

# 2009-2015

## Intimate Partner and Domestic Violence in Idaho



Idaho Statistical Analysis Center  
Grants & Research  
Idaho State Police

# Intimate Partner and Domestic Violence in Idaho: 2009-2015

## Authors:

Danielle D. Swerin

Misty Kifer

## For More Information:

Email: [pgr@isp.idaho.gov](mailto:pgr@isp.idaho.gov)

Website: [www.isp.idaho.gov/pgr/Research/sac.html](http://www.isp.idaho.gov/pgr/Research/sac.html)

Published: May 2018

Images do not represent actual victims.

Cost information for this publication is available from the Idaho State Police in accordance with Idaho Code, Section 60.202. This project was supported by subgrant No. 13STPISP awarded by the state administering office for the STOP Formula Grant Program and supported by Grant No. 2014-WF-AX-0050 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Idaho State Police, contributing agencies, or the U.S. Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women.

## Table of Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Highlights</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS) .....	5
Idaho Supreme Court Repository .....	6
Limitations .....	6
<b>Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS) Results</b> .....	<b>7</b>
Incident Characteristics .....	7
Crime Type.....	7
Intimate Partner Homicide (IPH) .....	7
Geography (Rural/Urban).....	7
Location and Time .....	8
Alcohol and Drug Use .....	9
Weapon Use .....	9
Rates of IPV Incidents by County.....	10
Victim Characteristics .....	11
Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity .....	11
Victim-Offender Relationship.....	11
Victim Injury .....	12
Offender Characteristics .....	12
Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity .....	12
Law Enforcement Response .....	13
Arrest .....	13
Exceptional Clearance .....	13
<b>Idaho Supreme Court Repository Results</b> .....	<b>15</b>
Domestic Violence Related Charges.....	15
Defendant Information .....	16
Amended Charges .....	17
Domestic Assault/Battery.....	17
Strangulation .....	18
Stalking/Harassment .....	18
No Contact Order Violations .....	19
Protection Order Violations.....	19
<b>Policy Implications</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>Appendix A: Missing Victim Information</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix B: Idaho Statutes</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix C: Victim Demographics by County</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Appendix D: Charges Amended from a Felony to a Misdemeanor</b> .....	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix E: Disposition by Crime Type and County</b> .....	<b>32</b>

## Introduction

According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, “more than 1 in 3 women (35.6%) and more than 1 in 4 men (28.5%) in the United States have experienced rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime<sup>1</sup>” (p. 2). Considering the widespread impact of intimate partner violence (IPV) throughout the United States, it is imperative that individual localities further examine the prevalence and response to intimate partner and domestic violence in their area.

The purpose of this report is to inform the criminal justice community and other interested parties about the prevalence, characteristics, and criminal justice system response to intimate partner and domestic violence in Idaho. Data include information on police reported violence between intimate partners as well as domestic violence related court cases from 2009 through 2015. The Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS) section of this report includes data on violent crimes committed by an intimate partner while the Idaho Supreme Court Repository section includes domestic violence related charges as defined by state statutes. The data analyses and conclusions referenced in this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the Idaho State Police or contributing agencies.

## Highlights

### Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS), 2009-2015

- The rate of intimate partner violence has declined steadily.
- One in four homicides were committed by an intimate partner.
- Victims of IPV were more likely to be injured compared to victims of other violent crimes.
- Half of IPV victimizations were committed by a dating partner.
- The majority of IPV offenders were white, male, and between the ages of 25 and 44.
- IPV incidents were slightly more likely to have prosecution declined and slightly less likely to be cleared because the victim refused to cooperate compared to other violent crimes.
- A larger percentage of IPV offenders were arrested than offenders of other violent crimes.

### Domestic Violence Related Court Cases, 2009-2015

- 42% of all charges filed for a violent crime were for domestic assault/battery, stalking/harassment, or strangulation.
- Of the domestic violence related charges filed, the majority were domestic assault/battery followed by no contact order violations.
- Charges for no contact order violations increased from 1,014 in 2009 to 1,281 in 2015.
- One in four domestic assault/battery charges included the “in the presence of a child” enhancement.
- More than one-third of domestic violence related charges were amended to a different category.
- Of the domestic assault/battery charges that were amended to a different category, 74% were amended to disturbing the peace or disorderly conduct.
- More than three-quarters of strangulation charges that were not amended resulted in a dismissal.

---

<sup>1</sup> Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L, Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey: 2010 summary report. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. Retrieved from [https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/NISVS\\_Executive\\_Summary-a.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/NISVS_Executive_Summary-a.pdf)

# Methodology

Two sources of data were used for this report:

- 1) Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS)
- 2) Idaho Supreme Court Repository

## Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS)

One segment of information on intimate partner and domestic violence comes from police incidents reported to the Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS). IIBRS is a collection of all criminal incidents reported to the Idaho State Police Incident Based Reporting System from 99.9% of law enforcement agencies in Idaho. This data provides information on victim, offender, arrestee, and offense characteristics and is a key measurement for reported cases of intimate partner violence. For the purposes of this study, data were collected and analyzed for all violent incidents from 2009 through 2015.

Within this section, *intimate partner violence (IPV)* refers to violent crimes committed by an intimate partner<sup>2</sup>, as indicated in police incident reports. Because IIBRS data are based on violence committed by an intimate partner and do not necessarily reflect the statutory definition of domestic violence, the term intimate partner violence is used throughout the IIBRS section of this report.

For the purpose of this report, *violent crime*<sup>3</sup> includes aggravated assault, sex offenses (i.e., rape, sodomy, sexual assault with an object, and fondling), intimidation, kidnapping/abduction, homicide, and simple assault. These offenses were selected by the researchers based on the nature of the offense (as defined in the NIBRS User Manual<sup>4</sup>) and association with intimate partner violence. For example, because simple assault and intimidation incidents are crimes against persons and a large proportion are committed by an intimate partner, it is important that these offenses are included in analyses in order to provide a comprehensive review of intimate partner violence in Idaho. Conversely, because robbery incidents rarely involve an intimate partner<sup>5</sup>, robbery was excluded from the definition of violent crime in this report.

The information collected from IIBRS is extensive and includes the following:

- Victim Information (up to 999)
  - Type of victim (person, business, society, etc.)
  - Age, race, sex, and ethnicity
  - Aggravated assault and homicide circumstances
  - Injuries suffered (up to 3)
  - Victim-offender relationships (up to 10)
- Arrestee Information (up to 99)
  - Age, race, sex, and ethnicity
  - Arrest date
  - Type of arrest (citation, on-view, etc.)
  - Weapons in possession of arrestee (up to 3)
  - Arrest offense (only 1)
  - Disposition of juvenile arrestees
- Incident Information
  - Date/time
  - Reporting agency
  - Exceptional clearance
- Offense Information (up to 10 per victim)
  - Weapons used per offense (up to 3)
  - Types of criminal activity (up to 3)
- Offense location
- Suspected use of alcohol or drugs by offender

---

<sup>2</sup> Intimate partner includes spouse, common-law spouse, ex-spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend, and same-sex relationship.

<sup>3</sup> The definition of violent crime in this report does not reflect the definition used in the FBI's Summary Reporting System (SRS) or the Crime in Idaho report; as a result, findings cannot be accurately compared across these reports.

<sup>4</sup> Offense definitions can be found in the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS) User Manual: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/nibrs/nibrs-user-manual>

<sup>5</sup> Of the 3,343 victims of robbery reported in Idaho between 2009 and 2015, 2 were victimized by an intimate partner.

## Idaho Supreme Court Repository

For the second section of this report, the Idaho Statistical Analysis Center received data from the Idaho Supreme Court Repository, which includes domestic violence related charges, cases, and offender information. In order to ensure privacy of juvenile records, all cases involving an offender under the age of 18 were removed. For ease of analysis, original and adjudicated charges were classified into five distinct categories<sup>6</sup>:

- Domestic Violence (assault or battery)
- Attempted Strangulation
- Stalking
- No Contact Order Violation
- Protection Order Violation

Within this section of this report, *domestic violence (DV)* is defined by statute as the assault or battery of a household member (i.e., spouse, former spouse, child in common, or cohabitant). Because the data in this section reflect statutory definitions, the term domestic violence is used throughout the Idaho Supreme Court Repository section of this report. Also included in the analysis of court data are crimes frequently related to domestic violence including stalking, attempted strangulation, civil protection order (CPO) violations, no contact order (NCO) violations, and domestic assault/battery. Although these crimes are frequently related to domestic violence, analyses are based solely on the type of offense without regard to victim-offender relationship. As a result, some of the domestic violence related crimes (i.e., stalking, attempted strangulation, CPO violations, and NCO violations) included in this section may not involve individuals in a domestic relationship.

