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INTRODUCTION

This 2012 report of the Duval County Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team (DVFRT) examines and analyzes domestic violence homicides which occurred in Duval County (the consolidated city of Jacksonville), Florida, from January 1 through December 31, 2012. This report marks the sixteenth year that the DVFRT has reviewed all the domestic homicides occurring within Duval County. Therefore, this report also provides overall summary patterns on domestic violence homicides from 1997 through 2012.

In general, the purpose of fatality reviews of any kind is to identify patterns and trends in deaths which might have been prevented. One expert notes that “[l]ike the reviews conducted after an airplane crash, a fatality review helps determine what went wrong and what could have been done differently to prevent the tragedy” (Websdale, 2003, p. 27). Domestic violence fatality reviews in particular seek to identify patterns and trends in homicides among intimate partners and/or family members which arise from domestic violence which might be prevented in the future through revised responses from criminal justice or other service providers in the local community. It is important to note that the approach used in fatality reviews is not to seek to attach blame for the death(s) to anyone other than the offender/suspect in the case but, instead, to identify agency practices or policies which might be improved. The National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative notes that “[e]rror recognition, responsibility, honesty, and systemic improvement should be the focus rather than denial, blame, and personalizing the review” (NDVFRI at http://www.ndvfri.org).

For this reason a diversity of membership on the review team is valuable for ensuring that major local organizations involved in providing responses/services to domestic violence victims or families are also involved in assessing where improvements might be needed. The Duval County DVFRT is composed of a variety of representatives of key local agencies and independent experts in the field (see page 2), each of whom comes to the review process with the intent to examine how fatalities might be prevented in the future. The summary findings and recommendations which arise from this examination (Section 2 herein) are intended to give local authorities guidelines for change. As one well-known expert in this area has observed, “…a fatality review identifies relevant social, economic, and policy realities that compromise the safety of battered women and their children” (Websdale, 2003, p.27). Such reviews may also examine deaths of third parties (e.g., other family members, friends, coworkers, neighbors) which happen to arise from violent domestic interactions even when the primary parties are not killed.

There are many uses for these annual fatality reviews, the most important of which is to inform the public about how the criminal justice system responds to incidents of domestic violence reported to police. By identifying areas of response which might be altered or improved, this review offers the possibility of preventing future deaths. These reviews are also instrumental in identifying lethal domestic violence patterns and securing federal or other assistance for local initiatives. For example, the DVFRT team notes that Jacksonville has been fortunate to have the InVEST (Intimate Violence Enhanced Services Team) program, a local initiative geared toward reducing intimate partner homicides through
integrating victim services from a variety of criminal justice and social service agencies. During the three years prior to the start of the InVEST initiative in 1999, there had been a steady increase in the number of intimate violence homicides in Duval County. However, since the beginning of that program, there has been a dramatic decline in intimate violence homicides among those domestic violence cases reported to police. It was in these cases that InVEST had an opportunity to intervene to try to prevent the violence from becoming lethal. It should be noted that 2011 year was the first time a victim who had stayed in shelter for more than 48 hours was killed by her abuser. In 2012 two victims who stayed in shelter more than 48 hours were killed but not by the abuser from which they sought shelter. On the whole, victims tracked by the DVFRT over the years were previously unreported to authorities and not receiving intervention services.

Research suggests that the nationwide drop in domestic violence homicides since the 1980s may be the result, at least in part, of improved services to victims and/or perpetrators (Brown & Williams, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Dugan et al., 1999; Puzone et al., 2000). In Duval County, Florida, the reductions were so dramatic that the Florida Attorney General funded pilot InVEST initiatives in eleven other Florida counties. The DVFRT believes that the proactive work done by InVEST in trying to intervene in intimate violence cases has had a positive impact on reducing domestic homicide cases in Duval County. These fatality reports also facilitated the receipt of a federal “Arrest Grant” that continues effective local collaborations, as well as funding for a new special misdemeanor domestic violence court in Duval County.

A copy of this report is provided to all Fourth Judicial Circuit judges, the local sheriff, the local state attorney's office, victim advocates, batterers’ intervention programs, local legislators, the military and local media. A copy is also placed on the web for public access (see listing at the National Domestic Violence Fatality Review Initiative at www.ndvfri.org).

The DVFRT hopes that the reader will find this report informative and useful. Any comments or questions about this report or the work of the DVFRT may be directed to 2012 Chair Theresa Simak at 904-630-2502 or via email at tsimak@coj.net.
METHODOLOGY

The Duval County Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team, hereafter referred to as DVFRT or the Team, was created in 1997 by the Duval County Domestic Violence Intervention Project Committee (DVIP). The Team exists for the purposes of annually collecting, reviewing and analyzing all domestic homicide cases within Duval County (Jacksonville), Florida, and issuing this report. The Team is composed of representatives of several governmental and non-profit agencies which deal directly with domestic homicide cases within the jurisdiction of Duval County, plus other local experts in this field. A complete list of the members of the Team for the 2012 analysis may be found on page two of this report.

Cases selected for review by this Team are those in which the key parties of the case (e.g., the primary offender and the primary victim) meet the definition of having a “domestic” relationship as set forth in Section 741.28 of the Florida Statutes. This defines domestic relationships as:

Spouses, former spouses, persons related by blood or marriage, persons who are presently residing together, as if a family, or who have resided together in the past, as if a family, and persons who have a child in common regardless of whether they have been married or have resided together at any time.

All homicide cases which meet this definition are flagged by the State Attorney’s Office (SAO), Fourth Judicial Circuit, and are brought to the attention of the Team for review. In addition, the Homicide Division of the Jacksonville Sheriff’s office (JSO) flags cases which would not have been referred to the SAO for prosecution, such as homicide-suicides. From time to time, the Team has wrestled with additional cases in which a dispute between domestic partners or family members has resulted in the death of a third party (but not a person who fits the Florida Statute definition above). The first challenge is to identify third party cases, since they are not identified as “domestic” homicides by the JSO, but it seems clear in such cases that a death would not have resulted except for a domestic altercation of some kind. In the last several years, the team has also sometimes included cases involving intimate partners that did not fit the domestic violence statute as written since the couple had not lived together nor had a child in common. However, these relationships had been of sufficient duration and the patterns were so similar that the team felt the case should be included to get a true picture of homicides among intimate couples. The Team identified one such case for the year 2011, in which a male suspect killed a male friend of his former girlfriend but there were no cases of that nature in 2012.

It should be noted that the Team excludes child deaths resulting from domestic violence, unless the child was killed as part of an attack on an adult that fits the Florida Statute definition, as there is a separate local child death committee that reviews those fatalities.

In terms of procedure, the Team meets approximately monthly, normally beginning in January of each year, to review each identified case of domestic homicide from the previous year. It is important to note that--unlike many other fatality review teams--this
Team reviews and reports on all domestic homicide cases which occur within a given year, regardless of the legal status of suspects at the time of the issuance of this report. Thus, this report accounts for all cases classified as domestic homicides in Duval County in 2012. For this reason, this report identifies cases by a number (e.g., 2012-01, 2012-02, etc.), an incident date, demographic facts, zip code, and police zone location only. No names of suspects or victims are used as some cases may still be pending legally. This approach provides a much more complete picture of domestic homicide in Duval County for any given year than is provided in those reports which include only closed cases. It also allows for more timely reviews and recommendations.

