

Cuyahoga County Domestic Violence High Risk Team:

One Year DA-LE Report

Jeff Kretschmar, PhD | Ashley Bukach, MPH | Rebecca Bray, MSSA



Begun Center for Violence
Prevention Research and Education



JACK, JOSEPH AND MORTON MANDEL
SCHOOL OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES
CASE WESTERN RESERVE
UNIVERSITY

March 2018

CONTENTS

Executive Summary..... E-1

Overview1

Number of DA-LEs Administered2

Number of DA-LEs Included in One Year Analyses2

DA-LE Classifications2

Frequencies of Total Scores3

Examining the Threshold for High Risk DA-LEs3

Total Scores of DA-LEs Marked for Further Review4

Further Review Justifications4

DA-LE Items5

“Not Answered/Unknown” Answers for Those Who Participated in the DA-LE6

Summary7

References8

Appendix A. Further Review Justifications A-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview

- ❖ As part of the Domestic Violence Homicide Prevention Demonstration Initiative, Cuyahoga County received funds from the U.S. Justice Department's Office on Violence Against Women to implement the Domestic Violence High Risk Team (DVHRT) in Cleveland Police Districts 1 and 5.
- ❖ The DVHRT model was developed in Massachusetts and incorporates an 11-item, evidence-based risk assessment known as the Danger Assessment for Law Enforcement (DA-LE) for police officers to use to identify victims at the scene of an intimate partner incidents who are at greatest risk for intimate partner homicide/severe assault.
- ❖ High risk victims identified by the DA-LE and accepted to the DVHRT receive individualized intervention plans, service linking, and case monitoring by a team of legal professionals and victim advocates in an effort to prevent domestic violence homicides and near-lethal incidents and increase offender accountability.
- ❖ This report presents data from the DA-LEs administered during the first year of implementation of the Cuyahoga County DVHRT, which took place from October 1, 2016 - September 30, 2017.

DA-LEs Administered

- ❖ During the first year of the Cuyahoga County DVHRT, 1,554 DA-LEs were administered to intimate partner violence victims by the Cleveland Division of Police in Districts 1 and 5.
 - 544 DA-LEs (35%) met the high risk threshold with 7 or more yes answers.
 - 160 DA-LEs (10.3%) did not meet threshold, but were marked for further review due to the police officer's belief that the victim was at a high level of risk.
 - Combining DA-LEs that met threshold and those that were marked for further review, a total of 704 DA-LEs (45.3%) were classified as high risk.
 - 68 DA-LEs (4.4%) were declined by victims.

Further Review Justifications

- ❖ Most DA-LEs marked for further review scored just below the threshold at a 6 or 5.
- ❖ The most common reasons police officers provided for marking a DA-LE for further review were: 1) history of abuse, 2) threats made by the suspect, and 3) victim's extreme fear of the suspect.

Questions Frequently Answered Affirmatively in High Risk DALEs

- ❖ The following DA-LE questions were answered affirmatively in over 80-90% of high risk DA-LEs:
 - Has the physical violence increased in severity or frequency over the past year?
 - Has he/she ever threatened to kill you?
 - Has he/she ever tried to choke (strangle) you?
 - Do you believe he/she is capable of killing you?

OVERVIEW

In 2013, Cuyahoga County's Witness Victim Service Center, a division of the Department of Public Safety and Justice Services, was one of 12 sites nationwide awarded an initial grant as part of the Domestic Violence Homicide Prevention Demonstration Initiative (DVHP Initiative). The DVHP Initiative was created by the U.S. Justice Department's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) and is evaluated through funding from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to test how well tools and services that have been identified as promising practices for reducing domestic violence homicides work in different communities. During Phase One, the 12 initial grantees provided information on their local structures and processes for addressing domestic violence and developed a work plan. As a grantee that demonstrated data-sharing capabilities and readiness for implementation of a DVHP Initiative model during Phase One, Cuyahoga County was one of four sites invited to continue to Phase Two of the DVHP Initiative. The model assigned to Cuyahoga County for implementation in Phase Two was the Domestic Violence High Risk Team (DVHRT) Model.

