

A woman with dark hair, wearing a pink shirt and dark jeans, is sitting on a couch with her hands covering her face, appearing distressed or crying. In the background, a man in a blue shirt is sitting on the same couch, looking away from her. The scene is set in a living room with a window and framed pictures on the wall.

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE (IPV)

INTIMATE PARTNER
VIOLENCE

Intimate Partner Violence

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) refers to behavior by a current or former intimate partner that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm, including physical aggression, sexual coercion, and psychological abuse and controlling behaviors. This type of violence can occur among heterosexual or same-sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy.^{1,2}

HOW DOES IT AFFECT THE UNITED STATES?

- In 2013, 992 women and 245 men were killed by their intimate partner (current spouse, ex-spouse, or dating partner).³ These murders represent 37 percent of all female homicide victims and 3 percent of all male homicide victims.
- In 2010, 1 in 3 women (36%) and 1 in 4 men (29%) reported being the victim of IPV in their lifetime.⁴
- Eighty-one percent of women and 35 percent of men who were victims of rape, stalking, or physical violence by an intimate partner reported at least one negative impact on their daily activities as a result of this violence.⁴
- Strangulation is one of the most lethal forms of violence in IPV and sexual assault cases. Studies show that anywhere from 43 to 53 percent of domestic homicide victims had experienced at least one incident of attempted strangulation prior to a lethal event.⁵
- In 2008, 53 percent of women murdered by an intimate partner were killed with a gun.⁶
- Forty-two percent of victims of non-fatal IPV reported that perpetrators were under the influence of alcohol or illicit drugs at the time of the attack.⁷
- In 2003, the estimated cost of IPV against women exceeded \$8.3 billion, including \$6.2 billion associated with physical assault, \$1.2 billion in the value of lost lives, \$461 million associated with stalking, and \$460 million associated with rape.⁸

HOW DOES IT AFFECT MARYLAND?

- In 2010, 4.23 million (42%) of women in Maryland reported being victims of rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime. Maryland has a higher percentage of females with a history of IPV compared to other states in the region. Nationally, Maryland reported the 6th highest lifetime rate of IPV among females.⁴
- In 2010, 2.97 million (27%) of men in Maryland reported being victims of rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime.⁴
- In 2010, 18 women and 3 men in Maryland were murdered as a result of IPV.⁹
- There were 15,055 crimes involving IPV reported to law enforcement agencies in Maryland in 2014. Twenty percent of these incidents involved assaults with dangerous weapons or resulted in a serious injury.⁹
- Homicide is a leading cause of death during pregnancy or within the first postpartum year in Maryland. The majority of these homicides were perpetrated by an intimate partner.^{10, 11}

Intimate Partner Violence

Table 1: Maryland IPV Laws from 2016

Legislative Session	Bill Number(s)	Title of Bill	Description
2016	SB 578/HB 167	Domestic Violence - Person Eligible for Relief	Summary: Expands eligibility for a domestic violence protective order by altering the definition of a “person eligible for relief” to include a person related to the person eligible for relief by blood, marriage, or adoption. The bill also repeals a provision that restricted eligibility for a parent, stepparent, child, or stepchild of the person eligible for relief to those individuals who reside or have resided with the respondent or person eligible for relief for at least 90 days within one year prior to the filing of the petition
2016	SB 960/HB1396	Family Law - Domestic Violence - Definition of Abuse	Summary: Alters the definition of “abuse” for purposes of specified provisions of law relating to domestic violence to include harassment and malicious destruction of property. Also, defining harassment and malicious destruction of property
2016	SB 1047	Task Force to Study Recording Deeds for Victims of Domestic Violence	Summary: Establishing the Task Force to Study Recording Deeds for Victims of Domestic Violence; requiring the Task Force to study and make recommendations regarding how to protect the identity and address of a participant in the Address Confidentiality Program for victims of domestic violence in the Office of the Secretary of State when recording a deed transferring real property to or from a Program participant; requiring the Task Force to report its findings to the Governor and General Assembly on or before December 1, 2017; etc.
2016	SB 1143	Prince George’s County - Neshante and Chloe Davis Domestic Violence Prevention	Summary: Establishes the Neshante and Chloe Davis Domestic Violence Prevention Task Force. Requires the Task Force to study and make recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly regarding domestic violence prevention strategies and policies on or before December 1, 2016.
2016	HB 819	Domestic Violence - Permanent Protective Orders - Probation and Suspended Sentence	Summary: Specifying that, for purposes of provisions of law requiring a court to issue a permanent final protective order under specified circumstances against an individual who was convicted and sentenced to serve a specified term of imprisonment for specified crimes, a term of imprisonment includes any period of probation or portion of the sentence suspended.

