1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
3	JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
4	
5	IRVIS OFFICE BUILDING ROOM G50
6	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
7	PUBLIC HEARING ON
8	HOUSE BILL 2255
9	
10	WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 10:00 A.M.
11	
12	BEFORE:
13	HONORABLE THOMAS R. CALTAGIRONE, MAJORITY CHAIRMAN
14 15	HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA HONORABLE RON MARSICO, MINORITY CHAIRMAN HONORABLE RICHARD R. STEVENSON
16	ALSO PRESENT:
17	HONORABLE CHERELLE L. PARKER
18	HONORABLE JOHN R. EVANS HONORABLE NICK KOTIK
19	HONORABLE DANTE SANTONI, JR.
20	
21	
22	
23	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR
24	P. O. BOX 278 MAYTOWN, PA 17550
25	717-426-1596 PHONE/FAX

1	ALSO PRESENT: (cont'd)			
2	DAVID D. TYLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (D)			
3	V. KURT BELLMAN, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT (D) DAVID M. MCGLAUGHLIN, ACTING CHIEF COUNSEL DOMINICK LEBO, INTERN (D) TAMARA FOX, STAFF COUNSEL KAREN S. COATES, SENIOR LEGAL COUNSEL (R) BRIANA ELZEY, CHIEF LEGISLATIVE AIDE FOR REP. PARKER			
4				
5				
6				
7	BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC			
8	NEFONIEN - NOTANT FUBLIC			
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

1	INDEX			
2	NAME	PAGE		
3	OPENING REMARKS AND INTRODUCTIONS	4		
4	REPRESENTATIVE CHERELLE PARKER	5		
5	KATE RUSH COOK	20		
6	BETH DOCHERTY	26		
7 8	DEBORAH HARLEY 34 CHIEF, FAMILY VIOLENCE/SEXUAL ASSAULT UNIT PHILADELPHIA DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S ASSOCIATION			
9 10 11	LYNN HECHT SCHAFRAN DIRECTOR NATIONAL JUDICIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM LEGAL MOMENTUM	48		
12 13	JILL MAIER DIRECTOR NATIONAL JUDICIAL EDUCATION PROGRAM WOMEN ORGANIZED AGAINST RAPE	60		
14 15	JOYCE LUKIMA DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF FIELD SERVICES PENNSYLVANIA COALITION AGAINST RAPE	67		
16 17	CAPTAIN JOHN DARBY SPECIAL VICTIMS UNIT PHILADELPHIA POLICE DEPARTMENT	72		
18	CLOSING REMARKS	8 6		
19				
20 21	JULES EPSTEIN ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF LAW WIDENER UNIVERSITY			
22				
23				
24				
25				

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 3 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: We'll get started with the hearing. It's House Bill 2255, 4 Cherelle Parker. I'm Chairman Tom Caltagirone, 5 Co-Chairman Marsico. 6 7 If the members and staff would just please introduce themselves for the record. 8 David. 9 10 MR. TYLER: Good morning. I'm Dave 11 Tyler, executive director for Tom Caltagirone. 12 MR. MCGLAUGHLIN: Good morning, everyone. My name is David McGlaughlin. I'm the 13 14 acting chief counsel for the judiciary committee. 15 REP. PARKER: Rep. Cherelle Parker, 16 200th District and prime sponsor of House Bill 2255. 17 REP. MARSICO: Good morning. Rep. Ron 18 19 Marsico. I represent parts of Dauphin County. 20 REP. KOTIK: Good morning. Rep. Nick 21 Kotik from Allegheny. 22 REP. SANTONI: Dante Santoni. 23 member from Berks County. REP. EVANS: Representative John Evans, 24 25 represent parts of Erie and Crawford Counties.

REP. STEVENSON: Good morning, Dick 1 2 Stevenson, representing parts of Butler County and 3 Mercer County. MS. FOX: Tammy Fox, staff to the 4 committee. 5 CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: And Karen 6 7 Coates, counsel to the committee. Just to let you know, I have been 8 requested to come over to the Justice Center with 9 10 chief -- not chief justice -- Justice McCaffery 11 dealing with some veterans issue, so I'll stay for 12 a little bit and I will be turning the hearing over to counsel -- Chairman Counsel Ron Marsico to take 1.3 14 the rest of the testimony, but I will read all of 15 this, I promise you, and we'll see how today's 16 hearing goes. 17 And I'd like to open it, even though 18 she's lost her voice. She just got married, so let's have a little round of applause for her. 19 20 So she's back from the honeymoon and 21 joined us today. 22 And if you'd like to open up with your 2.3 statement. 24 REP. PARKER: Before you leave Chairman

Caltagirone, to many of you who are in the

25

audience, you were with us in Philadelphia when we held a hearing on this in the 200th district. And when we talked about this issue, got a lot of the testimony on the record, we immediately came back to Harrisburg to speak to Chairman Caltagirone.

1.3

2.3

And I need to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the record for making this bill a priority and allowing us to have a hearing and in an effort to move the legislative process forward in an expedient manner. So I just want to thank you and Chairman Marsico. I want to thank you also for allowing us to be here today. Thank you.

Let me start by saying -- and no one told me that the work was going to start after the wedding and I would immediately lose my voice. He has something to do with this.

Let me say that when I first learned of this issue, it was when I was first elected. I read an article in the Philadelphia Inquirer and the Daily News about a case that those of you in this room are very much familiar with. And it was about a serial rapist who, because expert testimony regarding victim's behavior was not allowed or not admissible during the trial, that several of the victim's cases were found — or just unfounded,

they couldn't be proven. The prosecution just did not have enough evidence.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

And my friend, Diane Morris (phonetic), she and I we talked, we communicated. together language in a form of House Bill 66 that was during this previous session. We did move -we did work on redrafting the language, and with the assistance of Deborah Harley -- we thank you so much, all of those who testified in the hearing in Philadelphia, the Philadelphia Police Department -we made sure that we streamlined the language so that we were not trying to do what was characterized early on in prior language, was bolster the credibility of a victim in cases of sexual assault. That wasn't my goal. That wasn't the intent when we had the discussion. It was really just to provide a vehicle to educate juries.

I'm going to hear someone now, and I'm so happy. She comes from an organization out of New York, but finally the judges, so that they too could understand what a victim's behavior is like.

One of the things I did,

Mr. Chairman -- I found it very interesting as a woman, after the hearing in Philadelphia, I put my

own sort of prejudices and biases on trial, and did so with male family members and friends. And each of us had preconceived notions about how someone who is a victim of sexual assault was supposed to respond. Cherelle Parker's a pretty assertive, pretty aggressive woman. If someone ever tried to do something like that to me, I would fight to death. I would scream. I would kick. I would holler. I would immediately go to the police if I survived. And that's what I thought I said that I would do.

1.5

And then when I talked to people who were actually victims, they said, Cherelle, you watch Special Victims. You think he's going to jump out the bushes if you're trying to take a jog around Lincoln Drive or Kelly Drive. But the thing about the testimony given to you from the chief of the special victims unit in the Philadelphia Police Department and the number of sexual assaults that take place by someone that the victim knows, so I thought it was, you know, just opposite.

So it let me know that being a legislator, even a lay person who, you know, really thinks that I'm connected to what regular people think and feel, I, as a human being, have

```
preconceived notions and biases about how victims
1
2
     of sexual assault were supposed to act. And
     without the education that I received from those of
3
     you who participated in the hearing, I would simply
 4
5
     be walking around like normal every day
     Pennsylvanians, we're lay people. And what I'm
6
     learning, that we're not a monolithic people.
7
     don't all don't think alike and we don't form the
8
9
     same opinions.
10
                  So I'm excited about you all being here
11
     and moving this process forward.
12
                  And I want to state for the record that
1.3
     when House Bill 2255 was introduced, it is not a
14
     Democratic or Republican sponsored bill, there were
15
     equally the number of Democrats as well as
16
     Republicans, so this was a bipartisan effort, and I
17
     want to thank all of the colleagues who sponsored
18
     it.
                  And again, Chairman Marsico and
19
20
     Chairman Caltagirone, I'm so ever grateful for
21
     allowing us to move forward. So thank you.
22
                  CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE:
                                         Thank you,
     Cherelle.
2.3
24
                  And with your pardon, I will excuse
```

myself and go over to the justice center. I'll

25

turn the meeting over to Chairman Marsico. 1 2 REP. MARSICO: Thank you. 3 Mr. Chairman. First to testify -- excuse my 4 mispronunciation but Dr. Valliere. 5 DR. VALLIERE: Valliere. 6 7 REP. MARSICO: Valliere. I've got the 8 Italian pronunciation. I'm sorry. 9 DR. VALLIERE: You had to go for 10 French. REP. MARSICO: Begin when you're ready. 11 12 DR. VALLIERE: Thank you for allowing me to be here today. I mean, I'm very honored that 1.3 my voice is considered important in this fight. 14 1.5 Just a secretarial matter, it does not appear like you have all pages of my testimony 16 prepared; there's a missing page. But I'm not 17 18 going to focus this. 19 I just want to first give you a little foundation of where I'm from. I have -- I'm a 20 clinician, and I've dealt with hundreds of victims 21 22 and literally thousands of sex offenders from being on -- running a violent offender program and being 2.3 on the PA Sex Offender Assessment Board, doing the 24 25 Megan's law evaluations.

