

The Current State of Domestic Violence Courts
in the United States, 2007

by

Hon. Donald E. Shelton

(Published with permission from the author)

February 23, 2007

The Content contained within this publication is provided for general information purposes only. The National Center for State Courts cannot and does not warrant the information furnished on this site as current or accurate. In addition, the views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of NCSC.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
The History of Domestic Violence Courts.....	5
Domestic Violence Court as a Unique Problem-Solving Court	9
Domestic Violence Court Models.....	11
The State of Domestic Violence Courts in 2000	15
The Current Status of Identified Domestic Violence Courts	16
Conclusions.....	21
Appendix: Domestic Violence Courts in the United States - 2007	23

Introduction

This main thrust of this project initially was, simply we thought, an effort to collect, update and catalogue a list of specialized domestic violence courts in the United States. Such problem-solving courts dedicated to domestic violence cases have been in existence for well over ten years and a published collection of domestic violence courts appeared in 2000. One would think that it would be a relatively simple matter to update that list.

The Justice Department, through the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) has funded a comprehensive study designed to produce not only a list of all domestic violence courts in the country but also a detailed description of the operations of each such court. This “National Portrait of Domestic Violence Courts” study grant has been awarded to the Center for Court Innovation¹ which has partnered with a variety of organizations around the country. The results of that grant funded study are not likely to be available until 2008.

As one perhaps should have gathered by the very existence of the NIJ grant, this compilation project proved to be more daunting than expected. There is no current central source for such information and considerable research was required to obtain the more current information reflected in this study. Using old lists and personal resources at the National Center for State Courts, the 2000 compilation was expanded to reflect some additional courts that had been established. A comprehensive literature search revealed that several of the courts had been professionally evaluated and those individual

¹ The CCI is a well known national organization devoted to the concept of problem solving courts. The organization website is at www.courtinnovation.org.

evaluations were helpful in locating and describing a few of the new courts. Nevertheless a state by state internet search of court web sites was necessary to both locate new courts that had been established and to eliminate courts in the 2000 compilation that were no longer functioning. The quality and comprehensiveness of state court system web sites varies a great deal and in several cases it was then necessary to follow up with personal contact by telephone or email to attempt to get the basic information needed for this study.

The resulting catalogue of domestic violence courts is the table in this study titled “Domestic Violence Courts in the United States – 2007”. It does not purport to be a totally comprehensive compilation of existing domestic violence courts but reflects the best available investigation that could be conducted in the parameters of this study.

As a preface to the catalogue, it is helpful to initially review the history of domestic violence courts and I do so in the first section of this article. As they have developed, domestic violence courts have taken different forms. Some are very limited, such as personal protection orders only, while others have more expansive jurisdiction, even extending to serious criminal cases arising out of domestic assaults. The second section of this article describes and defines the various models that have been used across the country.

The third section sets the framework for the study with a description of the 2000 compilation. The results of the study, and the contents of the table, are described in the fourth section of the report. In addition to a discussion of the general results, I highlight some of the most important and laudable new efforts in this area.

The History of Domestic Violence Courts

Specialized courts have been a phenomenon in this country for almost a century. Initially thought of as techniques for making justice speedier and more efficient, they have also been more recently utilized to provide more specialized social justice goals.² Although specialized juvenile courts appeared early in the 1900s, they did not have the social “problem-solving” approach that would characterize more recent court innovations.³ Berman (2001) described the purpose of the “problem-solving” courts that began to appear in the 1980s:

“Problem-solving courts use their authority to forge new responses to chronic social, legal and human problems – including problems like family dysfunction, addiction, delinquency and domestic violence – that have proven resistant to conventional solutions. They seek to broaden the focus of legal proceedings, from simply adjudicating past facts and legal issues to changing the future behavior of litigants and insuring the future well-being of communities. And they attempt to fix broken systems, making courts (and their partners) more accountable and responsive to their primary customers – the citizens who use courts every day, either as victims, jurors, witnesses, litigants or defendants.”⁴

The application of this problem-solving approach to domestic violence was also the direct outgrowth of the feminism movement that began in the 1960s.⁵ Feminist legal theorists then directly posited the plight of battered women as a demonstration of the need for an equality model in the justice system. Okin for example pointed out that the exercise of male power in it’s “crassest form” was physical violence in the family setting

² Mirchandani, Rekha. (2005) “What’s So Special about Specialized Courts? The State and Social Change in Salt Lake City’s Domestic Violence Court,” 39 *Law & Society Review* 379.

³ Pleck, Elizabeth (1987) *Domestic Tyranny: The Making of Social Policy Against Family Violence from Colonial Times to Present*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press. Also see Littel, Kristin (2003) “Specialized Courts and Domestic Violence”, *Issues of Democracy*, U. S. Department of State. Available online at <http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itdhr/0503/ijde/littel.htm>.

⁴ Berman, Greg, & John Feinblatt (2001) “Problem-Solving Courts: A Brief Primer,” 23 *Law & Policy* 125 at p. 126.

⁵ Epstein, Deborah (1999) “Effective Intervention in Domestic Violence Cases: Rethinking the Roles of Prosecutors, Judges and the Court System,” 11 *Yale J. of Law and Feminism* 3; Hanna, Cheryl (1998) “The Paradox of Hope: The Crime and Punishment of Domestic Violence,” 39 *William & Mary Law Rev.* 1505.

and that even liberal views of the justice system tolerated such violence.⁶ Other feminist scholars saw the plight of battered women and the reaction, or non-reaction, of the justice system to that plight somewhat differently. Littleton and other proponents of an acceptance model of feminist legal argued that while gender difference must be accepted, the law must account for the consequences of such difference and should affirmatively work to make them "costless".⁷ Acceptance theorists argued that equality should function to prevent the legal punishment of women on the basis of their difference.

Regardless of the theoretical differences among feminist legal theorists, the models seemed to come together in a practical sense concerning physical violence against women, particularly in a family or domestic setting.⁸ Whether women were viewed as being treated as unequal when it came to being victims of physical violence or whether the differences between women and their male assaulters were not being taken into account, all agreed that the legal system needed to be modified to react to the battering of women by men.⁹

The battered women's cause brought about changes in the law enforcement, primarily prosecutors and police, and eventually changes in the courts themselves.¹⁰

Keilitz (2004) pointed out:

⁶ Okin, Susan M. (1989) *Justice, Gender and the Family* at p. 128. New York: Basic Books.

⁷ Littleton, Christine A., "Reconstructing Sexual Equality," 75 *California Law Review* 1279-1337 (1987).

⁸ See e.g. Schneider., Elizabeth M. *Battered Women and Feminist Lawmaking* (Yale University Press 2000); Epstein, *supra* note 5; Hanna, *supra* note 5; Nancy James, *Domestic Violence: A History of Arrest Policies and a Survey of Modern Law*, 28 *FAM. L.Q.* 509 (1994); and more generally Goldscheid, Julie, "Domestic and Sexual Violence as Sex Discrimination: Comparing American and International Approaches" in the Symposium "The Global Impact of Feminist Legal Theory", 28 *Thomas Jefferson Law Review* 355 (2006).

⁹ See Wills, Donna, *Mandatory Prosecution in Domestic Violence Cases: Domestic Violence: The Case for Aggressive Prosecution*, 7 *UCLA WOMEN'S L.J.* 173, 177 (1997).

¹⁰ Keilitz, Susan (2000) *Specialized Domestic Violence Case Management: A National Survey*.

Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts. Available online at www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/186192.pdf (last visited January 3, 2006)

“Since the late 1990s, a key development in State courts has been the institution of specialized structures, processes, and practices to address not only rising domestic violence caseloads but also the distinct nature of these cases and the need to give them special attention. These specialized approaches have collectively come to be called domestic violence courts. There is, however, great variation among these courts and in the specialized processes they use.”¹¹

In 1994, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act¹². It “heightened public awareness of domestic violence and its detrimental effects on families, business, and society”.¹³ Perhaps more important to the development of domestic violence courts, the Act made large sums of federal monies available to the States to address domestic violence. The statute provided grants for “personnel, training, technical assistance, data collection and other equipment for the more widespread apprehension, prosecution, and *adjudication* of persons committing violent crimes against women”.¹⁴

Initially courts were reluctant to embrace the idea of a specialized domestic violence court. Many reasons were given for the reluctance. Some judges argued that criminal assaults should be treated blindly and equally by the justice system and that singling out domestic assaults from assaults by strangers or other non-partners was not warranted, as the domestic violence court movement had maintained.¹⁵ Others did not

¹¹ Keilitz, Susan (2004) “Specialization of Domestic Violence Case Management in the Courts: A National Survey” (in *Violence Against Women and Family Violence: Developments in research, Practice and Policy* 2004, National Institute of Justice, Bonnie Fisher (ed.), at p. III-9-3. Available online at www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/199701_sectionIII.pdf.

