

# The Redwood...For Women And Children Fleeing Abuse



## Further Submissions Regarding Bill C-247

In Addition to the Speaking Notes of Raheena Dahya  
for The Redwood Statement to the House of Commons' Standing  
Committee on Justice and Human Rights Regarding the Creation of a  
Criminal Offence of Coercive Controlling Violence Per Bill C-247

## Reading This Document

This document adds to the *Speaking Notes of Raheena Dahya For The Redwood Statement to The House of Commons' Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights Regarding the Creation of a Criminal Offence of Coercive Controlling Violence Per Bill C-247 (Speaking Notes)*, which have already been submitted. This is a consolidation of oral testimony given by Raheena Dahya and Abi Ajibolade on February 18<sup>th</sup>, 2021; the *Speaking Notes*; and The Redwood's further submissions with respect to Bill C-247.

For ease of reference, all additions and amendments are differentiated from the original *Speaking Notes* in that they are colour-coded in blue (visual aid: [amendments colour coded in blue](#)). At times, the amendments necessitated grammatical or formatting changes; to the extent that it is has been practical to do so, deletions have been indicated by a strikethrough. (Visual aid: ~~this phrase has been stricken through.~~)

## Table of Contents

READING THIS DOCUMENT .....	2
OPENING STATEMENTS .....	2
INTRODUCTION.....	3
UNDERSTANDING <del>CCV</del> COERCIVE CONTROLLING VIOLENCE .....	4
BENEFITS OF CRIMINALIZATION .....	6
HARMS OF CRIMINALIZATION AND MITIGATING THESE HARMS; AND INTRODUCING MEASURES THAT REDUCE FEMICIDE AND CCV IN OUR COMMUNITIES.....	7
<i>Appropriate Programing</i> .....	8
<i>Supporting CoHs to Reduce Harm &amp; Fatality Rates</i> .....	9
<i>Harms of Criminalization: Deterring the Vulnerable from Seeking Support</i> .....	9
CRIMINALIZATION IN THE UK.....	11
THOUGHTS ON LEGISLATING FAMILY VIOLENCE IN A HOLISTIC MANNER.....	12
CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<i>Table 1</i> .....	14

## Opening Statements

- Thank you for inviting us to participate today.
- We also wish to acknowledge and express our gratitude to the Indigenous peoples upon whose traditional lands we reside.
- The Redwood provides programs and services, including shelter services, to support women and children to live and thrive without abuse, homelessness and poverty. We work for social change through learning, collaboration, and advocacy.
  - The Pandemic has significantly increased demand for our services. Notably, our recently launched the “idetermine” platform, which provides a safe,

accessible, and private online platform for women and non-binary folks who are looking for support to leave, or cope with, an abusive relationship. idetermine has exceeded our projected users by over 70% since its launch, clearly underscoring the need in the community for more resources and supports.

- The Redwood brings the perspective of the shelter residents and non-residential survivors of abuse, as well as former clients who have been murdered in the context of family violence to this forum.
- We wish to acknowledge and express our gratitude to the shelter residents, the non-residential clients, and the experts who have shared their stories and expertise with us. We are grateful to you for entrusting us with your stories, and thoughts, that have informed the statement that follows.

## Introduction

- We are deliberate with our language which is informed by anti-oppressive, feminist, trauma-informed, and attachment-informed lenses and is compatible with a transformational justice framework. In this statement we will use the following language:
  - Survivor: we refer to those who are living through, or have lived through, instances of intimate partner abuse or violence, or family abuse or violence, as *survivors*. This places an emphasis on their resilience and ability to overcome the harm which has occurred within their family or intimate partner system(s).
  - Victim/murdered/ deceased: For those who have died in the context of the abuse or violence, we refer to them as 'deceased', 'murdered', or 'victims'.
  - Causer-of harm (CoH): as opposed to the language of 'perpetrator' or 'abuser' we refer to these people as people 'causing harm', or causers-of-harm. We recognize that harm manifests itself in a variety of ways, including torture and murder.
  - Family violence (FV): we use the term family violence to include harm of any kind stemming from abuse or violence caused within a familial system, or within an intimate partner dynamic. We also recognize that intimate partners may include dating partners, and that intimacy is contextual, based on the participants in relationship at hand.
- We also acknowledge that intimate partners, and family members are people who have formed attachment bonds with one another. In this regard, issues of family violence differ from other types of criminal activity, where the person who causes harm may or may not have a relationship of some length or closeness with the survivor or deceased. This should be reflected in any legislation on the issue.