And when I first testified to this, and Rep. Parker said that the law was considered to unfairly bolster the credibility of victims, I thought, wow, I've heard dozens and dozens, hundreds now, of disclosures from offenders of how they've eroded the credibility of their victims, and the idea of -- that I can sit here and tell stories upon stories of how offenders take advantage of the biases we carry, how they construct their crimes to fool the audience, who we are, so that whatever the victim says, they're not believed. It was really a profound kind of statement, the idea that the victims could have unfairly bolstered credibility.

1.3

Everything about a sexual offense is to erode the victim's credibility. The grooming process or the clinical process of preparing the victim to be accepting of an assault, whether they're an adult victim or a child victim, to use the things that we count on in the community, like trust and kindness and care and vulnerability, that -- how the offenders exploit that and then rely on the victim's, quote, unquote, nonintuitive behavior. Because, as you explained, real victims are supposed to act a certain way.

And not only in my clinical experience is this relevant to confront this with the offenders and in my work with victims to show that this is not counterintuitive behavior, it's normal behavior in an abnormal situation, that truly what is going on is the offender is using counterintuitive behavior. The offender is taking the foundations of the trust and using kindness as a weapon, using the appearance of niceness to get the victim to protect the offender, too confuse and obfuscate the -- camouflage the offense behavior, and that not only is the community fooled by this, the audience, who we are, by expecting certain behaviors out of the victim, but the victim themselves are fooled.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

And I want to just quickly address some of the typical counterintuitive behaviors that we expect. First of all, we carry a whole bunch of biases and prejudisms about how people should act.

And I'm going to tell a quick vignette about -- one of the big issues is the idea of delayed reporting, that we think victims should, like in SVU, march into the police station and be righteously angry and report these crimes. And we had a big hail storm in Allentown, where I'm from. And my

husband's truck got completely dented, like seventy, eighty dents in it, and he was beside himself. And he didn't call the insurance company that day, and he didn't call them the next day or the next day, and I'm bugging him. I'm like, it's a truck, it's a truck. I don't want to talk about it.

1.3

1.5

2.3

On the sixth day, he called the insurance company, and that insurance agent did not say, sir, I'm not going to pay this claim, you delayed disclosure. You waited six days before you said this. And that example shows me that all these behaviors that we label counterintuitive in victims are really normal human behaviors. We don't want to talk about bad things. We don't want to talk a shameful things.

And multilayered on top of that is the idea and the biases of things like, how we differentiate intimate crime from normal crime. If there are no witnesses to a crime, like a robbery or a mugging or a carjacking, we don't call it a "he said/she said" thing, but in sexual assault, we say it's only he said/she said.

And so there are all these things that impact the victim's behavior post offense. The

offender's ability to exploit and the audience's interpretation of that victim's behavior. And some -- and the research bears this out, the clinical experience bears this out, and the offenders know this and exploit it as well.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And so with things like delayed disclosure, it's important for somebody to be able to say to a judge, Rethink this, think about it this way. This isn't counterintuitive behavior.

with the idea of delayed disclosure, we have the idea of resistance, earnest resistance it's called, fighting back with an offender. And there are lots of reactions to an assault, especially in an assault that you don't anticipate, especially in an assault by a loved one or a trusted one or someone you like or care for. The immediate response is typically confusion for most all of us, when somebody — not anger, not rage, not fighting back or retaliation. It's confusion. It's shock. It's fear. It's frozenness, which is the other side of fight, which is flight or frozen.

And so we have to be reminded of that, that that's not counterintuitive behavior. It's

exactly normal behavior to be in shock. But when we're going against the misunderstanding that not only real rapes happen with aggression and retaliation from the victim, but real rapes are stranger rapes, that's false as well. Real rapes happen by loved ones, more than 80 percent of people are assaulted by someone they know. And so that immediate bewilderment of the victim and freezing of the victim and confusion creates an atmosphere that the victim themselves cannot always label what's exactly happening.

1.5

So all of these behaviors that we look upon and say, Well, if he really raped her, this is how she would react, or if he really raped her, this is how he would react, totally, totally false.

And this is true whether it's a male victim or female victim. I'm currently working alongside the military, where the rate of -- in some military male sexual assault on male sexual assault is much higher than in the general population and these are soldiers trained to fight, and they still experience the freezing, the disbelief, the confusion, the avoidance of the wanting to be labeled as "asking for it." And a

male-on-male assault is very paralyzing for the victim. So when I'm using the term "she," I don't mean to be saying this is just male and female. It's a victim and offender behavior.

1.3

2.3

And the -- the biases and stereotypes we carry around that are borne out in juror research, research on public opinion, even nonscientific research, are -- shows that we carry around these things, and by carrying around these things, we judge whether or not this could have really happened. And we judge whether or not the victim is credible. We don't take the assumption that this kind of nice guy or nice-looking guy could do this. We take the assumption that he wouldn't do this, and she has to act a certain way to prove he did.

In the case that you were referring to,

Rep. Parker, it's called the -- referred to as the

Match.com rapist, where he solicited dates from

Match.com and would drug and rape women. Fortyeight victims were identified by the Philly DA's

office. I believe eight or eleven came to

prosecution, and only two were prosecuted. And
they were prosecuted at a much pled down, like
indecent assault.

The man went out and committed some rapes in Idaho and was convicted after PA convicted him, and some of the victim's behavior was explained. They had witnesses to explain the offender behavior, and he got sentenced to life out there, where he was only sentenced, I believe, on two counts of perhaps indecent assault in PA.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And the big thing in PA, the jury perceived these women as having what they quoted as buyer's remorse, they didn't like the date so they cried raped. And the proof of that was some of these women called him back and said, What did you do to me last night. We need to talk about this. We need to have coffee. He asked them out again and women responded.

He met one for another date, and she tried to figure out with this guy, Did you rape me? 'Cause real rapists don't bring you coffee in the morning. This was a confusing thing. And because of that behavior on the victim, this guy completely camouflaged his offense and the offense was successful in having him not prosecuted, and forty-eight victims he drugged and raped.

This is the kind of impact we're

talking about in terms the offenders power to influence the truth and the offenders power to use biases and misunderstandings, the secrecy and privacy of rape behavior, the confusion of the victim, and the disbelief of our environment. We want to be able to believe we can see who a rapist is. And we want to be able to believe that victims will take an active role in protecting themselves further, and the offenders exploit that, those needs in us, and over and over again.

1.3

2.3

I wish I could invite you all to sit in a treatment group and go around the circle and say to each offender, How did you get people to not believe the victim? And they will say, I got her drunk. They'll say, You know, I told her mother what a liar she was. They'll say, I told him when he — when he came back, you must have liked it, because if you didn't like it, you wouldn't keep coming back to see me. So it's not really rape. You like this. And we're talking about thirteen-year-old boys.

This is the kind of thing that I think this bill will help us expose. I do not think it's going to bolster the credibility of the victim. I think it will expose the weapons of the offender,

which they have the upper hand in all of this.

1.3

2.3

you coming in.

So I did not go off my testimony, and there's more research and information on that, but I really appreciate you -- I'm very passionate about this, and it's very -- it's a very difficult crime to expose. It's very difficult to have reported, and it's even more difficult to prosecute, and offenders have been far too successful in our community at exploiting not only the victim's trust and kindness and forgiveness, but our own.

And so I strongly urge you to consider this bill. Appreciate your time.

REP. MARSICO: Thank you very much.

Appreciate your -- hold on a second. Any questions from members? From the members? Staff? Anyone?

Thank you very much for your time and your expertise with this. We certainly appreciate

DR. VALLIERE: Thank you.

REP. MARSICO: Next on the agenda is

Kate -- are Kate Rush Cook and Beth Docherty.

Please come forward and begin when you are ready.

We have you scheduled for both of you to testify at the same time.

If you could introduce yourselves.

MS. COOK: Good morning. My name is Kate Rush Cook. Thank you for having me.

1.3

1.5

2.3

I believe you have my testimony, but I went back and made some revisions. I'm going to share with you my court experience and help you hopefully to understand what I, as a rape victim, went through during my trial.

I was victimized once by my rapist and subsequently by the court system, only to have my rapist acquitted. I believe that my experience could have been completely different had expert testimony be permitted. Maybe another woman would not have suffered at the hands of my attacker, had the expert testimony been permitted.

In 1993, I was kidnapped, terrorized, robbed, and raped. I promptly reported my offense to the police, still in tears and hysterical. Days later, my rapist was arrested, and months later the case went to trial.

I was not prepared for what was to come during my trial and would ultimately occur. I did not realize that I would have to defend myself from the myths and stereotypes the jurors had, which may have been negated had expert testimony been

permitted.

2.3

The day my trial began, I came to the courthouse dressed in a business suit, high heels, nails painted, and my long hair twisted up in the back. Is was told by the district attorney's office that I had to change my clothing to appear more victim-like to the jury. That request confused me. I had thought that I presented myself in a professional and appropriate manner for a courtroom. But while my rapist was on trial, I was made to feel as if I had to prove my innocence.

This was only the beginning of the litany of stereotypes for rape victims that I would encounter during the course of my trial and be expected to live up to. Myths and stereotypes that could have been avoided with the use of expert testimony.

Ironically, what I was told by the district attorney's office seventeen years ago still haunts me. Even as I was preparing to come here today, in a passing moment, I wondered if I would be wearing victim-like clothing. I wondered if I would fit your stereotype of what a rape victim should look like.

I will never forget the last day of my

trial. I came to the courthouse dressed in my victim-like clothing, as directed by the district attorney's office. I was wearing tan pinstriped pants, a cream turtleneck, a cream crocheted sweater, and had my long hair pulled up on the sides. The joke of the day with the victim witness coordinator and my mother and my friends was that if I had little glasses, I would look like a librarian.