The DVHRT Model was developed by the Jeanne Geiger Crisis Center (JGCC) in Newburyport, Massachusetts and incorporates evidence-based risk assessment into the community's domestic violence response system to identify the most dangerous cases. Victims identified at greatest risk for severe injury and homicide by the risk assessment are referred to the DVHRT for individualized intervention plans, service linking, and case monitoring by a team legal professionals and victim advocates. This nationally recognized model focuses on increasing both victim safety and offender accountability (Jeanne Geiger Crisis Center, 2018). Although adaptations needed to be made to the model in Cuyahoga County due to the significantly higher volume of high risk cases, the Cuyahoga County DVHRT operates under the same principle as the JGCC DVHRT that once high-risk victims are identified, law enforcement, prosecutors, courts and service providers can take action to protect them.

To identify victims at highest risk for intimate partner homicide and severe injury, Cuyahoga County uses the Danger Assessment for Law Enforcement (DA-LE). The DA-LE was developed by a team of researchers and practitioners led by Dr. Jacquelyn Campbell. It is designed for police officers to administer to the victim at the scene of an intimate partner incident. It includes 11 questions that ask about risk factors for lethality and severe assault (Jeanne Geiger Crisis Center, 2017). A DA-LE validation study was conducted to measure the accuracy of the risk assessment and ensure that the appropriate proportion of high risk cases and non-high risk cases were being screened in and out respectively (Messing & Campbell, 2016). As a result of the validation study, a threshold of seven or more yes answers was chosen to identify high risk victims. Police officers also have the option to override the threshold score and mark a DA-LE for further review if the officer believes the victim is at a high level of risk.

This report presents data from the DA-LEs administered during first year of implementation of the Cuyahoga County Domestic Violence High Risk Team (DVHRT), which took place from October 1, 2016 - September 30, 2017 in Cleveland Police Districts 1 and 5. Cleveland Division of Police Districts 1 and 5 were targeted by this project because they previously lacked specialized justice system responses for domestic violence cases.

NUMBER OF DA-LES ADMINISTERED = 1,604

The local evaluation team at the Begun Center for Violence Prevention Research and Education at Case Western Reserve University received a total of 1,604 DA-LEs during the first year of implementation of the Domestic Violence High Risk Team (DVHRT). The police officer who administered the DA-LE was known for 1,592 of the 1,604 DA-LEs (99.3%), and those 1,592 DA-LEs were administered by 264 officers. The minimum and most common number of DA-LEs administered by an officer was 1, the maximum was 24, and the mean was 6.0 (SD = 4.8). Victims have the right to decline participation in the DA-LE. Approximately 17% of officers submitted at least one DA-LE that was declined by the victim, with the number of refusals ranging from 1-5.

Of the 1,604 DA-LEs administered, 1,468 were forwarded to the local evaluation team by Cleveland Police Districts 1 and 5. An additional 136 DA-LEs were forwarded by the High Risk Team (HRT) coordinator who provided high risk DA-LEs that she had received that had not been provided to the local evaluation team by the districts (District 1 = 16; District 5 = 120). Overall, the number of high risk DA-LEs not forwarded to the local evaluation team by the districts decreased over the course of the year from as many as 17 in October 2016 to 6 in September 2017.

NUMBER OF DA-LES INCLUDED IN ONE YEAR ANALYSES = 1,554

Based on information provided on the DA-LE and information provided by DVHRT staff, the local evaluation team discovered that 50 of the DA-LEs received from the districts were completed by individuals who, according to DA-LE protocol, should not have been administered a DA-LE. Forty-eight (48) of the 50 DA-LEs that were completed in contrast to protocol were completed as part of a cross-complaint. A cross-complaint is considered an incident for which both parties involved make a domestic violence complaint against the opposite party regarding the same incident. According to DA-LE protocol, DA-LEs should not be administered for cross-complaints. For most of the cross-complaints for which the local evaluation team received DA-LEs, DA-LEs were received for both individuals involved in the incident. Furthermore, DA-LEs are only to be completed for domestic violence incidents that involve intimate partners; however, two (2) DA-LEs were received for incidents that did not involve intimate partners (e.g. victim and suspect were siblings). These 50 DA-LEs were therefore excluded from the analyses presented in this report, bringing the total number of DA-LEs analyzed from the first year of DVHRT implementation to 1,554.