- **Our principal concern is rooted in ensuring the safety of our clients, their children, and the community at large.** We operate on a harm-reduction basis, in which we meet concerns by listening to, educating, and respecting the wishes of survivors, as they are the experts in their own lives and their own needs.
  - We follow the principle that survivors can and do make good decisions for themselves.
  - We acknowledge that dismissing the views of survivors as those 'of vulnerable people who cannot make good decisions for themselves' are characterized by the same belittling narratives used by causers-of-harm themselves.

### Understanding ~~CCV~~ Coercive Controlling Violence

- **Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV)** is a serious issue which contributes to the harm against, and homicide of, women and children; it also contributes to causers of harms' own death by suicide.
- We are pleased to see the Federal government taking this issue seriously as evidenced by the recent amendments to the *Divorce Act* and the Bill C-247, being contemplated today.
- Stark coined the term 'coercive control' and published his book on the subject in 2007.<sup>1</sup> In 2008, Kelly & Johnson typified CCV as a form of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV).<sup>2</sup>
- Coercive control is the most lethal form of intimate partner violence.
  - ~~I wish to draw your attention to CCV and it's counter part, violent resistance.~~
  - We suggest that coercive control can be best understood when compared and contrasted with the other types of IPV that Kelly & Johnson typified.
    - The four forms of IPV typified in Kelly & Johnson's paper are: CCV, violent resistance, situational couple violence, and separation-instigated violence.
- **Situational Couple Violence (SCV):** is characterized by a Department of Justice publication as "Where one or both partners engage in negative behaviour towards

---

<sup>1</sup> Evan Stark, *Coercive Control: The Entrapment of Women in Personal Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

<sup>2</sup> Joan B. Kelly & Michael P. Johnson, *Differentiation Among Types of Intimate Partner Violence: Research Update and Implications for Interventions (2008)*, Family Court Review, Vol. 46 No. 3, July 2008 476 – 499.

the other but there is no fear of either by the other”<sup>3</sup> A good way to think about this is as abuse informed by poor conflict-management habits, where control is not the goal; and where the frequency of the abuse, corresponds to the level of harm incurred. It is roughly symmetrically perpetrated by all genders studied. After separation, it is likely that this form of violence will de-escalate.

- **Separation Instigated Violence (SIV):** to quote Kelly & Johnson is: “[v]iolence instigated by the separation where there was no prior history of violence in the intimate partner relationship or in other settings”<sup>4</sup>. It can be thought of as a few uncharacteristic, disorienting, and potentially traumatizing, episodes of violence. It can also be a sort of shock-related violence, like violence that occurs upon the discovery that a partner is having an affair. It is roughly symmetrically perpetrated by both genders studied. This sort of violence commences upon separation and tends to de-escalate after one or few episodes. This should not be construed to minimize the traumatic effects this type of violence may have.
- **Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV):** is the most dangerous and lethal category of IPV. CoHs use a mixture of some, or all, of the tactics on the Duluth Wheel of Power and Control.<sup>5</sup> Most domestic homicides are perpetrated by coercive-controlling CoHs. “In heterosexual relationships, Coercive Controlling Violence is perpetrated primarily by men.”<sup>6</sup> For CC CoHs, *control is the goal*. It is overwhelmingly perpetrated by men, and misogynistic attitudes prevalent among these CoHs. In the event of separation, there is a likelihood of an escalation of violence. There is a lethality risk to survivors, children, pets, and others; and potential suicide risk if control cannot be re-established by the causer-of-harm.
  - ~~Most domestic homicides are perpetrated by coercive-controlling CoHs. It is overwhelmingly perpetrated by men, and misogynistic attitudes are prevalent among these CoHs. In this sense, CCV can be seen as a legacy of patriarchal structures, past and present, in our society and culture.~~
  - ~~For coercive-controlling CoHs, *control is the goal*. In the event of separation, there is a likelihood of an escalation of violence. There is a lethality risk to survivors, children, pets, and others; and a potential suicide risk.~~
- **Violent Resistance (VR):** can only be understood as a response to CCV. To quote Kelly & Johnson: “[...]in attempts to get the violence to stop or to stand up for themselves, [violent resisters] react violently to their partners who have a pattern of Coercive Controlling Violence[...].”<sup>7</sup> VR is usually a short-lived as it is quelled by