## Limitations

This study examines domestic violence solely through the use of official records. For police records, data only include incidents that have been reported to the police and therefore do not represent all incidents of violence. For court records, the data represent court filings for domestic violence related cases only and may not include all case filings for a particular defendant.

### IIBRS Data

Of the 125,536 violent crime victims, 14,656 or 11.7% had at least one missing or unknown characteristic. No characteristics were reported for 0.3% of violent crime victims. The table in Appendix A provides detailed data on the number and percent of victims that are missing victim information.

### Court Data

- Kidnapping in IIBRS analyses was considered intimate partner violence if the victim and offender were intimate partners. In the analysis of court data, kidnapping was never classified as related to domestic violence since the relationship between the victim and offender was unknown.
- If the statute number listed with the charge did not indicate whether the charge was a misdemeanor or felony, the Idaho statute was looked up to determine the charge degree.
- Sometimes the original charge and the final charge were not related. For example, a driving under the influence charge became a domestic assault charge. In these cases, the following steps were taken:
  - A query using Microsoft Access was used to determine which cases involved charges that did not appear to be related.
  - The resulting case and charges were examined and re-matched if a better option was available.

---

<sup>6</sup> The table in Appendix B lists Idaho Statutes and how each one was categorized for analysis.

# Idaho Incident Based Reporting System (IIBRS) Results, 2009-2015

## Incident Characteristics<sup>7</sup>

The rates of both IPV and Other Violent incidents declined steadily from 2009 to 2015. However, IPV decreased at a slower rate with a 16% decline compared to 23% for Other Violent incidents (Chart 1).

### Crime Type

Simple assault accounted for the largest percentage of both IPV and Other Violent incidents. The second most prevalent crime type was aggravated assault for IPV and sexual assault for Other Violent incidents. Overall, 89% of IPV incidents were classified as simple or aggravated assaults (Table 1).


Among specific crime types, kidnapping, simple assault, and aggravated assault were most likely to involve an intimate partner. Specifically, nearly half (49%) of all kidnapping incidents were perpetrated by an intimate partner followed by more than one in three simple and aggravated Assaults.

### Intimate Partner Homicide (IPH)


One in four homicides in the state of Idaho were committed by an intimate partner. Of these, 88% of victims were female and 88% of offenders were male. Additionally, half of all female homicide victims were killed by an intimate partner compared to 5% of male homicide victims. Firearms were the most common weapon used in IPHs (57%). Overall, the number of IPHs remained relatively stable with 7 to 9 victims per year since 2010.

### Geography (Rural/Urban)

A similar percentage of reported IPV and Other Violent crimes occur in urban and rural areas. Overall, about three-fourths of IPV and other violent crimes in Idaho occurred in urban areas with a quarter in rural areas.



	IPV	Other Violent
Aggravated Assault	14%	14%
Sexual Assault	3%	16%
Intimidation	7%	6%
Kidnapping	1%	1%
Homicide	0%	0%
Simple Assault	75%	63%
<b>Total</b>	<b>36,869</b>	<b>119,373</b>



<sup>7</sup> Percentages are based on cases in which the incident information is known.  
 Charts 1 & 2: n= 36,869 for IPV and 70,644 for Other Violent  
 Chart 3: n=36,822 for IPV and 70,418 for Other Violent

### Location and Time<sup>8</sup>


While both IPV and Other Violent incidents demonstrated a similar pattern throughout the week, their paths diverged over the weekend (Chart 4). As Other Violent incidents began to decline slightly over the weekend, IPV incidents showed a sharp rise Friday through Sunday.

Both IPV and Other Violent incidents showed a steady decrease from 1:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. followed by a consistent increase throughout the day. However, at 7:00 p.m. IPV incidents continued to rise while Other Violent incidents decreased (Chart 5).


The most common location for any violent incident was in a residence/home; however, IPV incidents were more likely to occur in a residence/home compared to Other Violent crimes (Chart 6).

In sum, IPV incidents were most likely to occur over the weekend, later in the day, and at a residence/home.


**Chart 4: Percent of Incidents by Day of the Week**



**Chart 5: Percent of Incidents by Time of Day**



**Chart 6: Location of Incidents**




<sup>8</sup> Charts 4 & 6: n= 36,869 for IPV and 70,644 for Other Violent  
 Chart 5: n = 36,587 for IPV and 70,058 for Other Violent



## Alcohol and Drug Use

In IIBRS, alcohol and/or drug use includes incidents in which “any of the offenders in the incident were suspected of consuming alcohol or using drugs/narcotics during or shortly before the incident...” (p. 71).<sup>9</sup> Based on this definition, aggravated assault, simple assault, and homicide were most likely to involve alcohol or drug use for both IPV and Other Violent incidents. Although alcohol or drug use was higher for IPV among nearly every crime category, intimate partner homicides were less likely to involve the use of alcohol or drugs compared to non-IPV homicides. Overall, about 25% of incidents perpetrated by an intimate partner involved alcohol or drugs compared to 16% of Other Violent incidents (Chart 7).



n= 36,869 for IPV and 70,644 for Other Violent

## Weapon Use

Personal weapon (i.e., hands, feet, etc.) was the most common type of weapon used in both IPV and Other Violent incidents across all crime types other than homicide. As illustrated in Table 2, intimate partner homicides were more likely to involve the use of a firearm and aggravated assaults involving an intimate partner were substantially more likely to involve asphyxiation.

**Table 2: Use of a Weapon by Crime Type**

	Sexual Assault	Homicide	Aggravated Assault	Simple Assault	Kidnapping
<b>IPV</b>					
Asphyxiation	0%	8%	<b>19%</b>		1%
Blunt Object	0%	8%	8%		1%
Firearm	0%	<b>57%</b>	8%		4%
Knife	1%	16%	11%		4%
Personal Weapon	92%	6%	49%	95%	62%
Vehicle	0%	4%	4%		1%
Other Weapon	3%	10%	15%	4%	8%
Unknown	2%	6%	1%	2%	1%
<b>Other Violent</b>					
Asphyxiation	0%	1%	<b>2%</b>		0%
Blunt Object	0%	5%	14%		2%
Firearm	0%	<b>43%</b>	17%		11%
Knife	0%	15%	22%		5%
Personal Weapon	90%	16%	29%	91%	48%
Vehicle	0%	7%	7%	0%	1%
Other Weapon	2%	11%	20%	7%	7%
Unknown	3%	9%	2%	2%	3%

n= 36,869 for IPV and 70,644 for Other Violent

<sup>9</sup> Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2013). *National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) user manual*. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/nibrs/nibrs-user-manual>.