Case files are divided amongst Team members for intensive review in order to develop the elements of each case as presented herein. The documentary materials reviewed in each case include any the following:

1. Police reports involving the victim and suspect.
2. Department of Children and Families (DCF) referrals involving victim and/or suspect.
3. Shelter services, hotline contacts, court advocacy or other domestic violence services utilized by victim or suspect, when available.
4. Civil proceedings including Marchman and Baker Acts, Dissolutions of Marriage, paternity actions and Injunctions for Protection involving victim and/or suspect.
5. Criminal records of victim and suspect.
6. State Attorney files involving victim and/or suspect.
7. Batterers’ intervention program (BIP) participation including performance, completion, violations and victim contact.
8. Helping At Risk Kids Program (HARK) attendance by children of the victim and/or suspect.
9. Animal abuse or neglect complaints, if available.
10. Other relevant known services provided to the victim and/or suspect.
11. Autopsy reports or other Medical Examiner’s information.
The information which is sought about each case from these materials includes critical factors and sub-factors which are viewed as providing as complete a picture as possible about each of these tragic incidents. These factors and sub-factors are:

I. CRIME
   Relationship of parties
   Case summary
   Children present at the scene
   Location of the crime (by zip code and police zone)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS
   Domestic violence
   Non-domestic violent crimes
   Drug or alcohol related offenses
   Weapons offenses

III. CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS
   Domestic Violence Injunctions
   Dissolutions of Marriage
   Department of Children and Families Referrals
   Baker Act and Marchman Act Commitments
   Paternity Actions

IV. SERVICES
   Shelter services/hotline calls
   Helping at Risk Kids Program (HARK) attendance
   Batterers' intervention program (BIP) attendance
   Substance abuse program referral/attendance

V. OTHER CONCERNS/INFORMATION
   Includes anything else pertinent to the cause of this incident that is not covered in the categories listed above.

Individual Team members develop case profiles for each case using these factors. The case profiles are then shared with, and analyzed by, the whole Team for a collective review of each case. Questions may lead to further research on the case. The key factors permit the Team to try to understand the dynamics of what happened and to ask in each case whether there was anything that reasonably could have been done to prevent those events from unfolding. That is, were there warning signs which were ignored? Were there opportunities for intervention which were missed? Were there services which could have been provided to either the victim or the offender which were not provided---or not adequately provided? The Team recognizes that ultimately offenders are responsible for their actions and the fatalities which ensue. However, the Team also recognizes that the dynamics underlying domestic violence are complex and that other parties often know about potential danger within domestic relationships, even if they do not report this to outside authorities who might intervene. Helping victims find assistance, and offenders find intervention, before domestic violence becomes lethal is the goal of the DVFRT.
In section 4 of this report, the reader will find the profiles developed for each of the cases in 2012. In addition to these individual case profiles, this report also includes summary patterns for 2012 by gender, race, relationship, method of death, children present, criminal history of key actors, prior injunctions and other civil matters, prior child abuse referrals, shelter services extended to victims, services extended to children, interventions provided to abusers, prior alcohol/drug abuse by victims and suspects, mental health issues of suspects, and zip codes and law enforcement zones of the homicidal incident. Summary patterns for 1997-2012 are also provided. The Team uses these summaries to assess the long term patterns, as well as recurring problems and potential progress, in this area. It is from these long term and recurring patterns, as well as any unique event of the year, that the Team develops its annual findings and recommendations, which are set forth in the following Findings and Recommendations section.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
(2012)

This report reviewed domestic violence homicide cases from Duval County, Florida specifically for the year 2012. For 2012 the team reviewed 11 cases with a total of 12 homicides. In four of the cases the suspect committed suicide, which is unusually high and a concern for the team. In addition, the entire period of 1997-2012 during which the Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team (DVFRT) has been in operation was reviewed. A variety of patterns emerged from this data, both for 2012 alone (see this report pages 28-32) and for the full sixteen year time span (see this report pages 33-40).

Within the category of domestic homicide, the DVFRT distinguishes between intimate and non-intimate homicides (see Methodology, section 3). In 2012, eighty-two percent of the local domestic homicide cases (n=9) involved intimate partners. Over the previous fifteen years, the majority (76%) of domestic violence homicides in Jacksonville also involved intimate partners.

It is worth noting that intimate homicides have decreased nationally quite dramatically over the past decade, at least for male victims. Most experts believe this decrease is due, at least in part, to the increasing availability of alternate resources for resolving domestic violence, such as refuges for battered women and intervention programs for batterers (Brown & Williams, 1993; Brown et al., 1999; Dugan et al., 1999; Puzone et al., 2000). Such interventions and refuges are presumed to reduce the number of instances in which battered victims believe that killing the abuser is their only recourse.

Cases of domestic violence between intimate partners need to be taken seriously and viewed as potentially very lethal. Effective intervention can not only save the lives of battered victims, but can also sometimes save the lives of their abusive partners.

Based on the patterns in this report, the DVFRT made a number of findings and sets forth herein some recommendations based on those findings.

Finding #1
There continues to be a gender disparity in who commits domestic violence homicides in Duval County, with males killing females in 74% of the intimate cases and males killing other family members in 85% of the non-intimate cases. In 2012, eight of the eleven cases reviewed here involved male suspects (73%). In the previous fifteen years, males killed their female partners in 74% of intimate cases. In 85% of non-intimate cases, it was males who killed other family members. In 88% of the overall homicide-suicide cases, the suspect was male. In all of the multiple homicides, the suspect was male. Thus, lethal violence in Duval County is predominantly committed by males, which is consistent with national statistics.
**Recommendation:**
Domestic violence is still highly gendered, meaning that male offenders disproportionately victimize females in a wide variety of ways, including fatally. Though domestic violence is always wrong, we should not lose sight of the fact that this is primarily violence against women and that the female victim may be in greater lethal danger.

**Finding #2**
In 2012, the majority of both victims (73%) and suspects (64%) were black, whereas only 30% of the population of Duval County is black. This is not consistent with the overall pattern from the past fifteen years (53% of victims and 51% of suspects were white, while 43% of victims and 46% of suspects were black). However, it does mirror the pattern from 2008, 2009 and 2010 in which blacks outnumbered whites. The team is disturbed to see this pattern repeated in 2012.

**Recommendation:**
Research efforts are needed to help understand the disproportionate number of black victims and suspects in recent years. Also, more domestic violence intervention efforts need to be extended to the local black community. The assistance of the faith community is needed in raising awareness of the potential for lethality.

**Finding #3**
In 2012, only 18% of suspects (two males) and 27% of victims (3 males) had prior domestic violence arrests. In the overall period 1997-2012, the overwhelming majority of suspects (72%) had no prior domestic violence arrests that would have alerted authorities to the potential for fatal violence; only 28% of suspects (40 males, 4 females) and 21% of victims (24 males, 11 females) had such criminal histories. In one of the cases we reviewed, police and rescue responded to the residence the night before the homicidal event, but no report was written.

Protective orders are also underutilized with only 7% of victims and of suspects having injunctions in place. In 2012 one victim was a petitioner and one suspect was a respondent to a current civil injunction for protection or other civil matters relevant to the potential for violence. Overall, in the past, between 1997-2011, victims and suspects were equally represented (7%) in terms of being such respondents. Over that fifteen year period, males were more likely than females to have injunctions against them while females were more likely than males to file injunctions, regardless of whether those males and females were victims or suspects.
Recommendation:
Preventing domestic violence homicides is challenging if there have been no prior arrests, protective orders or other factors to alert authorities to the potential for lethal violence. When there is a history of violence—whether prior arrests, civil injunctions for protection, or anything else—that history should be taken very seriously. The prosecution and sentencing of offenders should be aggressive and take into account the history.

Finding #4
The team was concerned that in 2012 batterers’ intervention was not ordered in either of the cases with a history of arrests. There were two male suspects and three male victims with a history of one domestic violence arrest each. Overall, during the 1997-2012 time period, 44 suspects had prior arrests for domestic violence, but only 19 were ordered to batterers’ intervention programs. Batterers’ intervention programs remain underutilized. Only two of those 19 ordered into the program actually completed it. It appears that local referrals to intervention for abusers need to be more closely monitored. Since completion percentages are so low among those who eventually kill, noncompliance should result in incarceration. In Duval County, the success rate for individuals who do complete batterers' intervention programs locally is high: 88% were not rearrested during follow-up three-year tracking periods, according to arrest records checks done by the State Attorney’s Office.

Recommendation:
The criminal justice system should make full use of batterers’ intervention programs, and not only when mandated by statute. Furthermore, when batterers’ intervention is ordered by the courts, penalties for noncompliance should be severe. It is also recommended that the courts continue to order offenders only to those programs that have been certified and that have a proven track record of low recidivism.

Finding #5
In 2012, 36% of the suspects had a history of substance abuse arrests. This is consistent with previous years. While substance abuse is not a cause of domestic violence, it is highly correlated with such abuse nationally (see Macy & Goodbourne, 2012).