1.3

1.5

2.3

During the trial, I was using the locked employee's bathroom because I had been attacked by my rapist's family on the first day of the trial. After lunch that last day, I was in the locked employee's bathroom with my mother. Closing arguments were to start, and I was a bundle of nerves. I was crying and my mother was comforting me.

She told me, After today, you won't have to wear these librarian clothes anymore. You can go back to wearing your funky clothes and being Katie. A perfectly innocent conversation.

During the course of these events, a woman entered the bathroom. She used the restroom, washed her hands and left without a second glance.

When I reentered at the time courtroom

with my mother, I saw the woman from the bathroom speaking to the defense attorney. I later learned that she was an attorney with the public defender's office and that they shared that locked bathroom.

1.3

1.5

2.3

When Court reconvened, I was called to the stand again. The defense attorney asked my mother -- asked -- excuse me. Asked me about using the locked employee's bathroom and the conversation that I had with my mother. The conversation was twisted around to give it a different connotation. I was asked if I knew the woman from the bathroom, which I did not. He asked me if she had been in the bathroom when I was in there, and I answered yes. He said, So you know her? I answered, Just because I saw her in the bathroom does not mean that I know her. I was dismissed from the witness stand without so much as an objection from the district attorney or a comment from the judge.

The woman from the bathroom was then called to the stand. She recounted a story that was twisted and made it sound as if I was not telling the truth.

Closing arguments were given and the jury was charged. Forty-five minutes later, the jury acquitted my rapist. The district attorney

asked the jury why they made that decision and found that there were two reasons. Two jurors saw me laughing at lunch, and the line of questioning concerning the bathroom incident called my credibility into question.

1.3

1.5

2.3

A jury member saw me laugh outside the courtroom prior to deliberations. I was with my mother and my friends at lunch and laughed at a joke my mother had told me. It is a stereotype that rape victims should appear to be broken or else they are lying about their experience.

The defense attorney even asked me where I had bought my underwear and what color they were. It is a stereotype that rape victims who dress provocatively are asking to be raped or even deserve it.

I had no physical injuries because I did what I needed to do in order to survive the horrific situation that I was in. I complied with every one of my rapist's demands and was in genuine fear for my life. He told me many times that he would kill me if I did not cooperate.

Sometimes -- excuse me -- jurors want to see physical injuries or proof that you fought your attacker. I believe that it -- that a common

perception is that -- sorry -- that it is not rape if there was no struggle. The fact is that many victims do not have physical injuries, but the mental health of the victim is forever altered.

1.3

1.5

2.3

It is also a stereotype that all rape victims have -- behave the same way regardless of the circumstances surrounding the rape. There are many different reactions to rape and not everyone victim will respond the same way. Some victims go on to develop post-traumatic stress disorder, as I did, while others will not.

that can be dispelled by using expert testimony in rape cases. Jurors are lay persons who only -- who have these societal beliefs or stereotypes engrained into them. Only experts can explain reactions that do not fit the societal beliefs or stereotypes and provide evidence to the contrary and provide jurors with a better understanding of what happens mentally and emotionally to the rape victim, not only during the offense itself, but in the months and even years afterward.

Rape is the only crime where the victim is often on trial. We don't ask a burglary victim to prove that their home was burglarized, nor do we

ask a mugging victim to prove that they were mugged. So why is the crime of rape any different?

1.3

1.5

2.3

Rapists also have one of the highest rates for recidivism. Many of the cases are pled down or acquitted, many times because prosecutors are concerned that a jury does not or will not understand the behaviors and the actions of the victim. And these cases are pled down in fear of an acquittal by a lack of understanding by jury members.

By using the expert testimony, we would enable to the jury to make a more informed decision. It is my hope that these decisions will result in justice being served for the victims of these violent and life-altering events.

My rapist was acquitted. He re-offended. Perhaps his other victim -- sorry -- could have been saved had expert testimony been allowed at my trial.

Thank you.

REP. MARSICO: Beth, do you wish -
MS. DOCHERTY: Good morning. I

appreciate your willingness to allow me some of

your time today to speak about the importance of

using expert testimony in sexual assault cases.

1.3

1.5

2.3

My name is Beth Docherty and I a survivor of rape and childhood sexual abuse. I was fifteen years old when my high school music teacher began raping me. Music was and still is my passion, so when this teacher showed a special interest in me, I was thrilled. I didn't know that I was being groomed for abuse.

This man, who held this trusted position, quickly became my mentor. I looked up to him, and I respected him.

The abuse started with benign comments and gradually escalated. By the time I turned fifteen, he was raping me daily at school, sometimes two to three times a day, in classrooms, bathrooms, practice rooms, and closets.

He threatened me, telling me not to breathe a word to anyone. He said that he would kill me and nobody would believe me. He told me that it was my fault.

I endured these rapes for almost a year, telling no one. I was afraid that what my teacher told me would come true. I was filled with fear and shame, which forced me to live in a world of loneliness and isolation. I was terrified but

tried to appear like a happy teenager on the outside, burying the brutality as deeply as I possibly could.

1.3

I remained active, got good grades, and excelled in music, but I was always aware of the reality. Instead of being a carefree teenager, thinking about boys, clothes, and school, I was trying to figure out which clothing would be the most difficult to rip off. I was trying to hold back tears while taking my chemistry test because I had just been raped ten minutes earlier. I was worried about what I'd tell my parents if I somehow mysteriously got pregnant.

I appeared happy on the outside but remained in complete terror and turmoil on the inside.

Eventually, I told a trusted adult that I was being sexually abused. Even then, I just was very little. I was greatly relieved when she believed me and told me that it wasn't my fault, but I still had trouble accepting that that was true.

I pressed criminal charges and went through the brutal process of the court trial. Five other girls came forward; the teacher had

sexually abused them as well. There were many girls who told me that they had been abused by the same teacher but could not muster up enough courage to come forward.

1.3

1.5

2.3

One woman called the police and said that my teacher had raped her twelve years earlier, while he was student teaching, but the statute of limitation had expired, therefore, nothing could be done.

During the trial, the defense attorney accused me of seducing my teacher and being a drug addict, having mental problems. Anything to place the blame on me and perpetuate the societal myths about rape. He repeatedly asked why I hadn't told anyone I was being raped, why I had waited so long if this, quote, really happened.

my crying after some of the rapes and asked me what was wrong, why didn't I just tell them. Why hadn't I screamed while it was happening. It was painful, wasn't it? How is it possible that I could still have good grades and continue in music while this man was brutally raping me daily.

The defense asked me why, once I did tell, that I didn't tell everything that happened

all at once. When I wasn't able to recall every detail and date, he accused me of then being cavalier with the rapes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

It may be a surprise to some that there are parts of my abuse that I have never disclosed.

It is just too painful to recount such horrific memories.

Fortunately, the judge permitted my psychologist to testify. She was able to talk about my diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder, PTSD. She was able to explain to the jury that it's not normal -- I'm sorry -- that it is normal for children in my situation to not disclose immediately. She indicated that some have waited years to disclose, which I witnessed firsthand with some of my classmates and friends. She explained that victims feel that disclosing would bring on shame, anger, punishment or ostracism from family and friends, which often causes the victim to become paralyzed and unable to tell anyone about the abuse. In addition, the perpetrators have betrayed the victim's trust once, and the victim is likely to be reluctant to trust again.

The psychologist was able to clarify

that she would be suspicious if a child did disclose everything that happened at one sitting. Usually the details about sexual abuse come out piecemeal, with easier pieces of the story coming out first and more difficult, anxiety-laden pieces of the story emerging only later.

1.3

2.3

She testified that it was unfortunate that I was able to conceal the extent of my distress so well. She was able to point out how my behavior was common for a child of sexual abuse and to explain some of my misunderstood reactions.

My music teacher was found guilty and sentenced to thirty to seventy years in prison.

Unfortunately, many myths regarding sex crimes still exist, and there is still a stigma attached to rape victims. Although we have made great strides, society still tends to ask what the victim did or didn't do to cause the abuse. Jurors are not immune to societal influences and beliefs.

The psychologist's testimony in my teacher's trial cleared up any doubts that the jury may have had. Jurors are not experts in the field of trauma or how trauma effects the behavior of sexual assault survivors, victims.

There's a lack of understanding about

the different responses that survivor may have. If my jury hadn't been educated by an expert in the field, the verdict may have been gone the other way, giving this teacher unlimited access to hundreds of children.

1.3

2.3

The abuse that I endured has affected every aspect of my life, but I'm able to find some peace knowing that no more children are being raped and permanently scarred by this predator.

I believe, from my own personal experiences, that it is of the utmost importance for PA to utilize expert testimony in sexual assault cases.

I thank you in advance for helping to protect victims of sexual crimes, especially our children.

REP. MARSICO: Any questions, members?

REP. PARKER: For Kate and Beth, this is -- first let me just start by saying thank you so much for your courage and your willingness to just come forward and sort of bring back to the forefront of your minds the horrific acts and violations that took place in your personal lives. But today you showed a lot of strength and you showed a lot of character, and this is the way that

you were to do what you mentioned when you talked about protecting children in the future, when you talked about the person who assaulted you going on to re-offend after your case.

Your being here and testifying today is the strength and courage that we need to help to prevent this from happening in the future.

Just wanted to just bring to light, listening to you, Kate, you immediately went to the police.