## Rates of IPV Incidents by County

County	2009-2014	2015				Population
		2015 Rate	% Change	% of IPV	% of Population	
Ada	3.24	3.00	-7%	26%	26%	453,265
Adams	1.34	1.29	-4%	0%	0%	4,654
Bannock	4.57	4.12	-10%	7%	5%	84,044
Bear Lake	2.77	2.68	-3%	0%	0%	5,967
Benewah	3.50	4.07	16%	1%	1%	9,097
Bingham	2.90	2.76	-5%	2%	3%	45,724
Blaine	1.91	1.39	-27%	1%	1%	21,579
Boise	2.20	2.84	29%	0%	0%	6,337
Bonner	2.77	2.99	8%	2%	2%	41,849
Bonneville	3.95	3.24	-18%	8%	7%	125,909
Boundary	1.53	1.64	7%	0%	1%	10,996
Butte	1.99	0.87	-56%	0%	0%	3,436
Camas	1.66	0.98	-41%	0%	0%	1,025
Canyon	4.05	3.63	-10%	14%	12%	207,220
Caribou	1.18	1.17	-1%	0%	0%	7,720
Cassia	3.08	3.68	20%	2%	2%	34,213
Clark	1.63	0.00	-100%	0%	0%	843
<b>Clearwater</b>	4.87	<b>6.19</b>	27%	1%	1%	9,051
Custer	0.97	1.95	101%	0%	0%	4,096
Elmore	2.75	2.88	5%	1%	2%	27,130
Franklin	1.04	1.37	32%	0%	1%	13,113
Fremont	0.98	1.72	75%	0%	1%	12,805
Gem	3.18	1.95	-39%	1%	1%	16,951
Gooding	2.19	3.07	40%	1%	1%	14,998
Idaho	1.87	1.97	6%	1%	1%	16,228
Jefferson	1.33	0.84	-37%	0%	2%	27,286
Jerome	3.11	2.53	-19%	1%	1%	22,963
<b>Kootenai</b>	4.87	<b>4.85</b>	0%	14%	9%	150,107
Latah	1.79	1.39	-23%	1%	2%	39,596
Lemhi	1.49	0.91	-39%	0%	0%	7,690
<b>Lewis</b>	3.57	<b>5.71</b>	60%	0%	0%	3,856
<b>Lincoln</b>	1.85	<b>4.67</b>	152%	0%	0%	5,355
Madison	0.49	0.39	-20%	0%	2%	38,237
Minidoka	2.44	2.10	-14%	1%	1%	20,434
Nez Perce	3.31	2.49	-25%	2%	2%	41,424
Oneida	1.23	0.97	-21%	0%	0%	6,163
Owyhee	2.52	2.91	15%	1%	1%	11,350
Payette	3.01	2.05	-32%	1%	1%	24,441
Power	2.82	1.98	-30%	0%	0%	7,563
<b>Shoshone</b>	4.77	<b>5.11</b>	7%	1%	1%	13,691
Teton	1.06	0.66	-37%	0%	1%	12,077
Twin Falls	3.79	3.81	1%	6%	5%	83,196
Valley	2.27	2.84	25%	1%	1%	9,861
Washington	1.45	0.20	-86%	0%	1%	10,002
<b>Total</b>	3.30	3.08	-7%	100%	100%	1,713,542

n= 36,822

In 2015, Clearwater (6.19), Lewis (5.71), Shoshone (5.11), Kootenai (4.85), and Lincoln (4.67) counties had the highest rates of IPV in the state. However, with the exception of Kootenai County, these counties were not overrepresented when considering their proportion of the state population. Although Kootenai County represented only 9% of the state’s population, 14% of reported incidents of IPV occurred there. Lincoln County evidenced the largest percent increase (152%) from their 2009-2014 average rate to their 2015 rate. Custer, Fremont, Lewis, and Gooding counties also experienced large percent increases in the rate of IPV from the 2009-2014 average to the 2015 rate.

## Victim Characteristics<sup>10</sup>

### Age, Sex, and Race/Ethnicity

As illustrated in Chart 8, victims of IPV were most commonly between the ages of 25 and 34. Compared to victims of Other Violent crimes, IPV victims were notably less likely to be under the age of 18 or over the age of 55.


In regards to sex, the majority of IPV victims were female whereas the majority of victims of Other Violent crimes were male (Chart 9). The percentage of male and female victims of reported IPV remained stable from 2009 through 2015.

For both IPV and Other Violent crimes, 96% of victims were white, 2% were black, and 2% were Asian/Pacific Islander or American Indian. Nearly the same percentage of IPV and Other Violent crime victims were Hispanic (11% and 10%, respectively), both of which were lower than their representation in the general population (12%)<sup>11</sup>.


See Appendix C for a breakdown of victim characteristics by county.

### Victim-Offender Relationship

Half of IPV victimizations were committed by a dating partner and 37% were perpetrated by a current spouse. However, these percentages varied by crime type. Sexual assaults and aggravated assaults were more likely to involve a dating partner (80% and 53%, respectively), intimate partner homicides were more likely to be perpetrated by a current spouse (51%), and nearly 1 in 4 intimidation and kidnapping victimizations were committed by an ex-spouse.



n = 39,730 for IPV and 86,650 for Other Violent



n = 39,708 for IPV and 86,705 for Other Violent

IPV	
Same-Sex Relationship	1%
Victim was Boyfriend/Girlfriend	50%
Victim was Common-Law Spouse	5%
Victim was Ex-Spouse	7%
Victim was Spouse	37%
Other Violent	
Family - Non-Intimate	24%
Friend/Acquaintance	31%
Otherwise Known	16%
Relationship unknown	8%
Stranger	12%
Victim was offender	10%


n = 39,760 for IPV and 87,141 for Other Violent

<sup>10</sup> Includes cases in which victim information is known

<sup>11</sup> Based on July 1, 2015 population estimates: United States Census Bureau. (2015). *Quick facts: Idaho*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/RHI725215/16,00>.

## Victim Injury

Victims of IPV were more likely to sustain an injury compared to victims of Other Violent crimes (56% and 42%, respectively). In addition to victim-offender relationship, severity of injury also varied based on the sex of the victim. Specifically, female victims of IPV were more likely to sustain a major injury than male victims of IPV (8% and 2%, respectively). An opposite trend is observed among Other Violent crimes with a larger percentage of male victims sustaining a major injury compared to female victims (7% and 3%, respectively).




n = 27,430 for IPV and 38,137 for Other Violent

## Offender Characteristics <sup>12</sup>


### Age, Sex, and Race

Similar to victims, the majority of IPV offenders were between the ages of 25 and 44 (60%). The most recognizable difference between IPV and Other Violent offenders was in relation to the percentage of young offenders. Specifically, while approximately 1% of IPV offenders were under the age of 18, more than 20% of Other Violent offenders fell within this age range.



n = 39,703 for IPV and 82,876 for Other Violent

As illustrated in Chart 12, approximately 75% of offenders of both IPV and Other Violent crimes were men.



n = 39,728 for IPV and 83,673 for Other Violent

Additionally, for both IPV and Other Violent crimes, 95% of known offenders were White, 3% were Black, 2% were American Indian, and 1% were Asian/Pacific Islander.

<sup>12</sup> Includes cases in which offender information is known

## Law Enforcement Response

### Arrest

From 2009-2015, more IPV offenders were arrested than offenders of Other Violent crimes (Chart 13). This may be due to the higher percentage of IPV victims who sustain an injury as a result of the crime. The known identity of the offender in IPV incidents may also contribute to this difference. Considering the victim-offender relationship was unknown in 8% of Other Violent crimes, it is possible that the identity of the offender was also unknown, which may impact officers' ability to arrest.

Although offenses committed by intimate partners were more likely to result in arrest for nearly every crime type, intimate partner homicides were less likely to result in arrest compared to homicides committed by a non-intimate partner. However, this difference may be partially due to the fact that 25% of intimate partner homicides resulted in the death of the offender compared to 3% of homicides not committed by an intimate partner.


For both IPV and Other Violent crimes, a lower percentage of females were arrested compared to males, although the discrepancy is larger among IPV offenders. Specifically, 59% of male offenders of IPV were arrested compared to 50% of female offenders. For heterosexual relationships, this may be explained by the lower prevalence of major injury among male victims of IPV.

Differences in arrest were also observed when broken down by relationship category and crime type. In IPV cases, a lower percentage of offenders who were classified as an ex-spouse or same-sex partner were arrested compared to other relationship categories (Table 4).

When considering counties without missing data, Clearwater (40%), Twin Falls (40%), Boise (41%), Owyhee (46%), and Cassia (49%) counties had the lowest rates of arrest for IPV in the state. Conversely, Butte (97%), Washington (96%), Caribou (96%), Franklin (88%), and Benewah (87%) counties had the highest rates of arrest in the state. Washington County reported some significant changes in arrest practices within the past few years (Table 5).

### Exceptional Clearance<sup>13</sup>


IPV incidents were slightly more likely to have prosecution declined and slightly less likely to be cleared because the victim refused to cooperate compared to Other Violent incidents (Chart 14).



**Table 4: Arrest by Victim-Offender Relationship**

IPV	
Same-Sex Relationship	50%
Boyfriend/Girlfriend	57%
Common-Law Spouse	63%
Ex-Spouse	39%
Spouse	59%
Other Violent	
Family - Non-Intimate	47%
Friend/Acquaintance	43%
Otherwise Known	47%
Stranger	53%
Victim was Offender	28%

n = 39,747 for IPV and 77,669 for Other Violent



<sup>13</sup> An exceptional clearance is used when reasons outside of the control of the law enforcement agency prevented an arrest.