Recommendation:
Violent individuals who abuse substances have two issues requiring treatment: the substance abuse and the domestic violence. Both need to be addressed and screening for one should be done whenever the other is detected.

Finding #6
In 2012 there were four cases of homicide-suicide, in which one intimate partner killed the other and then himself/herself. In general, homicide-suicide of any kind is relatively rare, so four domestic violence homicide-suicides in one year is something the Team has not seen in previous years. The case narratives of two of these cases suggest that these two may
have been mutual decisions. The case narratives of the other two cases indicate that families and friends either knew about or suspected that lethal violence might be possible. For a variety of reasons, their concerns were not reported to authorities, though it is unclear what police could have done to intervene meaningfully in these cases.

**Recommendation:**
Whether because of mutual agreement or evolving problems in the family, domestic violence homicide-suicides are one of the most difficult forms of lethal violence for authorities to prevent. However, if the trend for several of these to occur each year continues in the future, the Team recommends more public education needs to be undertaken to alert families and friends to the symptoms of such potential lethal violence so that they might try to take preventative steps.
CURRENT AND CUMMULATIVE YEAR GRAPHS
AND 10-YEAR TRENDS

Gender of Homicide Victims 2012

Gender of Homicide Victims 1997-2012

Gender of Homicide Victims 2003-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race of Homicide Victims 2012

- White: 25%
- Black: 67%
- Asian: 8%

Race of Homicide Victims 1997-2013

- White: 51%
- Black: 45%
- Asian: 3%
- Hispanic: 1%

Race of Homicide Victims 2003-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domestic Violence Homicides by Intimate or Non-Intimate
1997-2012

(45) Non-Intimate DV Homicides
25%

(137) Intimate DV Homicides
75%

Domestic Violence Homicides by Intimate or Non-Intimate
2003-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intimate</th>
<th>Non-Intimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perpetrators of Intimate Homicides
1997-2012

(3) Same-Sex Homicide
2%

(31) Females
Killed Males
25%

(92) Males
Killed Females
73%

Perpetrators of Intimate Homicides
2003-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males Killed Females</th>
<th>Females Killed Males</th>
<th>Same Sex Homicide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suspects by Prior Domestic Violence Arrests

2012

(9) Suspects without DV arrests 82%

(2) Suspects with DV arrests 18%

1997-2012

(120) Without DV Arrests 72%

(47) With DV Arrests 28%

Suspects by Prior Domestic Violence Arrests

2003-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With DV Arrests</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without DV Arrests</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PATTERNS/2012 ONLY

**GENDER (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)**
- Male suspects: (n=8 cases, 73% of cases)
  - 6 males killed female partners; three of these males also committed suicide
  - 1 male killed his brother
  - 1 male killed his father and his mother
- Female suspects: (n=3, 27%)
  - 2 females killed their male partners, one of these females also committed suicide
  - 1 female killed her same sex partner

Male victims (n=4, 33%)
Female victims (n=8, 67%)

Among all suspects, eight males represented a majority (73%) compared to the three females (27%). Among all victims, eight females represented a majority (67%) compared to the four males (33%).

**RACE (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)**
- Victims (n=12)
  - 3 White (27% of cases, 25% of victims)
  - 8 Black (73% of cases, 66% of victims)
  - 1 Asian (9% of cases, 8% of victims)
- Suspects (n=11)
  - 4 White (36% of cases, 36% of suspects)
  - 7 Black (64% of cases, 64% of suspects)

Domestic homicides generally tend to be intra-racial (occurring between persons of the same race/ethnicity). This was true of the Duval County cases in 2012.

**RELATIONSHIP (BY NUMBER OF CASES) – changed to match overall patterns**
Intimate Relationships – 9 cases (82% of 11 cases) with 9 victims involved intimate relationships.
- In 8 cases (89% of intimate cases), the parties were cohabiting at the time of the homicide.
  - 3 married and cohabiting (33% of intimate cases)
  - 5 not married and cohabiting (45% of intimate cases)
- In 1 case (11% of intimate cases), the parties were married but separated at the time of the homicide.
Non-Intimate Relationships – 2 cases with 3 victims involved non-intimate relationships.

- 1 male killed his father and mother (50% of non-intimate cases)
- 1 male killed his brother (50% of non-intimate cases)

Intimate homicides usually outnumber non-intimate homicides, and this was true for 2012.

**METHOD (BY NUMBER OF VICTIMS)**

Of the 12 total victims:

- 10 gunshot wounds (83%)
- 2 stabbing wounds (17%)
  * 1 was with a broken bottle and one with a knife

Though homicides in the United States generally tend to involve mostly firearms (67% according to the FBI [www.fbi.com](http://www.fbi.com)), domestic homicides are more likely to also involve a variety of other fatal methods. There were substantially more gunshot wounds in 2012 than in the overall patterns (57%).

**CHILDREN (BY NUMBER OF CASES)**

In only two of the eleven cases (18%), minor children was present at the scene and/or witnessed the homicide. This is fewer than in past years (25%).

**CRIMINAL HISTORY: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)**

Only those cases in which victims and suspects were previously arrested for domestic violence are included below. (n=4 cases)

- Victims (n=3, 27% of total cases, 25% of victims)
  - 2 males with 1 domestic violence arrest
  - 1 male with 3 domestic violence arrests

- Suspects (n=2, 18% of total cases, 18% of suspects)
  - 2 males with 1 domestic violence arrest

Though prior arrest for domestic violence is considered a high risk indicator for possible lethal behavior (see Campbell, et al., 2007), only four of cases in 2012 involved offenders or victims who had previously been arrested for this offense. This does not mean that the other cases did not involve prior domestic violence; only that it did not result in an arrest.
INJUNCTIONS AND OTHER CIVIL MATTERS (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)

Only those cases in which victims and suspects had prior injunctions or other civil matters are included below. (n=4 cases).

- **Victims (2% of total cases, 1% of victims)**
  - 1 female was the petitioner to a current domestic violence injunction involving suspect. She was also denied an Injunction against Suspect three months before the homicide.
  - 2 females had a previous dissolution of marriage; one remarried Suspect
  - 2 females had filed for a dissolution
  - 2 females had petitioned for paternity and/or child support enforcement involving Suspect

- **Suspects (2% of total cases, 2% of suspects)**
  - 1 male was the respondent to a current domestic violence injunction involving victim. He was also respondent on a petition for a domestic violence injunction that was denied three months before the homicide and petitioner and responded three years prior.
  - 1 male had a previous dissolution of marriage to Victim but remarried
  - 2 males filed for dissolution of marriage
  - 2 males had actions to establish paternity and/or child support enforcement
  - 1 male had a repeat violence injunction to protect him as a minor child

One victim and one suspect had been petitioner and respondent to a current injunction for protection at the time of the 2012 homicidal incident.

CHILD ABUSE REFERRALS (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)

There were no child abuse referrals in 2012 cases, but one case had a DCF report of unsafe environment for a disabled son because of domestic violence. The case was closed.

SHELTER SERVICES (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)

- 2 female victims were sheltered from different suspects a year before the homicide.
- 1 female victim received outreach services and relocation funds.

Helping At Risk Kids (HARK) SERVICES (BY NUMBER OF CASES)

- There were no children involved in these cases that received HARK services either before or after the homicide cases reviewed this year.

There were two cases where the children were present at the time of the homicide. We found no record that these children received services which might prevent or reduce future bad outcomes.
INTERVENTION (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Only victims and suspects who were ordered to complete a batterers' intervention program (BIP) or other interventions are included below.

- Victims (no cases)
- Suspects (no cases)

ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Only victims and suspects who were previously arrested for substance abuse are included below. (n=5 cases).

- Victims (9% of total cases, 8% of victims)
  - 1 female with 1 substance abuse arrest

- Suspects (36% of total cases, 36% of suspects)
  - 3 males with 1 substance abuse arrest each
  - 1 male with 5 substance abuse arrests

Though alcohol and drug abuse do not cause domestic violence, they are known to be correlated with such violence.

MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Only victims and suspects with prior documented mental health issues are included below. (n=3 cases).