¹² 42 USC 3796 et seq.

¹³ Keilitz, *supra* note 10 at p. 1.

¹⁴ 42 USC 3796gg (b) [emphasis added]. For general information see the website of the Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women at www.usdoj.gov/ovw/index.html (last visited January 14, 2007).

¹⁵ See Simon, Leonore (1997), “Do Criminal Offenders Specialize in Crime Types?”, 6 *Applied & Preventive Psychol.* 35 and Sherman, Lawrence & Richard Berk, (1984), “The Specific Effects of Arrest for Domestic Assault”, 49 *American Sociological Review* 261.

accept the basic premise of a “problem-solving” court with its accompanying rejection of traditional adversary system methods.

More particularly however there was, and still is, some aversion to the problem-solving concept as applied to domestic violence cases. As more fully discussed later, the domestic violence courts differ considerably from the other therapeutic or problem-solving courts in their focus on the safety of the victim as opposed to the rehabilitation of the offender. Applying the collaborative theory of problem-solving courts meant that judges were an integral part of the planning and monitoring of the program together with the prosecutor, probation, victim advocates and domestic violence staff members. Involving judges in that process was seen by some as detracting from the impartiality judges are supposed to maintain and in effect made them part of the prosecution. On the contrary, advocates asserted that there was evidence of partiality by judges against victims of domestic violence that necessitated a change in approach.¹⁶

Aside from the publicly stated reasons many suspected, as the feminist legal scholars had argued, that the reluctance stemmed from the dominance of men in the judiciary. Perhaps not coincidentally, as more women assumed prominent positions in the judiciary, court systems began to warm to the concept and gradually however more courts embraced the idea of what has been called the “therapeutic justice movement”¹⁷ and expanded those concepts to the area of domestic violence.¹⁸

¹⁶ Ford, J. et al (1995) “Case Outcomes in Domestic Violence Court: Influence of Judges”, *77 Psychol Rep* 587-594.

¹⁷ Fritzler, R B., & Simon, L. M. J. (2000). “Creating a Domestic Violence Court: Combat in the Trenches”, *37 Court Review* 28-39; Simon, L. M. J. (1995). “A therapeutic jurisprudence approach to the legal processing of domestic violence cases.” *1 Psychology, Public Policy and Law* 43-79;

¹⁸ See Wittner, Judith (1998) “Reconceptualizing Agency in Domestic Violence Court”, in *Community Activism & Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class, and Gender*, (Nancy A. Naples ed.); Buzawa, Eve et al (1998), “The Response to Domestic Violence in a Model Court: Some Initial Findings and Implications”, *16 Behav. Sci. & L.* 185.

One of the early, and continued, architects of the domestic violence court concept was Judge Judith Kaye of New York State's highest court. She argued that battered women often have compelling and very practical reasons to dismiss charges against their attackers. She identified the fear, economic dependence, and even affection, which made prosecution of such cases in a traditional court setting extremely difficult.¹⁹ As this study found, the New York State system now serves as a model for domestic violence courts throughout the country.

Domestic Violence Court as a Unique Problem-Solving Court

Although the concept of domestic violence court originated in the problem-solving court era²⁰, there are basic differences between domestic violence courts and other forms of problem-solving or therapeutic courts. Those differences are so fundamental that while domestic violence courts are certainly properly characterized as a "specialized" court, they do not follow the therapeutic or problem-solving premise.

Most specialized courts follow a therapeutic model in which the emphasis is on rehabilitation of the offender.²¹ The focus is on the underlying causes or etiology of the offender's misconduct. The premise is that intense supervision and monitoring of the offender, coupled with the provision of treatment and resources, will solve address the underlying etiology of the offense and thus result in reduced recidivism.

¹⁹ Kaye, Judith S. and Susan K. Knipps, "Judicial Responses to Domestic Violence: The Case for a Problem Solving Approach", 27 W. ST. U. L. REV. 1 (2000)

²⁰ Id.

²¹ See Berman, Greg and John Feinblatt (2005). *Good Courts: The Case for Problem Solving Justice*, New York: New Press.

Drug courts are the classic model.²² The court, and the judge in particular, not only prescribes the disposition of the offender but also continues to monitor the progress of that disposition in continuing regular court proceedings until the offender has successfully completed the treatment. The treatment team is actually part of the court and works collaboratively with the judge to monitor progress. Treatment is often outpatient but some programs provide residential treatment programs as well. In Washtenaw County, for example, our Juvenile Court operates a juvenile drug court that includes residential treatment of delinquent youth for as much as nine months.

Other specialized courts follow a similar therapeutic model. Examples include mental health courts²³, sobriety courts²⁴ (a form of drug court sub-specialized for alcohol abuse), homelessness courts²⁵, re-entry courts²⁶ and community courts²⁷.

Domestic violence courts, on the other hand, focus primarily on the victim rather than the offender. The initial emphasis is on the safety of the battered women and any children that are involved. The court also focuses on the accountability of the offender for his own misconduct rather than on exploring the etiology of that conduct. While rehabilitation may be a byproduct of the domestic court process, its origins lie more in a

²² Nolan, James L. Jr (2003). *Reinventing Justice: The American Drug Court Movement*, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

²³ Denckla, Derek and Greg Berman (2001), "Rethinking the Revolving Door: A Look at Mental Illness in the Courts", *Center for Court Innovation Think Piece*. Available online at www.communityjustice.org/uploads/documents/rethinkingtherevolvingdoor.pdf (last visited February 20, 2006)

²⁴ Hoffman, Harvey (2003). "Healing Drunk Drivers: Michigan's OUIL? Sobriety Drug Courts", *Michigan Bar Journal*, January 2003, 29-32. Available online at www.michbar.org/journal/pdf/pdf4article532.pdf (last visited February 20, 2006).

²⁵ Binder, Steven R. (2002) *The Homeless Court Program: Taking Court to the Streets*, Washington: American Bar Association.

²⁶ Maruna, Shadd and Thomas P. LaBel (2003) "Welcome Home? Examining the "Reentry Court" Concept from a Strengths-based Perspective", *Western Criminology Review* 4(2), 91-107. Available online at <http://wcr.sonoma.edu/v4n2/manuscripts/marunalebel.pdf> (last visited February 20, 2006).

²⁷ Curtis, Richard (2000) *Dispensing Justice Locally: The Implementation and Effects of the Midtown Community Court*, New York: Routledge.

deterrence theory model. As a focus group at the Center for Court Innovation described it:²⁸

. . . [D]omestic violence courts do not view defendant rehabilitation as a high-priority part of the problem-solving process. This differs sharply from most problem-solving courts (with the possible exception of community courts). Rather, the mission of domestic violence courts concentrates more on the promotion of victim safety and offender accountability.

. . .
The primary difference concerned the basic dispositional processes in the court. In domestic violence court, unlike in most other problem-solving courts, the determination of guilt is an integral component, which often leads to an adversarial atmosphere in which defendants deny culpability and resist participation in community-based sanctions and services.

The domestic violence court is a rejection of the adversary model that is the basis for most of our justice systems. As Fritzler and Simon described this feature in 2000:²⁹

A final, unique characteristic of domestic violence cases that necessitates special handling by the courts is that these cases may suffer from a strict application of our adversarial legal system, which focuses on procedural issues and society's goals of deterrence, punishment, and retribution at the expense of the victim's welfare. The adversarial system may be better suited to litigating crimes between strangers and certain other issues brought before our court system. However, it may be less effective when dealing with crimes between intimate partners where the adversarial approach may exacerbate the problem and increase the danger to victims.