**Table 5: Percentage of IPV Offenders Arrested by County**

County	Number of Offenders 2009-2015	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Percent Arrested 2009-2015
Ada	9,938	49%	55%	56%	56%	49%	51%	47%	52%
Adams	45	75%	60%	100%		33%	64%	43%	60%
Bannock	2,917	62%	55%	58%	69%	74%	24%	69%	59%
Bear Lake	122	70%	65%	58%	43%	65%	47%	56%	57%
Benewah	240	92%	92%	88%	93%	94%	86%	71%	87%
Bingham	1,057	60%	64%	61%	54%	53%	61%	65%	60%
Blaine	287	68%	73%	78%	80%	94%	79%	93%	79%
Boise	98	14%	60%	46%	33%	80%	23%	39%	41%
Bonner	870	67%	59%	67%	67%	76%	79%	65%	68%
Bonneville	3,160	50%	56%	56%	49%	50%	52%	47%	52%
Boundary	124	70%	50%	56%	67%	100%	71%	79%	66%
Butte	37	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	97%
Camas	16	44%	0%	0%		0%	100%	0%	31%
Canyon	5,770	60%	58%	62%	56%	60%	58%	50%	58%
Caribou	67	100%	67%	100%	93%	100%	100%	100%	96%
Cassia	634	60%	48%	58%	84%	71%	26%	31%	49%
Clark	9	0%	50%	100%			100%		44%
Clearwater	327	39%	37%	39%	46%	31%	48%	42%	40%
Custer	29	50%		100%	80%	0%	50%	50%	62%
Elmore	591	40%	46%	47%	68%	61%	53%	64%	53%
Franklin	113	91%	86%	100%	71%	89%	100%	95%	88%
Fremont	107	67%	64%	56%	59%	79%	86%	78%	70%
Gem	362	36%	62%	71%	43%	45%	58%	67%	51%
Gooding	245	66%	68%	53%	54%	39%	59%	65%	58%
Idaho	221	83%	73%	81%	86%	82%	91%	74%	81%
Jefferson	245	78%	63%	66%	61%	36%	38%	43%	53%
Jerome	492	88%	75%	77%	83%	72%	72%	74%	77%
Kootenai	5,288	58%	57%	57%	60%	58%	60%	58%	58%
Latah	511	59%	48%	51%	67%	63%	68%	59%	59%
Lemhi	78	100%	83%	53%	67%	82%	100%	100%	83%
Lewis	103	50%	73%	70%	83%	78%	35%	55%	59%
Lincoln	82	100%	52%	100%	57%	100%	86%	62%	70%
Madison	140	44%	80%	53%	87%	75%	76%	67%	71%
Minidoka	341	78%	74%	76%	71%	83%	63%	67%	73%
Nez Perce	924	83%	80%	88%	70%	75%	73%	88%	79%
Oneida	42	43%	67%	100%	75%	20%	100%	100%	71%
Owyhee	223	48%	39%	40%	49%	41%	47%	51%	46%
Payette	521	63%	62%	71%	68%	75%	70%	70%	68%
Power	164	47%	50%	72%	59%	56%	88%	87%	65%
Shoshone	465	57%	81%	64%	60%	57%	65%	59%	63%
Teton	75	71%	67%	50%	33%	56%	91%	75%	65%
Twin Falls	2,352	39%	42%	42%	41%	36%	39%	41%	40%
Valley	164	46%	60%	42%	69%	56%	61%	60%	55%
Washington	102	100%	100%	100%	92%	100%	67%	0%	96%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>39,747</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>57%</b>



# Idaho Supreme Court Repository Results


## Domestic Violence Related Charges

A total of 64,588 charges for a violent crime were filed in Idaho between 2009 and 2015. Of all charges for violent crimes filed within this time period, 27,175 (42%) were originally charged as domestic assault/battery, stalking/harassment, or strangulation. Over time, this percentage has increased slightly from 42% in 2009 to 44% in 2015.

When considering all domestic violence related charges filed between 2009 and 2015, the majority were for domestic assault/battery (58%) followed by no contact order violations (20%). Of the domestic assault/battery charges, one in four included the “in the presence of a child” enhancement. As illustrated in Chart 17, the percentage of charges for no contact order violations has increased from 18% in 2009 to 22% in 2015.

Violent Related Charges	Percent
Violent (Assault/Battery)	43.2
<b>Domestic (Assault/Battery)</b>	<b>33.7</b>
Child Injury	2.2
Sexual	6.9
<b>Stalking/Harassment</b>	<b>4.3</b>
<b>Strangulation</b>	<b>4.0</b>
Kidnapping	1.6
Intimidation	1.3
Fighting	0.6
Human Trafficking	0.0
Homicide	0.7
Robbery	1.4
Other Violent	0.1
<b>Total Violent Charges</b>	<b>64,588</b>





n = 37,810

## Defendant Information

**Table 7: Percent of Cases by Case Type and Age, 2009-2014**

Age	18-24 years	25-34 years	35-44 years	45-54 years	55-64 years	65+ years	Total Cases	Average Age
Domestic Assault & Battery	21	37	25	13	3	1	21,842	34.4
Violation of Protection Order	17	36	26	16	4	1	2,694	36.0
Violation of No Contact Order	23	37	24	14	2	1	6,660	34.1
Stalking/Harassment	18	30	26	19	5	2	2,656	37.0
Strangulation	21	41	24	11	2	0	2,565	33.6
All Other Violent	30	32	19	14	4	2	30,588	33.7
<b>Total Domestic Violence Related</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33,883</b>	<b>34.6</b>

The average age of defendants in both domestic violence related and other violent cases was approximately 34 years old. Stalkers were the oldest group of offenders with an average age of 37 years.

**Table 8: DV Related Cases per Defendant, 2009-2015**

# of Cases	N	Percent
1	17,335	73.7
2	3,889	16.5
3	1,295	5.5
4	534	2.3
5	249	1.1
6+	216	.9
Total	23,518	100.0

**Table 9: DV Related Charges per Case, 2009-2015**


# of Charges	N	Percent
1	30,856	91.1
2	2,468	7.3
3	319	.9
4	107	.3
5	44	.1
6+	89	.3
Total	33,883	100

As illustrated in Table 8, the majority (73.7%) of domestic violence offenders had one domestic violence related case filed against them between 2009 and 2015. However, compared to defendants in other violent cases, defendants in domestic violence related cases were more likely to have multiple cases filed against them (26.3% and 14.3%, respectively). Additionally, more than 90% of all domestic violence related cases included one charge (Table 9).



## Amended Charges

A total of 34% of domestic violence related charges were amended or modified to a different charge. Domestic assault/battery in the presence of a child charges were most likely to be amended followed by domestic assault/battery and strangulation (Chart 18). When charges were filed with the court, violations of no contact orders and protection orders were least likely to be modified. See Appendix D for a breakdown of charges amended from a felony to a misdemeanor.



n = 37,810

## Domestic Assault/Battery

Table 10: Percent of Domestic Assault/Battery Charges Amended by Disposition							
Non Amended Charges (N =13,353)	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Domestic Assault	0.1	0.2	0.6	6.3	3.7	0.1	10.9%
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6%
Domestic Assault/Battery – Child Present	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.0	0.7%
Domestic Assault – Child Present	0.3	0.6	0.6	13.9	5.2	0.3	20.9%
Domestic Battery	0.7	2.0	2.6	37.2	23.4	0.8	66.8%
<b>Total Not Amended</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>58.0</b>	<b>32.9</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>13,353</b>
Amended Charges (N=8,422)							
Disturbing The Peace/Disorderly Conduct	-	0.4	6.8	3.5	63.3	0.1	<b>74.1%</b>
Battery	0.0	0.2	2.6	1.0	17.0	0.0	20.9%
Aggravated Assault	-	-	0.0	0.1	0.2	-	0.3%
Assault	-	0.0	0.2	0.2	1.4	-	1.8%
Assault/Battery	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	0.0%
Other	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.6	1.8	0.0	2.9%
<b>Total Amended</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>9.9</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>8,422</b>

\*Conditional Dismissal includes: conditional dismissal, dismissed after deferred prosecution, withheld judgement or diversion, and dismissed pursuant to plea agreement

Of the 61% of domestic assault/battery charges that were not amended to a different category, 58% were dismissed and 32.9% resulted in a guilty disposition. Of the 39% of domestic assault/battery charges that were amended to a different category, 74.1% were amended to disturbing the peace or disorderly conduct and 83.6% resulted in a guilty conviction.

