Children Who Live With Abuse, and Coercive Control: Current Ohio Law, the Science, and a Model Bill

Prepared by the Family Rights Movement (a national movement for enforceable family-court and victim-rights reform, starting in Ohio)
Contact: Carey Ann George, carey@jcconsultancy.biz
Draft date: November 10, 2026. Proposed section numbers are placeholders for the Legislative Service Commission to assign.

Law and bill references: R.C. 2919.25 (domestic violence; latest amendment HB 111, 135th General Assembly, effective March 20, 2025); R.C. 2929.12(B)(10) (felony seriousness factor, child in the vicinity; current text effective April 9, 2025, HB 234 and HB 531, 135th General Assembly); R.C. 2929.22 (misdemeanor sentencing; no child factor); R.C. 2919.22 (endangering children); R.C. 2151.031 (abused child); R.C. 3109.04(F)(1)(h) (custody factor); R.C. 3113.31 (domestic violence civil protection orders). Prior Ohio bills: HB 3 (133rd GA, 2019, As Introduced), HB 3 (134th GA), HB 486 (135th GA, Aisha's Law, not yet reintroduced in the 136th GA).

---

1. Summary for legislators

The problem. In Ohio, hitting a partner in front of a child is not a separate crime, and it does not raise the offense level. A first domestic violence offense is a misdemeanor. The only place Ohio law mentions a child being nearby is a felony sentencing factor the judge must "consider," so it never applies to a first offense, and it changes nothing about the charge. Ohio does make it a crime to drive drunk with a child in the car (R.C. 2919.22(C)) and to let a child within 100 feet of drug manufacturing (R.C. 2919.22(B)(6)). It does not make it a crime to beat or choke a child's parent while the child watches.

Coercive control isn't in Ohio law at all. The Supreme Court of Ohio's own judicial education material says: "Because coercive control is not codified in the Revised Code, the Power and Control Wheel may give context..." Ohio's protection order law covers physical harm, threats of imminent serious harm, stalking, child abuse and sexual offenses, but not the pattern of isolation, monitoring, financial control and intimidation that often comes before physical violence.

The science. Peer-reviewed meta-analyses covering hundreds of studies link children's exposure to domestic violence to emotional, behavioral and trauma problems. In one review, child witnesses fared about as badly as children who were physically abused themselves (Kitzmann et al., 2003). Witnessing domestic violence is one of the adverse childhood experiences (ACEs), which are linked to depression, heart disease, lung disease, suicide

attempts, violence and early death. CDC estimates that preventing ACEs could cut adult depression by up to 44% and could have avoided up to 21 million cases of depression and 1.9 million cases of coronary heart disease nationally (Merrick et al., 2019).

The cost. CDC economists estimate ACE-related health conditions cost the U.S. $14.1 trillion a year (Peterson et al., 2023). The estimated lifetime cost of intimate partner violence is $103,767 per female victim in 2014 dollars (Peterson et al., 2018). CDC now puts that at nearly $135,000.

What we ask. Two new offenses with no loopholes, plus the civil, custody, training and data provisions that make them work:

- **Part A. Domestic Violence in the Presence of a Child** (new R.C. 2919.252, placeholder). It's a separate offense, counted per child, with a felony tier for strangulation, weapons and serious harm. It explicitly protects the non-offending parent from being charged or blamed.
- **Part B. Coercive Control.** A civil definition in R.C. 3113.31, so survivors can get protection orders, and a criminal offense (new R.C. 2919.253, placeholder) for a proven pattern with serious effect, modeled on England and Wales, Scotland and Hawaii.
- **Part C. Custody, protection orders, training and data.** Mandatory written findings under R.C. 3109.04, children named as protected persons, statewide training, and annual public reporting.
- **Part D. Prevention.** Early intervention for child witnesses, a prevention fund, and ACE data reporting.

---

2. What Ohio law says today

2.1 Domestic violence, R.C. 2919.25

Exact text of the offense:

> "(A) No person shall knowingly cause or attempt to cause physical harm to a family or household member.
> (B) No person shall recklessly cause serious physical harm to a family or household member.
> (C) No person, by threat of force, shall knowingly cause a family or household member to believe that the offender will cause imminent physical harm to the family or household member."

Penalties: under (D)(2), a violation of (A) or (B) is a first-degree misdemeanor, and a violation of (C) is a fourth-degree misdemeanor. Enhancements in (D)(3) through (D)(6) cover prior

convictions and a victim the offender knew was pregnant. **No enhancement exists for a child being present.**

Source: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2919.25

2.2 The only "child nearby" provision: R.C. 2929.12(B)(10), felonies only

R.C. 2929.12(B) lists factors that indicate "the offender's conduct is more serious than conduct normally constituting the offense." Factor (10) reads:

> "(10) If the offense is a violation of section 2919.25 or a violation of section 2903.11, 2903.12, or 2903.13 of the Revised Code involving a person who was a family or household member at the time of the violation, the offender committed the offense in the vicinity of one or more children who are not victims of the offense, and the offender or the victim of the offense is a parent, guardian, custodian, or person in loco parentis of one or more of those children."

Why it isn't enough:

1. **It applies only to felonies.** R.C. 2929.12 governs felony sentencing. The misdemeanor sentencing statute, R.C. 2929.22, has no child-presence factor (checked against the current text). Because most first-offense domestic violence is a misdemeanor, the factor is out of reach in most cases.
2. **It's a "consider" factor, not an element or an enhancement.** It doesn't change the charge, the offense level, or the sentencing range.
3. **It doesn't treat the child as a victim.** It expressly covers children "who are not victims of the offense," so the child gets no victim status, no notice, and no protection-order or custody consequence.
4. **It's old and unchanged.** The same language was quoted by an Ohio appellate court in 2004 (2004-Ohio-7239) and carried forward in every later version. Aisha's Law bills (HB 3, 133rd and 134th GA; HB 486, 135th GA) left it untouched apart from renumbering.

Hawaii's legislature identified this exact weakness in 2014. It found that its law "allowed the sentencing judge to consider as an aggravating factor that the offense ... was committed in the presence of a child, but this factor does not impact the penalty imposed," and it made abuse in the presence of a child under 14 a class C felony (Act 117, SLH 2014; commentary to HRS 709-906).

Sources: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2929.12 ; https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2929.22 ; https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/11/2004/2004-Ohio-7239.pdf

2.3 Assault, R.C. 2903.13

Assault ("No person shall knowingly cause or attempt to cause physical harm to another or to another's unborn") is a first-degree misdemeanor with enhancements for specified victims, such as caretakers, corrections staff and emergency responders. **None of them covers a child witness.** Source: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2903.13

2.4 Endangering children, R.C. 2919.22

R.C. 2919.22(A) applies to a parent or custodian who "create[s] a substantial risk to the health or safety of the child, by violating a duty of care, protection, or support." Subsection (B) lists acts against a child, such as abuse, torture, and excessive corporal punishment. Ohio already criminalizes indirect exposure in two settings:

- (B)(6): allowing a child to be "within one hundred feet of" illegal drug manufacturing;
- (C)(1): driving while intoxicated "when one or more children under eighteen years of age are in the vehicle."