---

<sup>3</sup> Department of Justice, *What You Don't Know Can Hurt You: The Importance of Family Violence Screening Tools For Family Law Practitioners*, February 2018 [online: <https://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/jr/can-peut/can-peut.pdf> ], pg. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra* 2, pg. 487.

<sup>5</sup> Kelly & Johnson reference Ellen Pence & Michael Paymar's 1993 book, *Education Groups for Men Who Batter: The Duluth Model*, when discussing coercive controlling violence. The Duluth Model Power and Control Wheel [online: <https://www.theduluthmodel.org/wheels/>] is a result of Pence & Paymar's work.

<sup>6</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra* 2, pg. 482.

<sup>7</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra* 2, pg. 479.

disproportionate instances of violence on the part of a coercive controlling CoH. It can be thought of as an (un)equal and opposite reaction to CCV; or the other side of the CCV coin. This type of violence is overwhelmingly perpetrated by women, particularly those feeling trapped in a CCV relationship. In the event of separation, there is a likelihood that there will be an escalation of violence by a coercive controlling CoH towards a violent resistor. A violent resistor may kill of a coercive controlling CoH, which can be the result of the violent resistor's inability to safely separate.

- ~~• For brevity, I will simply point out violent resistance is a form of violence that responds to coercive controlling abuse. It can therefore be seen where patterns of coercive control exist, but coercive control is the cause — it does not arise on its own — and any criminal measure should acknowledge this.~~
- Table 1, summarizing these types of violence, is located in the Appendix of this document.
- Of the four types of IPV, I wish to draw your attention to CCV and its counter-part, violent resistance as there is a risk that a violent resistor may be mistaken for as a coercive controller and charged under the criminal offence being contemplated.
- A crucial point in understanding coercive control is recognizing that, unlike the other forms of IPV, *control is the goal*. As such, so long as control can be established, no physical violence may be present in a family violence dynamic. However, the loss of control can unleash a homicidal response when the survivor-partner seeks to separate in a desperate attempt to regain control.

Desmond Ellis explains the cases where no physical violence precedes homicidal behaviour in the context of CCV:

“...[A] pattern of effective coercive (fate) control by male partners will actually make the use of violence against female partners unnecessary. At the same time, it will increase their subordination to the point where they suffer psychologically because of their loss of autonomy and self-determination. [...]coercively controlling male partners who interpret the decision to separate as the ultimate challenge to their control over female partners are likely to be concentrated among those persons who seriously injure or kill them.”<sup>8</sup>

### Benefits of criminalization

- Criminalization of any form of family violence has its benefits and its harms.
  - Among the benefits:

---

<sup>8</sup> Desmond Ellis, *Managing Domestic Violence: A Practical Handbook for Family Lawyers*, Toronto: Lexis Nexis 2019, chapter 3, pgs. 23-4.