## Strangulation

Of the 62% of strangulation charges that were not amended to a different category, 80% were dismissed and 12.4% resulted in a guilty conviction. Of the 38% of strangulation charges that were amended to a different category, 53.8% were amended to domestic battery, 13.9% were amended to a battery, and 11.6% were amended to disturbing the peace. Overall, 77.3% of strangulation charges that were amended resulted in a guilty conviction.

Table 11: Percent of Strangulation Charges Amended by Disposition								
Non Amended Charge (N=1,607)	Conditional						Other	Total
	Acquittal	Active	Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty			
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Strangulation	2.7	1.4	1.2	<b>80.0</b>	<b>12.4</b>	2.2	1,607	
Amended Charges (N=998)	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Aggravated Assault	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.5	2.8	0.0	4.0%	
Aggravated Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4%	
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.1	0.0	1.3%	
Battery	0.0	0.0	1.7	1.5	10.7	0.0	<b>13.9%</b>	
Domestic Battery	0.2	0.4	6.7	3.6	42.6	0.3	<b>53.8%</b>	
Domestic Assault	0.0	0.1	0.8	0.5	1.7	0.0	3.1%	
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.8	0.0	0.9%	
Domestic Assault/Battery- In the Presence of a Child	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.3	5.4	0.1	6.9%	
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.4	9.0	0.0	<b>11.6%</b>	
No Contact Order Violation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.9	0.0	1.0%	
Kidnapping	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.1	0.5%	
Other	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.5	1.4	0.1	2.5%	
Total Amended	0.2	0.6	13.5	7.6	<b>77.3</b>	0.6	998	

## Stalking/Harassment

Table 12: Percent of Stalking/Harassment Charges Amended by Disposition								
Non Amended Charges (N=2,195)	Conditional						Other	Total
	Acquittal	Active	Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty			
	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Harass	0.6	2	3.8	51.1	41.5	0.9	64.1%	
Spy	0	0.1	0	0.1	0.1	0	0.2%	
Stalking	0.6	1.6	2.1	31.1	18	2.1	35.7%	
Total Not Amended	0.8	2.4	3.8	<b>52.8</b>	<b>38.2</b>	2	2,195	
Amended Charges (N=548)	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Disturbing The Peace/Disorderly Conduct	0	0.2	6	2.7	83.9	0.4	<b>93.2%</b>	
No Contact Order Violation	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	0.2%	
Public Nuisance	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	0	0.4%	
Other	0	0.2	0.5	0.7	4.7	0	6.2%	
Total Amended	0	0.2	6.6	3.6	<b>89.1</b>	0.4	548	

Of the 80% of stalking/harassment charges that were not amended to a different category, 52.8% were dismissed and 38.2% resulted in a guilty disposition. Of the 20% of stalking/harassment charges that were amended to a different category, 93.2% were amended to disturbing the peace or disorderly conduct and 89.1% resulted in a guilty conviction.

## No Contact Order Violations

Table 13: Percent of Charges for No Contact Order Violations Amended by Disposition							
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional		Guilty	Other	Total
			Dismissal	Dismissed			
<b>Non Amended Charge (N=7,402)</b>	%	%	%	%	%	%	
No Contact Order	0.1	1.6	0.7	<b>44.6</b>	<b>52.5</b>	0.5	7,402
<b>Amended Charge (N=348)</b>	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.6	61.5	0.0	<b>63.2%</b>
Protection Order Violation	0.3	0.3	0.3	2.3	10.9	0.0	14.1%
Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.0	1.1%
Domestic Assault/Battery - In the Presence of a Child	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6%
Domestic Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.9	0.0	1.1%
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.6%
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	1.7	0.0	2.6%
Other	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	10.9	0.0	16.7%
<b>Total Amended</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>7.8</b>	<b>87.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>348</b>

Of the 95.5% of charges for no contact order violations that were not amended to a different category, 44.6% were dismissed and 52.5% resulted in a guilty disposition. Of the 4.5% of charges for no contact order violations that were amended to a different category, 63.2% were amended to disturbing the peace and 87.1% resulted in a guilty conviction.

## Protection Order Violations

Table 14: Percent of Charges for Protection Order Violations Amended by Disposition							
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional		Guilty	Other	Total
			Dismissal	Dismissed			
<b>Non Amended Charge (N=2,630)</b>	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Protection Order Violation	0.4	2.5	1.5	<b>52.1</b>	<b>41.9</b>	1.6	2,630
<b>Amended Charge (N=255)</b>	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Disturbing The Peace/Disorderly Conduct	0	0	1.6	2.7	66.7	0.4	<b>71.4%</b>
No Contact Order	0	0	0	4.3	12.9	0	17.3%
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0	0	0.4	0.4	0	0	0.8%
Other	0	1.2	0	1.2	8.2	0	10.6%
<b>Total Amended</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>87.8</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>255</b>

Of the 91% of charges for protection order violations that were not amended to a different category, 52.1% were dismissed and 41.9% resulted in a guilty disposition. Of the 9% of charges for protection order violations that were amended to a different category, 71.4% were amended to disturbing the peace or disorderly conduct and 87.8% resulted in a guilty conviction.

See Appendix E for a breakdown of disposition by county.

## Policy Implications

This report examined the prevalence, characteristics, and criminal justice system response to domestic violence in Idaho. While an abundance of information was analyzed and discussed, a few key findings lend support for recommendations regarding policy and practice.

Foremost, 50% of all reported incidents of violence committed by an intimate partner in Idaho between 2009 and 2015 were perpetrated by a current dating partner. Despite the frequency of violence committed by a dating partner, the statute governing domestic violence in the state of Idaho is limited to assault or battery committed by a household member, which is defined as “a spouse, former spouse, or a person who has a child in common regardless of whether they have been married or a person with whom a person is cohabiting, whether or not they have married or have held themselves out to be husband or wife.” (Idaho Code 18-918[a]). Therefore, violence committed by a dating partner who is not a cohabitant or the biological parent of a child in common does not fall within the purview of domestic violence in Idaho.

Second, a total of 80% of strangulation charges that are not amended to a different offense are dismissed. This finding illustrates the need for additional training on evidence collection, presence of visible and non-visible injuries, severity and risk associated with strangulation, and courtroom strategies to improve likelihood of successful prosecution<sup>14</sup>.

Lastly, with the exception of strangulation, the overwhelming majority of domestic violence related charges that were amended to a different category were amended to disturbing the peace or disorderly conduct. Furthermore, more than 50% of charges for domestic violence in the presence of a child were amended to a different charge. Considering these findings, additional research examining prosecutorial decision-making in domestic violence related cases would provide valuable insight to help explain this consistent trend. A more in-depth understanding of this phenomenon would serve as a valuable tool for informing policy and practice.

---

<sup>14</sup> McKay, K. (2014). A closer look at strangulation cases. *The Texas Prosecutor*, 44(1), 21-29. Retrieved from <https://www.tdcaa.com/journal/closer-look-strangulation-cases>.