- Victims (no cases)
- Suspects (27% of total cases, 27% of suspects)
  - 3 males had documented mental health issues

Prior mental health problems are a known factor in some domestic violence cases. Three cases this year involved a suspect with pre-existing documented mental health issues. Most domestic homicides are not related to mental illness (see Campbell, et al., 2007).
ZIP CODES
Zip codes where the homicide occurred (n=11)

- 32204 - 1 (9% of cases)
- 32209 - 2 (18% of cases)
- 32210 - 1 (9% of cases)
- 32216 - 1 (9% of cases)
- 32218 - 2 (18% of cases)
- 32223 - 1 (9% of cases)
- 32226 - 1 (9% of cases)
- 32256 - 1 (9% of cases)
- 32277 - 1 (9% of cases)

LAW ENFORCEMENT ZONES
Law Enforcement Zones where the homicide occurred (n=6).

- Zone 1 - 0 (0% of cases)
- Zone 2 - 1 (9% of cases)
- Zone 3 - 3 (27% of cases)
- Zone 4 - 2 (18% of cases)
- Zone 5 - 2 (18% of cases)
- Zone 6 - 3 (27% of cases)

These distributions of cases indicate that domestic homicides can—and have—occurred anywhere in the city.
TOTALS
167 Cases, 126 of these Intimate Cases (75%)
217 Deaths
- 182 Homicides, 137 of these Intimate Homicides (76%)
- 36 Suicides (22%)

GENDER (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Intimate homicides (126 cases with 137 homicides, 75% of cases)
- 92 males killed their female partners resulting in 107 homicides (73% of intimate cases)
  - 2 also killed the wife's boyfriend
  - 1 also killed his grown daughter and son-in-law
  - 1 also killed his ex-girlfriend's minor daughter and current boyfriend
  - 1 also killed his father-in-law and brother-in-law
  - 1 also killed his ex-girlfriend's father
  - 1 also killed his wife's adult son
- 31 females killed their male partners resulting in 31 homicides (25% of intimate cases)
  - In one case the current boyfriend was also a suspect
- 2 males killed same sex partners (1% of intimate cases)
- 1 female killed same sex partner (1% of intimate cases)

Non-Intimate homicides (41 cases with 45 homicides, 25% of cases)
- 33 males killed other family members resulting in 37 homicides (81% of non-intimate cases)
- 5 females killed other family members resulting in 5 homicides (12% of non-intimate cases)
- 3 males killed a non-family member during an attack on an intimate partner (7% of non-intimate cases)

Above cases involving Homicide-suicides (36 cases, 22% of cases)
- 31 males committed suicide (86% of suicides)
- 5 females committed suicide (14% of suicides)

In all multiple homicide cases, the suspect was male.
RACE (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)

- Victims (total 180)
  - 93 White (51% of victims)
  - 81 Black (45% of victims)
  - 5 Asian (3% of victims)
  - 2 Hispanic (1% of victims)
    - Race of 2 Victims in 1997 not noted

- Suspects (total 166)
  - 83 White (50% of suspects)
  - 79 Black (48% of suspects)
  - 3 Asian (2% of suspects)
  - 1 Hispanic (<1% of suspects)
    - Race of 1 Suspect in 1997 not noted

RELATIONSHIP

Intimate Relationships – 126 cases (76% of 166 cases) with 137 victims involved intimate relationships.

- In 86 cases (68% of intimate cases), the parties were cohabiting at the time of the homicide.
  - 44 married and cohabiting (35% of intimate cases)
  - 39 not married and cohabiting (31% of intimate cases)
  - 3 divorced and cohabiting (2% of intimate cases)

- In 40 cases (32% of intimate cases), the parties were separated or divorced at the time of the homicide.
  - 17 married and not cohabiting (14% of intimate cases)
  - 22 not married and not cohabiting (17% of intimate cases)
  - 1 divorced and not cohabiting (1% of intimate cases)

Non-Intimate Relationships – 41 cases (25% of 167 cases) with 45 victims involved non-intimate relationships

- 18 males and 1 female killed parents/step-parents/grandparents (48% of non-intimate cases)
  - 4 cases where sons killed both parents
  - 5 cases where sons killed their mothers
  - 3 cases where sons killed their fathers
  - 2 cases where step-sons killed step-fathers
  - 4 cases where grandsons killed grandparents, one also killed a companion
  - 1 case where daughter killed mother

- 6 males and 2 females killed children/step-children (16% of non-intimate cases)
  - 1 case where step-father killed step-son
  - 1 case where step-father killed step-daughter
  - 1 case where ex-boyfriend killed ex-girlfriend's son
  - 1 case where father killed infant son
  - 2 cases where fathers killed adult sons
- 1 case where mother killed her son
- 1 case where mother killed her daughter

- 5 males killed their brothers (25% of non-intimate cases)
- 1 male killed brother-in-law (2.5% of cases)
- 1 male killed sister-in-law (2.5% of non-intimate cases)
- 1 female killed mother (2.5% of non-intimate cases)
- 2 females killed their brothers (5% of non-intimate cases)
- 1 male killed his ex-mother-in-law (2.5% of non-intimate cases)
- 1 male killed his niece (2.5% of non-intimate cases)
- 1 male killed his ex-wife’s boyfriend during an attack on ex-wife (2.5% of cases)
- 1 male killed a male friend of his girlfriend (2.5% of non-intimate cases)

**METHOD (BY NUMBER OF VICTIMS)**

Of the total homicides (n=182):

- 104 gunshot wounds (57% of victims)
- 41 stabbing wounds (23% of victims)
  - One involved broken bottle
- 13 strangulations (7% of victims)
- 16 blunt force trauma (9% of victims)
  - 1 also included knife wounds
- 8 other (4% of victims)
  - 1 died of a heart attack during the crime
  - 1 complications caused by paralysis after a broken neck
  - 2 asphyxiation (one during a wrestling restraint)
  - 1 hit by car
  - 1 thrown off a bridge
  - 1 rectal trauma
  - 1 bombing

**CHILDREN (BY NUMBER OF CASES)**

In 43 cases (25% of cases), a total of at least 93 children were present during and/or witnessed the homicide. All were intimate cases. (The 1997 and 1998 reports did not always list the number of children but would list “child” or “children.” When the plural form was used we counted it as only two children, though the number could be greater.)

In 2 cases (<2% of cases), the children were killed during an attack on an adult.

- In one case victim’s 16-year-old daughter was killed
- In one case suspect killed his infant son
CRIMINAL HISTORY - DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Only victims and suspects who were previously arrested for domestic violence are included below.

- **Victims (n=35, 21% of cases)**
  - 24 males had prior arrests for domestic violence
  - 11 females had prior arrests for domestic violence

- **Suspects (n=47, 28% of cases)**
  - 43 males had prior arrests for domestic violence
  - 4 females had prior arrest(s) for domestic violence

Only 44% of suspects (n=19 of 47) with criminal history were ordered to BIP. In addition, 34% of victims (n=12 of 35) with criminal history were ordered to BIP. Eleven of the 12 victims (92%) were male.

INJUNCTIONS AND OTHER CIVIL MATTERS (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)

Only victims and suspects with prior injunctions or other civil matters are included below. Seven percent of victims had an injunction against the suspect at the time of the homicide; 7% of suspects filed for or were respondents to injunctions at the time of the homicide.