- we recognize that criminalization of any social ill sends a signal to society that the elected government, as representatives of society, finds the conduct morally reprehensible.
- Particularly, when a legislature acknowledges the existence of long-standing harmful dynamics, such as family violence, it shines a light on issues that many of us have known has existed for years. This light denies these social and familial wrongs the ability to 'flourish in the darkness'<sup>9</sup>
- It also serves as a milestone which takes its place in social history. For example, the criminalization of marital rape can often be seen as a landmark shift in Canadian society.<sup>10</sup>
- We will address the harms of criminalization shortly

### Harms of Criminalization and Mitigating these Harms; and Introducing Measures That Reduce Femicide and CCV in Our Communities

- What we repeatedly hear from many of our clients is that they want to see supports for the people who cause them harm so that they can overcome their harmful tendencies.
  - We acknowledge that one of the goals of criminalization is to curtail the same harmful behaviour.
- Social supports are needed to support CoHs in healing in this way. Further marginalizing CoHs can exacerbate the very factors that lead to coercive, controlling, and homicidal behaviour. For example:
  - Ontario's Domestic Violence Death Review Committee (DVDRC) found a number of indicators that support this:
    - In 39% of homicides, the CoH was unemployed.
    - In 50% of deaths, the CoH was depressed.
    - In 44% of cases, the CoH either made prior threats, or actual attempts, to die by suicide.
    - A criminal conviction can harm a person's employment, education, and insurance prospects, as well as their residency status.

---

<sup>9</sup> This phrase is attributed to an anonymous friend of The Redwood.

<sup>10</sup> See for example: "Marital rape is both a product of and a contributing factor to women's inequality in Canadian society and internationally. Nevertheless, before 1983 it was legally permissible for a man to rape his wife in Canada without criminal sanction. A package of reforms to the Criminal Code was enacted in 1983, and for the first time since confederation marital rape was categorized as a criminal offence. Contemporaneous and subsequent reforms to the sexual assault provisions in the Criminal Code also recognized women's equality and right to be free from sexual violence." – Jennifer Koshan, *The Legal Treatment of Marital Rape and Women's Equality: An Analysis of the Canadian Experience*, equalityeffect September 2010, pg. 3.

- It begs the question: does criminalization help reduce instances of violence in our community, and within family systems?
- The Redwood has seen a variety of criminalization measures over the years but there has been no evidence to support that criminalization has reduced family violence-related fatalities.
- This does not mean there is no benefit to criminalization, simply that criminalization must be approached in a thoughtful way, and in coordination with measures that do reduce family violence-related fatalities.

### Appropriate Programing

- In contrast, it is our experience that educational and social programs aimed at healthy relationships, and safely leaving an unhealthy or violent relationship, does reduce femicide. We are in the process of collecting data to substantiate our anecdotal experience.
- Programs that are aimed at providing appropriate mental health and behavioural supports for CoHs are more likely to reduce the behaviour that leads to coercive control-related killing. I want to make clear we should not stigmatize mental health issues but, instead, meet the challenges they present.
- Similarly, programs that support CoHs in transitioning their values from patriarchal to egalitarian ones are more likely to reduce the cultural transmission of attitudes and values that underpin coercive controlling behaviour.
- If you choose to criminalize coercive control, funding these programs and services can help mitigate the exacerbating effects of criminalization.
  - James Gillian M.D. wrote:

“Violence is a contagious disease, not an hereditary one. The pathogen is psychological, not biological, and it is primarily spread by means of social, economic, and cultural vectors, not biological ones” <sup>11</sup>
  - Desmond Ellis makes clear that patriarchal values, and the culture that transmits them, are key factors in the spread of coercive controlling attitudes.<sup>12</sup> In this sense, the rampant existence of CCV in our society can be

---

<sup>11</sup> James Gillian, M.D, *Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic*, New York: Vintage Books 1996, chapter 5, pg. 105.

<sup>12</sup> “...[A]ttitudes and values inculcated in males during their gender role socialization legitimate a high sense of entitlement and ownership of women. Grounded in these attributes, adult males bring unfair and unreasonable expectations to their relationships with intimate female partners who are unable to meet them fully or quickly because they are so “unreasonable”. When unmet expectations are interpreted as resistance, male partners use violence and abuse to regain control over the female partners they believe they own.



seen as a legacy of patriarchal values and attitudes that remain pervasive in our language and culture.