And, Beth, you were a child, and it took you about a year to finally share with an adult what was happening to you. And yet at two different times in your lives, you were both experiencing some of the same feelings that others characterize as being abnormal without knowing exactly what the behaviors are and listening to experts who, you know, work with people who have been victims and to know that your behavior was actually a normal behavior.

So I just wanted to thank you for the record for your courage and standing up and sharing with the committee your experience.

MS. COOK: Thank you.

REP. MARSICO: Counsel McGlaughlin, do

1.3

2.3

```
you have a question?
1
 2
                  MR. MCGLAUGHLIN: Yes.
                                          Thank you,
3
     Mr. Chairman.
                  Ms. Rush Cook, I just real quickly
 4
     wanted to -- first of all, thank you very much for
5
     coming. And I know it's difficult.
6
7
                  Which county did your prosecution take
8
     place in?
9
                  MS. COOK: Mine was York County.
10
                  MR. MCGLAUGHLIN: York County?
                            Um-hum.
11
                  MS. COOK:
12
                  MR. MCGLAUGHLIN: Okay. Thank you.
                  REP. MARSICO: Any other members?
1.3
14
                  Yes. Thank you very much, on behalf of
15
     the committee, for being here and certainly had to
     be very difficult, and we thank you for being
16
            It took a lot of courage.
17
                                        Thank you.
18
                  MS. DOCHERTY: Thank you.
19
                  MS. RUSH: Thank you for having us.
20
                  REP. MARSICO: Next to testify is
21
     Deborah Harley, chief of the Family Violence and
22
     Sexual Assault Unit from the Philadelphia District
2.3
     Attorney's Association.
24
                  MS. HARLEY: Good morning, members of
25
     the House Judiciary Committee.
```

As stated, my name is Deborah Harley, chief of the Family Violence and Sexual Assault Unit in the Philadelphia DA's Office. I am also testifying here today on behalf of the PA District Attorneys Association. And I'm here today to testify in support of House Bill 2255, very important legislation, permitting expert testimony in cases involving sexual assault and sexual violence.

1.3

2.3

I want to thank Rep. Parker for her outstanding leadership in this issue. And I want to thank you for holding this hearing. It is a very important issue to victims of sexual assault.

Victim of rape and sexual assault undergo one of the most traumatic violations of humanity: forced, violent, sexual attacks on their physical person. While the occurrence of rape in America is shockingly high, 20 to 30 percent of women experience a sexual assault in their life time. Societal attitudes towards sexual violence create an atmosphere of skepticism, criticism, and backlash for victims.

It is because of the pervasive misperception in our culture that passage of this legislation is critical. Under current case law in

PA, expert testimony is impermissible to assist the jury in explaining any type of victim behavior.

This is in contrast to forty-eight states, the District of Columbia, the military, and the federal courts, where it is permissible for the prosecution to introduce expert testimony regarding the

behavior of adult victims of sexual assault.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Additionally, in PA, the law expressly permits the instruction to a jury that the jury may consider the promptness of a complaint in accepting a victim's -- in assessing a victim's credibility. The law, as it currently stands in the Commonwealth, is only serving to perpetuate the myths and misunderstanding surrounding the behaviors of sexual assault victim.

Over the last twenty years, I have seen thousands of cases of rapes and sexual assaults. In each case, the victim undergoes a traumatic experience with a wide range of behavioral and psychological responses. Some victim experience memory loss, some do not fight back, some disassociate themselves from the event, some blame themselves, and some are in a state of denial.

These patterns of behavior often contradict how the general public believes a victim

of crime would react, especially given the general skepticism regarding sexual assault.

1.3

Psychologists, psychiatrists, victim advocates, nurses, social workers, counselors, and other trained individuals who come into constant contact with rape victims must be allowed to testify, through their experience in the field, to the ranges of psychological and physical responses, victims may undertake. Such expert testimony on the general complexity of victim's reaction is necessary for the jury to be able to properly evaluate the response of a particular victim.

Jury members, unaided by expert testimony, are very likely to interpret victim behavior in flawed and biased ways, according to their own uneducated beliefs and beliefs that were impressed upon them by society. Juries often regard a rape victim as being unreliable because of behavior that is in direct response to prior sexual and/or physical abuse.

Victims that delay the reporting of sexual assault are deemed unreliable. Victim response psychology can offer explanations, based on research, education, training, and experience, for the cycle of domestic violence and for other

victim behaviors that appear to be counterintuitive after a traumatic assault and for delayed reports of rapes and sexual assault.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Lastly, even jurors have who have undergone a traumatic event themselves or know someone close to them who has gone through a traumatic event, they may be biased, because these jurors will compare the victim's responses to their own responses when assessing the facts of the case. Yet we know no two victims can be expected to react the same way.

For all of these reasons, legislation to allow expert testimony to explain victim behavior is absolutely necessary in PA. I sincerely believe that the misperceptions and myths surrounding sexual trauma are negatively impacting the state and our victims in successfully prosecuting rapists.

Permitting experts to testify as to the effects that sexual assault has on victims gives the jury the necessary tools to make an educated credibility decision and assess the facts of the case without bias or prejudice.

In our judicial system, it is imperative that juries be fair and impartial. It

is only with expert testimony in sexual abuse cases that those values can be ensured.

I thank you again, and I would be happy to answer any questions that you would have.

REP. MARSICO: Representative Parker.

REP. PARKER: Thank you, Ms. Harley,

for your testimony.

1.3

1.5

2.3

received from many members of the judiciary about expert testimony just bolstering the credibility, you know, of the victim. And when you listen to Beth Docherty's testimony, and she said that when her psychologist was allowed to testify, he or she determined that if, in fact, Beth had told her story and it was completely filled, with no holes, she remembered absolutely every detail, she communicated the assault as it occurred on each occasion, that that would have, like, sort of been a red light for the psychologist, because it's abnormal for a child to sort of recant in detail having been victimized in this way.

Can you to me talk about how -- how this legislation would assist in sort of making sure that we move forward to obtaining justice for both the victim and also the defendant?

So if -- so if, again, someone goes in and they tell you a complete story, that may be pause for you and the investigating officer to look at some other details.

1.3

2.3

MS. HARLEY: In the overwhelming majority of cases, we see that disclosure is a process. There are many reasons for it and most of it is safety. Children might put their toe in the water, tell a little bit about what happened, to see the reaction. And if the reaction is not one of anger or disbelief, the child might tell a little bit more.

There's so many issues that are involved with the sexual assault, the disclosure, what happens after the disclosure, especially a sexual assault that -- their family members. You know, children see, teenagers see what will happen if they give a full disclosure. The family will be torn apart. The victim might have to go into foster care. They would have to change schools. They would not be able to see their brother and sister anymore. And they see all of this. And they're also told this as they are being abused by a family member.

So we see it all the time, that

disclosure is a process. And when it isn't, it is usually a one-time event, and the child or the adult has spoken out immediately. Other than that, it is typical and expected for the disclosure to be a process.

1.3

2.3

REP. PARKER: Let me ask you a question, because I was really listening to the testimony, I just want to be clear that I'm understanding your testimony, because I'm not an attorney.

You state that PA law expressively permits instructing jury members that they may consider the promptness of a complaint in assessing a victim's credibility. So just let me understand, because I'm not a lawyer. So those who are expert in this field, from the psychologists to psychiatrists, doctors, law enforcement officers, those of you who are in the DA's office, you already know, and you've told us that when a victim doesn't immediately report the crime, that that is not abnormal behavior. You're telling this committee that that is normal behavior.

But our judicial system allows a judge to instruct a jury that if they want to determine whether or not this victim is credible, they can

use the promptness, the timing that the complainant actually disclose -- I just want to make sure

I'm -
MS. HARLEY: You're exactly right.

REP. PARKER: I want to understand this correctly.

MS. HARLEY: You're exactly right. If I could just describe, in a jury trial, after -- after closing, the judge gives jury instructions, that the jury is there to determine the facts and the judge is there to provide the law. So if you were to have an aggravated assault case, after the testimony and the closings, the judge would give the elements of the crime of aggravated assault to the jury. There is no jury instruction on an aggravated assault as to prompt complaint.

In a rape case, after the closings and the judge is to give the instruction to the jury, he'll give the elements of the charge of rape and/or indecent assault, and then will instruct the jury about the prompt complaint or lack thereof.

And if there was not a prompt complaint, the judge will instruct the jury that they may assess that, use that fact in assessing the credibility of the victim.

It is -- it's only in sexual assault cases. In no other case is there a jury instruction regarding prompt complaint. So we're trying cases with our hands tied behind our backs.

REP. PARKER: Just thank you for your professionalism and giving up the facts for the record.

If I look a little flabbergasted,
Mr. Chairman, it's just because I was just a little surprised.

Briana.

1.3

2.3

CHAIRMAN CALTAGIRONE: Rep. Evans.

REP. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a couple quick questions here.

I'm glad Rep. Parker, the sponsor of the bill, is here.

And also thank you, Miss Harley, for your testimony today. I think having you here would answer the question that I have. On page two of the bill, when it gets into the rule itself, the testimony by an expert qualified by the court regarding any recognized and accepted form of post-traumatic stress disorder and any recognized and acceptable counterintuitive behavior shall be admissible, I guess my question is, what does the

court recognize as an expert? Is perhaps the bill drawn broadly in the sense that, would this be a psychologist, a psychiatrist, would it be a school counselor, would it be a school nurse, would it be a member of the clergy? Who would be considered an expert?