There is no comparable provision for domestic violence committed where a child sees or hears it. Prosecutors sometimes try to stretch (A), but that subsection is built around a *caregiver's duty* and can be turned against the abused parent for "failure to protect." Our bill closes that door (Part A, division (G)).

Source: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2919.22

2.5 Abused child, R.C. 2151.031, and custody, R.C. 3109.04(F)(1)(h)

R.C. 2151.031 defines an "abused child" mainly by sexual abuse, endangerment under R.C. 2919.22, or physical or mental injury. Exposure to violence against a parent isn't named. When choosing a residential parent, R.C. 3109.04(F)(1)(h) asks the court to consider prior convictions for "a violation of section 2919.25 ... involving a victim who at the time of the commission of the offense was a member of the family or household that is the subject of the current proceeding." Because no offense names the *child* as a victim of witnessed violence, the custody court has no conviction that labels the child's harm, and it isn't required to make written findings about it.

Sources: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2151.031 ; https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3109.04

2.6 Protection orders, R.C. 3113.31

"Domestic violence" for civil protection orders means attempting to cause or recklessly causing bodily injury; placing a person, by threat of force, in fear of imminent serious physical harm, or menacing by stalking or aggravated trespass; committing an act that makes a child an abused child under R.C. 2151.031; or committing a sexually oriented offense (R.C. 3113.31(A)(1)).

Coercive control isn't included. The Supreme Court of Ohio's judicial education handout confirms: "coercive control is not codified in the Revised Code."

Sources: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3113.31 ; https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/JCS/domesticViolence/topics/powerControl/powerControlWheel.pdf

3. Ohio bills that tried, and what happened

Bill	Sponsors	What it did on children or coercive control	Outcome
HB 3, 133rd GA (2019 to 2020), As Introduced	Reps. Boyd and Carruthers	Would have added R.C. 2919.22(D)(1): "No person shall commit domestic violence, in violation of section 2919.25 of the Revised Code, in an occupied structure when one or more children under eighteen years of age are present in the occupied structure." Strict liability beyond the underlying offense; a first-degree misdemeanor (new (F)(6)); conviction allowed alongside R.C. 2919.25.	The provision was **removed** before House passage. The bill passed the House as Sub. HB 3 and stalled in the Senate.
HB 3, 134th GA (2021 to 2022)	Reps. Boyd and Carruthers	Aisha's Law (lethality screening, aggravated murder circumstance, arrest reporting). No child-presence offense in the as-passed text.	Passed the House; stalled in the Senate.
HB 486, 135th GA (2023 to 2024)	Reps. Carruthers and Brent, with 32 cosponsors	Aisha's Law. The sponsors' April 17, 2024 press release said it "expands the offense of 'child endangering' to include the offense of domestic violence in an occupied structure when a child is present." **However, neither the As Introduced nor the As Referred text amends R.C. 2919.22** (checked against the official LIS text). The only sentencing change adds lethality-screening results to R.C. 2929.12 and 2929.22.	Referred; not passed. Not yet reintroduced in the 136th GA.
HB 352, 136th GA	Rep. Brewer and cosponsors	Adds dating partners to R.C. 2919.25; misdemeanor DV and protection orders as weapons disabilities. No child or coercive control provision.	As Introduced.
HB 566, 136th GA (Break the Silence Act)	Reps. Jarrells and Williams	Health-care domestic violence protocols. No child or coercive control offense.	As Introduced.
Coercive control	None found	No Ohio bill creating a coercive control offense or civil definition was found in the 133rd to 136th GA.	Not introduced.

Sources: HB 3 (133rd) As Introduced: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_133/legislation/hb3/00_IN/html/ ; As Passed by the House: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_133/legislation/hb3/04_PH/html/ ; HB 3 (134th) As Passed by the House: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_134/

legislation/hb3/03_PH/html/ ; HB 486 (135th): https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_135/legislation/hb486/00_IN/html/ and https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_135/legislation/hb486/01_RFH/html/ ; sponsor release: https://www.ohiohouse.gov/news/republican/carruthers-brent-reintroduce-aishas-law-119645 ; HB 352: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_136/legislation/hb352/00_IN/html/ ; HB 566: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_136/legislation/hb566/00_IN/html/

Takeaway for sponsors. Ohio's own legislators drafted a child-presence offense in 2019 and then dropped it. Our proposal fixes the reasons it was weak. It wasn't counted per child, it applied only inside an "occupied structure" (not cars, yards or exchanges), it carried no felony tier for strangulation or weapons, it sat inside the caregiver-duty statute that is used against abused parents, and it had no custody or protection-order consequence.

---

4. How other states handle domestic violence in the presence of a child

Jurisdiction	Citation and year	How it works
Utah	Utah Code 76-5-114 (amended by ch. 243, 2025 General Session; effective September 1, 2025)	Separate crime: "Commission of domestic violence in the presence of a child." "In the presence of a child" means "in the physical presence of a child" or "having knowledge that a child is present and may see or hear an act of domestic violence." **Third-degree felony** for homicide attempts, serious bodily injury, dangerous weapons, or strangulation in a child's presence; class B misdemeanor otherwise. The charge is "separate and distinct from, and is in addition to," the domestic violence charge. **One offense for each child present.**
Oregon	ORS 163.160(3)(a)	Fourth-degree assault rises from a Class A misdemeanor to a **Class C felony** when "committed in the immediate presence of, or is witnessed by, the person's or the victim's minor child or stepchild or a minor child residing within the household."
Hawaii	HRS 709-906(10) (Act 117, SLH 2014)	Abuse of a family or household member is a **class C felony** "where physical abuse occurs in the presence of a minor ... and the minor is a family or household member less than fourteen years of age." Sentences include parenting classes when the offense "involved the presence or abuse of a minor" (709-906(7)).
Idaho	Idaho Code 18-918(4)	**Maximum penalties doubled** when domestic assault or battery "took place in the presence of a child" (under 16), using the same "may see or hear" definition as Utah.
Georgia	O.C.G.A. 16-5-70(d) (cruelty to children, third degree; Ga. L. 1999, "Crimes Against Family Members Act of 1999"; amended 2004)	Crime for the **primary aggressor** who "intentionally allows a child under the age of 18 to witness" a forcible felony, battery or family violence battery, or commits one "having knowledge that a child under the age of 18 is present and sees or hears the act." Misdemeanor for the first two convictions; felony (1 to 3 years) on the third. The "primary aggressor" element protects the abused parent.