Data in this table compiled by University of Maryland School of Law. Information on these IPV laws can be found here: <http://mgaleg.maryland.gov/webmga/frmLegislation.aspx?pid=legisnpage&tab=subject3>

Intimate Partner Violence

Table 1: Maryland IPV Laws from 2016, *Continued*

Legislative Session	Bill Number(s)	Title of Bill	Description
2016	SB 31/HB 7	Family Law - Child Abuse and Neglect - Expungement of Reports and Records - Time Period	Summary: Alters the time period after which a local department of social services is required to expunge specified reports and records of suspected child abuse and neglect. Local departments must maintain report of suspected abuse or neglect and investigative findings for at least five (5) years after the date of referral if the report is unsubstantiated or ruled out and no further reports of abuse or neglect are received during the five years. The report and investigative findings must be expunged after the expiration of this time period.
2016	SB 69/HB 1215	Civil Actions - Child Sexual Abuse - Statute of Limitations	Summary: Extends the statute of limitations in specified civil action relating to child sexual abuse from 7 years to 20 years.
2016	SB 310/HB 245	Child Abuse and Neglect - Failure to Report	Summary: Requires an agency that is participating in a child abuse or neglect investigation and that has substantial grounds to believe that a person has knowingly failed to report child abuse as required under a specified provision of law to file a specified complaint with a specified board, agency, institution, or facility.
2016	SB 577/HB 825	Child Protection - Reporting - Threat of Harm	Summary: Authorizes an individual to notify the local department of social services or the appropriate law enforcement agency if the individual has reason to believe that a verbal threat of imminent severe bodily harm or death to a child has been made by a specified individual and that the child is at substantial risk of child abuse. Also, the bill specifies the procedures and requirements for a report concerning a verbal threat of harm to a child
2016	SB 1096	Child Abuse and Neglect - Information Regarding Parents Responsible for Child Abuse or Neglect	Summary: Alters the circumstances under which the Executive Director of the Social Services Administration is required to provide to the Secretary of Health and Mental Hygiene information relating to individuals who have had their parental rights terminated without consent or who have been identified as responsible for child abuse or neglect that resulted in a criminal conviction. Also, removes a 5-year time limitation on a specified requirement that the Secretary provide specified birth record information to the Executive Director.

Intimate Partner Violence

HOW DO WE ADDRESS THIS PROBLEM?

- In April 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) released STOP SV: A Technical Package to Prevent Sexual Violence to help states and communities prioritize efforts to prevent sexual violence. This technical package is a collection of strategies that represent the best available evidence to prevent or reduce public health problems like violence. They help improve the health and well-being of communities.¹²
- The CDC supports programs and interventions that prevent violence before it occurs.¹³ Evidence-based programs that encourage healthy and safe relationships in teens can reduce dating violence, and can reduce the risk of future IPV. Incorporating these programs into school curricula would expand their reach and impact.¹⁴
- Current Maryland Laws include arrests, protective, and peace orders related to domestic violence. See Table 1 for laws from 2016.
- Risk of IPV is lower when victims can obtain protective orders from courts. Judges in Maryland can now grant protective orders to individuals in an abusive relationship who do not live together but had a sexual relationship within the past year. Previously only peace orders, which are not as restrictive to the perpetrator, could be granted to dating couples who were not living together. Peace orders can only be extended to six months while protective orders can be extended to two years. Allowing peace orders the same duration as protective orders will likely offer greater protection to victims of IPV that are not married to, or cohabiting with the perpetrator.^{15,16,17}
- Substance abuse and mental illness are common among perpetrators of IPV.¹⁸ Policies which require screening¹⁹ and treatment for offenders with these conditions reduce IPV.²⁰