Domestic Violence Court Models

By 2000, Keilitz (2000) estimated that over 300 judicial systems nationwide had some sort of specialized processes to handle domestic violence cases and they were all

²⁸ "How Do Domestic Violence Courts Compare to Other Problem-Solving Courts", Center for Court Innovation, online at www.courtinnovation.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Document.viewDocument&documentID=598&documentTopicID=23&documentTypeID=10 (last visited February 17, 2006)

²⁹ Fritzler, Randal and Leonore Simon (2000) "Creating a Domestic Violence Court: Combat in the Trenches", 37:1 *Court Review* 28 at 33. Available online at <http://aja.ncsc.dni.us/courtrv/cr37/cr37-1/CR9FritzlerSimon.pdf> (last visited February 22, 2007)

regarded as some form of domestic violence court.³⁰ However, as the Keilitz survey pointed out, the term had a great divergence in meaning:

“Although many of these 103 courts have instituted some change in organization, procedures, or judicial assignment to managing domestic violence cases, relatively few appear to have implemented a more comprehensive system for their domestic violence caseloads. For example, only 27 of the courts reported having intake, case screening, a specialized calendar, and a judicial review calendar to monitor compliance with court ordered batterer intervention programs. Only seven of these courts also assign judges exclusively to hear domestic violence cases and have an automated system to identify related cases. These reports from the 103 courts suggest that the concept of a domestic violence court is not yet well developed or defined among the court community. Although many practitioners working in and with courts have adopted the term “domestic violence court,” only a small number of courts have taken the more holistic approach to domestic violence case management that signifies an intention to function as a domestic violence court. The findings from the follow-up telephone interviews, presented in Part IV of this report, reinforce the conclusion that the implementation of specialized processes for domestic violence cases is proceeding without common understandings of what components and resources are needed for a coherent and effective case management system.”

This study indicates that the variety in these courts and their processes persists today.

In spite of the large variance in domestic violence court structures and processes, some distinct models have been identified. Sack³¹ categorized the models and subcategories as 1) Dedicated Civil Protection Order Docket; 2) Criminal Model; and 3) Domestic Violence Courts with Related Caseload. Within the latter, she separates the a) Integrated Domestic Violence Court; b) Unified Family Court; and c) Coordinated Court.

The *Dedicated Civil Protection Order Docket* model is easily the most common. “CPOs”, or what is referred to in many states as “PPOs” (Personal Protection Orders), are

³⁰ Keilitz, *supra* note 10.

³¹ Sack, Emily (2002) *Creating a Domestic Violence Court: Best Practices*. San Francisco: Family Violence Protection Fund. Available online at www.endabuse.org/programs/healthcare/files/FinalCourt_Guidelines.pdf. See also Littel, *supra* note 2.

statutorily-enabled Court restraining orders to prevent an abuser from having contact with the petitioning victim.³² As an example, the Michigan statute directly addresses the relationship between the parties and the specific types of conduct that can be enjoined:

- “(1) . . . an individual may petition the family division of circuit court to enter a personal protection order to restrain or enjoin a spouse, a former spouse, an individual with whom he or she has had a child in common, an individual with whom he or she has or has had a dating relationship, or an individual residing or having resided in the same household as the petitioner from doing 1 or more of the following:
- (a) Entering onto premises.
 - (b) Assaulting, attacking, beating, molesting, or wounding a named individual.
 - (c) Threatening to kill or physically injure a named individual.
 - (d) Removing minor children from the individual having legal custody of the children, except as otherwise authorized by a custody or parenting time order issued by a court of competent jurisdiction.
 - (e) Purchasing or possessing a firearm.
 - (f) Interfering with petitioner's efforts to remove petitioner's children or personal property from premises that are solely owned or leased by the individual to be restrained or enjoined.
 - (g) Interfering with petitioner at petitioner's place of employment or education or engaging in conduct that impairs petitioner's employment or educational relationship or environment.
 - (h) Having access to information in records concerning a minor child of both petitioner and respondent that will inform respondent about the address or telephone number of petitioner and petitioner's minor child or about petitioner's employment address.
 - (i) Engaging in conduct that is prohibited under section 411h or 411i of the Michigan penal code, 1931 PA 328, MCL 750.411h and 750.411i.
 - (j) Any other specific act or conduct that imposes upon or interferes with personal liberty or that causes a reasonable apprehension of violence.”³³

These petitions and the hearings alleging violations of protection orders make up much of the court's domestic violence docket. With this model in larger jurisdictions, these cases are assigned to one judge who only handles protection orders. In smaller

³² See Little *supra* note 3.

³³ MCL 600. 2950(1)

jurisdictions, the assigned judge may also have other types of caseloads but the protection order caseload is maintained separately as a specialized docket.

The *Criminal Model* is also a common form of domestic violence specialized courts. This model separates criminal cases which charge domestic violence for specialized handling by a particular judge or judges. Many states have defined domestic violence as a separate crime, either as a misdemeanor or a felony or both. For example, in Michigan the statute creates a special category of misdemeanor assault for domestic assaults³⁴ and allows the prosecutor to charge repeated offenses as a felony.³⁵ The Michigan statutes also enhance the punishments for felony assaults when the victim is a spouse or in a personal relationship.³⁶ Many courts have created specialized misdemeanor domestic violence dockets, while others have criminal dockets that handle both misdemeanors and felonies.

The general idea of the *Domestic Violence Courts with Related Caseload* model is to merge the civil proceedings related to divorce/custody cases and protection orders with related criminal proceedings such as domestic assault. However, this model can take at least three separate forms. In an *Integrated Domestic Violence Court* model one judge handles criminal domestic violence cases and the accompanying civil matters. In a *Unified Family Court* model no criminal matters are assigned separately but all civil matters involving the same family are assigned to a single judge. In a *Coordinated Court* model both criminal domestic violence and related civil matters are assigned to the same court division but not to the same judge.

³⁴ MCL 750.81(2) and (4).

³⁵ MCL 750.81(4)

³⁶ MCL 750.81a(2) and (3).

The various models have been otherwise identified. Heiling³⁷ described the four models she reviewed as: 1) Pretrial Conferences Only; 2) All Non-Evidentiary Appearances; 3) All Appearances in Specialized Court; and 4) Combined Criminal and Civil Jurisdiction. Still other organizations³⁸ have taken a broader view and described models to include 1) Dedicated Courts and Prosecutors; 2) Integrated Court Systems; 3) Dedicated Processing; and 4) Dedicated Resources.

The State of Domestic Violence Courts in 2000

By 2000, many of the arguments against the concept of a domestic violence court had been overcome. Much of the earlier resistance to the concept, especially by judges, had waned and more judges accepted the idea that this modified form of therapeutic courts was justified by the “unique characteristics” of domestic assaults.³⁹

In 2000 Susan Keilitz, working with the National Center for State Courts, conducted a national survey of domestic violence courts.⁴⁰ She concluded:

“Our examination of specialized processes, structures, and services for domestic violence cases in 103 courts across the country indicates a field undergoing rapid and differentiated change. Although the concept of specializing court structures and operations for domestic violence cases is gaining momentum, the court community has yet to develop and test models based on a shared vision about the goals of domestic violence courts or specialized processes. The most common reasons courts cite for implementing specialized processes for domestic violence cases are improved assistance to victims, enhanced victim safety, and increased batterer accountability. Yet, in the majority of courts, these goals are not

³⁷ Heiling, Julia A., “Specialized Criminal Domestic Violence Courts”, Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse, 2005. Available online at www.vaw.umn.edu/documents/helling/helling.html (last visited January 14, 2007).

³⁸ “Specialized Domestic Violence Court Systems”, Stop Violence Against Women, 2006, online at www.stopvaw.org/Specialized_Domestic_Violence_Court_Systems.html?SEC={932A5424-32B4-4D2D-AB62-359D54B911B3}&Type=B_BASIC (last visited January 14, 2007).