Jurisdiction	Citation and year	How it works
Washington	RCW 9.94A.535(3)(h)(ii)	Aggravating circumstance supporting a sentence above the standard range when a domestic violence offense "occurred within sight or sound of the victim's or the offender's minor children under the age of eighteen years."
Scotland	Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018, s. 5	The abusive-behavior offense is **aggravated** if A directs behavior at a child or uses a child, if "a child sees or hears, or is present during" an incident, or if a reasonable person would consider the conduct "likely to adversely affect a child usually residing with A or B." **No evidence is needed** that the child was aware or harmed. The court must state and record the aggravation and explain any difference it makes to the sentence.

Sources: https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title76/Chapter5/C76-5-S114_2025090120250507.html ; https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors_163.160 ; https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol14_Ch0701-0853/HRS0709/HRS_0709-0906.htm ; https://legislature.idaho.gov/statutesrules/idstat/title18/t18ch9/sect18-918/ ; https://georgiacommons.org/code/16-5-70 ; https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=9.94A.535 ; https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2018/5/section/5

5. How other jurisdictions handle coercive control

5.1 Criminal offenses

Jurisdiction	Citation and year	Key elements
England and Wales	Serious Crime Act 2015, s. 76 (amended by Domestic Abuse Act 2021, s. 68, in force April 5, 2023)	A "repeatedly or continuously engages in behaviour" toward B that is "controlling or coercive"; they are "personally connected" (now including former partners); the behavior has a "serious effect" on B, meaning fear on "at least two occasions" that violence will be used, or "serious alarm or distress which has a substantial adverse effect on B's usual day-to-day activities"; and A "knows or ought to know" it will have that effect. Maximum **five years** on indictment.
Scotland	Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018, s. 1 and s. 5	Course of abusive behavior toward a partner or ex-partner, with the child aggravation described above.
Hawaii	HRS 709-906(6), with coercive control as defined in HRS 586-1 (Act 238, SLH 2021, within the Act 19, SLH 2020 pilot)	Exercising "coercive control, as defined in section 586-1, over a family or household member" is a **petty misdemeanor**. It was enacted as a pilot with a repeal-and-reenactment date of June 30, 2026 (see verification notes). Hawaii is the only U.S. state to have criminalized coercive control.
New York (pending)	S4079 / A679 (2025 to 2026)	Would create Penal Law 135.80, coercive control, a class E felony. In the Senate Codes Committee (referred January 7, 2026).

Sources: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/9/section/76 ; https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2018/5/section/5 ; https://data.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessions/sessionlaws/Years/SLH2021/SLH2021_Act238.pdf ; https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2025/S4079

5.2 Civil and family-court definitions

State	Citation and year	Definition highlights
California	Fam. Code 6320(c) (SB 1141, 2020; most recently amended by SB 50, Stats. 2025, ch. 676, effective January 1, 2026)	"Disturbing the peace" includes "coercive control, which is a pattern of behavior that in purpose or effect unreasonably interferes with a person's free will and personal liberty." Examples include isolation, deprivation of necessities, monitoring movements, communications, finances or access to services, compulsion by threat including immigration threats, and reproductive coercion. Expressly covers conduct "through the use of a third party" and through technology.
Washington	RCW 7.105.010(4) (protection order act, ch. 7.105 RCW)	"A pattern of behavior that is used to cause another to suffer physical, emotional, or psychological harm, and in purpose or effect unreasonably interferes with a person's free will and personal liberty," judged "from the perspective of a similarly situated person." Examples include threats to harm children or pets, threats of self-harm, control of identity documents, "driving recklessly with the other party or minor children in the vehicle," and **"vexatious litigation or abusive litigation"** used to harass or drain resources. It excludes "protective actions taken by a party in good faith ... protecting themselves or children."
Connecticut	C.G.S. 46b-1 (Public Act 21-78, "Jennifer's Law," 2021)	Adds coercive control, "a pattern of behavior that in purpose or effect unreasonably interferes with a person's free will and personal liberty," to the family-court definition of domestic violence, which opens restraining orders and custody consideration.
Hawaii	HRS 586-1 (Act 19, SLH 2020)	Defines coercive control for protective orders, in part as "a pattern of threatening, humiliating, or intimidating actions, which may include assaults, or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten an individual" (as quoted in Senate Standing Committee Report 754, 2021).

Other states with civil coercive control definitions reported by USA Today (April 24, 2026): Colorado, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey and Vermont.

Sources: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=FAM&sectionNum=6320 ; https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=7.105.010 ; https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/rpt/pdf/2023-R-0107.pdf ; https://data.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessions/session2021/CommReports/SB829_SD1_SSCR754_.HTM ; https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2026/04/24/coercive-control-laws-domestic-abusers/89781299007/

6. The science: how abuse in front of children harms them

All figures below come directly from the cited peer-reviewed abstracts or government reports. Most studies are observational and show links, not proof of cause. We say "linked to" or "associated with" unless a source says more.

6.1 Child witnesses are harmed, often as much as directly abused children

- **Kitzmann, Gaylord, Holt and Kenny (2003)**, a meta-analysis of 118 studies: child witnesses "had significantly worse outcomes relative to nonwitnesses (d = -0.40)," and their outcomes "were not significantly different from those of physically abused children." *J Consult Clin Psychol* 71(2):339-52. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12699028/
- **Wolfe, Crooks, Lee, McIntyre-Smith and Jaffe (2003)**, a meta-analysis of 41 studies: "Forty of these studies indicated that children's exposure to domestic violence was related to emotional and behavioral problems." Co-occurring child abuse made the problems worse. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev* 6(3):171-87. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14620578/
- **Evans, Davies and DiLillo (2008)**, "Exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent outcomes," *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 13:131-140 (citation verified through Crossref, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.005). Its effect sizes are reported secondhand and are not quoted here (see verification notes).