## Appendix A: Missing Victim Information

Missing Victim Characteristics: 2009-2015					
	At least one missing		All missing		Total victims of violent crime
	N	%	N	%	
2009	1,722	8.8%	77	0.4%	19,593
2010	1,732	9.3%	63	0.3%	18,548
2011	1,760	9.8%	42	0.2%	17,937
2012	1,758	9.9%	42	0.2%	17,788
2013	2,059	12.0%	47	0.3%	17,090
2014	2,654	15.3%	51	0.3%	17,297
2015	2,971	17.2%	47	0.3%	17,283
<b>Total 2009-2015</b>	<b>14,656</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>125,536</b>

## Appendix B: Idaho Statutes

Statute	Charge	Sub Category
I18-5414	Domestic Violence Protective Order - False Statement	Protection Order - False Statement
I18-6702	Interception of Wire or Oral Communications	Spy
I18-6710	Telephone - Use to Annoy, Harass, Intimidate or Threaten	Harass
I18-6710 {F}	Telephone - Use of to Threaten, Harass, Offend/Obscene Calls	Harass
I18-6710 {M}	Telephone - Use of to Threaten, Harass, Offend/Obscene Calls	Harass
I18-6710(1)(C)	Telephone - anonymous or identified phone calls to dist peace, or right of privacy	Harass
I18-6710(1)(c) {F}	Telephone - (Second or Subsequent Conviction) Use to Annoy, Harass, Intimidate or Threaten	Harass
I18-6710(1)(c) {M}	Telephone - Repeated Calls With or Without Conversation that Disturbs the Peace or Privacy of Another	Harass
I18-6710(2)	Telephone - Use of to Harass/Make Obscene Calls, Etc Second Offense	Harass
I18-6711	TELEPHONE Annoying, intimidating, harassing or terrifying by false statements	Harass
I18-6711 {F}	Telephone - Used to Annoy, Harass, Intimidate or Threaten by False Statements	Harass
I18-6711 {M}	Telephone - Used to Annoy Harass, Intimidate or Threaten False Statements	Harass
I18-6711(M)	TELEPHONE Annoying, intimidating, harassing or terrifying by false statements	Harass
I18-6719	TELEPHONE Definition of pen registers - trap and trace devices	Harass
I18-7902	Malicious Harassment	Harass
I18-7905	Stalking - First Degree	Stalking
I18-7905 {F}	Stalking	Stalking
I18-7905 {M}	Stalking	Stalking
I18-7906	Stalking - Second Degree	Stalking

I18-7906 {M}	Stalking in the 2nd Degree	Stalking
I18-915(5) {M}{2}	DOMESTIC BATTERY (SECOND OFFENSE)	Domestic Assault/Battery 2nd
I18-918	Domestic Assault or Battery	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(2)	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury
I18-918(2) (A)	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury
I18-918(2) {M}	Assault-domestic	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(2)(A)	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury
I18-918(2)(A) {F}	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury
I18-918(3)	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury
I18-918(3) {F}	Domestic Battery (Third Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 3rd
I18-918(3) {M}	Domestic Battery	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(A)	Domestic Assault	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(A) M	Domestic Assault	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(A) {F}	Domestic Assault (Third Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 3rd
I18-918(3)(A) {M}	Domestic Assault	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(A) {M}{2}	Domestic Assault (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 2nd
I18-918(3)(a) {M}{ENH}	Assault-Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child Without Traumatic Injury to a Household Member	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(3)(b)	Domestic Battery - no injury	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(B) M	Domestic Battery - with No Traumatic Injury	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(B) M 2	Domestic Battery - with No Traumatic Injury	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(B) {F}	Domestic Battery - Traumatic injury	Domestic Battery - Traumatic Injury
I18-918(3)(B) {M}	Domestic Battery - with No Traumatic Injury	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(3)(B) {M}{2}	Domestic Battery - with No Traumatic Injury (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 2nd
I18-918(3)(B)(C)(4) {M}{2}	Domestic Battery or Assault - In The Presence of a Child (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(3)(C) {F}	Domestic Battery (Third Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 3rd
I18-918(3)(C) {M}{2}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4)	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4) M	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4) {F}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4) {M}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4) {M}{2}	Domestic Battery or Assault - In The Presence of a Child (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4) M	DOMESTIC BATTERY OR ASSAULT ENHANCEMENT IN PRESENCE OF CHILD	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(4)(7)(A) {M}{2}	Domestic Battery or Assault - In The Presence of a Child (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-918(5)	Domestic Battery (prior felony)	Domestic Assault/Battery 2nd
I18-918(5) {F}	Domestic Battery - prior felony	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(5) {M}	Domestic Battery	Domestic Assault/Battery
I18-918(5) {M}{2}	Domestic Battery (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 2nd
I18-918(7)(B) {F}	Domestic Battery or Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC

I18-918(7)(B) {M}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
I18-920	No Contact Order Violation	NCO
I18-920 {A}	Violation of a No Contact Order (Attempted)	NCO
I18-920 {AT}	No Contact Order Violation (Attempted)	NCO
I18-920(2)	No Contact Order Violation	NCO
I18-920(3)	No Contact Order Violation	NCO
I18-920(3) M	No Contact Order Violation	NCO
I18-920(3) {F}	No Contact Order Violation (Third Offense)	NCO
I18-920(3) {F}{3}	No Contact Order Violation (Third Offense)	NCO
I18-920(3) {F}{A}	No Contact Order Violation (Third Offense) (Attempted)	NCO
I18-920(3) {M}	No Contact Order Violation	NCO
I18-920(3)(F)	Violation of no contact order 2 prior convictions within 5 years	NCO
I18-920(A)	No Contact Order - Attempted Violation Of	NCO
I18-920(M)	No Contact Order Violation	NCO
I18-923	Strangulation (Attempted)	Strangulation
I18-923 {F}	Attempted Strangulation	Strangulation
I18-923(1)	Strangulation (Attempted)	Strangulation
I39-6312	Domestic Violence - Violation Of Protection Order	Protection Order Violation
I39-6312(1)	Domestic Violence - Violation Of Protection Order	Protection Order Violation
I39-6312(1) {AT}	Domestic Violence -Violation of Protection Order (Attempted)	Protection Order Violation
IPART II(18-918(3)(B)) {F}{3}	Domestic Battery (Third Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 3rd
IPART II(18-918(3)(C) {M}{2}	Domestic Battery (Second Offense)	Domestic Assault/Battery 2nd
IPART II(18-918(4)(B)	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
IPART II(18-918(4)(B) {M}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
IPART II(18-918(7)(B) {M}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
IPART II(I18-918(4) {F}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
IPART III(18-918(4) {F}	Domestic Assault - In The Presence of a Child Enhancement	Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC
IX18-903-B {M}	Domestic Battery	Domestic Assault/Battery

## Appendix C: Victim Demographics by County

Victim Age and Sex by County								
County	Victim Sex		Victim Age					
	Female	Male	Under 18	18-24	25 to 34	35 to 44	45 to 54	55+
Ada	73%	27%	2%	22%	35%	24%	12%	4%
Adams	67%	<b>33%</b>	0%	13%	36%	29%	9%	13%
Bannock	73%	27%	2%	26%	38%	20%	10%	3%
Bear Lake	75%	25%	9%	12%	33%	25%	15%	7%
Benewah	75%	24%	3%	26%	30%	16%	19%	6%
Bingham	74%	26%	6%	24%	39%	19%	10%	3%
Blaine	82%	18%	5%	19%	37%	23%	12%	4%
Boise	76%	22%	1%	10%	29%	26%	26%	9%
Bonner	72%	28%	3%	19%	32%	23%	16%	7%
Bonneville	76%	24%	3%	26%	37%	23%	9%	2%
Boundary	78%	22%	1%	18%	37%	27%	15%	3%
Butte	86%	14%	3%	14%	49%	22%	8%	5%
Camas	63%	<b>38%</b>	<b>13%</b>	38%	19%	25%	6%	0%
Canyon	78%	22%	4%	28%	36%	20%	10%	3%
Caribou	67%	<b>33%</b>	1%	16%	42%	21%	15%	4%
Cassia	77%	23%	5%	27%	37%	20%	9%	2%
Clark	89%	11%	0%	0%	44%	22%	22%	11%
Clearwater	73%	27%	3%	17%	28%	28%	17%	7%
Custer	62%	<b>34%</b>	0%	21%	24%	14%	24%	<b>17%</b>
Elmore	69%	31%	4%	32%	34%	19%	8%	3%
Franklin	69%	31%	9%	16%	38%	19%	16%	3%
Fremont	77%	23%	7%	20%	29%	21%	22%	2%
Gem	75%	25%	3%	24%	35%	22%	12%	4%
Gooding	80%	17%	8%	21%	30%	25%	14%	2%
Idaho	82%	18%	3%	24%	28%	19%	18%	8%
Jefferson	81%	18%	2%	17%	46%	22%	10%	2%
Jerome	78%	21%	7%	28%	34%	17%	10%	4%
Kootenai	73%	27%	2%	24%	34%	22%	14%	4%
Latah	73%	27%	3%	25%	37%	20%	12%	3%
Lemhi	83%	17%	3%	25%	33%	25%	10%	4%
Lewis	83%	17%	1%	24%	27%	26%	15%	8%
Lincoln	65%	<b>35%</b>	6%	16%	37%	26%	10%	6%
Madison	79%	21%	7%	39%	26%	19%	7%	1%
Minidoka	84%	15%	10%	21%	35%	20%	13%	2%
Nez Perce	75%	25%	2%	29%	35%	22%	9%	3%
Oneida	83%	17%	5%	19%	31%	31%	12%	2%
Owyhee	75%	25%	3%	25%	32%	23%	13%	4%
Payette	71%	29%	3%	27%	34%	20%	13%	3%
Power	77%	23%	8%	27%	30%	20%	12%	4%
Shoshone	79%	21%	4%	21%	37%	21%	14%	3%
Teton	73%	27%	1%	15%	27%	36%	17%	4%
Twin Falls	74%	26%	4%	24%	40%	20%	9%	2%
Valley	74%	26%	4%	18%	26%	30%	14%	7%
Washington	75%	25%	7%	25%	29%	19%	16%	4%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3%</b>