1.3

MS. HARLEY: In order to be qualified as an expert, the Commonwealth prosecutors would have show that that person, standing before the court, has more knowledge than the ordinary lay person. So to qualify somebody as an expert, we would show — suppose it was a psychologist, their education, their work with victims, and anything that they've written about it, anything they've read about it, anything to show that they have more knowledge on the subject than an ordinary jury would have.

REP. EVANS: I'm just wondering if perhaps that is too broad to what we are looking to do here, to identify that. Wouldn't it be best to say psychologist or psychiatrist.

MS. HARLEY: Well, actually social workers, people who have constant contact with rape victims would have an expertise in that area.

People who work in the emergency rooms. In

```
Philadelphia, as it currently stands, we have two
1
2
     hospitals that see our rape victims, Jefferson and
                 So it is not like our victims are going
3
     Episcopal.
     to fifteen different hospitals, so that the workers
 4
     there see rape victims each and every day.
5
     on over a thousand -- over a thousand?
 6
7
                  CAPTAIN DARBY: About a thousand rapes
8
     reported every year.
9
                  MS. HARLEY: About a thousand rapes
10
                 So if you look at it statistically,
     every year.
11
     what you're seeing, that's at least three victims a
12
     day. So they would have elevated knowledge.
1.3
                  REP. EVANS: Okay.
                                      Thank you.
                  And I do see that there is an amendment
14
15
     Rep. Parker has to clarify that language that I was
16
     concerned about.
                  MS. HARLEY: We did that after the
17
18
     February hearing.
19
                  REP. EVANS: I didn't see that on the
20
     original bill here, so I apologize for that.
21
                  Thank you very much.
22
                  REP. MARSICO:
                                 Anyone else?
23
                  MS. ELZEY: I had a quick question.
                                                        Ιt
24
     wasn't in your testimony, but I noticed it in a
25
     slight dissent to certain things in the bill. I
```

Where --

just was wondering if you've known any cases where the defendant has been denied the use of an expert to explain their behavior in a sexual assault case.

MS. HARLEY: I'm sorry.

1.3

1.5

2.3

MS. ELZEY: Where the defense may want to bring in an expert to explain their behavior in any way, shape, or form when they're accused of sexual assault, to help exonerate them. Have they ever been denied or a case be retried because they brought in expert?

MS. HARLEY: I can tell you that as long as I've been here, we've not had any case where the defense has attempted to bring in an expert. But it also may be because the Commonwealth can't bring in an expert, so, therefore, we wouldn't get to the step of the defense bringing in an expert.

MS. ELZEY: Yeah, I just asked just in case -- because the cases we've seen cited are ones where the prosecution has brought in one, it's been allowed, but it's been overturned on appeal. I was just wondering if there were any cases -- I mean, you know, it's probably something nobody was thinking about, but cases where defense has brought

```
it in, and, of course, you can't really appeal on
1
2
     defense. I mean you can, but usually when the
3
     defense wins a case and they're acquitted, it's
     left alone. That is double jeopardy.
 4
                  MS. HARLEY: Right.
5
                  MS. ELZEY: I was just curious maybe if
6
7
     any were on record but I doubt it since it wasn't
8
     an appeals process.
9
                  MS. HARLEY: Right.
                  MS. ELZEY:
10
                              Okay.
11
                  MR. MCGLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, very
12
     quickly.
                  Ms. Harley, don't you think it would
1.3
14
     permit or open the door to allowing defense
15
     witnesses, expert witnesses? If this -- this bill
16
     would cut both ways, wouldn't it?
                  MS. HARLEY: But at least it would be
17
18
     an even playing field.
19
                  MR. MCGLAUGHLIN: Understood.
                                                  Thank
20
     you.
21
                  REP. MARSICO: Okay. Any other
22
     questions?
2.3
                  Thank you.
24
                  MS. HARLEY: Thank you.
25
                  REP. MARSICO: Appreciate your help
```

with this.

1.3

2.3

MS. HARLEY: Thank you very much.

REP. MARSICO: Next to testify is Lynn Hecht Schafran, director of the National Judicial Education Program.

MS. SCHAFRAN: Good morning, and thank you so much for having me. I am the one out-of-stater here, I believe. I was very honored to be asked to testify at the hearings in Philadelphia in the winter, and I so much appreciate the opportunity to be with you again today.

My question is, do you have my testimony? Because I see that it wasn't in the pile that was reproduced. And I have extra copies to give out and so on, if need be.

How I come to you today is, as Rep.

Parker said, I run the National Judicial Education

Program. And this is a project of legal momentum

in cooperation with the National Association of

Women Judges. We have been around since 1980.

And from the beginning of this project, we have been very concerned with the issue of adult victims of assault.

In the mid '90s, I secured a grant from the State Justice Institute to create a two-day

curriculum for judges. And Rep. Parker mentioned this with specificity, and I'm going to highlight that. A two-day curriculum for judges called Understanding Sexual Violence: The Judicial Response to Stranger and Nonstranger Rape and Sexual Assault.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We've presented that program here in And how we learned that PA does not allow PA. expert witness testimony in these cases is that when we came to present this program in PA, which the first time we did it was 1997, we learned from your judges that you are one of the two outlier states in the country -- the other is Minnesota. Both of you have a supreme court case that came very early in the years when the people began to research the response of rape victims. And there was simply an assumption on the part of your respective high courts that you didn't need to have any expert witnesses in cases like this. Common sense would tell the jury how to evaluate the credibility of the witness.

Not to belabor everything that you've heard today, I think that what you've heard from the prior witnesses and what's detailed in my testimony is that common sense about rape victims

is exactly a hundred eighty degrees from reality. People do not report immediately. Victim most often freeze with fright and couldn't resist, even if they thought that that was the way to save their lives, which usually it is not. People have post contact assault with victims. People display every possible kind of behavior on the witness stand. And one thing that wasn't mentioned, of course, is that if you display too much emotion, then, for a woman, you're labeled hysterical and you won't be believed either. So the notion that common sense will do it is really wrong.

1.3

2.3

And the other state, I think you will be interested to know, that doesn't allow this, as I said, is Minnesota. Right now they have an expedited appeal to their supreme court on a case which is, once again, testing this issue of the admission of expert witness testimony. And I know, because I'm working with Minnesota on another project, that they're very interested in what you are doing here in PA, because if they are not able to change this through their supreme court, they will be looking at HB-2255 and thinking about going to their own state legislature. So what you do here will not only profoundly affect victims of

sexual assault here in PA, but could very well affect profoundly the lives of victims of sexual assault in Minnesota as well.

1.3

2.3

So we produced a four-hour video that was based on our two-day curriculum for judges.

There's a PA judge on this DVD -- I brought some copies for the committee -- Judge Jacqueline Allen from Philadelphia. She had been a faculty member for us when we did our live, two-day curriculum, and the judges -- when we came to the judge's panel in these DVDs, the judges from the other four states were real amazed to learn from Judge Allen that, as we're here discussing today, PA does not permit expert witness testimony.

The question about how we come to know this, I mean, is this just anecdotal evidence that expert witness testimony makes such a difference or that juries really don't know what they're talking about, or that they really rely on bias when they're making their decisions?

There is a huge amount of very serious sociological, professional research on jury bias.

And interestingly, it all started here in PA, with Kalven and Zeisel back in the 1960s. They did some research where they found that in cases where

the -- rape cases where the victim and offender knew one another and there wasn't a weapon, that the judges and the juries came out very -- in very different places, where the judges would have convicted, the jurors acquitted.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And their analysis of this came down to what they called assumption of risk, that if a woman went to a bar with a man, went home with him, anything that was short of, you know, an arranged marriage, she assumed the risk of whatever might happen afterward.

There has subsequently, for example, been some extensive research with three hundred thirty-one jurors who actually sat in sexual assault cases in Indianapolis, ninety-minute interviews with each one of them. And the bias was rampant. Their idea of how to make a decision was their assessment of the complaining witness's character. Tremendous bias against women of color.

There was a horrible situation in -written up -- it's a book by Garrett

LaFree (phonetic) -- where he describes all this
research. A thirteen-year-old black girl, raped,
and the attitude of the jurors was, Well, she came

from a bad neighborhood anyway.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So the juror ignorance and bias is a tremendous, tremendous factor in these There's also a tremendous amount of opinion cases. polling. And, you know, who makes up our jurors? They're the public. When you look at opinion polls from the United States, and the most recent research has been done in the UK, but I think kind of similar population, similar attitudes, you find that both men and women take the attitude that if a woman is wearing, quote, unquote, provocative clothing, if she's drinking, if she's alone in a dangerous, deserted neighborhood, she's asking for She's culpable. She deserved to be raped. it. Maybe she wasn't even raped at all, she's just lying.

There is a huge mistaken belief about false allegations. This is also an area where there is a tremendous amount of serious methodical research. I cite some of it in my testimony. The best research in this area is that, depending upon the study, between 2 and 10 percent of cases are false, meaning not just unfounded, not just the detectives didn't bother to do the work, meaning it was determined that there was no reality to this

claim, but the assumption is that women just cry rape willy-nilly, and these cases are not real.

1.3

1.5

2.3

We have comments that are made by jurors who come out of the experience of sitting with their colleagues and they're just stunned by what has been said in the jury room. They cannot believe that, in the face of all this evidence, if the woman's genitals weren't carved up, then she couldn't have been telling the truth. And I quote in my own testimony some statements made by jurors in these cases, interviews they have given to the New York Times and other places after the fact.

that were held in February, I thought it would be useful to talk to two people whom we work with extensively who have been expert witnesses in probably between more than a hundred cases.