DA-LE CLASSIFICATIONS

There are two ways in which a DA-LE could be classified as high risk: 1) The DA-LE score met the high risk threshold of seven or more yes answers (indicators) or 2) the DA-LE did not meet threshold, but was marked for further review. During the first year of the DVHRT, 35.0% of DA-LEs met threshold. This percentage is slightly higher than the percentage of DA-LEs that met threshold in the DA-LE validation study (30.4%), which was conducted in Oklahoma (Messing & Campbell, 2016). In Cuyahoga County, an additional 10.3% were marked further review by officers, meaning 45.3% of DA-LEs administered screened in as high risk. Although District 5 administered a higher number of DA-LEs (851) than District 1 (701), District 1 had a slightly higher percentage of DA-LEs classified as high risk (48.9%). See Table 1 for DA-LE classifications by district and overall. (NOTE: District was unknown for two DA-LEs.)

Table 1. DA-LE Classifications by District

Risk Classification	District 1 (n = 701) n (%)	District 5 (n = 851) n (%)	All DA-LEs (N = 1,554) n (%)
Classified as High Risk	343 (48.9%)	361 (42.4%)	704 (45.3%)
7 or More Indicators	262 (37.4%)	282 (33.1%)	544 (35.0%)
Further Review	81 (11.6%)	79 (9.3%)	160 (10.3%)
Not Classified as High Risk	358 (51.1%)	490 (57.6%)	850 (54.7%)
6 or Fewer Indicators	308 (43.9%)	412 (48.4%)	721 (46.4%)
Partially Completed	35 (5.0%)	39 (4.6%)	75 (4.8%)
Victim Declined*	15 (1.0%)	39 (4.1%)	54 (3.5%)

*The victim declined category only includes declined DA-LEs not marked for further review. The 14 DA-LEs (District 1 = 10; District 5 = 4) that were declined and marked for further review are included in the further review category. The total number of declined DA-LEs is reported in Table 2.

FREQUENCIES OF TOTAL SCORES

The most frequently reported DA-LE score was 7 (13.1%), followed by 5 (10.7%) and 6 (10.6%).

Table 2. Frequencies of Total Scores

DA-LE Score	District 1 (n = 701) n (%)	District 5 (n = 851) n (%)	All DA-LEs (N = 1,554) n (%)
N/A (victim declined)	25 (3.6%)	43 (5.1%)	68 (4.4%)
0	26 (3.7%)	56 (6.6%)	82 (5.3%)
1	49 (7.0%)	71 (8.3%)	120 (7.7%)
2	51 (7.3%)	70 (8.2%)	122 (7.9%)
3	45 (6.4%)	102 (12.0%)	147 (9.5%)
4	66 (9.4%)	73 (8.6%)	140 (9.0%)
5	84 (12.0%)	83 (9.8%)	167 (10.7%)
6	93 (13.3%)	71 (8.3%)	164 (10.6%)
7	86 (12.3%)	117 (13.7%)	203 (13.1%)
8	71 (10.1%)	72 (8.5%)	143 (9.2%)
9	65 (9.3%)	57 (6.7%)	122 (7.9%)
10	33 (4.7%)	28 (3.3%)	61 (3.9%)
11	7 (1.0%)	8 (0.9%)	15 (1.0%)

EXAMINING THE THRESHOLD FOR HIGH RISK DA-LES

Table 3 shows the number and percentage of DA-LEs that would be considered high risk if the high risk threshold were lowered to 6 or increased to 8, compared to the current threshold of 7.