6.2 Where there is partner violence, children are often being hit too

- **Appel and Holden (1998)**, a review: "When a conservative definition of child abuse was used, a median co-occurrence rate of 40% was found" between spouse abuse and physical child abuse. In community samples, the overlap was about 6%. *J Fam Psychol* 12(4):578-599. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.12.4.578
- **Hamby, Finkelhor, Turner and Ormrod (2010)**, using the nationally representative NatSCEV survey (4,549 youth): "More than 1/3 (33.9%) of youth who witnessed partner violence had also been maltreated in the past year, compared with 8.6% of non-witnesses. For lifetime data, more than half (56.8%) ... had also been maltreated." *Child Abuse Negl* 34(10):734-41. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20850182/
- **Finkelhor, Turner, Shattuck and Hamby (2015)**, NatSCEV 2013 to 2014 (4,000 children): "5.8% witnessed an assault between parents" in the study year. *JAMA Pediatr* 169(8):746-54. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26121291/

6.3 Brain and stress-system effects

- **Teicher and Samson (2016)**, a review of neuroimaging research: "Parental verbal abuse, witnessing domestic violence and sexual abuse appear to specifically target brain regions (auditory, visual and somatosensory cortex) and pathways that process and convey the aversive experience." Maltreatment is linked to changes in the "anterior cingulate, dorsal lateral prefrontal and orbitofrontal cortex, corpus callosum and adult hippocampus," and

to "enhanced amygdala response to emotional faces." *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 57(3):241-66. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26831814/

- **Harvard Center on the Developing Child**: toxic stress is "excessive or prolonged activation of stress response systems," including "the release of stress hormones like cortisol," and "can disrupt the healthy development of brain architecture and other bodily systems, increasing risk for stress-related disease well into adulthood." "Exposure to violence" is named as a cause, and "supportive, responsive relationships with caring adults ... can help prevent or reverse the damaging effects." https://developingchild.harvard.edu/key-concept/toxic-stress/
- **PTSD.** In a national sample of 6,483 U.S. adolescents, the "conditional probability of PTSD was highest for PTEs [potentially traumatic experiences] involving interpersonal violence" (McLaughlin et al., 2013, *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 52(8):815-830). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23880492/

6.4 Intergenerational effects

- **Ehrensaft et al. (2003)**, a 20-year prospective study of 543 children: exposure to domestic violence between parents was the second-strongest risk for *perpetrating* partner violence, after conduct disorder, and "conferred the greatest risk of receiving partner violence." *J Consult Clin Psychol* 71(4):741-53. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12924679/
- **Kimber et al. (2018)**, a systematic review: 16 of 19 studies found child exposure to intimate partner violence "significantly and positively associated with adult IPV perpetration," though "the methodological quality of the studies was low." *Child Abuse Negl* 76:273-286. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29175277/

6.5 Coercive control harms children directly

- **Katz (2016)**, "Beyond the Physical Incident Model: How Children Living with Domestic Violence are Harmed By and Resist Regimes of Coercive Control," *Child Abuse Review* 25:46-59 (https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2422). This qualitative U.K. study argues that children are harmed by the ongoing regime of control in the home, not only by physical incidents.
- **Callaghan, Alexander, Sixsmith and Fellin (2018)**, interviews with 21 children aged 8 to 18: children "are significantly affected, and can be reasonably described as victims of abusive control," and should be treated "as direct victims, not as passive witnesses." *J Interpers Violence* 33(10):1551-1581. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26663742/
- **Stark, *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*** (Oxford University Press, 2007) is the foundational work describing coercive control as a pattern of domination that restricts liberty. It's cited here for the concept only.

---

7. The real cost of trauma to the body and mind

7.1 Childhood trauma and adult disease

- **Felitti et al. (1998), the original ACE Study** (9,508 adults; "violence against mother" was one of the seven categories): a "graded relationship between the number of categories of childhood exposure and each of the adult health risk behaviors and diseases," including "ischemic heart disease, cancer, chronic lung disease, skeletal fractures, and liver disease." People with 4 or more categories had "4- to 12-fold increased health risks for alcoholism, drug abuse, depression, and suicide attempt." *Am J Prev Med* 14(4):245-58. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9635069/
- **CDC Vital Signs (Merrick et al., 2019)**, covering 25 states including Ohio's 2015 data: compared with adults with no ACEs, adults with 4 or more had adjusted odds of 1.8 for coronary heart disease, 2.8 for COPD, 1.4 for cancer, 1.4 for diabetes and 5.3 for depression. *MMWR* 68(44):999-1005. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/68/wr/mm6844e1.htm
- **Hughes et al. (2017)**, a meta-analysis of 37 studies (253,719 participants): with 4 or more ACEs, associations were "moderate for ... cancer, heart disease, and respiratory disease (ORs of two to three)" and "strongest for problematic drug use and interpersonal and self-directed violence (ORs of more than seven)." *Lancet Public Health* 2(8):e356-e366. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29253477/

7.2 Early death

- **Brown et al. (2009)**, ACE Study follow-up (17,337 adults): among those who died during follow-up, "people with six or more ACEs died nearly 20 years earlier on average than those without ACEs (60.6 years ... vs 79.1 years)." After adjustment, they were 2.4 times more likely to die at or before age 65. *Am J Prev Med* 37(5):389-96. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19840693/

7.3 Stress hormones, inflammation and the immune system

- **Danese et al. (2007)**, a birth cohort followed to age 32: "Maltreated children showed a significant and graded increase in the risk for clinically relevant C-reactive protein levels 20 years later ... (RR = 1.80)," also seen in fibrinogen and white blood cell count. Childhood maltreatment was an "independent, and preventable risk factor for inflammation in adulthood." *PNAS* 104(4):1319-24. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17229839/
- CDC: ACEs can evoke "toxic stress responses" that alter "gene expression, brain connectivity and function, immune system function, and organ function" (Merrick et al., 2019, above).

7.4 Survivors' bodies and minds

- **Brain injury.** Among 99 battered women, "almost three quarters of the sample sustained at least 1 partner-related brain injury and half sustained multiple." Brain injury severity was linked to worse memory, learning and cognitive flexibility, and to more depression, anxiety and PTSD symptoms (Valera and Berenbaum, 2003, *J Consult Clin Psychol* 71(4):797-804). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12924684/
- **Strangulation.** A systematic review of 30 studies found outcomes including "arterial dissection and stroke," "loss of consciousness, indicating at least mild acquired brain injury," seizures, and "PTSD, depression, suicidality, and dissociation" (Bichard et al., 2022, *Neuropsychol Rehabil* 32(6):1164-1192). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33432860/ Prior non-fatal strangulation was associated with "over seven-fold odds (OR 7.48)" of later homicide (Glass et al., 2008, *J Emerg Med* 35(3):329-35). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17961956/
- **Chronic pain and other conditions.** "Injury, chronic pain, gastrointestinal, and gynaecological signs ..., depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder are well documented by controlled research in abused women" (Campbell, 2002, *Lancet* 359:1331-6). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11965295/ CDC adds that IPV is linked to chronic "conditions affecting the heart, muscles and bones, and digestive, reproductive, and nervous systems." https://www.cdc.gov/intimate-partner-violence/about/index.html

7.5 The economic cost

- **ACEs:** "an annual economic burden of $14.1 trillion ($183 billion in direct medical spending and $13.9 trillion in lost healthy life-years)," or "$88 000 per affected adult annually and $2.4 million over their lifetimes." Adults with 4 or more ACEs "comprised 58% of the total economic burden" (Peterson et al., 2023, CDC, *JAMA Netw Open* 6(12):e2346323). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38055277/
- **Intimate partner violence:** "$103,767 per female victim and $23,414 per male victim, or a population economic burden of nearly $3.6 trillion (2014 US$)." **"Government sources pay an estimated $1.3 trillion (37%)"** (Peterson et al., 2018, CDC, *Am J Prev Med* 55(4):433-444). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30166082/ CDC's current page updates this to "nearly $135,000 for women and over $30,000 for men," and $5.6 trillion overall.
- **North America:** ACE-attributable costs of "$748 billion" a year, and "a 10% reduction in ACE prevalence could equate to annual savings of 3 million DALYs or $105 billion" across Europe and North America (Bellis et al., 2019, *Lancet Public Health* 4(10):e517-e528). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31492648/

8. Prevention: protecting children now prevents violence, suicide and homelessness later

First, an important caution. Most children who live through trauma never become violent. The landmark "cycle of violence" study found that abuse and neglect increase risk, "However, the majority of abused and neglected children do not become delinquent, criminal, or violent" (Widom, 1989, *Science* 244:160-6; https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2704995/). Trauma raises risk. It doesn't determine anyone's future, and survivors should never be stigmatized. That is exactly why early protection and support work.

