



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 71		DATE: 4/21/2021	
COMMITTEE: Crime Prevention			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: AISLINN MCCARTHY-SINCLAIR 		PHONE NUMBER: 707-494-9046 	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI ALLIANCE FOR ANIMAL LEGISLATION 		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 5340 DELMAR BOULEVARD 			
CITY: ST. LOUIS 		STATE: MO 	ZIP: 63128
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/21/2021 12:00 AM 	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 71		DATE: 4/21/2021	
COMMITTEE: Crime Prevention			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: ANDY BRISCOE		PHONE NUMBER: 573-248-9136	
REPRESENTING: AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 5111 DEER VALLEY DRIVE			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65109
EMAIL:	ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 4/21/2021 12:00 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 71		DATE: 4/21/2021	
COMMITTEE: Crime Prevention			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:			
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVOCAT		PHONE NUMBER:	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			
CITY:		STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL: arniedienoff@yahoo.com		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/21/2021 1:45 AM

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

I am in Support of this Bill on its face. I want to make sure that this Law is not misued or abused



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: SB 71		DATE: 4/21/2021	
COMMITTEE: Crime Prevention			
TESTIFYING: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> IN SUPPORT OF <input type="checkbox"/> IN OPPOSITION TO <input type="checkbox"/> FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME			
REGISTERED LOBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: JENNIFER CARTER DOCHLER		PHONE NUMBER: 573-356-4109	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC AND SEXUAL VIOLENCE (MCADSV)		TITLE: PUBLIC POLICY DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: 217 OSCAR DRIVE, SUITE A			
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL: jennnc@mocadsv.org	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT DATE: 4/20/2021 8:38 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.			

MCADSV Supports SB 71 (Sen. Elaine Gannon, R-De Soto) with an amendment MCADSV Priority Legislation for 2021: SB 71The Missouri Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (MCADSV) unites Missourians with a shared value that rape and abuse must end, and advances this through education, alliance, research and public policy. MCADSV is a statewide membership association comprised of approximately 120 domestic violence and sexual assault agencies. MCADSV supports SB 71 which would allow a judge to issue lifetime civil Orders of Protection against unrelenting abusers and allow those seeking Orders of Protection to have the orders grant them legal possession and protection of their pets from the person who has harmed them. Need for a lifetime protection order optionSurvivors deserve safety, so we must continue to keep pace with the ways offenders find loopholes, such as those that are remedied in SB 71. This option is critical as some abusers are unrelenting; it is unfair and unsafe for a victim to have to repeatedly go back to court to request needed protection. Kansas offers a lifetime option for full Orders of Protection. Missouri should offer the same option. When an abuser is unrelenting, the burden is placed on the victim to continue to petition the court for an Order of Protection. The abuser may avoid service so that another protection order cannot be in effect. Or, it creates a risk for survivors as the abuser will know the victim will be in court for the hearing. The ongoing burden, trauma, and safety risks, can be avoided by allowing a judge the discretion to issue a lifetime order for circumstances that warrant one. Need to address domestic violence and pet abuseAnimals are often victimized; many abusers harm or threaten to harm pets as part of the abuse cycle. • One study found 71% of pet-owning domestic violence survivors reported pet abuse. • Another study found 89% of pet-owning survivors reported animal maltreatment by the abuser during the relationship. • Survivors whose pets experienced abuse reported significantly higher rates of physical and sexual violence than survivors whose pets did not experience abuse.Domestic violence survivors are hesitant to leave an abusive household without their pets. • They may fear further harm to the pet. • The pet may be a primary source of emotional security and comfort. • Survivors frequently cited fears of companion animal injury or death as a barrier to escape.Animal abuse is a frequent tool used by abusers to retaliate against survivor actions. • “On one occasion, because I would not give him the grocery receipt, he went to grab the bird and was plucking feathers, one by one, until I gave him the receipt.” • Tactics include threatening to get rid of a pet (65%), refusing to give a pet food or water (40%), or killing a pet (15%).Thirty-five states allow judges to include companion animals on protection orders issued. Among these thirty-five are five of the eight states that border Missouri (Iowa, Illinois, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Oklahoma). All adult and child, ex parte and full Orders of Protection would include specific provisions in the orders allowing a judge to grant a petitioner possession and control of pets.

SB 71 also would allow the court to order payments to the petitioner for medical costs for a pet abused by the respondent. MCADSV seeks a House Committee Substitute for SB 71. Here's a brief explanation of the proposed amendments, by subsection:

1. 455.010.1(1): The amendment is grammatical to make clear in the statutes the process of obtaining an order of protection, after a hearing, that could last for longer than one year (up to 10 years). a. This amendment restructures the sentence that contains the new language—putting current law at the beginning of the sentence, and the new language at the end of the sentence. This makes the process clearer for the court to issue longer-duration protection orders.

2. 455.010.1(2): The amendments don't change the content of what was perfected and passed in the House—they make the content clearer by revised sentence structure.

a. This amendment clarifies the process for:

- obtaining a renewal of an Order of Protection after a hearing,
- allowing judges to issue longer-lasting renewals, after a hearing, that can range from 180 days to one year, or, if the judge determines serious danger exists, for two years to the lifetime of the respondent
- the documentation required of a judge to renew an order that is in effect for two years to the lifetime of the respondent.

3. 455.010.1(3): These amendments are technical to delete the current law's process for protection order renewal hearings, which are addressed in the new process in Section 455.010.1(2). a. This amendment deletes the duplicative first and third sentences of subsection (3), retaining existing law in subsection (3) that:

- Allows Orders of Protection to be continued in effect if a renewal hearing can't be held before the order expires;
- Allows Orders of Protection to be renewed without requiring a new and subsequent act of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault. and that clarifies that additional abuse isn't required for renewal of orders.

Although MCADSV staff are not there in-person, please do not hesitate to contact us if you have questions. Research citations available upon request.