³⁹ Fritzier, *supra* note 28

⁴⁰ Keilitz, *supra* note 10.

supported by the key services and practices needed for survivor safety and batterer accountability.”⁴¹

The Keilitz survey obtained responses from 103 courts from 22 states who indicated that they had some form of domestic violence model in place. The distribution in the Keilitz survey was as follows⁴²:

Arizona (2 courts)	New Mexico (12 courts)
California (12 courts)	North Carolina (10 courts)
Colorado (1 court)	Nevada (6 courts)
Connecticut (1 court)	New York (1 court)
Delaware (1 court)	Oklahoma (1 court)
Florida (9 courts)	Pennsylvania (3 courts)
Iowa (5 courts)	Rhode Island (1 court)
Illinois (9 courts)	Texas (1 court)
Kansas (3 courts)	Utah (1 court)
Michigan (2 courts)	Washington (20 courts)
Minnesota (1 court)	Wisconsin (1 court)

One purpose of this paper is to review available information to assess 1) whether the states with courts identified by Keilitz in 2000 are still operating those specialized domestic violence courts and 2) whether other states have made any significant additions to the stock of domestic violence courts around the country.

The Current Status of Identified Domestic Violence Courts

The results of this study are shown in the attached table, **Domestic Violence Courts in the United States – 2007**. Although an effort was made to search publicly available resources, this does not purport to be an exhaustive survey of all existing domestic violence courts.

⁴¹ *Id.* at p.29.

⁴² *Id.* at p.11

This study first attempted to locate information about the courts indicated in the Keilitz survey. Where web sites are available for those courts, the Keilitz information has been supplemented with links. If further information is available about those courts, it is provided in the comments section as well.

The second phase of this study attempted to locate information about courts not existing or at least not disclosed in the 2000 Keilitz survey. Those additional courts are shown in italics in the table.

Fifty-one additional courts were added to the Keilitz list. Five states not previously identified as having domestic violence courts were added, including Alabama, Hawaii, Idaho, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. Some of the significant additions are described in the remainder of this report.

New York appears to have made the most strides in the development of domestic violence courts.⁴³ Some New York courts use the criminal model defined there as a “Domestic Violence Court” where a dedicated Judge presides over cases from arraignment through disposition and monitors offenders and their compliance with orders of protection. Eighteen counties use that system, the history of which is described by the New York court system:

“The first Domestic Violence Court in New York State opened in Brooklyn in 1996, handling felony-level domestic violence cases. Domestic Violence Courts are currently operating in Manhattan, Brooklyn, Albany, Troy, Glens Falls, Saratoga Springs, Syracuse, Binghamton, Auburn, Buffalo, Clarkstown, Spring Valley, Westchester, Queens, Bronx, and Erie, Nassau, and Suffolk Counties. Courts are also being planned in several other jurisdictions in New York State”.⁴⁴

⁴³ New York State Domestic Violence Courts Fact Sheet, New York State Division of Criminal Justice Series, January 2, 2007. Online at www.criminaljustice.state.ny.us/ofpa/domviolcrtfactsheet.htm (last visited January 14, 2007).

⁴⁴ Id.

On a larger scale, New York has established at least 28 domestic violence courts using the integrated model identified as “Integrated Domestic Violence Courts”.⁴⁵ The problem is also on a large scale since in New York City alone over 20% of all criminal cases are domestic assaults.⁴⁶ In New York’s integrated model, one judge handles criminal domestic violence cases and all related family issues, such as custody, visitation, civil protection orders and divorces. The State claims that “[s]ince their inception in 2001, Integrated Domestic Violence Courts have served over 5,000 families and seen over 22,000 cases in New York State.”⁴⁷ Court officials estimate an even higher amount of service and claim that “[s]ince their inception, IDV Courts have handled over 33,000 cases and served over 7,000 families.”⁴⁸ The Courts assert that “more than three quarters of the residents of New York State live in counties served by these courts” and that an additional nine Integrated Domestic Violence Courts in the planning stages.⁴⁹ The New York system is also the most sophisticated in the country and employs a technologically advanced inter-connectivity system.⁵⁰ The New York system has been extensively

⁴⁵ Id. “Integrated Domestic Violence Courts are currently operating in Rensselaer, Westchester, the Bronx, Rochester, Syracuse, Schenectady, Yonkers, Queens, and Cayuga, Wyoming, Nassau, Suffolk, Richmond, Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Tompkins, Erie and Suffolk Counties. In addition, courts are operating in Kings, Fulton, Hamilton, Montgomery, Oswego, Broome, Chautauqua, Niagara, Orange, and St. Lawrence Counties and will be opening in additional locations across the State.”

⁴⁶ See “Symposium, Women, Children, and Domestic Violence: Current Tensions and Emerging Issues”, 27 *Fordham Urb. L.J.* 565 (2000).

⁴⁷ New York State Domestic Violence Courts Fact Sheet, *supra* note 43.

⁴⁸ Kluger, Judy Harris. “Integrated Domestic Violence Courts”, New York State Unified Court System. May 2006. Online at www.courts.state.ny.us/ip/domesticviolence/index.shtml (last visited January 14, 2007)

⁴⁹ Id.

⁵⁰ Young, Pamela, “An Informed Response: An Overview of the Domestic Violence Court Technology Application and Resource Link”, Center for Court Innovation, 2001. Available online at www.communitycourts.org/uploads/documents/Informed%20Response1.pdf (last visited January 12, 2007).

described and now serves as a recognized example of a fully integrated domestic violence court system.⁵¹

California also indicates a significant effort in the establishment of domestic violence courts. A 2000 report indicated that there were 39 domestic violence courts in the State although the “[c]ourts throughout the state have responded to the challenge of domestic violence cases in a variety of different ways, making it difficult to identify only one model or definition of domestic violence courts”.⁵² The California definition of “domestic violence courts” is simply “those courts that assign judicial officers to hear a special domestic violence calendar, regardless of whether the judicial officers hear those cases exclusively or as part of a mixed assignment”.⁵³ In the Los Angeles area, the first Domestic Violence Court began operations in 1993 at the Long Beach Courthouse. The County now also claims to have domestic violence courts at the El Monte Courthouse, West Covina Courthouse, Pomona Courthouse and the Stanley Mosk Courthouse in downtown Los Angeles.⁵⁴

Clearly the most tangible addition to the stock of domestic violence courts has occurred in Chicago. Cook County built a separate \$51 million Domestic Violence

⁵¹ Mazur, Robyn and Liberty Aldrich, “What Makes a Domestic Violence Court Work: Lessons From New York”, *The Judges' Journal*, American Bar Association, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Spring 2003). Available online at www.communitycourts.org/uploads/documents/whatmakesdvcourtwork.pdf (last visited January 14, 2007); Wolf, Robert and Liberty Aldrich and Samantha Moore, “Planning a Domestic Violence Court: The New York state Experience”, Center for Court Innovation, 2004. Available online at <http://www.communitycourts.org/uploads/documents/dvplanningdiary.pdf> (last visited January 14, 2007).

⁵² “Domestic Violence Courts: A Descriptive Study”, Judicial Council of California Administrative Office of the Courts, May 2000. Available online at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/programs/cfcc/pdffiles/dvreport.pdf (last visited January 14, 2007)

⁵³ *Id.* at p. 1.

⁵⁴ Superior Court of Los Angeles web site, www.lasuperiorcourt.org/criminal/domesticviolence.htm (last visited January 14, 2007).

Courthouse.⁵⁵ The courthouse opened in October of 2005. It houses a fully integrated domestic violence court that hears all civil and criminal calls for orders of protections, and for misdemeanors, felonies, and preliminary hearings in felony domestic violence cases. It is an impressive facility with 10 handicapped accessible courtrooms, full audio-visual capabilities, significant courthouse security, a "Victim Support Area", and a childcare facility.

In New Jersey, although no specific domestic courts are listed in the table the State has taken a different approach. New Jersey employs a system utilizing a "Domestic Violence Hearing Officer (DVHO)" to allow trained hearing officers to hear most requests for a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) at the Superior Court Family Part. A Superior Court Family Part Judge must review DVHO recommendations and if approved, the recommendations are incorporated into a TRO signed by a judge. The DVHO program began as a pilot program in 1993 in Hudson and Ocean counties, it became statewide in 1998. Presently, 17 out of New Jersey's 21 counties have a DVHO.⁵⁶

Other states are considering or already using innovative technological approaches. For example, in Michigan legislation has been proposed that would allow domestic violence court judges to order offenders to wear GPS devices that send alarms to their accusers if the defendant approaches.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ "Cook County Holds Grand Opening for New Domestic Violence Courthouse", Cook County Information center, September 29, 2005. Online at http://www.co.cook.il.us/Media/05_releases/ccpr_092905.htm (last visited January 14, 2007).