Suicide. In the ACE Study (17,337 adults), adverse childhood experiences "increased the risk of attempted suicide 2- to 5-fold." Compared with people with no ACEs, those with 7 or more had an adjusted odds ratio of 31.1 for ever attempting suicide. The population-attributable fractions for 1 or more ACEs "were 67%, 64%, and 80% for lifetime, adult, and childhood/adolescent suicide attempts." The authors concluded that "prevention of these experiences and the treatment of persons affected by them may lead to progress in suicide prevention" (Dube et al., 2001, *JAMA* 286(24):3089-96). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11754674/

Youth violence and self-harm. Among 136,549 Minnesota students, "witnessing abuse" was one of six adverse experiences studied. "Each type of adverse childhood experience was significantly associated with adolescent interpersonal violence perpetration … and self-directed violence (self-mutilatory behavior, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempt). For each additional type of adverse event reported by youth, the risk of violence perpetration increased 35% to 144%" (Duke et al., 2010, *Pediatrics* 125(4):e778-86). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20231180/

Shared roots. CDC's *Connecting the Dots* (Wilkins et al., 2014) explains that intimate partner violence, child maltreatment, youth violence, bullying, suicidal behavior and elder abuse "are interconnected and often share the same root causes," and lists "witnessing violence" among individual risk factors. https://www.cdc.gov/elder-abuse/communication-resources/connecting_the_dots-a.pdf

Depression and chronic disease. CDC estimates that preventing ACEs could reduce adult depression by up to 44.1% and coronary heart disease by up to 12.6%. Nationally, that's "up to 1.9 million cases of coronary heart disease … and 21 million cases of depression that would have been potentially avoided" (Merrick et al., 2019). The same report cites trials showing "48%-52% reductions in rates of child abuse and neglect associated with preschool enrichment and early childhood home visitation programs."

Homelessness.

- Among adults experiencing homelessness, the "lifetime prevalence of one or more ACEs … was 89.8%" and of four or more "53.9%" (Liu et al., 2021, meta-analysis of 29 studies, *Lancet Public Health* 6(11):e836-e847). https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34599894/

- U.S. HHS (Administration for Children and Families, 2016): "among mothers with children experiencing homelessness, more than 80% had previously experienced domestic violence," and "between 22 and 57% of all homeless women report that domestic violence was the immediate cause of their homelessness." https://acf.gov/print/pdf/node/5588

Conclusion for legislators. Every dollar Ohio spends getting a child witness to safety and support goes against a documented downstream bill for depression, heart and lung disease, suicide attempts, violence, homelessness and early death. Prevention is the cheapest violence-reduction and homelessness-reduction strategy available, and it starts with recognizing the child as a victim.

If you or someone you know is thinking about suicide or is in crisis, call or text 988 (the 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline) or chat at 988lifeline.org. If you are in immediate danger, call 911.

---

9. Model bill concept

Drafting conventions are the same as our Marsy's Law and protection order amendments. Every duty has a named official, a deadline, proof, a consequence and a remedy. "Shall" means mandatory. Section numbers in brackets are placeholders.

Why a new section instead of an enhancement inside R.C. 2919.25

We recommend a **new, separate offense** (placeholder **R.C. 2919.252**). An enhancement inside R.C. 2919.25 would be weaker, for four reasons:

1. **The child becomes a legal victim.** A separate offense names the child as the victim. That triggers Marsy's Law rights (Ohio Const. Art. I, Sec. 10a; R.C. Chapter 2930), victim notice, and the custody factor in R.C. 3109.04(F)(1)(h).
2. **Counting per child.** Following Utah 76-5-114(5), one count per child present reflects each child's separate harm.
3. **No merger.** Under R.C. 2941.25 and *State v. Ruff*, 143 Ohio St.3d 114, 2015-Ohio-995, offenses involving separate victims or separate, identifiable harm are of dissimilar import, so a conviction for harming the parent and a conviction for harming the child can both stand. The bill states this intent expressly.
4. **It reaches misdemeanor cases.** It fixes the gap where R.C. 2929.12(B)(10) applies only to felonies.

Note: **R.C. 2919.251 already exists** (bail for domestic violence offenders), and HB 486 (135th GA) proposed a new R.C. 2919.261. LSC should assign final numbers.

PART A. Domestic violence in the presence of a child

Current law: No offense. R.C. 2929.12(B)(10) is a felony-only "consider" factor. R.C. 2929.22 has no child factor.

Proposed new section, R.C. 2919.252 [placeholder]. Domestic violence in the presence of a child.

(A) Definitions. As used in this section:
(1) "Child" means a person under eighteen years of age.
(2) "In the presence of a child" means either of the following: (a) in the physical presence of a child; or (b) when the offender knows or reasonably should know that a child is present and may see or hear the act, including through a door, wall, vehicle, or electronic device. The child's actual awareness, understanding, or later recollection of the act is not an element and need not be proved.
(3) "Qualifying offense" means a violation of section 2919.25, 2903.11, 2903.12, 2903.13, 2903.18 [strangulation], 2903.21, 2903.211, 2905.01, 2905.02, 2911.211, or 2919.27 of the Revised Code, or a sexually oriented offense, committed against a family or household member or a person with whom the offender is or was in a dating relationship.
(4) "Primary aggressor" means the primary physical aggressor, as determined under divisions (B)(3)(b) and (d) of section 2935.03 of the Revised Code.

(B) Prohibition. No person shall commit a qualifying offense in the presence of a child.