- **Victims**
  - 13 females had injunctions in place; one had also had a petition denied
    - 2 reported violations
  - 1 female had a prior injunction
  - 1 female had a temporary injunction dismissed for failure to appear
  - 1 female had an injunction against her husband’s ex-girlfriend
  - 1 female filed for an injunction against the suspect’s ex-wife but was denied
  - 1 female filed for an injunction against former boyfriend but was denied
  - 1 female was respondent to one injunction by a different person
  - 1 female was respondent to a repeat violence injunction
  - 2 males were respondents to one injunction each (not by the suspect)
  - 2 males were respondents to two injunctions (not by the suspect). One also had two injunctions that were dismissed and one final injunction entered.
  - 1 male had an injunction against his mother’s ex-boyfriend (the suspect)
  - 3 females had dissolutions of marriage (not from the suspect)
  - 3 females had dissolutions of marriage from the suspect (two of them pending at the time of homicide). One of these had a prior dissolution of marriage from suspect.
  - 2 females had filed for a dissolution of marriage
  - 2 females had petitioned for paternity and/or child support enforcement involving suspect
Suspects
- 1 female filed for injunction against male victim's son and girlfriend - both were denied
- 3 females had injunctions against their victims
- 1 female had an injunction against an ex-boyfriend who was not the victim
- 9 males were respondents to an injunction; one was also respondent to a denied injunction with victim and petitioner and respondent 3 years prior.
- 5 males were respondents to multiple injunctions (not by the victims); one was denied; one was dismissed because petitioner failed to appear.
- 1 male was respondent to multiple injunctions by multiple females.
  - This male also petitioned for an injunction multiple times, but was denied
- 1 male was respondent to a repeat violence injunction
- 2 males had a dissolution of marriage (not from the victim)
- 3 males had dissolutions of marriage from the victims (two were pending at the time of the homicide). One of these had a previous dissolution of marriage from the victim.
- 1 male had filed for dissolution of marriage but did not proceed
- 2 males had actions to establish paternity and/or child support enforcement
- 1 male had a repeat violence injunction to protect him as a minor child

CHILD ABUSE REFERRALS (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
*Only victims and suspects with prior child abuse referrals are included below.*

- Victims (7% of victims)
  - 8 females had referrals to the Department of Children and Families
  - 4 males had referrals to the Department of Children and Families

- Suspects (10% of suspects)
  - 4 females had referrals to the Department of Children and Families
  - 12 males had referrals to the Department of Children and Families

SHELTER SERVICES (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
*Only victims and suspects that received prior services are included below.*

- Victims (n=13, 7% received some services)
  - 3 females stayed in shelter less than 48 hours several years before the homicides
  - 3 females stayed in shelter for about two months at least a year before the homicide. Only one was killed by the suspect from which they sought shelter.
  - 5 females were provided court advocacy services (including two of those who were sheltered as noted above)
  - 2 females received safety planning
  - 1 female received services through InVEST for police report involving different suspect
  - 1 female received outreach services and relocation funds but declined the InVEST program.

- Suspects (n=3, 2% received some services)
  - 1 female went through domestic violence education class
  - 2 females received outreach services
HARK (BY NUMBER OF CASES)
- Of the 43 cases (26%) where children were actually present and/or witnessed the homicide (n=93), HARK referrals were made in only three cases (7%).

INTERVENTION (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Only victims and suspects who were ordered to complete BIP, ordered to anger management or counseling are included below.

- Victims (n=16, 9% of victims)
  o 11 males ordered to batterers' intervention programs as a result of domestic violence arrests.
    ▪ 2 completed
    ▪ 1 ordered twice, completed twice
    ▪ 2 ordered twice, each completed once
  o 3 males ordered to anger management as part of earlier domestic violence cases
  o 1 male ordered to counseling for previous domestic battery
  o 1 female ordered and completed batterers' intervention program
  o 1 female received marriage counseling

- Suspects (n=31, 19% of suspects)
  o 19 males ordered to batterers' intervention programs
    ▪ 1 ordered twice and did not complete either time
    ▪ 1 ordered twice, but completed once
    ▪ 1 also ordered to anger management years earlier
  o 1 male ordered to marriage counseling as part of injunction
  o 10 males ordered to anger management (1 on the morning of the homicide)
  o 1 female ordered to anger management

Cases where anger management was ordered were in the earlier years of this report. Florida Statute 741.281, effective 7/1/2000, requires sentencing to include ordering a defendant to a BIP that meets the statutory requirements.

ALCOHOL/DRUG ABUSE (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Only victims and suspects who were previously arrested for substance abuse are included below.

- Victims (n=32, 18% of victims)
  o 19 males with substance abuse arrests
  o 13 females with substance abuse arrests

- Suspects (n=58, 35% of suspects)
  o 51 males with substance abuse arrests
  o 7 females with substance abuse arrests
MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES (BY NUMBER OF PEOPLE)
Only victims and suspects with prior documented mental health issues are included below.

- **Victim** (n=2, <1% of victims)
  - 2 females with mental health issues

- **Suspects** (n=24, 14% of suspects)
  - 18 males with mental health issues
  - 6 females with mental health issues

ZIP CODES (BY NUMBER OF CASES 2006-2011)
Zip codes where the homicide occurred. (n=74)

- 32204 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32205 - 5 (7% of cases)
- 32206 - 5 (7% of cases)
- 32207 - 4 (5% of cases)
- 32208 - 5 (7% of cases)
- 32209 - 5 (7% of cases)
- 32210 - 5 (7% of cases)
- 32211 - 3 (4% of cases)
- 32212 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32216 - 3 (4% of cases)
- 32217 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32218 - 5 (7% of cases)
- 32219 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32220 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32221 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32223 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32224 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32225 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32226 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32233 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32244 - 4 (5% of cases)
- 32246 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32250 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32254 - 3 (4% of cases)
- 32256 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32257 - 2 (3% of cases)
- 32258 - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- 32277 - 2 (3% of cases)
LAW ENFORCEMENT ZONES (BY NUMBER OF CASES 2006-2011)

Law Enforcement Zones where the homicide occurred (n=74).

- Zone 1 - 7 (9% of cases)
- Zone 2 - 7 (9% of cases)
- Zone 3 - 17 (23% of cases)
- Zone 4 - 21 (28% of cases)
- Zone 5 - 15 (20% of cases)
- Zone 6 - 5 (7% of cases)
- Jacksonville Beach - 1 (1.4% of cases)
- Atlantic Beach - 1 (1.4% of cases)
Victim: Black Male, 41
Suspect: Black Male, 45

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Brothers

B. CASE SUMMARY: On February 17, 2012, the Suspect and the Victim were arguing over bills. Victim and Suspect lived together and were brothers. Suspect pulled out a pistol and shot Victim in the back one time. Victim fell to the floor in the doorway of the residence. Suspect stood over Victim and shot him in the back again. The witness (girlfriend of the Victim) stated Suspect began waving the gun at her and told her to leave the home. Victim was pronounced dead at Shands Hospital. Suspect is currently judged incompetent to stand trial.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32218 (Zone 6)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: a) 09/22/98 – Armed Robbery with a firearm – Adjudicated Guilty

C. DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: a) 12/06/96 – Possession of Cocaine and
possession of a firearm by a convicted felon – Adjudicated Guilty

D. WEAPONS OFFENSES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

III. CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. Victim: None Found
B. Suspect: None Found

IV. SERVICES

A. Victim: None Found
B. Suspect: a) 09/19/97 – Committed to Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services for involuntary placement in a treatment facility authorized by (394.467) Florida Statutes.

V. OTHER CONCERNS:

Over the past 15 years, Suspect has received several psychiatric evaluations during criminal trials (with varying professional opinions). For example, on August 29, 1997, the psychiatrist stated, “patient continues to manifest active psychosis…probable diagnosis would be Schizophrenic Disorder, paranoid type”. As of September 18, 1997, a Judge signed an order that stated “the court retains jurisdiction in this cause and the Defendant shall not be discharged or released from involuntary hospitalization without further order of this court, except as otherwise provided herein”. In a different case, on June 5, 1998, Suspect was ordered mentally competent to stand trial. As of February 15, 2013, Suspect was adjudged mentally incompetent.
Victim 1: Black Female, 42  
Victim 2: Black Male, 52  
Suspect: Black Male, 21  

I. CRIME  

A. RELATIONSHIP: Mother/Son, Father/Son  
B. CASE SUMMARY: On May 1, 2012, JSO was called to Victims’ residence in reference to a 911 call that two people had been shot. The caller reported that her parents had been shot by her brother. Patrol officers arrived at the scene and observed both victims inside of the residence with multiple gunshot wounds. The victims were transported to the hospital where they were pronounced deceased.  