⁵⁶ "New Jersey Domestic Violence Information and Initiatives", New Jersey Family Practice Division. Online at www.judiciary.state.nj.us/family/dv.htm (last visited January 14, 2007)

⁵⁷ "Domestic violence victims could get GPS alert system", *Lansing (Michigan) State Journal*, February 13, 2007. And more generally on the issue of using technology, see "Key Principles of Domestic Violence Court: Accountability", *Center for Court Innovation*, online at <http://www.courtinnovation.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Document.viewDocument&documentID=596&documentTopicID=23&documentTypeID=10> (last visited February 23, 2007)

It should be noted however that domestic violence courts are still opposed by some people from a broad range of perspectives. Where the model is limited to personal protection orders or misdemeanors, some victim advocates complain that it is ineffective and that the therapeutic approach does not adequately protect victims.⁵⁸ On the other end of the spectrum, some still maintain that domestic violence courts encourage biased judges who do not respect the constitutional rights accorded to defendants in other types of assault cases.⁵⁹ Notwithstanding that opposition, there is evidence that the special attention to domestic assaults, through domestic violence courts and otherwise, is having the desired effect of reducing the recidivism of batterers and therefore protecting women from assaults.⁶⁰

Conclusions

The tangible concept of a specialized domestic violence court has now been with us for well over 15 years. Although regarded as part of the therapeutic or problem-solving court genre, it has features, particularly its emphasis on victim safety rather than offender rehabilitation, which distinguish it from other courts.

As the domestic court idea has grown from its roots in the feminist legal movement, it has taken many forms or models as its implementation has taken place in a “piecemeal” fashion around the country. The crucial infusion of federal funds for the establishment of such courts was done in a way that resulted in the development of

⁵⁸ “Our DV Court: A Deceptive Dangerous Sham” complains the Women’s Justice Center of Santa Rosa, California on its website at www.justicewomen.com/cj_dv_court_sham.html (last visited February 22, 2007).

⁵⁹ See “Bias in the Judiciary: The Case of Domestic Violence”, by a group calling itself “Respect Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting” at www.mediadar.org/docs/Bias-In-The-Judiciary.pdf (last visited February 22, 2007).

⁶⁰ Ventura, Lois A. and Gabrielle Davis (2005) “Domestic Violence: Court Case Conviction and Recidivism”, 11 *Violence Against Women* 255-277.

alternative models in various locales. Some of these models have been fairly timid in approach while others have been much more aggressive. The development of integrated domestic violence courts in New York, which brings together many of the various legal aspects of domestic violence, has perhaps proven to be one of the most successful forms.

The piecemeal nature of the growth of domestic violence courts has also resulted in the lack of a comprehensive source identifying those courts and their various features. The Keilitz study in 2000 was the last published list of operation domestic violence courts. A working grant from the Department of Justice to the Center for Court Innovation will hopefully produce a comprehensive study list of all domestic violence courts in the country but the results of that study are not likely to be available until 2008. In the meantime this project focused on a more immediate identification of the changes that have taken place in our stock of domestic violence courts since 2000. The results of that effort are contained in the following Appendix.

Appendix:

Domestic Violence Courts in the United States – 2007

Domestic Violence Courts in the United States – 2007

Hon. Donald E. Shelton

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Alabama	<i>Jefferson County Circuit Court</i> 716 Richard Arrington, Jr. Blvd North Birmingham, Alabama 35203	www.birminghambar.org/jefferson_circuit.cfm and see www.al.com/news/birminghamnews/index.ssf?/base/news/1168337742231690.xml&coll=2
Arizona	Tucson City Court P.O. Box 27210 Tucson, AZ 85926-7210	http://www.tucsonaz.gov/courts/ “mixed caseload with special dv calendar” Sent email inquiry
	Phoenix Municipal Court 400 North 7th Street Phoenix, AZ 85006	http://phoenix.gov/COURT/index.html “mixed caseload with special dv calendar” Sent email inquiry
	<i>Maricopa County Superior Court</i>	http://www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/justiceCourts/Info/domesticviolence.asp comprehensive online instructions and forms see http://www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/familyCourt/opTour/index.asp but apparently no special dv calendar but all protection orders are handled separately by family court judges
	<i>Pinal County Superior Court</i> P.O. Box 2547 Florence, Az 85232	http://www.co.pinal.az.us/SupCourt/ Type - Domestic Violence with related caseload. Single judge assigned.
California	Alameda County Superior Court Berkeley Courthouse 2120 Martin Luther King Jr. Way Berkeley, CA 94704	www.alameda.courts.ca.gov/courts
	King County Superior Court 1400 W. Lacey Blvd. Hanford, CA 93230	www.metrokc.gov/kcsc
	San Francisco Superior Court Unified Family Court 400 McAllister St., Dept 405 San Francisco. CA 94102	www.sfgov.org/site/courts_index.asp
	San Francisco Superior Court 851 Bryant Street San Francisco, CA 94103	

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
California (continued)	San Diego Superior Court East County Division 250 East Main Street El Cajon, CA 92020	
	Sonoma County Superior Court 600 Administration Drive Room 209-J Santa Rosa, CA 95403	www.sonomasuperiorcourt.com
	Santa Barbara County Superior Court 118 East Figueroa Street Santa Barbara, CA 93101	www.sbcourts.org
	Riverside County Superior Court 4100 Main Street Riverside, CA 92501	www.courts.co.riverside.ca.us/
	Yolo County Superior Court 725 Court Street, Room 308 Woodland, CA 95695	www.yolocourts.com/
	Sacramento County Superior Court 120 9th Street Sacramento, CA 95814	www.saccourt.com/criminal/dv_court/domviolence.asp
	Fresno County Superior Court 61 9 N Street Sanger, CA 93657	www.fresnosuperiorcourt.org/
	<p><i>Los Angeles County Superior Court</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>415 West Ocean Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90802</i> • <i>11234 East Valley Blvd., El Monte, CA 91731</i> • <i>1427 West Covina Parkway, West Covina, CA 91790</i> • <i>400 Civic Center Plaza, Pomona, CA 91766</i> • <i>111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012</i> 	www.lasuperiorcourt.org/criminal/domesticviolence.htm
Colorado	Denver County Court 1437 Bannock Street, Room 108 Denver, CO 80202-5301	Handles all protection orders in a single court dedicated to that purpose. 2005 annual report - http://www.denvergov.org/admin/template3/forms/DCCAnnRpt05.pdf

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Colorado (continued)	<i>Nineteenth Judicial District (Weld County) P.O. Box 2038 915 10th Street Greeley, Colorado 80632</i>	NEW – dedicated docket of single judge handling misdemeanors and protection orders http://www.courts.state.co.us/district/19th/judges/19maghoskins.htm
Connecticut	Connecticut Superior Court Judicial District Courthouse 1061 Main Street Bridgeport, CT 06604	http://www.jud.ct.gov/external/super/spsess.htm The Connecticut Judicial Branch now operates family violence dockets in Waterbury, Bridgeport, Stamford and New Haven. “Dockets that handle domestic violence cases using a vertical case management approach. Teams comprised of prosecutors, family relations counselors, domestic violence victim advocates, and representatives of law enforcement coordinate case processing through regular meetings. Defendants are required to return to court frequently to ensure that they are following court orders.” Criminal model
	<i>Superior Court Judicial District & G.A. 1 123 Hoyt Street Stamford, CT 06905</i>	
	<i>Superior Court Judicial District Courthouse 235 Church Street New Haven, CT 06510</i>	
	<i>Superior Court Judicial District Courthouse 300 Grand Street Waterbury, CT 06702</i>	
Delaware	Family Court of the State of Delaware 704 King Street, Second Floor Wilmington, DE 19801	http://courts.delaware.gov/Courts/Family%20Court Unified State Court system provides for a “Family Court” with extensive jurisdiction over all domestic relations matter, including “intrafamily misdemeanors, misdemeanor crimes against children, and civil domestic violence protective orders.”
	<i>New Castle County Family Court 500 North King Street Wilmington, DE 19801</i>	
	<i>Kent County Family Court 400 Court Street Dover, DE 19901</i>	