Victim Race and Ethnicity by County						
County	Victim Race			Victim Ethnicity		
	American Indian	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	White	Hispanic	non-Hispanic
Ada	0%	1%	3%	96%	6%	94%
Adams	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Bannock	9%	1%	2%	88%	8%	92%
Bear Lake	1%	0%	1%	98%	2%	98%
Benewah	8%	0%	1%	91%	2%	98%
Bingham	7%	0%	0%	92%	20%	80%
Blaine	0%	0%	0%	100%	25%	75%
Boise	1%	0%	0%	99%	2%	98%
Bonner	1%	0%	0%	98%	1%	99%
Bonneville	1%	0%	1%	98%	13%	87%
Boundary	6%	0%	1%	93%	0%	100%
Butte	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Camas	0%	0%	7%	93%	6%	94%
Canyon	0%	0%	1%	98%	24%	76%
Caribou	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Cassia	1%	0%	1%	98%	31%	69%
Clark	0%	0%	0%	100%	44%	56%
Clearwater	2%	0%	1%	97%	2%	98%
Custer	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
Elmore	0%	1%	4%	95%	11%	89%
Franklin	0%	1%	0%	99%	7%	93%
Fremont	0%	1%	1%	98%	9%	91%
Gem	0%	1%	0%	98%	7%	93%
Gooding	0%	0%	0%	100%	22%	78%
Idaho	1%	0%	0%	98%	1%	99%
Jefferson	0%	0%	0%	100%	9%	91%
Jerome	0%	0%	0%	99%	35%	65%
Kootenai	1%	1%	1%	97%	2%	98%
Latah	1%	1%	1%	97%	2%	98%
Lemhi	0%	0%	1%	99%	3%	97%
Lewis	8%	1%	2%	89%	2%	98%
Lincoln	0%	0%	0%	100%	31%	69%
Madison	0%	0%	1%	99%	18%	82%
Minidoka	0%	0%	1%	99%	34%	66%
Nez Perce	10%	0%	0%	90%	1%	99%
Oneida	0%	2%	0%	98%	2%	98%
Owyhee	0%	0%	0%	100%	23%	77%
Payette	0%	0%	1%	98%	19%	81%
Power	1%	1%	1%	97%	25%	75%
Shoshone	1%	0%	0%	99%	1%	99%
Teton	0%	0%	0%	100%	23%	77%
Twin Falls	0%	1%	1%	98%	16%	84%
Valley	0%	1%	0%	99%	1%	99%
Washington	0%	0%	2%	98%	20%	80%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>89%</b>

## Appendix D: Charges Amended from a Felony to a Misdemeanor

Initial Charge of Felony Domestic Assault/Battery by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	N	%	Number
<b>Felony to Felony</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>26.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>60.3</b>	<b>1,375</b>
Aggravated Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.6	14
Aggravated Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	3
Cultivate/Manufacture	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault	0.0	0.0	0.2	1.1	1.5	0.2	2.9	67
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.5	0.0	1.4	31
Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.1	0.0	0.1	5.2	2.2	0.4	8.1	184
Domestic Battery	0.7	0.5	1.4	21.1	21.2	1.5	46.4	1,059
Intimidating A Witness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	3
Rape	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	2
Strangulation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	5
Unknown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Weapon Enhancement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Felony to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>32.6</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>39.3</b>	<b>896</b>
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	11
Battery	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.5	4.8	0.0	5.9	3
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.1	4.3	0.0	4.9	135
Domestic Assault	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	2.1	0.0	2.4	112
Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	54
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.4	3.2	0.0	4.2	3
Domestic Battery	0.0	0.1	1.9	1.4	17.2	0.0	20.7	96
Kidnapping - False imprisonment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	472
No Contact Order	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	2
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7
<b>Felony to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>1</b>
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	7
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>31.6</b>	<b>58.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,437</b>

\*IPC = In the Presence of a Child

Initial Charge of Misdemeanor Domestic Assault/Battery by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Number
<b>Misdemeanor to Felony</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>174</b>
Aggravated Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	11
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7
Domestic Assault_IPC*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	22
Domestic Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.5	100
Intimidating A Witness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4
Kidnapping - 1st Degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Strangulation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	19
Weapon Enhancement	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Misdemeanor to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>37.8</b>	<b>49.3</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>96.8</b>	<b>18,749</b>
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.8	151
Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Battery	0.0	0.1	1.0	0.4	6.8	0.0	8.3	1,606
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.1	0.0	1.3	243
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.1	2.8	1.2	23.7	0.0	27.9	5,402
Domestic Assault	0.1	0.1	0.4	4.2	2.1	0.1	6.9	1,329
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.5	94
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.2	0.4	0.4	8.8	2.9	0.2	12.8	2,482
Domestic Battery	0.4	1.3	1.4	22.8	11.3	0.3	37.6	7,287
Fighting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	24
Injury to a Child	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
Kidnapping/False Imprisonment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5
No Contact Order	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	17
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	17
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Unlawful Entry	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
Weapon Charge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Misdemeanor to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>364</b>
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1.7	0.0	1.9	360
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>38.4</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>19,373</b>

\*IPC = In the Presence of a Child

Initial Charge of Strangulation by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Number
<b>Felony to Felony</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>49.8</b>	<b>13.9</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>1,818</b>
Aggravated Assault	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	1.1	0.0	1.5	40
Aggravated Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	4
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	3
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	2
Domestic								
Assault/Battery_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	7
Domestic Battery	0.1	0.0	0.7	0.2	4.6	0.1	5.6	147
Kidnapping - 2nd Degree	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	4
Rape	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Strangulation	1.7	0.9	0.8	49.4	7.7	1.3	61.7	1,607
<b>Felony to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>29.7</b>	<b>773</b>
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.5	12
Battery	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.6	4.1	0.0	5.3	139
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.1	3.5	0.0	4.4	115
Domestic Assault	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.0	1.1	28
Domestic								
Assault/Battery_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	4
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.1	1.7	0.0	2.2	57
Domestic Battery	0.0	0.2	1.8	1.2	11.7	0.0	15.0	390
Fighting	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Kidnapping /False								
Imprisonment	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.2	4
No Contact Order	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.4	10
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.4	10
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Weapon Charge	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	2
<b>Felony to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>
Domestic Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.3	7
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Other	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	6
<b>Total Felonies</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>52.3</b>	<b>37.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>2,605</b>

Initial Felony Stalking Related Charges by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Number
<b>Felony to Felony</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>33.3</b>	<b>30.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>71.6</b>	<b>58</b>
Harass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	1
Spy	0.0	0.0	3.7	29.6	27.2	0.0	60.5	49
Stalking	0.0	2.5	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	4.9	4
Aggravated Assault	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.5	1.2	0.0	4.9	4
<b>Felony to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>16.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>21.0</b>	<b>17</b>
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	1
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	1
Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	3.7	3
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	3.7	0.0	6.2	5
Harass	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	4.9	0.0	6.2	5
Stalking	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2	0.0	2.5	2
<b>Felony to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0</b>
Harass	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0	7.4	6
<b>Total Felony</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>37.0</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>81</b>

