forensic Healthcare Online:

<http://www.forensichealth.com>

Provides links to studies on intimate partner violence and sexual assault.

AEquitas:

<http://www.forensichealth.com>

AEquitas publishes the STRATEGIES newsletter and monographs on complex topic areas, emerging issues, and promising practices related to the prosecution of violence against women cases.

Prosecutor's Resource on Violence Against Women

www.Aequitasresource.org

The Women's legal defense and Education fund

www.Legalmomentum.org

End Violence Against Women International

www.evawintl.org

National Sexual Violence Resource Center

www.nsvrc.org



Prosecutors and Law Enforcement working together at a recent Family Violence Training Session. The Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Resource Prosecutor is available to provide technical assistance or training for your office. Please feel free to contact DVSARP Sharla D. Jackson at (404) 969-4001, or by email at sdjackson@pacga.org.

Other sites:

<http://www.nij.gov/journals/264/SANE.htm>

<http://www.aequitasresource.org/library.cfm>

http://www.aequitasresource.org/Prosecutor_Reference_Medical_Evidence.pdf

http://www.aequitasresource.org/Benefits_of_Specialized_Prosecution_Units_in_Domestic_and_Sexual_Violence_Cases_Issue_8.pdf

http://www.aequitasresource.org/Benefits_of_a_Coordinated_Community_Response_to_Sexual_Violence_Issue_7.pdf

http://www.aequitasresource.org/Absence_of_Anogenital_Injury_in_the_Adolescent_Adult_Female_Sexual_Assault_Patient_Issue_13.pdf

http://www.aequitasresource.org/Prosecuting_Cases_of_Sexual_Abuse_in_Confinement.pdf

http://www.wcasa.org/file_open.php?id=3

<http://law.lclark.edu/live/files/6470-a-criminal-justice-guide-legal-remedies-for-adult>

http://www.aequitasresource.org/Rape_and_Sexual_Assault_Analyses_and_Laws.pdf

<http://www.legalmomentum.org/our-work/njep/mat-for-jd-edu/the-challenges-of-adult-victim-sexual-assault-cases-materials-for-new-judges/title-page-and-main-menu/newjudgesmainmenu.html>

<http://legalmomentum.org/search/node/sexual%20assault%20cases> [GFV](#)

Recognizing the magnitude and impact of Domestic Violence in the State, the Governor's Office for Children and Families awarded a grant to the Prosecuting Attorneys' Council of Georgia. The grant provides much needed funding to train law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and victim advocates to more effectively respond to and prosecute crimes of domestic and sexual violence. The training is designed to improve the effective adjudication of domestic and sexual violence cases and effectuate the reduction of such crimes across our state.



Don't forget to visit our Training Web page to register for our family violence-related conferences and training courses.



ATTENDEES AT THE
PAC 2014 VWAP
CONFERENCE HELD IN
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA
AUGUST 13-14, 2014

PAC STAFF
ASSISTING 2014
VWAP CONFERENCE
ATTENDEES WITH
REGISTRATION



>>> **UPCOMING TRAINING EVENTS**

NOVEMBER 13, 2014
Family Violence - Camilla
Mitchell EMC Auditorium
475 Cairo Road
Camilla, Georgia 31730
9:00 AM to 4:00 PM

NOVEMBER 14, 2014
Family Violence - Dawson
Terrell County Government Complex
995 Forrester Drive
Dawson, Georgia 39842
9:00 AM - 4:00 PM

DECEMBER 5, 2014
Family Violence - Cordele
Crisp County Sheriff's Office Training Facility
196 Georgia 300
Cordele, Georgia 31015
9:00 AM - 4:00 PM

GEORGIA

Family Violence Newsletter

Prosecuting Attorneys' Council of Georgia
Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault Resource Program
104 Marietta Street, NW
Suite 400
Atlanta, Georgia 30303



Governor's Office for
Children and Families

>>> GEORGIA DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT RESOURCE PROGRAM



Sharla D. Jackson
Domestic Violence and Sexual
Assault Resource Prosecutor
(404) 969-4001 (Atlanta)
sdjackson@pacga.org

>>> DID YOU KNOW?

In Georgia, "Family Violence" also known as Domestic Violence is defined as: "the occurrence of one or more of the following acts between past or present spouses, persons who are parents of the same child, parents and children, stepparents and stepchildren, foster parents and foster children, or other persons living or formerly living in the same household: (1) Any felony; or (2) Commission of offenses of battery, simple battery, simple assault, assault, stalking, criminal damage to property, unlawful restraint, or criminal trespass. The term "family violence" shall not be deemed to include reasonable discipline administered by a parent to a child in the form of corporal punishment, restraint, or detention."

-Statistics from 2012 Georgia Domestic Violence Fatality Review Annual Report courtesy Georgia Coalition Against Domestic Violence (www.gcadv.org) and Georgia Commission on Family Violence (www.gcfv.org)