These issues can be dealt with through strong, evidence-based programming.

- Brene Brown tells us that shame is a social wound, and that we don't fix these issues<sup>13</sup> by "cutting people down to size and reminding them of their inadequacies and smallness. Shame is more likely to be the cause of these behaviours, not the cure"<sup>14</sup> Gillian tells us that shame is a pre-requisite for all forms of violence.<sup>15</sup> In order to hold causers of harm accountable without further stigmatizing, shaming, and vilifying them, (which may only exacerbate the dangerous behaviour), we ~~We~~ must understand the root causes of the behaviour and support programming that treats the problem, not the just the violent symptoms.

### Supporting CoHs to Reduce Harm & Fatality Rates

In Peel Region, police attending a family violence incident complete a Domestic Violence Risk Management Report (DVRMR) that includes a risk factor survey based on the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA). For example, questions 10-13 relate to whether the accused:

- A) has mental health or personality disorders;
- B) homicidal / suicidal thoughts or behaviour;
- C) was a child or adolescent survivor of, or a witness to, family violence;
- D) is unemployed.

It would be useful to implement a policy connecting CoHs with appropriate services & supports to address the needs identified by the DVRMR upon completion of such a report.

### Harms of Criminalization: Deterring the Vulnerable from Seeking Support

Among the harms associated with criminalization:

- We ask you to recognize that criminalization of family violence dynamics can open proverbial 'cans of worms' for survivors. A call to the police for a family violence-related incident can serve as a trigger event from which criminal, family law, child

---

The cultural context for the dynamic underlying male partner violence is a patriarchal society that values power generally and the power of men in particular." – Ellis, *Supra* 8, chapter 3, pg. 24.

<sup>13</sup> Brene Brown Ph.D., LMSW, *Daring Greatly: How the Courage to Be Vulnerable Transforms the Way We Live, Love, Parent, and Lead*. New York: Gotham Books 2012. Here, Brown refers to the issue of narcissism, but we suggest that the concept is of equal value here.

<sup>14</sup> Brown, *Supra* 13, chapter 1, pg. 21.

<sup>15</sup> "The emotion of shame is the primary or ultimate cause of all violence, whether towards others or toward the self. Shame is a necessary but not a sufficient cause of violence [...]. Several preconditions have to be met before shame can lead to the full pathogenesis of violent behavior." - Gillian, *Supra* 11, chapter 5, pgs. 110-11.

protection, and immigration issues can flow. This is particularly true in the context of the policy of mandatory charges in instances of family violence.

- We respect the history of mandatory charges, however family violence is a complex issue, and we wish to raise the following concerns that can deter survivors from seeking support during a violent incident owing the criminal nature of the event:
  - This fear can deter survivors from seeking state assistance, especially those from more vulnerable cohorts such as immigrants; and those from over-policed, over-incarcerated communities, the same communities that tend to see an over-representation of their children apprehended within the child protection system. Survivors should not have to choose between living with violence and the fear that they will lose their children whom they seek to protect; be deported; or lose their main source of income.
  - Survivors may be dependent on the person causing harm in a variety of ways, including but not limited to:
    - As a source of income to the family system
    - As a principal applicant in an immigration context
    - As a co-parenting support
    - As a connection to family support via in-laws / members of the causer-of-harm's family members
    - A source of genuine affection and love, albeit within a deeply unhealthy relationship, as a result of the toxicity of a CC dynamic.
  - Against this backdrop of dependency:
    - the nature of criminal law, where the State sues the accused, and the survivor's role is that of a witness, can also create fears surrounding the Crown's ability to arrest and compel survivors to attend court as witnesses, against their will. The impact this can have on survivors includes re-traumatization, further loss of agency, and the passing of control from causer-of-harm to the State.
    - Policing & carceral concerns can also exist, such as:
      - Loss of family income owing to the CoH's incarceration;
      - Relationship with over / under policing within the community; and
      - Experiences of systemic racism within policing conduct.
    - Preservation of autonomy and restoration of control over one's life in the aftermath of a coercive controlling dynamic is an important part of a survivor's and their children's healing. This must be supported.