Table 3. Examining Potential Thresholds for High Risk DA-LEs

Threshold Score	Meet threshold (n = 1,554) n (%)	Further Review (n = 1,554) n (%)	Total Classified as High Risk (n = 1,554) n (%)
6	708 (45.6%)	99 (06.4%)	807 (51.9%)
7	544 (35.0%)	160 (10.3%)	704 (45.3%)
8	341 (22.9%)	Unknown	Unknown

TOTAL SCORES OF DA-LES MARKED FOR FURTHER REVIEW

A total of 160 DA-LEs that scored below a 7 were marked for further review. Most marked for further review scored just below threshold at a 5 or 6.

Table 4. Scores of DA-LEs Marked for Further Review

DA-LE Score	Respondents (n = 160) n (%)
N/A (victim declined)	14 (8.8%)
0	1 (0.6%)
1	2 (1.3%)
2	10 (6.3%)
3	14 (8.8%)
4	22 (13.8%)
5	37 (23.1%)
6	60 (37.5%)

FURTHER REVIEW JUSTIFICATIONS

There were 160 DA-LEs that scored a six or lower that were marked for further review. At the beginning of the project, officers were instructed to write their justifications for checking the further review option in the narrative of the police report. Since the local evaluation team does not receive the police reports, the local evaluation did not receive those justifications. During the year, the DA-LE form was updated to include a space for officers to include their justifications directly on the DA-LE form. Although the second version of the form was intended to replace the first, both versions of the form continued to be used by both districts throughout the first year of the DVHRT.

After the second version of the form became available, however, the local evaluation team did receive 52 DA-LEs marked for further review that included justifications on the DA-LE form. On average, officers provided two reasons to justify why the DA-LE was marked for further review. After a review of the justifications, the local evaluation team determined there were 13 categories of reasons given. Table 5 shows the number of justifications that fell into each category. The most commonly cited reasons were a history of abuse, threats made by the suspect, and the victim's high level of fear. Each of the 52 justifications are provided as they appeared on the DA-LE forms in Appendix A.

Table 5. Justifications for Further Review

Justification Provided for Further Review	DA-LEs (n = 52) n* (%)
History of abuse	32 (61.5%)
Threats made by suspect	13 (25.0%)
Victim extremely fearful	12 (23.1%)
Specific mention of strangulation	9 (17.3%)
Suspect's mental health/substance abuse issues	7 (13.5%)
Pregnancy of victim/violence toward children	6 (11.5%)
Escalation in abuse	5 (9.6%)
Severity of injuries	5 (9.6%)
Suspect's access to victim/stalking behaviors/no contact order violation	5 (9.6%)
Presence of a weapon	5 (9.6%)
Victim redacting story	2 (3.8%)
Victim unable to defend self due to age or disability	2 (3.8%)
Other (e.g. extreme control, officer felt environment unsafe)	4 (7.7%)

*The total number of justifications (107) is greater than the number of DA-LEs (52) because officers could provide more than one justification for why they checked further review.

DA-LE ITEMS

Table 6 shows the percentages of “Yes” answers to each DA-LE item from the DA-LEs completed during the first year of the DVHRT in Cuyahoga County and the DA-LEs from Oklahoma included in the DA-LE validation study. The two items that had discrepancies greater than 10% when comparing the percentages of affirmative answers locally to the percentages in the validation study appear in bold in Table 6. A lower percentage of respondents in Cuyahoga County left the suspect after living together in the past year compared to the Oklahoma validation study; whereas, a higher percentage of respondents in Cuyahoga County reported that the suspect made threats to kill.

The local DA-LEs are further examined by those that were classified as high risk (scored high risk or marked further review) and those that were not. The highlighted questions in Table 6 were answered affirmatively by over 80% of high risk respondents in Cuyahoga County. Of the 495 victims who answered “Yes” to all four of these items, 431 (87.1%) were classified as high risk or further review.