After additional information was obtained by patrol officers from the victims’ daughter, it was discovered Suspect had fled on foot. He was apprehended in the neighborhood shortly after the shooting. Suspect was arrested for homicide.  
C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None  
D. LOCATION: 32210 (Zone 4)  

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS  

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  

1. Victim #1: No Record  
2. Victim #2:  
   a) 05/27/11 – Misdemeanor domestic battery against daughter; charges were reduced to fighting. Fees and court costs.  
   b) 06/09/08 – Misdemeanor domestic battery against wife; charges reduced to fighting (2 days in jail).  
3. Suspect:  
   a) 07/06/10 – Simple Assault/Battery against Victim #2; charges dropped.
B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim #1: No Record

2. Victim #2: No Record

3. Suspect: a) 01/13/12 – Simple Assault/Battery, Obscenity, pled no contest; 29 days in jail.

C. DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES

1. Victim #1: No Record

2. Victim #2: No Record

3. Suspect: a) 04/24/10 – Drugs/Narcotics, pled guilty; 2 days in jail.

D. WEAPONS OFFENSES

1. Victim #1: No Record

2. Victim #2: No Record

3. Suspect: No Record

III. CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. Victim #1: None Found

B. Victim #2: None Found

C. Suspect: None Found

IV. SERVICES

A. Victim #1: None Found

B. Victim #2: None Found

C. Suspect: None Found
V. OTHER CONCERNS

According to a family member, the suspect suffers from mental illness and was not taking his prescribed medications at the time of the event. Days prior to the incident, Victim #2 kicked Suspect out of the residence due to Suspect using drugs and alcohol.
Victim: White Male, 73
Suspect: White Female, 64

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Husband/Wife (cohabitating)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On May 11, 2012 officers responded to shots fired at the residence. The call came from a neighbor at 9:40 AM. Victim was laying in the front yard with multiple gunshot wounds but was still alive. Victim made no statements and died in route to Shands Hospital. Officers found Suspect dead on the master bedroom floor with a single gunshot wound to her chest. The shooting was ruled a homicide-suicide.

Investigation determined that Suspect shot Victim twice while Victim was in the bedroom. A struggle ensued and Victim was able to get the gun away from Suspect. Suspect took another gun and continued to fire at Victim. The blood stain evidence suggested there was an exchange of gunfire in the living room resulting in Victim being shot two more times. Victim was shot a total of four times. Crime Scene Unit detectives found two firearms, projectiles and fragments, casings and then blood throughout the home leading straight out the front door.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32256 (Zone 3)

II. CRIMINAL HISTORY

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record
C. **DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES**
   1. Victim: No Record
   2. Suspect: No Record

D. **WEAPONS OFFENSES**
   1. Victim: No Record
   2. Suspect: No Record

III. **CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS**
   B. Suspect: None Found

IV. **SERVICES**
   A. Victim: None Found
   B. Suspect: None Found

V. **OTHER CONCERNS**

Suspect’s son told officers that Suspect had just been fired for missing work due to a recent surgery. The son stated Suspect hadn’t been the same since her surgery and he felt she was being over medicated. He stated Suspect had told him recently she had been having bad thoughts and may not want to live.
Victim:    Black Female, 28
Suspect:   Black Male, 32

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Boyfriend/Girlfriend (cohabitating)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On May 16, 2012 Patrol Officers responded to the residence in reference to a female injured. Upon arrival they discovered Victim, deceased in her kitchen (on the floor), badly beaten. Victim had three children that were present and saw the incident. Those children were in the company of a neighbor. They indicated to the neighbor that Victim’s boyfriend (with whom she lives, as if a family), beat their mother. Suspect was seen by witnesses fleeing the apartment and complex. Suspect turned himself in at the Police Memorial Building a short time later. He was interviewed, at which time he made no further statements. The subsequent Medical Examiner’s Investigation revealed a single gunshot wound entrance in Victim’s mouth, with a projectile lodged in her head. Based on statements given by the children, witnesses and evidence at the crime scene, Suspect was charged with the murder of the victim.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: There were three children present, 7, 5 and 2 years of age.

D. LOCATION: 32277 (Zone 2)

II. CRIMINAL HISTORY

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: a) 12/11/12 – Armed Robbery, adjudicated guilty.
C. **DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES**

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: 
   a) 09/17/12 – Possession of Controlled Substance and Possession of Less than Twenty (20) grams of Cannabis, adjudicated guilty.

D. **WEAPONS OFFENSES**

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: No Record

III. **CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS**

A. Victim: 
   a) 09/16/11 – Petitioner in Final Administrative Support Order (not Suspect)

   b) 02/15/11 – Petitioner in Final Administrative Support Order (not Suspect)

   c) 12/13/06 – Petitioner in Final Judgment of Paternity (not Suspect)

B. Suspect: 
   a) 10/19/11 – Respondent in Final Judgment of Support (not Victim)

IV. **SERVICES**

A. Victim: None Found

B. Suspect: None Found

V. **OTHER CONCERNS**

Victim had been battered in other relationships. Witnesses indicated that Victim was in an unreported violent relationship with Suspect.
Victim: Asian Female, 48
Suspect: White Male, 46

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Boyfriend/Girlfriend (cohabiting)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On July 31, 2012, JSO responded to a call from a local hotel in response to two people found deceased in a hotel room. Victim and Suspect did not check out at the appointed time so the hotel staff went into the room. Hotel staff saw Suspect lying on the floor. On July 30, 2012, Victim and Suspect purchased ammunition and subsequently checked into the hotel. Victim drafted notes to her children, not of this relationship, her husband, and a friend. Suspect shot Victim in the mouth while she was lying fully clothed on top of the bed. Suspect committed suicide by shooting himself in the mouth. After investigation it was determined that Victim was a willing participant in the homicide-suicide.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32216 (Zone 3)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

C. DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record
D.  WEAPONS OFFENSES

1. Victim:  No Record

2. Suspect:  No Record

III.  CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A.  Victim:  
   a) 02/02/11-Dissolution of Marriage filed by Victim (not against Suspect). Victim dismissed action on 04/18/11.

B.  Suspect:  
   a) 11/04/10-Dissolution of Marriage filed by Suspect (not against Victim). Court dismissed the case for lack of prosecution on 12/14/12.

IV.  SERVICES

A.  Victim:  None Found

B.  Suspect:  None Found

V.  OTHER CONCERNS

There was an open investigation regarding Suspect’s possession of child pornography. JSO searched the home of Victim and Suspect four (4) days before the homicide-suicide. According to the note left for Victim’s friend, Victim knew Suspect was going to jail and Victim would rather die than lose everything. Victim’s husband stated Victim threatened to commit suicide on a previous occasion. During the search of the home for child pornography, Victim stated that her marriage involved domestic violence.

Several of Suspect’s family members committed suicide. Suspect’s brother was not surprised that Suspect committed suicide. Suspect’s wife stated Suspect had a history of depression. Suspect’s wife also stated Suspect had a pornography addiction, which lead to the end of their marriage.
Date of Homicide-Suicide: 8/24/12

Victim: Black Female, 50  
Suspect: Black Male, 55

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Husband/Wife (not cohabiting)

B. CASE SUMMARY: Victim and Suspect attended a final hearing for injunction for protection against domestic violence on August 15, 2012 in which an injunction was granted against Suspect. Suspect was ordered out of the marital home and was not living with Victim.

On August 24, 2012, a neighbor saw Suspect standing at Victim’s car. The neighbor stated that she did not speak to Victim or Suspect. The neighbor went into her home and heard several gunshots. A few moments later, the neighbor stated that another neighbor came to her home and they observed Victim in her car and Suspect sitting in a chair on the porch. When police arrived, they found Victim dead with multiple gunshot wounds and Suspect dead with a single gunshot wound to the head. Police found the autistic adult son of Victim in the home unharmed.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32218 (Zone 6)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: a) 02/05/09- Domestic Battery (against Victim) – charges dropped.

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: a) 07/05/09 Aggravated Assault- Deadly Weapon – sentenced to 60 days in jail, Probation for two years, Batterers’ Intervention
C. **DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES**

1. **Victim:** No Record

2. **Suspect:** No Record

D. **WEAPONS OFFENSES**

1. **Victim:** No Record

2. **Suspect:** No Record

III. **CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS**

A. **Victim:**
   
a) 08/15/12 – Petitioner in a current final Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence. Suspect was Respondent.

b) 08/14/12 – Filed Petition for Dissolution of Marriage against Suspect.

c) 05/15/12 – Respondent in Order Denying Petition for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence filed by Suspect.

d) 05/15/12 – Petitioner in Order Denying Petition for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence filed against Suspect.