## Criminalization in the UK

- In 2015 the UK criminalized coercive or controlling behaviour in an intimate or family relationship.<sup>16</sup> The offence includes a 'best interests' defence. We would ask this Committee to consider any defences that could be included in the presently proposed offence.
- Our understanding of the UK experience is that:
  - Charges have predominantly been brought against one main demographic: Muslim men.
  - There is no evidence that the rates of domestic violence have reduced in the UK since 2015.
  - The public education campaign that accompanied the criminalization has raised awareness around the issue of coercive control, and enabled people to understand and articulate problematic and dangerous dynamics within their family and intimate relationships.
  - The general and professional understanding of coercive control has enabled the legal system to understand the impact of coercive control on violent resisters.
  - Generally speaking, some mothers express fear of disclosing family violence owing to the perception and community experiences of children being removed from parental care in the context of family violence.<sup>17</sup>
  - Our understanding of the benefits in the UK are all directly related to public and professional education campaigns, rather than the criminalization itself.
- One way in which we think we could borrow from the UK's approach to dangerous and harmful crimes is to look at their dangerous driving model. They have adopted a diversion program<sup>18</sup> in which drivers may be offered to take a driver offender retraining course. This option treats the situation with the seriousness it deserves while also providing room for rehabilitation of the offensive behaviour.
  - Ensuring that CoHs with first time coercive control charges can be diverted into a well-resourced programs, including appropriate services to deal with mental health issues, unemployment, and other issues we know correlate

---

<sup>16</sup> S.76, *Serious Crime Act 2015* [online: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2015/9/section/76/enacted>]

<sup>17</sup> See, for example, Rebekah Wilson, *Domestic Violence and Care Proceedings: Re-victimising the Victim?*, *Family Law Week*, December 11, 2015 [online: <https://www.familylawweek.co.uk/site.aspx?i=ed152435>]

<sup>18</sup> See Association of Chief Police Officers, *National Driver Offender re-training Scheme (NDORS): ACPO Guidelines on Eligibility Criteria for NDORS Courses*, 2013 [online: <https://www.npcc.police.uk/Publication/NPCC%20FOI/Operations/069%2015%20NPCC%20Response%20att%2001%20of%2002.pdf>]

with the killing of women in the context of family violence, would be a useful course of action.

### Thoughts on Legislating Family Violence in A Holistic Manner

- The benefits of criminalization could outweigh the harms if:
  - It takes into consideration the complexities of:
    - the criminal law system
    - the family law system
    - the immigration system, and the unique vulnerabilities of immigrants
    - family relations and family systems principles, such as attachment theory
  - It is based on a sound understanding of different types of intimate partner violence and incorporates measures to protect and provide supports to violent resisters.
  - It takes into consideration the intersectional challenges of BIPOC and other marginalized communities; and communities that face various forms of discrimination, for example, the LGBTQ2IA+ community
  - It is considered carefully when being treated as an adverse factor in child protection issues, and supports the prevention of unnecessary family breakdown
  - It is done in conjunction with:
    - A strong, multi-faceted public and professional education campaign which includes, but is not limited to, educating:
      - The public  
And on a regular basis and with annual refresher courses:
      - The police
      - The Bar
      - The Judiciary
      - Mental health practitioners
      - The penitentiary system
      - First responders
    - A strictly enforced policy that the law should be applied equally throughout society, and not disproportionately affect specific demographics.

- A policy that supports survivors connected to the child protection system in looking after and protecting their children while in parental care, rather than resorting to apprehending children.
- Increased funding to social services that can respond to the needs of survivors; and stabilize causers-of-harm in an effort to prevent harm that flows from mental, financial, and other forms of instability.