Table 6. DA-LE Item Frequencies and Percentages

Question	DA-LEs from Cuyahoga County DVHRT			DA-LEs from Oklahoma Validity Study* (%)
	Not Classified as High Risk (n= 795) n (%)	Classified as High Risk (n=691) n (%)	All DA-LEs (n=1,486) n (%)	
1. Has the physical violence increased in severity/frequency over the past year?	341 (42.9%)	593 (85.8%)	934 (62.9%)	56.8%
2. Have you left him/her after living together in the past year?	301 (37.9%)	461 (66.7%)	762 (51.3%)	72.5%
3. Does he/she control most or all of your daily activities?	179 (22.5%)	398 (57.6%)	577 (38.8%)	39.0%
4. Has he/she tried to kill you?	74 (9.3%)	388 (56.2%)	462 (31.1%)	24.7%
5. Has he/she ever threatened to kill you?	329 (41.4%)	606 (87.7%)	935 (62.9%)	50.2%
6. Has he/she used a weapon against you or threatened you with a lethal weapon?	118 (14.8%)	404 (58.5%)	522 (35.1%)	31.4%
7. Has he/she ever tried to choke (strangle) you?	369 (46.4%)	608 (88.0%)	977 (65.7%)	70.5%
8. Has he/she choked (strangled) you multiple times?	165 (20.8%)	488 (70.6%)	653 (43.9%)	37.0%
9. Do you believe he/she is capable of killing you?	357 (44.9%)	616 (89.1%)	973 (65.5%)	57.0%
10. Does he/she own a gun?	77 (9.7%)	252 (36.5%)	329 (22.1%)	19.0%
11. Has he/she ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?	177 (22.3%)	321 (46.5%)	498 (33.5%)	33.5%

*Data were collected between 2009 and 2013 from female DV victims in seven OK police jurisdictions (Messing & Campbell, 2016).

“NOT ANSWERED/UNKNOWN” ANSWERS FOR THOSE WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE DA-LE

The majority (86.7%) of those who agreed to participate in the DA-LE answered each DA-LE question. About 11% of respondents declined to answer one question, approximately 2% declined two questions, and less than 1% of respondents declined more than two questions.

Table 7 shows the numbers and percentages of “Not Answered” or “Unknown” answers for each DA-LE question for those who agreed to participate. The three items with the highest percentages of “not answered/unknown” are highlighted in yellow. The vast majority of those who provided a reason for not answering indicated that they did not answer because they did not know the answer to the question.

Table 7. Not Answered/Unknown Answers by DA-LE Item

Question	All DA-LEs Not Declined (n = 1,486)
1. Has the physical violence increased in severity or frequency over the past year?	10 (0.7%)
2. Have you left him/her after living together in the past year?	14 (0.9%)
3. Does he/she control most or all of your daily activities?	16 (1.1%)
4. Has he/she tried to kill you?	23 (1.5%)
5. Has he/she ever threatened to kill you?	15 (1.0%)
6. Has he/she used a weapon against you or threatened you with a lethal weapon?	14 (0.9%)
7. Has he/she ever tried to choke (strangle) you?	11 (0.7%)
8. Has he/she choked (strangled) you multiple times?	15 (1.0%)
9. Do you believe he/she is capable of killing you?	76 (5.1%)
10. Does he/she own a gun?	71 (4.8%)
11. Has he/she ever threatened or tried to commit suicide?	37 (2.5%)