Initial Misdemeanor Stalking Related Charges by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Number
<b>Misdemeanor to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>43.8</b>	<b>41.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>92.8</b>	<b>1,370</b>
Other	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	1.2	0.0	1.4	21
Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	1
Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	2
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	1.4	21
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.6	15.3	0.1	17.1	253
Harass	0.1	0.6	0.6	19.9	12.5	0.3	34.0	502
NCO	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	4
Protection Order Violation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.3	4
Stalking	0.5	0.9	1.7	23.1	10.0	1.5	37.8	558
Unlawful Entry	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	4
<b>Misdemeanor to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>106</b>
Harass	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.5	3.7	0.0	4.4	65
Stalking	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	1
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	2
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	2.2	0.0	2.5	37
Unknown	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	36
<b>Total Misdemeanors</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>47.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1,476</b>

Initial No Contact Order Violation by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Number
<b>Felony to Felony</b>								
No Contact Order	0.0	0.1	0.0	1.3	1.3	0.0	2.7	210
<b>Felony to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>34</b>
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
No Contact Order	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	33
<b>Misdemeanor to Felony</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>48</b>
Aggravated Assault	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Intimidating A Witness	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
No Contact Order	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.5	42
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Misdemeanor to Unknown</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>41.4</b>	<b>51.7</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>95.8</b>	<b>7,425</b>
Assault/Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	2.6	0.0	2.7	209
Domestic Assault/Battery_IPC*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Assault_IPC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Domestic Battery	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
No Contact Order	0.1	1.4	0.6	41.1	48.1	0.4	91.8	7,117
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.5	41
Protection Order Violation	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.5	0.0	0.6	49
Unlawful Entry	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Misdemeanor to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.3</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>33</b>
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	8
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	10
Other	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>0.7</b>	<b>43.0</b>	<b>54.1</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7,750</b>

\*IPC = In the Presence of a Child

Initial Protection Order Violation by Outcome								
	Acquittal	Active	Conditional Dismissal	Dismissed	Guilty	Other	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	Number
<b>Misdemeanor to Misdemeanor</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>48.2</b>	<b>45.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>99.8</b>	<b>2,878</b>
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.6	0.0	0.2	5
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	6.1	176
Disturbing The Peace	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	5.7	0.0	1.5	44
No Contact Order	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.0	0.0	1
Protection Order Violation	0.4	2.3	1.4	47.5	38.2	1.4	91.2	2,630
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Unlawful Entry	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Misdemeanor to Unknown</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.2</b>	<b>7</b>
Stalk/Harass/Spy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Disorderly Conduct	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>48.3</b>	<b>45.9</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,885</b>

## Appendix E: Disposition by Crime Type and County

County	Domestic Assault			NCO Violation			CPO Violation			Stalking			Strangulation		
	Dismissed	Guilty	Total	Dismissed	Guilty	Total	Dismissed	Guilty	Total	Dismissed	Guilty	Total	Dismissed	Guilty	Total
	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N	%	%	N
Ada	25.2	57.4	1240	34.6	61.5	546	35.3	57.8	116	21.6	64.1	153	36.9	48.1	268
Adams	82.4	11.8	17	100.0	0.0	4	0.0	100.0	1	50.0	50.0	2	100.0	0.0	5
Bannock	39.5	55.4	453	50.8	48.0	254	54.7	39.1	64	34.9	60.6	109	45.0	50.0	40
Bear Lake	33.3	66.7	21	33.3	66.7	6	33.3	66.7	3	100.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	1
Benewah	45.7	47.1	70	41.7	50.0	12	28.6	57.1	7	62.5	37.5	8	50.0	50.0	2
Bingham	47.0	44.4	151	57.6	30.3	33	55.3	31.6	38	50.0	35.7	14	45.5	36.4	11
Blaine	36.6	43.9	41	41.7	41.7	12	33.3	55.6	9	0.0	33.3	3	83.3	0.0	6
Boise	45.0	35.0	20	33.3	66.7	3				50.0	50.0	2	33.3	33.3	3
Bonner	36.4	35.8	165	70.5	24.6	61	75.0	17.9	28	40.0	60.0	5	61.9	33.3	21
Bonneville	29.7	56.7	344	40.7	58.2	194	43.3	52.2	67	39.0	58.5	41	27.8	57.4	54
Boundary	42.9	33.3	21	75.0	25.0	8	33.3	33.3	3	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	2
Butte	28.6	71.4	7										100.0	0.0	1
Camas	0.0	0.0	1												
Canyon	41.4	46.2	906	44.0	52.8	527	47.5	48.2	139	42.2	53.3	45	48.4	39.6	182
Caribou	28.6	64.3	14	33.3	66.7	3							100.0	0.0	2
Cassia	31.4	61.4	70	27.8	69.4	36	70.0	30.0	10	35.3	41.2	17	66.7	22.2	9
Clark	0.0	100.0	1												
Clearwater	55.3	42.6	47	57.1	42.9	14	50.0	50.0	6	44.4	44.4	9	100.0	0.0	2
Custer	40.0	60.0	5				0.0	100.0	2	33.3	66.7	3			
Elmore	40.7	47.2	123	39.2	56.9	51	54.5	45.5	11	66.7	33.3	3	56.3	37.5	16
Franklin	2.8	86.1	36	0.0	0.0	2	50.0	40.0	10	25.0	50.0	4	0.0	100.0	1
Fremont	40.0	57.1	35	37.5	62.5	8	50.0	50.0	4	16.7	66.7	6	100.0	0.0	2
Gem	63.8	19.1	47	40.9	59.1	22	28.6	71.4	7	50.0	50.0	2	83.3	16.7	6
Gooding	41.1	53.6	56	27.3	72.7	11	0.0	100.0	2	40.0	60.0	5	40.0	60.0	5
Idaho	57.6	40.7	59	30.8	46.2	13	70.0	30.0	10	60.0	40.0	5	85.7	14.3	7
Jefferson	42.9	40.0	35	100.0	0.0	5	81.8	18.2	11	20.0	80.0	5	25.0	50.0	4
Jerome	37.8	56.1	98	58.1	38.7	31	62.5	37.5	8	66.7	16.7	6	66.7	0.0	6
Kootenai	36.9	49.5	833	47.8	48.1	316	43.4	47.4	76	39.8	46.0	113	46.3	26.8	82
Latah	40.7	48.8	86	36.7	60.0	30	55.6	33.3	9	42.9	42.9	14	100.0	0.0	1
Lemhi	25.0	70.8	24	66.7	25.0	12	75.0	25.0	4	100.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	1
Lewis	42.9	57.1	14	40.0	40.0	5	25.0	75.0	4	50.0	50.0	4	100.0	0.0	1
Lincoln	67.6	32.4	34	83.3	16.7	6				83.3	16.7	6	100.0	0.0	1
Madison	70.2	29.8	47	100.0	0.0	7				40.0	60.0	5	50.0	25.0	4
Minidoka	21.9	53.1	64	66.7	33.3	15	57.1	42.9	7	40.0	60.0	5	0.0	100.0	1
Nez Perce	48.2	37.6	197	55.6	40.0	90	63.2	28.9	38	72.7	18.2	22	60.0	35.0	20
Oneida	53.8	30.8	13	50.0	50.0	4	42.9	28.6	7	0.0	100.0	1	40.0	40.0	5
Owyhee	51.4	42.9	35	57.1	28.6	14	37.5	50.0	8	0.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0	1
Payette	73.0	24.0	100	31.6	55.3	38	39.1	60.9	23	75.0	25.0	4	42.9	42.9	7
Power	23.8	76.2	21	33.3	66.7	6	50.0	50.0	2	44.4	55.6	9	42.9	28.6	7
Shoshone	26.1	59.8	92	55.9	23.5	34	20.0	70.0	10	57.1	28.6	14	71.4	28.6	7
Teton	55.6	44.4	27	66.7	33.3	3				100.0	0.0	1	60.0	20.0	5
Twin Falls	33.1	55.9	136	45.0	47.5	40	40.0	53.3	30	18.2	72.7	11	50.0	45.5	22
Valley	52.0	36.0	25	33.3	61.1	18	0.0	100.0	4	66.7	33.3	3	75.0	25.0	4
Washington	56.7	33.3	30	16.7	83.3	6	20.0	60.0	5	66.7	33.3	3	33.3	66.7	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>37.2</b>	<b>50.1</b>	<b>5861</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>51.6</b>	<b>2500</b>	<b>46.9</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>668</b>	<b>45.7</b>	<b>40.6</b>	<b>828</b>