They're both in Colorado. And apropos of the question that was asked about who would be qualified as an expert, these are — one of these women was the head of an organization called Moving to End Sexual Assault — thank you — and is now head of a major unit within that same mental health center. Another is a social worker who was also a clinician and ultimately served for many years as

head of the Colorado Sex Offender Management Board.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And they told me about their testimony, and I asked them afterward, Colorado jurors, can you poll the jurors, can you talk to them about what was salient in their decision making, and what I learned from them was the jurors themselves would tell the prosecutors that absent the expert witness testimony that was offered to them about why victims don't report immediately, why victims have post assault contact with a rapist, all of these issues that you've heard about this morning, but absent the testimony that they heard from Dr. D'Anniballe and Dr. McAllister, they would not have understood what happened in this case. They would not have understood why they should convict.

Dr. D'Anniballe told me she's actually had jurors seek her out and call her up afterward to say, Thank you so much for your testimony. If you had not been there, I would have let this rapist go.

The other person that I spoke of, Jean McAllister, said that she constantly hears from prosecutors who say that the jurors told them that she was pivotal to their understanding of this case

and judges who have told other therapists that expert witness testimony that she gave was pivotal.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I want to speak to this notion that this is bolstering the credibility of the witness, because this is very disturbing to hear. Not in my testimony is something that I think is worthwhile bringing up. We're in the process of a major project -- in which PA, by the way, is also involved -- which has to do with developing an approach toward judicial education about adult and elder victim sexual assault, which is going to cover the waterfront from the straightforward sexual assault case to women in drug treatment courts who are there because they are self medicating the results and the consequences of childhood and adult sexual abuse, and if you don't have the right kind of program that deals with the underlying trauma, the program fails them, they fail the program, and they end up in prison and lose their children.

And in the course of developing this whole program, I knew that I wanted to do something for new judges, because this is an area that is so fraught with misinformation that if the judges

themselves don't have both the misinformation from the point of view of this is what the public is believing and the accurate information, they won't know how to run a fair process. They won't understand why they need to admit expert witnesses.

1.3

2.3

Obviously, in our particular form of jurisprudence, a judge cannot call an expert witness him or herself, but when the prosecution, or the question was asked, the defense seeks to bring in an expert witness, the judges need to know how to evaluate that request and how to evaluate the qualifications of the proffered expert.

And in speaking to a judicial educator, she said, Well, why don't you do something like the top ten things I wish I knew before I presided in an adult victim sexual assault case. And so I polled judges across the country who have served as faculty for us over the years, and I ended up writing something called Judges Tell: What I Wish I Had Known Before I Presided in an Adult Victim Sexual Assault Case. And it is more than David Letterman's top ten at this point, but what it is, is a series of -- it's like seventeen points and a commentary.

And the most basic thing these judges are writing: I wish I knew that most assaults are committed by someone the victim knows. I wish I knew that most people don't report immediately. I wish I knew that most people aren't physically injured in a, you know, visible sense.

1.3

1.5

2.3

How is this one: I wish I knew that it is not uncommon for a rape victim to have a physical response. It's not an expression of mutuality and desire. It's an expression of sheer physiology. The defense expert says to the witness: Didn't you have some sexual response? Were you lubricated? Did you have an orgasm? This is enormously confusing to victims. By the way, this can also happen to male victims as well. How do you explain that without expert witness testimony?

So judges themselves really need to have a lot of education, and they need to hear it hopefully from programs like mine and other entities to provide judicial education. And I know PCAR does some of that here in your own state. And Judge Panella has written a wonderful bench book for judges on sexual assault with PCAR.

But not every judge is going to be

reached this way. Not every topic will be covered. The judges themselves need to hear from expert witnesses.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

I know that my time is short, so I just want to touch on one other thing. With respect to the fact that PA law has this very unusual prompt complaint jury charge written into its law, I thought I could best tell you how misleading this is and how undermining the fair administration of justice by telling you that in Britain, where I have worked with them over a number of years because it's virtually impossible to get a conviction, the Crown Court judicial bench book now directs the judges that they are to charge the jury the reverse of what your judges charge. They are to charge the jury that the fact that someone did not immediately make a disclosure or a complaint is not to be taken as evidence of fabrication, that everybody responds differently and reports differently, and that this is an individual thing, and they should assess it from the point of view of the individual response, explanation, how things happened, but they should not make an assumption -that's the word they use -- don't make an assumption that because someone delayed reporting

1 there was a fabrication.

1.3

So, in sum, this is extremely important legislation. I thank you for considering this. I thank you for allowing me to come and testify again. And I hope that very soon this will be the law in PA.

And, again, I'd also be happy to answer any questions.

REP. MARSICO: Any questions?

Thank you very much for your coming to central PA, and have a good trip back. Thank you.

Jill Maier, director of National

Judicial Education Program, Women Organized Against

Welcome.

Rape.

MS. MAIER: Good morning. Thank you very much for taking the time to hear my testimony. I'm very honored to be here.

As was said, I'm Jill Maier, director of counseling services for Women Organized Against Rape. If I can just clarify, we're a rape crisis center in Philadelphia, PA, and America's oldest rape crisis center. I'm also a licensed professional clinician.

As we've been talking today, sexual

violence is a trauma which can violate an individual's mind, body and soul. The most startling statistics from the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network state that almost eighteen million American women and 3 percent of American men have been victims of attempted or completed sexual assault.

1.3

1.5

2.3

The effects of sexual assault can be life altering, causing a multitude of short and long-term system and -- excuse me -- and result in victims being three times more likely to experience depression, six times more likely to experience post-traumatic stress disorder, thirteen times more likely to abuse alcohol, twenty-six times more likely to abuse drugs, and four times more likely to consider suicide than the average American. With statistics such as these, our society needs to make great efforts to protect and care for its women, men and children.

Over the last several decades there have been great strides in research, advocacy efforts, and treatment for sexual assault. The criminal justice system has made great strides as well, but there remains some areas in which the law needs to provide better protection for victims of

crime. And I'm glad that the House is taking the time today to look at one of these issues.

1.3

Unfortunately, as we've been discussing already this morning at great length, the general public still does not truly understand the dynamics of sexual violence. It's not a topic people like to talk about. Many people think that most assaults are the stranger jumping out of the bushes in the park. And while this does happen, the majority of rapes are perpetrated by someone the victim knows such as a family member, a friend, or a lover.

Many people get their conceptions of rape from the media, most often the popular television show, Law and Order: Special Victims Unit. On this show, a victim is typically portrayed as female, extremely emotional, and the criminal case proceeds very quickly, always hinging on the discovery of DNA.

Most times we know in reality this is not the case. A victim can be a woman, a man, or a child. They may experience a range of emotions following an assault, including fear, anger, shock, depression, avoidance, or be completely numb and express no feelings at all.

Also rape remains one of the most underreported crimes, with only less than 50 percent being reported to the police, mainly because of the victim's fear of reporting due to threats made by the perpetrator or a fear that the system will not believe them.

1.3

Now, imagine when a rape case is being heard in court. It is difficult enough for a victim to retell their story and to sit a few feet away from their attacker, but to then have a jury that may not truly understand the issues seems like yet another crime being committed.

Courts across the nation have recognized the importance of allowing expert testimony in criminal proceedings in sexual assault cases in order to provide jurors an informed and comprehensive understanding of the complexities of a victim's behavior. This is important because many jurors, as members of the general public, may hold certain preconceived notions about what a rape victim should look like and how they should behave after an assault.

For example, as we've said, if the victim is not crying on the stand, did not report the assault immediately, they find the victim

unbelievable because she's not acting like a typical rape victim.

1.3

2.3

During a trial, the defense may try to claim the victim displayed unusual behavior after the assault, for example not fighting back, freezing instead of running, not having any physical evidence of injury, blaming oneself for the assault, not having an overly emotional reaction, or having a personal relationship with the perpetrator.

What the research has demonstrated, however, and what I have seen in my own treatment of victims, is that these are not unusual behaviors but are common reactions to trauma. By allowing an expert in the field to testify that these behaviors can be explained as common, albeit counterintuitive behaviors, the jurors will be well informed and be able to fairly interpret the evidence presented.

Additionally, it is important for the jury to able to learn about post-traumatic stress disorder. Many people assume that PTSD is diagnosed for people returning from battle zones or people who've experienced a natural disaster. However, rape victims suffer the same symptoms of PTSD as people who've experienced other forms of

trauma.

1.3

1.5

2.3

In PA, the jury should be allowed to understand all the aspects of a case, similar to a medical expert explaining medical evidence, an expert in the field of psychology and victims services should be allowed to explain the psychological realities of sexual violence.

I have testified previously in a civil proceeding describing the counseling my client received in a support group. This was the cause of thirty-five-year-old woman who went to a car dealership looking to buy a new car. While on the test drive with the salesman, she was forced to pull over into a parking lot where he raped her. She was in shock and embarrassed after the rape and did not tell anyone or go to the police.

After a few days, she told her husband, and he took her to the police, where they filed a report. The criminal case could not be pursued due to lack of physical evidence, so she decided to pursue the case in civil court. Because expert testimony was not allowed when I was testifying, I could merely say that she received counseling but could not explain why she did not immediately report the assault to the police because I was not

allowed to state common reaction to trauma. I was also not allowed to explain I had diagnosed her with post-traumatic stress disorder because I could not say that the words PTSD.