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Delaware (continued)	<i>Sussex County Family Court</i> 22 The Circle Georgetown, DE 19947	
Florida	16th Judicial Circuit - Upper Keys 53 High Point Road Tavernier. FL 33070	<p>Florida has what it calls a “Unified Family Court” http://www.flcourts.org/gen_public/family/familycourts.shtml Pursuant to legislative action, the Florida Supreme Court has required every circuit to establish a family court http://www.floridasupremecourt.org/decisions/pre2004/bin/sc00-1410.pdf Each of the local courts has adopted its own version, subject to approval by the Supreme Court. Common to all is separate jurisdiction over protection orders. The Court urged local court to assign such cases to a single judge but did not require it. The inclusion of misdemeanor criminal domestic violence cases to the discretion of each local court. There are 20 circuit courts in Florida. It appears that each has a “domestic relation” or “family court” docket but there is no uniformity as to the assignment of single judges to hear protection orders. The more populous circuits such as the 9th (Orlando) have separate domestic relations courts with separately assigned judges who preside over protection order matters. http://www.ninja9.org</p>
	16th Judicial Circuit - Middle Keys 53 Highpoint Road Tavernier. FL 33070	
	17th Judicial Circuit Court Broward County 201 SE 6th St., Room 565 Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301	
	16th Judicial Circuit-Lower Keys 500 Whitehead Street Key West, FL 32040	
	6th Judicial Circuit Court West Pasco Judicial Center 7530 Little Road New Port Richey, FL 34654	
	7th Judicial Circuit Court 125 E. Orange Ave., Suite 300 Daytona Beach, FL 321 14	

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Florida (continued)	9 th Judicial Circuit Court Domestic Relations Court 425 North Orange Ave., Rm. 320 Orlando, FL 32801	
	Second Judicial Circuit Court PO. Box 726 Tallahassee, FL 32302	
	8th Judicial Circuit Court Alachua County Courthouse 201 E. University Ave., Suite 400 Gainesville, FL 32601	
	<i>11th Judicial Circuit Court Lawson E. Thomas Courthouse Center 175 N.W. 1st Avenue Miami, Florida 33128</i>	The 11 th Circuit (Miami, Dade County) appears to be the only circuit that has established an integrated domestic violence court model with a “Domestic Violence Division, in which criminal domestic violence-related misdemeanors and injunction violation cases, as well as civil orders of protection (temporary and permanent domestic and repeat violence injunctions) are heard.” http://www.jud11.flcourts.org/about_the_court/judicial_circuit_overview.htm “The Unified Family Court staff researches the cases in the circuit wide database system to determine if any additional Domestic Relations, Dependency, Delinquency, Domestic Violence, and/or related Criminal cases exist. If a matter qualifies for transfer to Unified Family Court, a Transfer Order will be prepared for signature by the appropriate Complex Litigation Division Judge, and the parties will be noticed to appear before the designated Complex Litigation Division Judge.” http://www.jud11.flcourts.org/programs_and_services/unified_family_court.htm
	<i>13th Judicial Circuit Court 800 E. Twiggs St., Room 602 Tampa, Florida 33602</i>	The 13 th Circuit (Tampa, Hillsborough County) has a separate panel of family court judges who hear protection orders as part of the family docket but has also assigned two other judges to hear domestic violence criminal misdemeanors. http://www.fljud13.org/divisions_circuitunifiedfamnav.htm

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Hawaii	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st Circuit Oahu, Ka`ahumanu Hale, 777 Punchbowl Street Honolulu HI 96813 – 5093 • 2nd Circuit Court Maui, Hoapili Hale, 2145 Main Street, Wailuku, HI 96793-1679 • 3rd Circuit Court Hawaii, 75 Aupuni Street, Hilo, HI 96720-4253 • 5th Circuit Court Kauai, 3970 Ka`ana Street, Lihu`e, HI 96766 	<p>Hawaii’s family courts handle domestic violence matters that include requests for civil restraining orders involving family members; persons charged with the offense of abuse of family and household members; and felony charges limited to offenses against household members.</p> <p>http://www.courts.state.hi.us/page_server/Courts/Family/153E4A87ED63B9F8EBD8E1142F.html</p>
Idaho	<p>4th Judicial District Ada County 200 W. Front St. Boise, ID 83702</p>	<p>www.isc.idaho.gov/flqspr05.pdf and www.isc.idaho.gov/4th%20district%20cfcc%20report%20and%20budget%20request%20(2).pdf</p>
Illinois	<p>21st Circuit Court 450 East Court Street, Third Floor Kankakee, IL 60901</p>	<p>www.prairienet.org/21jcc/21st.htm no further information</p>
	<p>18th Judicial Circuit Court 505 N. County Farm Rd., Suite 2015 Wheaton, IL 601 87</p>	<p>Separate domestic relations division and separate docket for domestic violence misdemeanors. http://www.dupageco.org/courts/generic.cfm?doc_id=1959</p>
	<p>20th Judicial Circuit Court P.O. Box 831 Belleville, IL 62222-0831</p>	<p>www.co.st-clair.il.us/Departments/Circuit+Clerk+Department/default.htm and www.state.il.us/court/CircuitCourt/CircuitMap/20th.asp no further information</p>
	<p>Grundy County Court 111 E. Washington Street Morris, IL 60450</p>	<p>www.state.il.us/court/CircuitCourt/CircuitMap/13th.asp no further information</p>
	<p>McLean County Circuit Court 41 1 Justice Center 104 W. Front Street Bloomington, IL 61701</p>	<p>www.co.mclean.il.us/CircuitCourt no further information</p>
	<p>12th Judicial Circuit Court 14 West Jefferson Street Joliet, IL 60432</p>	<p>www.willcountycourts.com/Interpreters_and_OP.htm Apparently a separate courtroom and judge for hearing protection orders</p>
	<p>7th Judicial Circuit Court 200 S. 9th Street, RM 405 Springfield, IL 62701</p>	<p>www.co.sangamon.il.us/Court no further information</p>

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Illinois (continued)	13th Judicial Circuit Court 100 W. Lafayette Street Ottawa, IL 61 350	www.state.il.us/court/CircuitCourt/CircuitMap/13th.asp no further information
	<i>Cook County Circuit Court</i> <i>555 West Harrison Street</i> <i>Chicago IL</i>	Following up on its early role as a leader in establishing a separate family court, in probably the most ambitious effort to establish a domestic relations court, Cook County (Chicago) built a separate \$51 million Domestic Violence Courthouse.
	<i>Cook County Circuit Court</i> <i>555 West Harrison Street</i> <i>Chicago IL</i>	www.co.cook.il.us/Media/05_releases/ccpr_092905.htm It is a fully integrated domestic violence court “The court will hear all civil and criminal calls for orders of protections, and for misdemeanors, felonies, and preliminary hearings in felony domestic violence cases.” http://www.suffredin.org/news/newsitem.asp?language=english&newsitemid=975
Iowa	1st District Court 316 E. 5th Street Waterloo, IA 50703	www.judicial.state.ia.us/District_Courts/District_One/
	Scott County District Court Iowa Judicial Branch 416 West 4th Street Davenport, IA 52801	www.scottcountyiowa.com/courts/clerk.php
	6th District Court Linn County P.O. Box 1468 Cedar Rapids, IA 52406-1468	www.judicial.state.ia.us/District_Courts/District_Six/
	Pottawattamie County District Court PO. Box 476 Council Bluffs, IA 51501-0476	www.judicial.state.ia.us/District_Courts/District_Four/
	5th Judicial District Court 500 Mulberry Street Des Moines. IA 50309	www.judicial.state.ia.us/District_Courts/District_Five/
Kansas	10th Judicial District Court Johnson County 1255 E. 119th Street Olathe, KS 66061	http://courts.jocogov.org/dc_dv.htm no further information - appears two judges assigned to hear protection orders
	18th Judicial District Court 525 N. Main Street Wichita. KS 67203	http://www.dc18.org no further information