(C) Penalties.
(1) Except as provided in divisions (C)(2) and (3) of this section, a violation is a misdemeanor of the first degree, and the court shall impose a jail term of not less than [3] days, which shall not be suspended unless the court finds on the record that the offender has enrolled in a certified batterer intervention program.
(2) A violation is a felony of the fourth degree if any of the following apply: (a) the qualifying offense involved strangulation or suffocation as described in section 2903.18 of the Revised Code; (b) the offender used or brandished a deadly weapon or dangerous ordnance; (c) the qualifying offense caused serious physical harm; (d) the child was physically harmed, was used as a shield, or was threatened during the act; or (e) the offender previously has been convicted of a violation of this section or a substantially similar law.
(3) A violation is a felony of the third degree if the qualifying offense is an attempted or completed homicide offense.

(D) One count per child. A separate violation is committed with respect to each child present.

(E) Separate offense; no merger. A violation of this section is separate from and in addition to the qualifying offense. The child is a victim of the violation for all purposes, including Article I, Section 10a, Ohio Constitution, and Chapter 2930 of the Revised Code. The general assembly declares that the qualifying offense and a violation of this section involve separate victims and

separate, identifiable harm and are offenses of dissimilar import under section 2941.25 of the Revised Code.

(F) Mental state. Outside the culpable mental state required for the qualifying offense, the offender's knowledge of the child's presence is the only additional element, and it is satisfied by proof that the offender knew or reasonably should have known a child was present.

(G) Protection of the non-offending parent. No person shall be charged under this section, under division (A) of section 2919.22 of the Revised Code, or under any municipal ordinance, and no child shall be adjudicated abused, neglected, or dependent based on the conduct of a person, solely because that person was the victim of a qualifying offense committed in the presence of a child, or because that person did not leave, did not prevent the offense, or did not report it. Only the primary aggressor may be charged under this section. A law enforcement officer who charges both parties shall state in writing, within 24 hours, the specific facts supporting a finding that each party was a primary aggressor, and a supervisor shall review that statement within one business day.

(H) Mandatory consequences on conviction. The court shall do all of the following:
(1) Order completion of a certified batterer intervention program and, if the offender has parenting time, a court-approved parenting program focused on the effects of violence on children. Proof of completion shall be filed within the time the court sets. Failure to file is a violation of community control.
(2) Issue or extend a protection order under section 2919.26 of the Revised Code naming each child as a protected person unless the court finds by clear and convincing evidence, in writing, that doing so would endanger the child.
(3) Within one business day of sentencing, transmit a certified copy of the judgment to the clerk of any court with a pending or existing case allocating parental rights over any child named in the judgment.

(I) Officer documentation. A peace officer responding to a report of domestic violence shall ask whether any child was present or in the residence, record the name, age, and location of each child, record any statement of a child only as volunteered and in a trauma-informed manner, and provide the non-offending parent, in writing, with information about the services in Part D. Failure to document shall be noted in the agency's annual report under Part C, division (D).

Proposed amendment, R.C. 2929.12(B)(10) and R.C. 2929.22. Keep (B)(10) for felonies and add the same factor to R.C. 2929.22(B)(1) for misdemeanors, so the factor applies at every level. Delete the words "who are not victims of the offense" and add: "or the offense was committed in the presence of a child as defined in section 2919.252 of the Revised Code."

Proposed amendment, R.C. 2151.031. Add: "(G) Is a victim of a violation of section 2919.252 or 2919.253 of the Revised Code committed by a parent, guardian, custodian, or household member, except that no finding under this division shall be made against a parent who was the victim of that violation."

PART B. Coercive control

B-1. Civil definition, R.C. 3113.31(A)

Current law: "Domestic violence" covers bodily injury, threats of imminent serious harm, menacing by stalking, aggravated trespass, acts that make a child an abused child, and sexually oriented offenses. Coercive control is not included.

Proposed language. Add to R.C. 3113.31(A)(1)(a):
"(v) Engaging in coercive control."

Add new R.C. 3113.31(A)(13):
"'Coercive control' means a pattern of behavior that, in purpose or effect, unreasonably interferes with a person's free will and personal liberty, or causes the person to fear for the person's own safety or the safety of a child, family member, or pet, judged from the perspective of a reasonable person in the petitioner's situation. The pattern may be committed directly, through a third party, or through technology. Examples include, but are not limited to:
(a) Isolating the person from friends, relatives, school, employment, or other sources of support;
(b) Depriving the person of basic necessities, or controlling, withholding, or monitoring finances, economic resources, identity documents, transportation, or access to medical care or services;
(c) Monitoring, tracking, or surveilling the person's movements, communications, devices, or accounts;
(d) Threatening to harm the person, a child, a family member, or a pet, threatening suicide or self-harm to compel conduct, or threatening to report the person to an immigration, child protective, or other agency to compel conduct;
(e) Threatening to take, conceal, or withhold a child, or using a child to monitor, threaten, or harass the person;
(f) Sexual or reproductive coercion;
(g) Abusive litigation, meaning filings or court actions whose primary purpose is to harass, intimidate, exhaust the resources of, or maintain contact with the person;
(h) Degrading, humiliating, or punishing the person.
'Coercive control' does not include protective actions taken in good faith by a person to protect the person or a child from the risk of harm posed by another party, including seeking a protection order, reporting abuse, or limiting a child's contact with an abusive person in accordance with a court order or while seeking one."

Why: Language tracks Cal. Fam. Code 6320(c) and RCW 7.105.010(4), both in use and enforced. The protective-actions exclusion comes from Washington, so a protective parent can't be accused of "coercive control" for protecting a child.

Protection-order eligibility. Add to R.C. 3113.31(D): "A petition alleging coercive control shall not be denied ex parte solely because the petition does not allege physical injury or a threat of imminent physical harm."

B-2. Criminal offense, R.C. 2919.253 [placeholder]

Current law: No offense.

Proposed new section, R.C. 2919.253. Coercive control.
(A) No person shall knowingly engage in a course of conduct of coercive control, as defined in section 3113.31 of the Revised Code, against a family or household member or a person with whom the person is or was in a dating relationship, when both of the following apply:
(1) The course of conduct consists of two or more acts on separate occasions; and
(2) The course of conduct has a serious effect on the victim, meaning it causes the victim (a) to fear, on at least two occasions, that physical harm will be used against the victim or a child; or (b) serious alarm or distress that has a substantial adverse effect on the victim's usual day-to-day activities, including employment, schooling, housing, health care, or care of a child.
(B) "Knowingly" is satisfied if the offender knew or a reasonable person in the offender's position would have known that the course of conduct would likely have a serious effect on the victim.
(C) Penalties. A violation is a misdemeanor of the first degree. It is a felony of the fifth degree if any of the following apply: (1) the offender previously has been convicted of a violation of this section, section 2919.25, 2919.252, or 2919.27, or a substantially similar law; (2) the course of conduct occurred while a protection order protecting the victim was in effect; or (3) the course of conduct was committed in the presence of a child or used a child, as described in division (D).
(D) Child aggravation, modeled on Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018, s. 5. The offense is aggravated if, during the course of conduct, the offender directed behavior at a child, used a child to direct behavior at the victim, a child saw, heard, or was present during an incident, or a reasonable person would consider the conduct likely to adversely affect a child usually residing with either party. No evidence that the child was aware of or harmed by the conduct is required. The court shall state the aggravation on the record, record it in the judgment, and state the extent of and reasons for any difference in sentence.
(E) Exclusions. This section does not apply to protective actions taken in good faith to protect oneself or a child from harm, to lawful parental supervision of a minor child that is not part of a pattern of abuse toward the other parent, or to conduct under a lawful power of attorney or guardianship that is exercised in good faith.
(F) Evidence. A course of conduct may be proved by the victim's testimony, records, communications, financial records, device data, witness testimony, or other evidence. Corroboration is not required. The absence of physical injury is not a defense.
(G) Separate offense. A violation of this section is separate from any offense committed as part of the course of conduct, and convictions for both are not merged.