1.3

2.3

Because of this, I felt the jury was not being provided with any accurate picture of my client's experience, and, therefore, was not being given a fair trial. When the verdict came in, it was a mistrial. Her attorney informed me later that the jurors were not able to come to a decision because some did not believe her story simply because she did not go to the police or tell her husband. And this a civil case.

I can only imagine with dismay how many times this is happening in criminal cases, which is even more frightening, because then we're keeping the criminals on the streets to rape again.

We're asking today for your support of House Bill 2255 so that we can follow what other parts of country are already doing. We're simply asking that a victim of rape be given a fair trial, which means having a jury that is allowed to hear all the evidence in a case.

Research has demonstrated that the general public still holds beliefs in rape myths

and misconceptions about sexual assault, therefore, it should be clear that expert testimony be allowed to dispel the myths and allow rape victims to have a fair day in court.

Thank you very much.

REP. MARSICO: Any questions?

Thank you very much for being here.

Appreciate it.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Next to testify is Joyce Lukima, deputy director of field services, PA Coalition Against Rape.

MS. LUKIMA: Good morning. Thank you so much for the opportunity to be here to speak to you on this important issue of expert testimony in sexual assault. I think my comments will act to summarize much of what you've already heard from my colleagues today.

I've spent my career counseling and advocating for victims of sexual violence. In the twenty years I have worked with victims of violence, I have seen vast improvements in the way we respond to rape and other forms of sexual assault.

Both research and experience have taught my colleagues and I to better understand

and, therefore, better respond to victims of sexual violence. This includes understanding behavior that sometimes does not make sense to someone who has not been raped or someone who has worked extensively with victims of rape.

1.3

1.5

2.3

As you know, rape is a deeply personal and invasive crime. Its impact is often devastating. Although an understanding of the pervasiveness of sexual violence has increased, there is still many misconceptions held about the way a woman who is raped should act.

A common reaction from a person on the street is, if I were raped, I would fight to the death. While it is easy to understand how someone might expect themselves to react when confronted with an attack of sexual violence, the reality, as you've heard today, is that freezing in a traumatic situation is a normal response and sometimes maybe life saving.

Myths continue to be engrained in our society and the impact of actions we each take when we come into contact with victims of rape. Jurors who are -- who are a reflection of this society, believe those myths and bring those beliefs into the courtroom as well as into the jury deliberation

room and may subsequently allow the myths to influence their credibility assessment and the verdict, even more than the evidence and the law that they are instructed to follow.

1.3

1.5

2.3

Expert testimony related to the reality of sexual violence and the response of victims of sexual violence is integral in helping to discern reality from myth. If, like most rape -- most victims of rape, the victim does not report, as you've heard today, or does not report immediately, we may assume that she is not truthful. Without an understanding of the confusion, fear of being blamed, fear of not being believed, or shame experienced, a delayed report may be interpreted as an untruth rather than a common reaction.

This occurred in -- this occurred in egregious proportion in the Jeffrey Marsalis case, which you've heard about earlier today. The vast majority of the twenty-one known women that were sexually assaulted had significant delays in reporting. Some only reported when confronted by law enforcement. Like most victims of sexual violence, their first thought was not to contact the police.

The testimony of an expert can play a

key role in explaining this behavior, which may seem illogical but is the norm for victim of sexual violence.

1.3

1.5

2.3

The unfortunate reality for many victims of rape is that we have preconceived expectations about the behavior which we believe is associated with real rape. Behavior which falls outside of this scope has suspicion and judgment on victim's credibility and impacts the outcome in court.

If a victim of rape does not present tearfully when reporting to law enforcement or during testimony, doubt erupts. The behaviors of victims of sexual violence follow along a continuum. Individual victims have individual responses.

There is a lack of understanding about the vast variety of responses we have all -- we have when presented with a life-altering event like rape, and the influence our culture and socialization have in shaping this. Appearing calm or numbing emotions can be a result of trying to maintain order in what has become a chaotic world as a result of the rape.

Or if raised in a culture where

expressing emotions is frowned upon, fighting to
maintain control -- a controlled appearance in
court is a very normal response.

An assessment of sexual assault victim's credibility is intertwined with her behavior, and the judgment of her behavior is based on myths.

The dynamics of sexual violence and its impact on victims is not complicated but it is beyond the common understanding of jurors. Expert testimony about victim's behavior is relevant and often necessary to counter the misconception surrounding sexual assault. The realities of sexual assault do not match myths. The victim's credibility cannot be judged based on her behavior without understanding the underlying factors which cause this behavior.

REP. MARSICO: Okay. Thank you.

Any questions?

Thank you very much.

MS. LUKIMA: Thank you.

REP. MARSICO: Next to testify is

Captain John Darby, Special Victims Unit,

24 | Philadelphia Police Department.

Welcome.

1.3

CAPTAIN DARBY: Good morning,

1.3

Mr. Chairman, Rep. Parker, members of the Judiciary Committee, my law enforcement partners from the Philadelphia's District Attorney's office, victims, and victim advocates.

I've been asked and am pleased to attend this hearing as a representative of the Philadelphia Police Department. My name is John Darby, a captain in my thirtieth year on the police force. I currently am the commanding officer of the Special Victims Unit, a position that I have held since early 2002, a little over eight years.

If I may contribute some background, the Philadelphia Police Department's Special Victim Unit was formed and centralized in 1980 to provide a dedicated, specialized response to and investigation of all allegations of sexual assault and related crimes city wide as well as child physical and sexual abuse by a caretaker or caretakers.

Formerly known as the Sex Crimes Unit, which was a crass label, the name was changed to the Special Victims Unit in 1998, to reflect the sensitive, personal, and invasive nature of these crimes. The purpose of this specialized unit is to

enable the police department to offer minimally threatening intervention by specially trained and motivated police investigators. The focus of adult sexual assault, child sexual abuse investigations is to establish all facts, evidence, and supporting statements relevant to the case.

1.3

2.3

intense and they are emotionally charged. Fact finding is conducted by a thorough and careful assembly of the case from the primary account of the incident, a very important account, that is provided by the victim, as well as the all collateral and corroborative sources of information. Physical evidence, photographs, DNA or biological material, clothing, fingerprints, records, and journals are collected to provide an objective background to the allegation.

After assembling the facts of the case and establishing probable cause, the case is referred to the district attorney's office, the Family Violence and Sexual Assault Unit specifically, for review and approval of charges, where appropriate.

The Special Victims Unit investigates approximately five thousand cases annually. That

is my universe. Approximately one thousand rape cases, they're rape reports, annually, aside from the thousands of equally important but lesser-coded cases of sexual assault and child sexual abuse.

1.3

2.3

From my perspective as well as independent sources, statistically and otherwise, there clearly exists unique challenges to the successful investigation and prosecution of these cases.

The PA Coalition Against Rape cites probability of arrest at just over 50 percent of reported rapes. The challenges begin with the alarming low rate of reporting. The United States Department of Justice estimates that only 36 percent of completed rapes, 34 of percent of attempted rapes, and 26 percent of other sexual assaults occurring between the years 1992 and 2000 were actually reported to police. And those figures haven't changed over the year, folks.

At the same time, National Crime

Victims surveys reflect that persons aged twelve

years and older experienced, on average, over four
hundred thousand such crimes annually. Many

founded rapes go unreported to police because of
fears, distrust, yes, including distrust of the

police, self blame, and personal relationships.

1.3

2.3

Some victims, especially but not exclusively children, are unaware that a crime has even been committed against them. The majority of rapes and related sexual assaults are not perpetrated by strangers, but -- not the individual jumping out from behind the bushes, as you've heard, to attack an unsuspecting victim, but rather by a current or former domestic or family member, a partner, friend, or acquaintance.

National statistics, similar to our local breakdown at Philadelphia's SVU, indicate that 32 percent of reported rapes and related sexual assaults are committed by a stranger or an unknown offender; 68 percent, however, by someone that the victim knows. The closer the relationship between the victim and the offender, of course the more likelihood of no report.

For the victims who do report, there is an incredible burden placed upon them. In the case of the stranger rape, identification of the perpetrator becomes the focus. The advancement of DNA technology, where evidence is present, has greatly enhanced our search for and positive identification of the perpetrator.

On the other hand, in cases of known or acquaintance rape of an adult, identification is a nonissue; however, consent is.

1.3

Rape is looked upon as a different kind of crime. The only crime in which the victim must prove their innocence. As a result of cultural myths and misconceptions and stereotypes, there is a marked contrast between what is called the real rape versus the righteous rape.

Unfortunately, juries carry into the courtroom these preconceived attitudes as they judge their peers, both the accused and the victim.

Now, historically, legislative changes have been, in hindsight, reflective of society's reluctance to focus on the victim. Under PA law prior to 1990, statute explicitly excluded a spouse from being capable of rape by another spouse. In 1991, progress was made. Spousal sexual assault was introduced; however, the victim was required to report within ninety days of the incident.

In the case of what could be termed a date rape, prior rape language required force.

Now, lack of consent is sufficient to arrest and to prosecute.

Any discussion regarding victims of sexual assault, in my experience and opinion, has to include the devastating emotional impact of the crime. We at Special Victims witness daily complaints, that is victims of all ages, whose demeanor, whose affect is unpredictable or seems inappropriate at times. Our watch word is: Don't be fooled, don't be misled. Continue the investigation.

1.3

2.3

We have seen the agitation, sometimes directed at the investigator, the hysteria, including uncontrolled giddiness and laughter, the blank affect, the poor recall of the events, the anxiety, the fear, the mood swings, the denial.