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Kansas (continued)	29th Judicial District Court Wyandotte County 710 North 7th Street Kansas City, KS 66101	www.wycokck.org/gen/wyco_generated_pages/District_Courts_m372.html no further information
Massachusetts	Quincy District Court One Dennis F. Ryan Parkway Quincy, MA 02169	www.mass.gov/courts/courtsandjudges/courts/quincydistrictmain.html
Michigan	15th District Court 101 East Huron, PO. Box 8650 Ann Arbor, MI 481 07	www.ci.ann-arbor.mi.us/15DCourt/index.html
	Berrien County Trial Court Berrien County Courthouse St. Joseph, Mi 49085	http://www.berriencounty.org/?dept=8&pid=23 Separate criminal model domestic violence court to hear all domestic violence misdemeanors
	Washtenaw County Trial Court 101 E. Huron St., PO Box 8645 Ann Arbor, MI 48107-8645	http://washtenawtrialcourt.org/family/ppo Protection orders are assigned to a single judge.
	54-A District Court 124 W. Michigan Ave. 6th Floor, City Hall Lansing, MI 48933	www.cityoflansingmi.com/court/domestic_violence_court.jsp criminal model hears all domestic violence misdemeanors
Minnesota	2nd Judicial District Court 1700 Ramsey County Courthouse St. Paul, MN 55102	www.courts.state.mn.us/district/2/ no further information
New Jersey		www.judiciary.state.nj.us/family/dv.htm New Jersey employs a system utilizing a “Domestic Violence Hearing Officer (DVHO)” to allow trained hearing officers to hear most requests for a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) at the Superior Court Family Part. A Superior Court Family Part Judge must review DVHO recommendations and if approved, the recommendations are incorporated into a TRO signed by a judge. The DVHO program began as a pilot program in 1993 in Hudson and Ocean counties, it became statewide in 1998. Presently, 17 out of New Jersey’s 21 counties have a DVHO.
New Mexico	3rd Judicial District Court 201 W. Picacho, Suite A. Las Cruces, NM 88005	http://www.thirddistrictcourt.com no further information
	4th, 9th, 10th Judicial District Court 700 N. Main St., Suite 15 Clovis, NM 88101	www.nmcourts9thjdc.com/html/d_violence_overview.htm no further information

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
New Mexico (continued)	13th District Court EO. Box 1089 Los Lunas, NM 87031	www.13districtcourt.com no further information
	1st Judicial District Court P.O. Box 2268 Santa Fe, NM 87504	http://firstdistrictcourt.com/dvoffice.htm no further information
	10th Judicial District Court PO. Box 1067 Tucumcari, NM 88401	
	12th Judicial District Court 1000 New York Ave., Room 209 Alamogordo, NM 88310	
	2nd Judicial District Court DV Division P.O. Box 488 Albuquerque, NM 87108	www.nmcourts.com/seconddistrictcourt/dv2.html Single judge assigned to protection order docket
	5th Judicial District Court P. O. Box 1776 Roswell, NM 88202-1776	www.fifthdistrictcourt.com no further information
	5th Judicial District Court / Eddy County P. O. Box 1776 Roswell, NM 88202-1776	Same court as above
	5th Judicial District Court/ Lea County P. O. Box 1776 Roswell, NM 88202-1776	Same court as above
	Socorro County District Court P.O. Drawer 11 29 Socorro, NM 87801	
	6th Judicial District Court PO. Box 608 Lordsburg, NM 88045	
Nevada	Las Vegas Municipal Court 400 E. Stewart Ave. Las Vegas, NV 891 01	
	Las Vegas Township Justice Court P.O. Box 55251 1 200 South Third Street Las Vegas, NV 891 55	

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Nevada (continued)	4th Judicial District Court 665 W. Silver Street Elko, NV 89801	www.elkonv.com/~fourjdc1 no further information
	Henderson Municipal Court 243 Water Street Henderson, NV 89105	
	North Las Vegas Municipal Court 2240 Civic Center Drive North Las Vegas, NV 89031)	www.ci.north-las-vegas.nv.us/Departments/MunicipalCourt/MunicipalCourt.cfm no further information
	8th Judicial District Court Family Division 601 N. Pews Road, Rm. 54 Las Vegas, NV 89101-2408	www.co.clark.nv.us/district_court/courthome.htm no further information
New York	12th Judicial District Bronx County IDV Court 215 E. 161st Street Bronx, NY 10451	www.nycourts.gov/courts/12jd/index.shtml Integrated model
	Brooklyn Domestic Violence Court Kings County Supreme Court 360 Adams Street Brooklyn, New York 11201	www.nycourts.gov/admin/stateofjudiciary/stofjud9/4%20criminal.pdf
	<i>2nd Judicial District Richmond County IDV Court Richmond County Supreme Court 18 Richmond Terrace Staten Island, NY 10304</i>	http://www.nycourts.gov/courts/2jd/richmond.shtml Integrated model
	<i>9th Judicial District White Plains IDV Court Westchester County Supreme Court 111 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. White Plains, NY 10601</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/9jd/index.shtml Integrated model
	<i>9th Judicial District Yonkers IDV Court Yonkers City Court Robert W. Cacace Justice Center 100 South Broadway Yonkers, New York 10701</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/9jd/Westchester/Yonkers.shtml Integrated model

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
New York (continued)	<i>10th Judicial District Nassau County IDV Court Nassau County Supreme Court 100 Supreme Court Drive Mineola, New York 11501</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/10jd/nassau/domesticviolence.shtml Integrated model
	<i>10th Judicial District Suffolk County IDV Court Suffolk County Supreme Court John P. Cohalan, Jr. Court Complex 400 Carleton Avenue Central Islip, NY 11722</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/10jd/suffolk/dv_mission.shtml Integrated model
	<i>11th Judicial District Queens County IDV Court Queens County Supreme Court Criminal Term 125-01 Queens Blvd Kew Gardens, New York 11415</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/11jd/supreme/index.shtml Integrated model
	<i>3rd Judicial District Rensselaer County IDV Court Rensselaer County Supreme Court 72 Second Street Troy, NY 12180</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/3jd/family/index.shtml Integrated model
	<i>4th Judicial District Clinton County IDV Court Clinton Supreme and County Court 137 Margaret Street Plattsburg, New York 12901</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/5jd/onondaga/syracuse/index.shtml Integrated model
	<i>4th Judicial District Essex County IDV Court Essex County Court 100 Court Street Elizabethtown, NY 12932</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/4jd/index.shtml Integrated model
	<i>4th Judicial District Franklin County IDV Court Franklin County Court 355 Main Street Malone, NY 12953</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/4jd/franklin/index.shtml Integrated model
	<i>4th Judicial District Schenectady County IDV Court Schenectady County Court 612 State Street Schenectady, New York 12305</i>	www.nycourts.gov/courts/4jd/index.shtml Integrated model

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
New York (continued)	6th Judicial District Tompkins County IDV Court Tompkins Supreme and County Court 320 North Tioga Street P.O. Box 70 Ithaca, NY 14851-0070	www.nycourts.gov/courts/6jd/tompkins/family/domestic.shtml Integrated model
	6th Judicial District Broome County IDV Court 65 Hawley Street Binghamton, NY 13901	www.nycourts.gov/courts/6jd/broome/idv/index.shtml Integrated model
	5th Judicial District Onondaga County IDV Court Onondaga County Supreme Court 401 Montgomery Street Syracuse, NY 13202	www.nycourts.gov/courts/5jd/onondaga/syracuse/index.shtml Integrated model
	7th Judicial District Cayuga County IDV Court Cayuga Supreme and County Court 152 Genesee Street Auburn, New York 13021	www.nycourts.gov/courts/5jd/onondaga/syracuse/index.shtml Integrated model
	7th Judicial District Monroe County IDV Court Monroe County Supreme Court 545 Hall of Justice Rochester, NY 14614	www.nycourts.gov/courts/7jd/Monroe/IDV.pdf Integrated model
	8th Judicial District Erie County IDV Court Erie County Supreme Court One Niagara Plaza Buffalo, NY 14202	www.nycourts.gov/courts/8jd/Erie/spec_idv.shtml Integrated model
	8th Judicial District Wyoming County IDV Court Supreme, County, Family and Surrogates Courts 147 North Main Street Warsaw, New York 14569	www.nycourts.gov/courts/8jd/idv.shtml www.nycourts.gov/courts/8jd/Wyoming/index.shtml Integrated model
	9 th Judicial District Dutchess County 10 Market Street Poughkeepsie, NY 12601	www.courts.state.ny.us/courts/9jd/Dutchess/supremecounty.shtml http://www.nycourts.gov/ip/dv/benchmanual.pdf