SUMMARY

During the first year of the Cuyahoga County DVHRT, 1,554 DA-LEs were administered to intimate partner violence victims by the Cleveland Division of Police in Districts 1 and 5. Of those, 68 (4.4%) were declined by the victim, and 1,486 (95.6%) were completed. The percentage of DA-LEs that met the high risk threshold (35.0%) was slightly higher than the percentage of cases that met threshold in the DA-LE validation study conducted in Oklahoma (30.4%; Messing & Campbell, 2016). Since an additional 10.3% of DA-LEs were flagged for further review, a total of 45.3% of DA-LEs were classified as high risk. The majority of DA-LEs marked for further review scored just below the high risk threshold. Over half of the justifications for further review received cited a history abuse as a reason for further review. Threats and extreme fear were also both cited by officers in about one quarter of DA-LEs marked for further review. While a higher percentage of Cuyahoga County victims indicated that the suspect threatened to kill them compared to the validation study, fewer Cuyahoga County victims indicated they left the suspect after living together in the past year. Finally, the four DA-LE questions related to an increase in violence (1), threats to kill (5), attempt to strangle (7), and the victim’s belief that the suspect is capable of killing him/her seem to be particularly important indicators of risk in Cuyahoga County, as they were answered affirmatively in over 80% of high risk cases.

REFERENCES

Jeanne Geiger Crisis Center. (2017, October 12). New domestic violence risk tool for law enforcement available. Retrieved from <http://dvhrt.org/news-events/news/just-announced-the-danger-assessment-law-enforcement-is-now-available>

Jeanne Geiger Crisis Center. (2018). About the domestic violence high risk team (DVHRT) model. Retrieved from <http://www.dvhrt.org/about>

Messing, J. T., & Campbell, J. (2016). Informing collaborative interventions: Intimate partner violence risk assessment for front line police officers. *Policing, 10*(4), 328-340. doi: 10.1093/policing/paw013

APPENDIX A. FURTHER REVIEW JUSTIFICATIONS

<p>She did state that he choked her today and she was unsure if she passed out or not.</p>
<p>Unable to speak with victim due to injuries that are critical/conveyed to Metro Hospital by EMS 33. EMS 33 stated victim inside EMS stated 'my girlfriend stabbed me' but changed story to EMS then stated 'I fell on the knife in the kitchen.'</p>
<p>Victim seemed really scared with physical harm of past incidents of physical harm, of her teeth being knocked out.</p>
<p>Victim seemed very scared and afraid of being hurt by suspect. She could barely talk to officers due to being choked and has been hurt before and went to hospital but suspect tells victim that he would harm her more if calls police.</p>
<p>Due to language barrier only speaks [LANGUAGE REMOVED]. History of DV [DATE REMOVED] victim stated offended pulled out her hair, hits her and beats her several times. Victim does not want to be around offender. When detective follows up have translator translate victim's story.</p>
<p>Due to priors and victims believe on the legitimacy of his threats.</p>
<p>Offender's mental state & increase in of incidents</p>
<p>Female states there is a history of abuse with the N.S. She states she never reported it before because they are married, so she tries to work it out. The last time he 'choked' her she said she couldn't breathe.</p>
<p>Female is elderly, unable to defend herself and her husband has anger and mental health issues. There is a firearm in the house.</p>
<p>[VICTIM NAME REMOVED] stated that [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] has choked or strangled her numerous time and it keeps increasing.</p>
<p>Due to the fact of previous domestic violence arrests.</p>
<p>Victim and son stated the offender [NAME REMOVED] has strangled and punched victim in the past and no report has been made.</p>
<p>Victim stated that her husband (suspect) is becoming more physically + verbally abusive and things are escalating. Victim also states that male has been behaving more irrational and odd in the past month, male takes lithium but victim doesn't think he is taking his meds and that he is going to kill her.</p>
<p>The suspect has strangled [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] several times in the past.</p>
<p>Was hit with a broom and conveyed victim to hospital for her injuries.</p>

Victim is prior victim of domestic violence listed on camera all the red flag that name suspect is doing yet when question using DA-LE had tendency to denies.

Offender has violent tendencies, assaulted her in the past and knew to carry a gun. This isn't the first time police have been out there for the same situation.

Victim has a DV that occurred within the last two weeks [DATES REMOVED]. Suspect was extremely violent/lots of property was destroyed. In this incident male suspect brandished a handgun although unable to locate it there is enough evidence to suggest one exist DV's between parties seems to be escalating.

The threats we witnessed, she has prosecuted him before, and she truly believes he will kill her.