The detail and disclosure of a sexual assault is not a one-time event. It is a process. The emotional trauma is often manifested, exacerbated by the actual report. Delayed reporting, then, is no doubt common.

The most illustrative case and one of the more challenging crime patterns handled by my unit as it relates to delayed reporting, involved one Jeffrey Marsalis. You've heard him. I'm going to diverge right now from my testimony.

You've met several victims today. Now

I want you to meet a rapist (displaying photo).

Not a bad looking fellow. Jeffrey Marsalis

portrayed himself as a astronaut, as a trauma

surgeon, as a CIA agent, as a confidant to the

president. My unit investigated Jeffrey Marsalis.

1.3

2.3

Over a period of several years, he victimized women, mostly professional women. He actually -- he actually paraded, I'd guess you say, one of his victims through one of our major center city hospitals, right through the emergency room, wearing a white lab coat and portraying himself as a surgeon on staff at that particular hospital.

Our investigation revealed costumes like this, multiple forms of ID, body armor, at least one weapon. This guy had it all. He had it all. But he is a predator. He is a rapist, actually deemed by some to be the worst date rape serial rapist in PA history and perhaps beyond.

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{I just wanted to bring him -- I wanted} \\ \mbox{you to meet this fellow.}$

So appropriately the seemingly unusual behavior exhibited by victims of sexual assault should not be held against them. Additionally, jurors should be provided with all pertinent, relevant information in their role as decision

makers, information professionally supplied by expert testimony.

1.3

2.3

It is for all the above reasons that I, as a representative of the Special Victims Unit and the Philadelphia Police Department, without hesitation, support the judicial amendment title House Bill 2255.

Thank you, Chairman, for the opportunity to comment, as well as to all the members of the committee for your time today. I'll be glad to take any questions you have.

REP. MARSICO: Thank you.

Representative Parker has a question.

REP. PARKER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to give full disclosure. In my opening remarks, when I mentioned that I had to put my own preconceived notions about how victims should act to test, after I received an education at the hearing in February, it was much of Captain Darby's testimony, being on the front line and heading up this unit and seeing firsthand how victims respond from a law enforcement perspective, so your experience and your knowledge in this arena was very much valuable to me.

I want to go back, because I just read

a article today, and I said, Wow, I'm glad Captain Darby's going to be here, and this was, I believe, in the Inquirer or even in the Daily, one of our PA senators is hosting a hearing about the chronic failure to report and investigate rape cases. The Women's Law Project has, you know, raised some concerns about it, and they talk about it happening in New York, the Baltimore Sun, but I haven't heard PA. So I just -- not that you can give us an answer for all of PA, but just based on your knowledge and in the field, is this a challenge that we see within law enforcement in our commonwealth?

1.3

CAPTAIN DARBY: Well, we certainly did see it in Philadelphia. In fact, I met with

Commissioner Ramsey yesterday afternoon to prepare his -- help prepare his testimony in front of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Philadelphia has -- has taken its knocks. You know, back in 1998, '99 we had a history of -- of falling victim -- as many do, as many jurors do -- as it relates to accepting cases of rape and sexual assault, given all the misconceptions that are out there.

The police -- the civilians are not the

only ones that have these misconceptions. You know, police are the -- they're family members, they're fathers, they're brothers, they're sons just as well. And we sometimes carry those misconceptions into our workplace.

1.3

1.5

2.3

And -- but Philadelphia has come a long way. There's been quite a turnaround, certainly in my tenure there. And Commissioner Ramsey, I think, has been called down to testify that Philadelphia is -- you know, is a prototype.

REP. PARKER: If you could, just for the record, for me -- one of the things that I also mentioned in my opening remarks was the misconception about who the rapist is, and we've heard it from a number of individuals who've testified, but I think it's very important for us, using this as sort of a fact finding sort of cause here, for you, as the law enforcement agency, to talk about who the rapist is. Because I too, you know, if it wasn't Kelly or Lincoln Drive, and they weren't jumping out of the driveway in my district, you know, what do you mean? Talk about that and how often you see it.

CAPTAIN DARBY: Yeah. The reality is, and I illustrate it with some statistics, but the

reality is that those that are closest, especially in the case of children, and 65 to 70 percent of our victimology involves juveniles, involves kids. And what happens in many of those cases is that those that are around the child, that child depends on, that the child respects, that the child is living with and who is charged or responsible for taking care of that child, actually becomes their rapist.

1.3

We stressed or I stressed certainly a lot about Mr. Marsalis as it relates to adult sexual assault victims. When you start talking about child victimology, I mean, we're in a whole other world, folks. And that is that, you know, I think the sense is that people think that children are miniature adults; they are not. You really have to, when you're talking with a child sexual assault victim, you have to stop for a moment, hesitate and think about what their life is about, what their circumstances are.

Just a couple weeks ago, I had -- I happened to step into a room and there were two young victims, age six and eight, and they were there to -- as part of a disclosure, as I said, a process, a disclosure of a -- of a rapist inside

their household. That's not what they were worried about. Their greatest fear -- and to some degree sometimes that overwhelms the idea of disclosure or reporting -- is -- that, they asked the police investigator, Are you going to take me out of the house? Am I going to have to go back to foster care? Or, am I going to be removed? So their whole world is turned upside down as a result of their disclosure.

1.3

1.5

2.3

So they -- they feel the guilt. They feel the direct and indirect pressure, sometimes threats from the other -- from the other parent in cases. Indirect influence, and that is, they start thinking about, what's going to happen to my world after I report this crime.

So it's hesitancy and delay not only as it relates to adults but also victims.

REP. PARKER: I know a question,
Mr. Chair, is that I'm wondering now and should
have asked this of Miss Harley, and I'm thinking
about Lynn Schafran's testimony, and I just want to
ask you, Captain, when I think about the
instructions that our judges give to a jury, I'm
thinking from -- from my perspective, has there
ever been an opportunity for judges to sit with law

enforcement meetings of the police department, the district attorney's association, an educational organization like this national judges education program, who -- who in the judiciary ever calls on the people who are on the front line or the people who have been prosecuting this to say, what is normal behavior? Or, you know, what my grandmother used to say, Cherelle, there is no utopia. Am I describing utopia, with hoping that different branches of people in our criminal justice process are talking and that just doesn't happen?

CAPTAIN DARBY: That's a difficult The only thing I wanted to mention, as question. it relates to -- and I don't want to keep going back to Jeffrey Marsalis, but it was -- there was a article in the Daily News, which I have in front of me, and again it diverges from my testimony -- or from my formal testimony, and that is , there was a request by the jurors themselves, Daily News article, after the second series of trials involving Jeffrey Marsalis in Philadelphia, and as I think it's been presented, that of the many victims of rape that were prosecuted and tried in Philadelphia, only two victims -- there were only two convictions, and they were of lesser crimes.

But jurors themself, if I could just quote from the Daily News article, one juror in the second trial told the Daily News about a week after Marsalis' sentencing that the woman's behaviors were just so hard, so hard to believe. It wasn't so much the actions of Jeffrey but the actions of the women, the jurors said. This is from a juror.

She said she has known people who have been date raped and didn't tell police, but you don't go back out with them, the men. That don't make sense.

Another juror said, There should have more evidence. She said, Like I said, wasn't explained too much why some of the women would go back and see Marsalis again. These are jurors asking for more, more testimony, perhaps expert testimony. I leave you with that.

REP. MARSICO: Go ahead.

MS. ELZEY: Just, just for the record, I'm just curious, because, you know, I want to make it clear that, of course, this is not SVU, this is real life. Just general questions. How many detectives about are in your unit, like how large is your unit?

CAPTAIN DARBY: I've got a total

```
contingent of seventy people. That's broken down
1
2
     by investigators, supervisors and other support
3
     staff.
                 MS. ELZEY: So you divide by
 4
     specialities and things like that as far as --
5
                  CAPTAIN DARBY: We break down -- yeah,
6
7
     there's a -- the line squad, which handles the
     crimes coming in via the 911, 24/7. We have a
8
     child abuse section, which handles just those
9
10
     specific types of reports, which often come in as
11
     third-party reports, again not from the victims,
12
     but from some other source.
1.3
                 MS. ELZEY: Okay. I just wanted to
14
     clarify that -- you know, that indeed, within your
15
     own unit, there are experts as opposed to just five
16
     detectives that generally go to every case and then
17
     try to work it out.
18
                 CAPTAIN DARBY: Oh, yeah. Yeah.
                                                     Wе
     handle them all.
19
20
                 MS. ELZEY: Okay. Thank you very
21
     much.
22
                 REP. MARSICO: Well, thank you very
23
     much, Captain. Appreciate you being here.
24
                 For the record, actually, we have
25
     written testimony from Jules Epstein, the associate
```

1	professor of law, Widener University. We'll
2	provide that to you as well.
3	And also for we will keep the record
4	open for written comments for one week.
5	And thank you for your leadership with
6	this, Rep. Parker.
7	And, once again, thanks to everyone for
8	coming here today. Appreciate your time and your
9	input with this.
10	That concludes the hearing. Thank
11	you very much.
12	(Whereupon, the hearing concluded
13	at 11:45 a.m.)
14	
15	* * * *
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE I HEREBY CERTIFY that I was present upon the hearing of the above-entitled matter and there reported stenographically the proceedings had and the testimony produced; and I further certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of my said stenographic notes. BRENDA J. PARDUN, RPR Court Reporter Notary Public