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
North Carolina	14 th District Domestic Violence Court 201 E. Main Street Durham, NC 27701	www.nccourts.org/County/Durham/Courts/Family/Default.asp no further information
	11th Judicial District Court P.O. Box 849 Sanford, NC 27330	www.nccourts.org/County/Lee/Default.asp no further information
	13th Judicial District Court Brunswick County P.O. Box 127 Bolivia, NC 28422	www.nccourts.org/County/Brunswick/Default.asp no further information
	4th Judicial District Court 632 Court Street Jacksonville, NC 28540	www.nccourts.org/County/Onslow/Default.asp no further information
	21st District Court PO. Box 20083 Winston Salem, NC 27102	www.nccourts.org/County/Forsyth/Default.asp no further information
	Wake County Criminal Domestic Violence Court P.O. Box 31 Raleigh, NC 27602	www.nccourts.org/County/Wake/Default.asp no further information http://web.co.wake.nc.us/courts/domestic.html
	26th Judicial District Court 700 E. Trade Street Charlotte, NC 28202	www.nccourts.org/County/Mecklenburg/Courts/Family/Default.asp no further information
	District/Superior Court P.O. Box 1925 Rockingham, NC 28380	www.nccourts.org/County/Rockingham/Default.asp no further information
	Guilford County District Court P.O. Box 3008 Greensboro, NC 27402-3008	www.nccourts.org/County/Guilford/Default.asp no further information
	10th Judicial District Court P.O. Box 31 Raleigh, NC 27602	See Wake County above – same court

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
North Carolina (continued)	8 th Judicial District Court Greene County 301 N Greene St Snow Hill, NC 28580	www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Family/Default.asp?topic=1 “The three original pilot sites are District 14 (Durham County), District 20 (Anson, Richmond, Stanly, and Union Counties), and District 26 (Mecklenburg County). By 2001, North Carolina had added five more Family Court sites: District 12 (Cumberland County), District 6A (Halifax County), District 5 (New Hanover and Pender Counties), District 8 (Wayne, Lenoir and Greene Counties) and District 25 (Burke, Caldwell and Catawba Counties). In 2004, funds were allocated to implement Family Court in District 28 (Buncombe County), and in 2005, for implementation of District 10 (Wake County). With the legislative split in District 20, there are currently eleven Family Court sites.” A map of all family court sites in North Carolina with dates of inception is at www.nccourts.org/Citizens/CPrograms/Family/Documents/familycourtmap.pdf
	8 th Judicial District Court Greene County 301 N Greene St Snow Hill, NC 28580	“Special family court judges hear all cases involving juvenile delinquency charges; neglect and abuse charges; termination of parental rights and adoptions; domestic violence; child custody and visitation rights; divorce and related financial issues like child support, alimony, or equitable distribution of property; and involuntary commitments.” Greene County www.nccourts.org/County/Greene/Courts/Family/Default.asp Lenoir County www.nccourts.org/County/Lenoir/Courts/Family/Default.asp Wayne County www.nccourts.org/County/Wayne/Courts/Family/Default.asp
	5 th Judicial District New Hanover County Judicial Building WAC Judicial Annex, Suite 323 Wilmington, North Carolina 28401	www.nccourts.org/County/Pender/Default.asp
	25 th Judicial District 201 South Green St Morganton, NC 28655	www.nccourts.org/County/Burke/Default.asp www.nccourts.org/County/Catawba/Default.asp www.nccourts.org/County/Catawba/Default.asp

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
North Carolina (continued)	12th Judicial District County Courthouse 117 Dick Street Fayetteville, NC 28301	www.nccourts.org/County/Cumberland/Default.asp
	6A Judicial District Halifax County Courthouse P.O. Box 66 Halifax, NC 27839	www.nccourts.org/County/Halifax/Default.asp
	28 th Judicial District 60 Court Plaza Asheville, NC 28801	www.nccourts.org/County/Buncombe/Default.asp
Oklahoma	Garfield County Court 114 West Broadway Enid, OK 73701	http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/start.asp?viewType=COUNTYINFO&county=GARFIELD no further information
Pennsylvania	32nd Judicial District Court 201 W. Front St. Media, PA 19063	www.co.delaware.pa.us/courts/domesticrelations.html no further information
	Carbon County Court of Common Pleas P.O. Box 166 Jim Thorp, PA 18229-01 66	www.carboncourts.com/DOMESTIC.htm no further information
	3rd Judicial District Court 669 Washington Street Easton, PA 18042	www.nccpa.org/fammatters/pfainfo.html no further information
Rhode Island	Rhode Island Family Court One Dorrance Plaza Providence, RI 2903	www.courts.state.ri.us/family/domesticviolence.htm “The mission of the Domestic Violence Court is to effectively manage a specialized domestic abuse docket within the overall framework of affording protective orders and services to victims and their families while at the same time ensuring batterer accountability and encouraging behavior changes.”
Texas	Dallas County Criminal Court 133 N. Industrial Blvd. 2nd Floor, LB 3 Dallas, TX 75207	www.dallascourts.com/courts.htm
Utah	3rd Judicial District Court 450 South State Salt Lake City, UT 841 11	www.justicecourt.slco.org

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Washington	Jefferson County Superior Court PO. Box 1220 Port Townsend. WA 98368	www.co.jefferson.wa.us/supcourt/
	Spokane Municipal District Court N. 901 Monroe #200 Spokane, WA 99201	www.spokanecounty.org/districtcourt/
	Clallam County Superior Court 223 East 4th Street Port Angeles, WA 98362	www.clallam.net/Courts/html/court_superior.htm
	Fife Municipal Court 3737 Pacific Hwy E. Fife, WA 98001	www.cityoffife.org/?page=departments&dname=municipalcourt
	Mason County District Court P.O. Box 1490 Shelton, WA 98584	
	Westport Municipal Court P.O. Box 1208 Westport, WA 98595	www.ci.westport.wa.us/court.html
	Douglas County District Court P.O. Box 730 Bridgeport, WA 9881 3-0730	www.douglascountywa.net/departments/districtcourt/
	Clark County District Court P.O. Box 9806 Vancouver, WA 98666-9806	www.co.clark.wa.us/courts/district/
	Kitsap Superior Court 614 Division Street Port Orchard, WA 98366	www.kitsapgov.com/sc/
	Pierce County Superior Court 930 Tacoma Avenue South #IO8 Tacoma, WA 98402	www.co.pierce.wa.us/pc/abtus/ourorg/supct/abtussup.htm
	Bainbridge Island Municipal Court P.O. Box 151 Rolling Bay, WA 98061	www.ci.bainbridge-isl.wa.us/default.asp?ID=393
	Snohomish District Court Cascade Division 41 5 E. Burke Avenue Arlington, WA 98223	http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/DistrictCourt/
Seatac Municipal Court 17900 International Blvd., Ste. 401 Seatac, WA 98058	www.ci.seatac.wa.us/department/courthome.htm	

State	Court	Web Site Links , Status and Comments
Washington (continued)	Everson Municipal Court P.O. Box 315 Everson, WA 98247	www.ci.everson.wa.us/COEDepMunicipalCourt.html
	Snohomish County District Court Evergreen Division PO. Box 625 Monroe. WA 98272	http://www1.co.snohomish.wa.us/Departments/District_Court/Divisions/Evergreen_Division/
	Blaine Municipal Court 344 H Street Blaine, WA 98230	
	Everett Municipal Court 3028 Wetmore Avenue Everett, WA 98201-4018	http://www.everettwa.org/default.aspx?ID=49
	Pacific County Superior Court PO. Box 67 South Bend, WA 98586	www.co.pacific.wa.us/courts/superior/
	Lake Forest Park Municipal Court 1771 1 Ballinger Way NE Lake Forest Park, WA 98155	www.cityoflfp.com/city/court.html
	Yakima County Superior Court 128 N. 2 nd Street, #323 Yakima, WA 98901	www.co.yakima.wa.us/SuperiorCourt/Default.htm
Wisconsin	1st Judicial District Court 901 N. 9th Street, Room 609 Milwaukee, WI 53233	www.milwaukeecounty.org/CourtServices7714.htm