B. **Suspect:**

a) 08/16/12 – Served with the Petition for Dissolution of Marriage filed by Victim.

b) 08/15/12 – Respondent in a current final Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence. Victim was Petitioner.

c) 08/02/12 – Respondent in Order Denying Petition for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence filed against Victim.

d) 05/15/12 – Respondent in a Petition for Injunction for Protection Against Domestic
Violence filed by Victim; denied.

e) 09/15/09 – Respondent in Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Repeat Violence (not Victim).

f) 09/15/09 – Petitioner in Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Repeat Violence (not Victim).

IV. SERVICES

A. Victim: None Found

B. Suspect: None Found

V. OTHER CONCERNS

In 2010, The Department of Children and Families received a report of unsafe environment for their disabled adult son due to previous domestic violence and suspicion of weapons in the home. The case was closed indicating no current domestic violence at the time of the report.

Victim’s sister, who resides out of state was aware of the domestic violence history and knew there was an injunction for protection against domestic violence issued against Suspect. Suspect’s daughter knew there was domestic violence by her father against Victim and feared that her father would seriously hurt Victim one day.

The neighbor told police that Victim had come over to her home several times asking her to call the police because Suspect had been violent to her. She said on several occasions when the police were called for violence, Suspect would be asked to leave, but she would witness him watching the house or jumping the fence to access the house.

The neighbor stated that she did not speak to Suspect because he was arrested for pulling a knife on her husband in the past. The neighbor stated that she had concerns for the autistic adult child because Suspect had several guns in the home.
I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Girlfriend/Girlfriend (cohabiting)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On August 30, 2012 police were called to respond to a stabbing. Witnesses report Victim and Suspect, who were intimate partners, were in an argument and Suspect broke a beer bottle and stabbed Victim in the neck. Victim fled to the bedroom and Suspect followed her and repeatedly stabbed her in the neck in the bedroom. Victim was unresponsive and transported to the hospital where she was pronounced dead. Suspect was apprehended walking away from the scene and was arrested.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32209 (Zone 5)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: a) 10/31/05 – Aggravated Battery Intended Harm; 3 years, 5 months, 8 days in prison (Pinellas County).
C. **DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES**
   
   1. **Victim:** No Record
   
   2. **Suspect:** No Record

D. **WEAPONS OFFENSES**
   
   1. **Victim:** 05/19/97 – Robbery with weapon (not deadly); 15 years prison (served 12 years).
   
   2. **Suspect:** No Record

III. **CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS**

   A. **Victim:** None Found
   
   B. **Suspect:** None Found

IV. **SERVICES**

   A. **Victim:** a) 2012 – three hotline calls followed by shelter. Abuser was not Suspect.
   
   B. **Suspect:** a) 2012 – three hotline calls followed by shelter. Suspect was the victim in that case and Victim was not the abuser.

V. **OTHER CONCERNS**

   Suspect used multiple aliases so criminal history may not be complete.
I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Husband/Wife (cohabiting)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On September 6, 2012 patrol officers responded to a report of a person being shot at a residence. Upon arrival, officers found a white male witness outside the residence who turned out to be the son of Victim and Suspect. Inside police found a deceased male on the floor who had been shot in the head. Nearby on a love seat they found a female who had also been shot on the head but was alive at that time. She was taken to the hospital but died from her injuries three days later.

Investigation revealed that Suspect had shot Victim during an argument and then shot himself. The son was home at the time in a back room. He reported that he had heard his parents arguing and then two popping sounds which he did not recognize as gun fire. However, when he got up and investigated he found his parents in the positions in which they were later found by police. He fled to a neighbor’s house to ask for assistance. The case was closed as a homicide-suicide.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32226 (Zone 6)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record
C. **DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES**

1. **Victim:** No Record
2. **Suspect:** No Record

D. **WEAPONS OFFENSES**

1. **Victim:** No Record
2. **Suspect:** No Record

III. **CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS**

**A. Victim:**

a) 04/24/12 – Filed Petition for Dissolution of Marriage against Suspect. On 08/1/12, filed Motion to Abate (stop) Dissolution of Marriage.

b) 02/1/96 – Final Judgment of Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence (not Suspect).


d) 10/18/90 – Paternity action filed (not Suspect). Final Judgment of Paternity entered 01/24/91.

e) 06/08/89 – Paternity action filed (not Suspect). Case was dismissed 10/19/89.

**B. Suspect:**

a) 04/25/12 – Served with Petition for Dissolution of Marriage filed by Victim.


IV. **SERVICES**

**A. Victim:** None Found

**B. Suspect:** None Found
V. OTHER CONCERNS:

Investigation indicated that Suspect and Victim had been married for about 20 years. Relatives said the couple had a history of some marital discord, mostly due to Suspect’s drinking and abuse of prescription medications. In 2011 the couple had separated for about a year and Victim moved out of the house when she filed for divorce. However, they had reconciled before the divorce was finalized, and she had recently moved back into the house. Relatives reported that Suspect had joined a church, “got saved”, and stopped drinking. The couple was reportedly working on their relationship “but still had disagreements”. They were supposed to leave on vacation again the morning of the incident, and relatives said that everything seemed fine the day before.

The son reported that his father was bi-polar and could have “severe mood swings”, though the son had never seen him be physically violent toward his mother. However, a sister-in-law told police that Suspect had been both verbally and physically violent toward Victim, though nothing was ever reported to police. A neighbor also reported that she believed there had been physical altercations. Another son reported that Suspect had talked about killing himself several times over the past five months. A daughter reported that she had just returned from a vacation in North Carolina with her parents during which she said Suspect told her he did not think his medication was working in moderating his mood. She reported that the fact that Suspect may have killed her mother “did not surprise her and it was almost expected.” The daughter also said that “She was so scared that he was going to do this.”

The Review Team is disturbed by the presence of several possible warning signs that might have permitted interventions that might have prevented this incident.
Victim:  White Female, 23
Suspect:  White Male, 23

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Husband/Wife (cohabitating)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On September 23, 2012, Suspect was at his sister’s home screaming and knocking things over. He returned to the apartment where Victim and her male friend (the witness) were sitting on the couch together. Suspect saw a text from the male to Victim. Victim and male have been friends since high school and never had an intimate relationship. Suspect began to argue with Victim. Suspect grabbed his shotgun and pointed at the witness. Someone knocked at the door and Suspect shot the door. Witness said Suspect was acting as if he were in a video game. The witness put his hands up, told Suspect he was not a threat to him, and walked into another room. Victim asked Suspect why he was doing this and Suspect told her to shut up and that she was dead. Suspect then shot Victim in the head. Suspect pointed the firearm at the witness, but paused to re-load the gun. The witness fled the scene and reported the incident to police. Officers located Suspect hiding under a shed with no clothes. He told police that drug dealers shot his wife. Suspect made statements to rescue about using drugs for two days. Suspect had smoked a lot of marijuana that had possibly been laced with bath salts.

Suspect told police he thought he killed the witness because his wife was planning on leaving him for the witness. Victim was apparently upset with Suspect for hanging out with drug dealers.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32223 (Zone 3)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim:  No Record
2. Suspect:  No Record
B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: a) 01/11/13 – Charged with possession of child pornography. Charged while in jail for current murder charge. Case is still pending.
   b) 10/03/12 – Battery on a Law Enforcement Officer while in jail for the current charge. Case is still pending.

C. DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

D. WEAPONS OFFENSES

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

III. CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. Victim: None Found
B. Suspect: None Found

IV. SERVICES

A. Victim: None Found
B. Suspect: None Found

V. OTHER CONCERNS

According to Suspect’s mother, Suspect has a history of illegal drug use. There were other guns, ammo, and drugs in the home. Victim was making plans to leave Suspect. Suspect used a gun that he and Victim bought a couple days before the shooting.