Intimate Partner Violence

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

- House of Ruth: www.hruth.org
- Criminal Defense Lawyer: <http://www.criminaldefenselawyer.com/resources/criminal-defense/domestic-violence/maryland-domestic-violence-laws-charges-penalt>
- The People's Law Library of Maryland: <http://www.peoples-law.org/dvshelters>
- Maryland Courts: <http://www.courts.state.md.us/legalhelp/domesticviolence.html>
- DHMH Maternal and Child Health Bureau: <http://phpa.dhmh.maryland.gov/mch/Pages/ipv.aspx>
- Children's Safety Network: <https://www.childrensafetynetwork.org/injury-topics/familyintimate-partner-violence>

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015, May 28). Intimate Partner Violence. Retrieved July 15 2016, from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/>
2. World Health Organization. (n.d.). Violence against women. Retrieved July 15 2016, from <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>
3. Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2013). Crime in the United States. United States Department of Justice. Retrieved July 15 2016, from https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/offenses-known-to-law-enforcement/expanded-homicide/expanded_homicide_data_table_10_murder_circumstances_by_relationship_2013.xls.
4. Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved July 15 2016, from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/nisvs_report2010-a.pdf
5. Block, C. R., Devitt, C. O., Fonda, D., Fugate, M., Martin, C., McFarlane, J., et al. (2000). The Chicago Women's Health Study: Risk of serious injury or death in intimate violence: A collaborative research project.
6. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2011). Homicide Trends in the United States, 1980-2008. Annual Rates for 2009 and 2010. Retrieved July 15 2016, from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/htus8008.pdf>
7. Calatano S. (December, 2007). Intimate Partner Violence in the United States. US Department of Justice. <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipvus.pdf>.
8. Max, W., Rice, D. R., Finkelstein, E., Bardwell, R. A., & Leadbetter, S. (2004). The economic toll of intimate partner violence against women in the United States. *Violence and victims*, 19(3), 259-272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/vivi.19.3.259.65767> Retrieved July 15 2016.
9. Maryland State Police. (November, 2015). Crime in Maryland: 2014 Uniform Crime Report. Pages 54-55.
10. Horon IL, Cheng D. Enhanced Surveillance for Pregnancy-Associated Mortality—Maryland, 1993-1998. *JAMA*. 2001;285(11):1455-1459. doi:10.1001/jama.285.11.1455.
11. Cheng, D., & Horon, I. L. (2010). Intimate-Partner Homicide Among Pregnant and Postpartum Women. *Obstetrics & Gynecology*, 115(6), 1181-1186.
12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). Technical Packages for Violence Prevention: Using Evidence-based Strategies in Your Violence Prevention Efforts. Retrieved July 15 2016 from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pub/technical-packages.html> .
13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Preventing intimate partner and sexual violence: program activities guide. Retrieved July 15 2016, from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/IPV-SV_Program_Activities_Guide-a.pdf
14. Wolfe DA, Crooks C, Jaffe P, Chiodo D, Hughes R, Ellis W, Stitt L, Donner A. (2009). A school-based program to prevent adolescent dating violence. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*. 163(8):692-699.
15. Holt VL, Kernick MA, Wolf ME, Rivara FP. Do protection orders affect the likelihood of future partner violence and injury? *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2003; 24:16-21.

Intimate Partner Violence

16. Campbell JC, O'Sullivan C, Roehl J, et al. (July, 2005). What battered women know and do to protect themselves from abuse: Results and methodological challenges from the domestic violence risk assessment validation experiment. Presented at the 9th International Family Violence Research Conference.
17. Logan TK. (2010). Civil protective order effectiveness: justice or just a piece of paper? *Violence and Victims*. 25(3):332-348.
18. Moracco KE, Andersen K, Buchanan RM, Espersen C, Bowling M, Duffy C. (2010). Who are the defendants in domestic violence protection order cases? *Violence Against Women*. 16:1201-1223.
19. Brackley MH, Williams GB, Wei CC. (2010). Substance abuse interface with intimate partner violence: what treatment programs need to know. *Nursing Clinics of North America*. 45:581-589.
20. Gover AR, MacDonald JM, Alpert GP. (2003). Combating domestic violence: Findings from an evaluation of a local domestic violence court. *Criminology & Public Policy*. 3:109-132.