PART C. Making it work: custody, protection orders, training and data

(A) Custody findings, R.C. 3109.04.
Current law: R.C. 3109.04(F)(1)(h) lists prior domestic violence convictions as a factor the court "shall consider." No written findings on children's exposure are required.
Proposed language: Add new R.C. 3109.04(F)(5): "When there is evidence that either parent has

committed domestic violence in the presence of a child, coercive control, or a violation of section 2919.252 or 2919.253 of the Revised Code, or that a protection order has been issued against either parent, the court shall, before any temporary or final allocation of parental rights, make written findings of fact on: (a) whether the conduct occurred and its frequency and severity; (b) the effect on each child; (c) which parent was the primary aggressor; and (d) why any allocation, parenting time, or shared parenting order protects each child and the victim parent. There is a rebuttable presumption that it is not in a child's best interest to be placed in the sole or shared custody of a parent convicted under section 2919.252 or 2919.253 within the preceding five years. The presumption may be overcome only by clear and convincing evidence, stated in writing, including proof of completion of a certified batterer intervention program. A victim parent's good-faith protective actions shall not be weighed against that parent under division (F)(1)(c), (f), or (i) of this section."

(B) Protection orders, R.C. 3113.31. Children of the household are named protected persons in every full-hearing order unless the court finds in writing that naming them is unnecessary. A violation in the presence of a child is a separate violation of R.C. 2919.27 for each child present.

(C) Training, R.C. 109.744 and Supreme Court of Ohio judicial education. Within one year of the effective date, the Ohio Peace Officer Training Commission and the Supreme Court of Ohio Judicial College shall each adopt mandatory training of at least [4] hours, refreshed every two years, for peace officers, prosecutors, magistrates, judges, guardians ad litem, custody evaluators and children services caseworkers. The training shall cover recognizing and documenting children's presence and harm; coercive control; primary aggressor determination; strangulation; trauma-informed interviews of children; and the non-offending parent protections in R.C. 2919.252(G). Completion shall be a condition of appointment as a guardian ad litem or custody evaluator. Each agency shall publish completion rates annually.

(D) Data reporting. Each law enforcement agency, prosecuting attorney, and court shall report to the Office of Criminal Justice Services by March 1 each year: the number of domestic violence incidents with a child present; charges and convictions under R.C. 2919.252 and 2919.253; dual arrests and the written primary-aggressor justifications; protection orders naming children; and referrals of child witnesses under Part D. The Office shall publish a statewide and county-level report by June 30 each year, without personal identifying information. An agency that fails to report shall be listed by name in the report.

PART D. Prevention provisions

(A) Early intervention for child witnesses. When a peace officer documents a child present under R.C. 2919.252(I), the agency shall, within 72 hours and with the non-offending parent's consent, refer the family to a certified domestic violence program or child advocacy center for trauma screening and evidence-based treatment. Refusal of services shall not be used against the non-offending parent in any proceeding. The referral shall be free to the family.

(B) Child Witness Prevention and Recovery Fund. Create a fund in the state treasury, administered by the Department of Children and Youth with the Attorney General. It is funded by an additional court cost of [$X] on each conviction under R.C. 2919.25, 2919.252, 2919.253 and 2919.27 (never charged to a victim) and by appropriation. It pays for (1) trauma treatment for child witnesses; (2) evidence-based ACE prevention named by CDC, including home visiting and parenting support; and (3) housing assistance for survivors and their children, to prevent homelessness after leaving an abuser.

(C) ACE and outcome data. The Department of Health shall include the CDC ACE module in Ohio's Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System at least every two years and publish ACE prevalence, including witnessing intimate partner violence, with the Part C annual report.

10. Current law vs proposed law at a glance

Issue	Current Ohio law	Proposed
DV in front of a child	Not a crime. Felony-only "consider" factor, R.C. 2929.12(B)(10).	Separate offense, R.C. 2919.252: M1 with mandatory jail; F4 for strangulation, weapons, serious harm or repeat; F3 for homicide attempts; one count per child.
Child's legal status	"Not victims of the offense."	Child is a victim with Marsy's Law rights.
Misdemeanor sentencing	No child factor in R.C. 2929.22.	Child factor added.
Abused parent	Can be charged with endangering children for "failure to protect."	Barred. Only the primary aggressor is charged, and dual arrests need written justification.
Coercive control	Not in the Revised Code.	Civil definition for protection orders, R.C. 3113.31; criminal offense, R.C. 2919.253, with serious-effect and course-of-conduct elements and a child aggravation.
Abusive litigation	Not recognized as abuse.	Named as a form of coercive control (RCW 7.105.010 model).
Custody	Prior DV conviction is a factor to "consider."	Mandatory written findings; rebuttable presumption against custody after a conviction; protective actions protected.
Training	No mandatory coercive control or child-witness training.	Mandatory, refreshed every two years, published completion rates.
Data	None statewide on children present.	Annual public report, by county and agency.
Prevention	None tied to DV cases.	Free referral within 72 hours, a dedicated fund, and ACE surveillance.

11. Answers to likely objections

- **"This punishes victims."** It does the opposite. Division (G) bars charging the non-offending parent and bars child-protection findings against her for the abuser's conduct. Only the primary aggressor can be charged. Georgia uses the same "primary aggressor" safeguard.
- **"Coercive control is too vague."** The civil definition copies language already in force in California and Washington. The criminal offense adds a course of conduct (two or more acts), a "serious effect" threshold, and a knowledge element, all drawn from a statute England and Wales have enforced since 2015. It also includes explicit exclusions.
- **"This will flood the courts."** Most cases will be charged alongside an existing domestic violence charge, from the same facts and in the same proceeding. Utah, Oregon and Hawaii have operated child-presence laws for years.
- **"Cost."** CDC estimates an ACE burden of $88,000 per affected adult each year and an IPV cost of $103,767 per female victim (2014 dollars), with government paying 37%. Prevention costs less than the downstream bill.