Since the arrest for the murder, Suspect has been charged with attacking two corrections officers in the jail. Also during this investigation, Suspect has been charged with 39 counts of possession of child pornography. Suspect is currently incompetent to proceed in the criminal case.
Date of Homicide: 9/30/12

Victim: Black Male, 46
Suspect: Black Female, 39

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Boyfriend/Girlfriend (cohabiting)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On September 30, 2012, Patrol Officers responded to a call to investigate a stabbing. During the investigation and questioning, witnesses stated Suspect and Victim had been involved in an argument at the residence. Victim had been stabbed in the neck by his live-in girlfriend. Victim was transported to Shands Hospital with life-threatening injuries where he died from his injuries several days later. Suspect was arrested and is awaiting trial.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: None

D. LOCATION: 32209 (Zone 5)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim:  
a) 10/01/08 Violation of Probation – for Battery, jailed for 51 days, Probation continued 10 months.

b) 12/10/06 Battery – (Different Female), Adjudicated Guilty, Jailed for 45 days, ordered Batterers’ Intervention Program, placed on probation 10 months.

2. Suspect: No Record

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: No Record
C. **DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES**

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

D. **WEAPONS OFFENSES**

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: No Record

III. **CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS**

A. Victim: None Found
B. Suspect: None Found

IV. **SERVICES**

A. Victim: None Found
B. Suspect: None Found

V. **OTHER CONCERNS**

The evening of the incident, witness statements describe that Victim and Suspect had been drinking throughout the night after returning from a club. During their arguments they were described as being ‘intoxicated’. No testing was performed on Victim or Suspect to test any blood alcohol levels. Victim’s father stated to police during the investigation after pressure from other family members that he wanted to honor his son’s wishes by not telling the police that Suspect had stabbed him.
Victim: Black Female, 23
Suspect: Black Male, 27

I. CRIME

A. RELATIONSHIP: Boyfriend/Girlfriend (cohabitating)

B. CASE SUMMARY: On December 4, 2012 Jacksonville Sherriff’s Officers were dispatched to a shooting at a residence. Upon arrival the officers found Victim lying on the ground in front of the residence with several citizens standing around her. One of the citizens advised that Victim’s child was inside the home and a responding officer entered the residence and recovered the child. Victim was transported to Shands hospital by Jacksonville Fire and Rescue and was pronounced deceased at Shands Hospital. The roommate of Victim, who was an eye witness to the murder, advised that Suspect and Victim were arguing the night before and the police were called. Victim’s roommate advised that Victim arrived back at their shared residence at approximately 4:00 am with her head bandaged. At approximately 6:30 am Victim’s roommate advised she was awakened to Victim and Suspect arguing, Victim coming to her room to get the roommate’s phone to call police and eventually Victim and Suspect falling down the stairs together. Victim’s roommate went downstairs and saw Suspect pull out a handgun and point it at Victim. Victim then armed herself with a knife and cut the Suspect on his hand. Victim and roommate urged Suspect to leave the apartment. When Victim attempted to go back into the apartment, Suspect fired the gun and shot Victim. The Medical Examiner’s investigation revealed Victim had eight gunshot wounds and died from a gunshot wound to the chest. Suspect was located at Shands Hospital with a wound to his hand and, when identified as the shooter was arrested for the murder of the Victim.

C. CHILDREN PRESENT: There was one child present, age 3.

D. LOCATION: 32204 (Zone 4)

II. CRIMINAL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

1. Victim: No Record
2. Suspect: a) 5/19/11 – Criminal Mischief/Domestic Disturbance. Plead guilty 06/14/11. Sentenced to 8 months to be served at The Matrix House Program.

b) 04/09/11 – Domestic Battery against Victim – charges dropped.

B. NON-DOMESTIC VIOLENT CRIMES

1. Victim: No Record

2. Suspect: No Record

C. DRUG OR ALCOHOL RELATED OFFENSES


2. Suspect: a) 04/09/2011 – Possession of less than 20 grams Cannabis- Sentenced to 39 days in Duval County Jail.

b) 2/23/07 – Possession of Controlled Substance–Charges Dropped

c) 08/09/06 – Possession of Cocaine and Controlled Substance Paraphernalia - Sentenced to 30 days in Duval County Jail.

d) 08/03/05 – Possession of Cocaine- Sentenced to 90 days in Duval County Jail.

e) 05/12/05 – Possession of Controlled Substance; Adjudication withheld.

D. WEAPONS OFFENSES

1. Victim: a) 07/01/08 – Carrying Concealed Firearm-Charges Dropped.

2. Suspect: No Record
III. CIVIL RECORDS AND REPORTS

A. Victim:
   a) 02/15/11 – Petition to Establish Paternity, Child Support and for Other Relief through Child Support Enforcement (against Suspect). Suspect not served.

B. Suspect:
   a) 02/15/11 – Petition to Establish Paternity, Child Support and for Other Relief through Child Support Enforcement (against Suspect). He was not served.
   b) 12/30/03 – Petition to Establish Paternity, Child Support and for Other Relief through Child Support Enforcement (not Victim). Final judgment entered 01/07/04.
   c) 2000 – Repeat Violence Injunction for Protection Against Domestic Violence filed on behalf of Suspect, a minor child against someone else (not Victim)

IV. SERVICES

A. Victim:
   a) 2009-2010 Hubbard House Outreach Program

B. Suspect:
   None Found

V. OTHER CONCERNS

In 2010 Victim met with a Hubbard House advocate and received Safety Planning information as well as applied for and received Relocation Assistance from the Attorney General’s Office. Victim was offered and declined InVEST services in 2012. On 12/3/2012 the Jacksonville Sherriff’s Office and Jacksonville Fire and Rescue were called to the residence where Victim had visible injuries, however no report was written.
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GLOSSARY

Adjudicated Delinquent – A person under the age of 18 who the court finds guilty of committing an illegal act, but has not been sentenced as an adult for a felony. The court can commit the youth or place the youth on community supervision.

Baker Act – A means of providing individuals with emergency services and temporary detention for mental health evaluation and treatment when required, either on a voluntary or an involuntary basis.

BIP – Batterers’ intervention program refers to a state certified 26 week curriculum for men who have committed acts of violence against an intimate partner. The weekly group helps those ordered to accept responsibility for the violence and to learn skills that will help them replace existing power and control behaviors inflicted on their victims with appropriate, nonviolent behaviors that promote equality in their relationships. As used in this report, it may also refer to a comparable, but separate, local 26 week program for women who have committed acts of violence against an intimate partner.

DCF – Department of Children and Families is a state organization which works hard to protect the vulnerable, promote strong and economically self-sufficient families, and advance personal and family recovery and resiliency. The Department provides a number of different services including: food stamps, temporary cash assistance, access to substance abuse and mental health treatment.

DVFR – Domestic Violence Fatality Review Team is a team comprised of local law enforcement, social service organization and officers of the court who examines and analyzes domestic violence homicides to gain a better understanding of the causes and recommend possible solutions to help decrease the number and effects of domestic violence homicides in Duval County.

Family Nurturing Center – An organization which works to create a warm, compassionate environment where children can safely meet their parents for supervised visitations and exchange and to help adults learn to be better parents with comprehensive support and educational programs offered throughout the area.

FDLE – Florida Department of Law Enforcement is a state department which works to promote public safety and strengthen domestic security by providing services in partnership with local, state, and federal criminal justice agencies to prevent, investigate, and solve crimes while protecting Florida’s citizens and visitors.

HARK – Helping At Risk Kids is a therapeutic intervention and prevention program designed to empower children from abusive homes, consisting of a 12-week course. Heavy emphasis is placed on breaking the cycle of violence by teaching anger management, non-violent conflict resolution, and respect for others. The program is sponsored by Hubbard House.
**Hubbard House** – A local organization which strives to provide safety for victims and their children, empower victims, and enact social change through education and advocacy.

**InVEST** – Intimate Violence Enhanced Services Team – A local initiative geared toward reducing intimate partner homicides through integrating victim services from a variety of criminal justice and social services agencies.

**JALA** – Jacksonville Area Legal Aid, Inc. is a non-profit law firm that specializes in providing civil legal assistance to low income persons.

**JSO** – Jacksonville Sheriff’s Office strives to preserve the peace of Jacksonville Community and to prevent crime and disorder while constantly guarding personal liberties as prescribed by law.

**Marchman Act** – A means of providing an individual in need of substance abuse services with emergency services and temporary detention for substance abuse evaluation and treatment when required, either on a voluntary or involuntary basis.

**SAO** – State Attorney’s Office is responsible for the prosecution of all crimes committed in Duval, Clay and Nassau Counties in Northeast Florida.