Victim only lives 1 street over from offender and stated that he owns a firearm. Victim stated offender threatened to use his firearm against her.

Connection with rape

Victim 6 months pregnant. Possible previous case followed up by DV Unit. Unreported previous incident.

Prior D.V. calls/reports made w/ no follow up to prosecutor. Suspect has violent tendencies reported by dispatch. Threats to kill victim and strangled her once previously, as she states.

The suspect has violated a no contact order that is in place and the victim states that the suspect has said he would kill her and himself.

Female has been dealing with DV issues with NS and never reported because she didn't want him to get in trouble.

Victim states [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] is capable of crazy behavior and she afraid he will come back and attack her and her children.

The victim says that the offender uses multiple drugs and drinks and very bitter and upset about their divorce of recent. The offender has according to the victim, strangled her unconscious before and did not remember.

While asking the above questions [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] hesitated and seemed afraid to answer truthfully See RMS report and pics for further. Victim is fearful of named suspect to the point where she is putting his welfare ahead of her own and her child's (illegible).

[VICTIM NAME REMOVED] stated there is a long & unreported history of abuse between her and [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] (9 year relationship). [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] was visibly shaking as she gave info for the report and in fear of [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED]. She stated [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] controls virtually every aspect of her life.

Further review based on victim being 6 months pregnant with suspect's child and taken to metro to be treated for stomach pain.

CCH shows prior D.V., child injured in incident, threats to kill her & kids, has warrant in Medina County.

Broke into the home.

Victim has her baby in her arms as name suspect punch her knocking both victims down to the ground.

The victim was very uncooperative, but due to the situation I feel the victim is living in a unsafe environment with her children.

Victim believes she may be suffering from years of abuse.

Due to multiple strangulations.

Victim stated she is currently pregnant with suspects child. Victim stated suspect has prior history of DV.

Victim is afraid to prosecute, fearing further violence from NS.

Request due to severity of [VICTIM NAME REMOVED]'s injuries. [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] unable to speak due to her condition. Witness reported her unborn child's father assaulted her at [ADDRESS REMOVED].

6 'yes' answers and [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] told [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] that calling the police will make her situation worse. [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] needs assistance from an outside source, she is afraid for her life.

Victim states continued DV incidents [SUSPECT INITIALS REMOVED] abuses alcohol. Incidents increased when [SUSPECT INITIALS REMOVED] started drinking alcohol again.

Victim believes she is being stalked and the suspect has a mental illness. There is alleged prior abuse towards her son. She believes he will show up at her job to find her.

Male suspect has DV warrant, victim fears him, suspect has easy access to victim.

The visible injuries were sever and this happened in front of their daughter.

[VICTIM NAME REMOVED] appeared highly distraught, scared, and traumatized from the incident. [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] allegedly threatened [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] w/a gun and proceeded to shoot it in the air. No gun was found, but [VICTIM NAME REMOVED] was adamant that [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] has a gun.

Suspect has made numerous threats against victim and has acted on it. Victim feels fear for her safety as well as her children. Victim also feels suspect is capable of killing her.

The victim declined the risk screen, but I believe that the incident requires further review due to numerous prior incidents of DV between the two, with both parties named as suspects. Victim also stated that next time, she will kill the offender.

[VICTIM NAME REMOVED] stated [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] has past DV convictions.

While being transported to CPU, [SUSPECT NAME REMOVED] was extremely agitated and threatened to kill the victim. He also threatened to bash her face in. He made these threats repeatedly while in our custody. #4 was assumed no (the form showed that the officer checked yes and no but somewhat crossed out yes & only totaled 1 yes response.

Victim states that this male has made several threats w/ a gun (and knife) pointing at her. Victim states he has also threatened her kids. Victim states male has put his hands on her in past [DATE REMOVED]. Was in a relationship for 1 year, broke up 3 weeks ago.

Victim is afraid that suspect will kill her. She is not able to defend herself due to having rheumatoid arthritis. Her hands have no function in them.

Due to offender history of DV and violence.