---

12. Verification notes (items not fully verified from primary text)

1. **Hawaii coercive control pilot status after June 30, 2026.** Act 238 (2021) and Act 19 (2020) set a repeal-and-reenactment date of June 30, 2026. Whether the coercive control petty misdemeanor survived past June 30, 2026 was not confirmed. The Hawaii statute page fetched still shows the language with the repeal note.
2. **Enacting bill for R.C. 2929.12(B)(10).** The factor was in force by 2004 and appears in the post-1996 Senate Bill 2 sentencing structure, but the specific enacting act was not confirmed.
3. **Evans, Davies and DiLillo (2008) effect sizes.** A secondary summary reports a large effect for trauma symptoms (d = 1.54, based on six studies, with heterogeneity). The full text could not be opened, so the number is not used in the body.
4. **Connecticut C.G.S. 46b-1 exact text.** The definition is quoted from the Connecticut Office of Legislative Research report (2023-R-0107) and search summaries, not from the statute page itself.
5. **Hawaii HRS 586-1 definition.** Quoted as reproduced in Senate Standing Committee Report 754 (2021), not from the statute page.
6. **States with civil coercive control laws** beyond CA, CT, HI and WA are listed from USA Today (April 24, 2026), not from each statute.
7. **HB 486 (135th GA) child-endangering provision.** The sponsors' 2024 press release describes it, but the official As Introduced and As Referred texts don't contain it. Sponsors may have intended a later substitute bill.

8. **Proposed penalty levels, jail minimums and dollar amounts** in brackets are policy choices for sponsors and LSC, not existing law.

---

13. Sources

Ohio law and bills

- R.C. 2919.25: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2919.25
- R.C. 2929.12: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2929.12
- R.C. 2929.22: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2929.22
- R.C. 2919.22: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2919.22
- R.C. 2903.13: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2903.13
- R.C. 2151.031: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2151.031
- R.C. 2935.03: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-2935.03
- R.C. 3109.04: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3109.04
- R.C. 3113.31: https://codes.ohio.gov/ohio-revised-code/section-3113.31
- Supreme Court of Ohio, Power and Control Wheel (coercive control not codified): https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/docs/JCS/domesticViolence/topics/powerControl/powerControlWheel.pdf
- 2004-Ohio-7239 (quoting the child-vicinity factor): https://www.supremecourt.ohio.gov/rod/docs/pdf/11/2004/2004-Ohio-7239.pdf
- State v. Ruff, 2015-Ohio-995: https://www.courtnewsohio.gov/cases/2015/SCO/0325/131441.asp
- HB 3 (133rd GA) As Introduced: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_133/legislation/hb3/00_IN/html/
- HB 3 (133rd GA) As Passed by the House: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_133/legislation/hb3/04_PH/html/
- HB 3 (134th GA) As Passed by the House: https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_134/legislation/hb3/03_PH/html/
- HB 486 (135th GA): https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_135/legislation/hb486/00_IN/html/
- Carruthers and Brent release, April 17, 2024: https://www.ohiohouse.gov/news/republican/carruthers-brent-reintroduce-aishas-law-119645
- HB 352 (136th GA): https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_136/legislation/hb352/00_IN/html/
- HB 566 (136th GA): https://search-prod.lis.state.oh.us/api/v2/general_assembly_136/legislation/hb566/00_IN/html/

Other jurisdictions

- Utah Code 76-5-114: https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title76/Chapter5/C76-5-S114_2025090120250507.html
- ORS 163.160: https://oregon.public.law/statutes/ors_163.160
- HRS 709-906: https://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol14_Ch0701-0853/HRS0709/HRS_0709-0906.htm
- Hawaii Act 238 (2021): https://data.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessions/sessionlaws/Years/SLH2021/SLH2021_Act238.pdf
- Hawaii SSCR 754 (2021): https://data.capitol.hawaii.gov/sessions/session2021/CommReports/SB829_SD1_SSCR754_.HTM
- Idaho Code 18-918: https://legislature.idaho.gov/statutesrules/idstat/title18/t18ch9/sect18-918/
- O.C.G.A. 16-5-70: https://georgiacommons.org/code/16-5-70
- RCW 9.94A.535: https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=9.94A.535
- RCW 7.105.010: https://app.leg.wa.gov/RCW/default.aspx?cite=7.105.010
- Cal. Fam. Code 6320: https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=FAM&sectionNum=6320
- Connecticut OLR, Jennifer's Law (2023-R-0107): https://www.cga.ct.gov/2023/rpt/pdf/2023-R-0107.pdf
- Serious Crime Act 2015, s. 76: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/9/section/76
- Domestic Abuse (Scotland) Act 2018, s. 5: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2018/5/section/5
- New York S4079 (2025): https://www.nysenate.gov/legislation/bills/2025/S4079
- USA Today, April 24, 2026: https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2026/04/24/coercive-control-laws-domestic-abusers/89781299007/

Science and economics

- Felitti et al. 1998: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/9635069/
- Kitzmann et al. 2003: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12699028/
- Wolfe et al. 2003: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/14620578/
- Evans et al. 2008: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.005
- Appel and Holden 1998: https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.12.4.578
- Hamby et al. 2010: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20850182/
- Finkelhor et al. 2015: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26121291/
- Teicher and Samson 2016: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26831814/
- Harvard Center on the Developing Child, Toxic Stress: https://developingchild.harvard.edu/key-concept/toxic-stress/
- McLaughlin et al. 2013: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23880492/
- Ehrensaft et al. 2003: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12924679/

- Kimber et al. 2018: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29175277/
- Katz 2016: https://doi.org/10.1002/car.2422
- Callaghan et al. 2018: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26663742/
- Merrick et al. 2019 (CDC Vital Signs): https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/68/wr/mm6844e1.htm and https://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/aces/index.html
- Hughes et al. 2017: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29253477/
- Brown et al. 2009: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19840693/
- Danese et al. 2007: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17229839/
- Valera and Berenbaum 2003: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12924684/
- Bichard et al. 2022: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33432860/
- Glass et al. 2008: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17961956/
- Campbell 2002: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11965295/
- CDC, About Intimate Partner Violence: https://www.cdc.gov/intimate-partner-violence/about/index.html
- Peterson et al. 2023: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38055277/
- Peterson et al. 2018: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30166082/
- Bellis et al. 2019: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31492648/
- Widom 1989: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2704995/
- Dube et al. 2001: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/11754674/
- Duke et al. 2010: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20231180/
- CDC, Connecting the Dots (Wilkins et al. 2014): https://www.cdc.gov/elder-abuse/communication-resources/connecting_the_dots-a.pdf
- Liu et al. 2021: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34599894/
- HHS ACF, Domestic Violence and Homelessness: Statistics (2016): https://acf.gov/print/pdf/node/5588
- 988 Suicide and Crisis Lifeline: https://988lifeline.org/