### Concluding Remarks and Recommendations

- Finally, we remind you that criminalization may exacerbate harm – if you choose to criminalize, please do so bearing in mind that criminalization can open a proverbial ‘can of worms’ for the entire family, triggering both legal and practical consequences. To manage this, a thoughtful, multi-pronged and multi-faceted, and flexible solution must be implemented. This will require a cohesive legal, policy, educational, and economic response.
- We suggest you consider the creation of a legislative task force, comprising of both federal and provincial participants, that can legislate issues of family violence in a holistic way, taking into account the various intersecting legal schemes, as well as our knowledge of family violence, rather than legislating in a piecemeal approach. We suggest this would serve the community best. Perhaps such a task force could fall under the umbrella of the National Gender Based Violence Strategy.
- Ultimately, each situation of family and intimate partner violence needs to be responded to in a contextual manner, and with flexible responses. The responses should be survivor-centric; and aim to curtail the harm caused to families and survivors by dangerous social and cultural values which translate to abuse within the family system. Sometimes, this will look like providing services that improve the health and well-being of the causer of harm. It will almost always include providing a variety of services to survivors and their children.
- If you choose to criminalize, please do so in a way that ensures that:
  - It is accompanied by community-based, survivor-centric, programs and services that are well-resourced and advertised, for example PARS programs; safety planning services; and programs aimed at supporting healthy masculinity, and healing, including counselling services, for CoHs and survivors.
- Thank you.

## APPENDIX

**Table 1**

(Adapted from *Coercive Controlling Violence: A Primer For Family Lawyers*<sup>19</sup>, with permission from R. Dahya)

Kelly & Johnson IPV Typology	Characteristics	Mnemonic(s)	Gender (a)symmetry	Likelihood of (de-) escalation post-separation
<b>Situational Couple Violence (SCV)</b>	“Where one or both partners engage in negative behaviour towards the other but there is no fear of either by the other” <sup>20</sup>	Poor conflict-management habits, control is not the goal; the higher the frequency, the higher the detriment.	Roughly symmetrically perpetrated by all genders studied.	de-escalation.  *but note Ellis’s disagreement with this point. <sup>21</sup>
<b>Separation Instigated Violence (SIV)</b>	“Violence instigated by the separation where there was no prior history of violence in the intimate partner relationship or in other settings” <sup>22</sup>	A few uncharacteristic, disorienting, episodes of violence; shock-induced violence.	Roughly symmetrically perpetrated by all genders studied.	Commences upon separation, de-escalates after a few episodes.
<b>Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV)</b>	This is the most dangerous and lethal category.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abusers use a mixture or all of the tactics on the Duluth Wheel of Power and Control.</li> <li>• Most domestic homicides are perpetrated by coercive-controlling CoHs.</li> <li>• “In heterosexual relationships,</li> </ul>	Control is the goal.	Overwhelmingly perpetrated by men, misogynistic attitudes prevalent among CoHs.	Escalation – lethality risk to survivor, children, pets, and others; potential suicide risk if control cannot be re-established by the causer-of-harm.

<sup>19</sup> Raheena Dahya, *Coercive Controlling Violence: A Primer for Family Lawyers*, Law Society of Ontario, November 5, 2019, pg. 5.

<sup>20</sup> Department of Justice, *Supra 3*, pg.9.

<sup>21</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra 2*, wrote: “[s]ituational Couple Violence is less likely to escalate over time than Coercive Controlling Violence, sometimes stops altogether, and is more likely to stop after separation[.]”- pg. 486. However, 11 years later, Ellis, *Supra 8*, when discussing conflict-instigated violence (CIV), a term analogous to Kelly & Johnson’s Situational Couple Violence, wrote: “The assertion that, compared to CCV and VR, CIV is “more likely to stop after separation” is simply wrong.” – Chapter 2, pg. 13

<sup>22</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra 2*, pg. 487.

<b>Kelly &amp; Johnson IPV Typology</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Mnemonic(s)</b>	<b>Gender (a)symmetry</b>	<b>Likelihood of (de-) escalation post- separation</b>
	Coercive Controlling Violence is perpetrated primarily by men." <sup>23</sup>			
<b>Violent Resistance (VR)</b>	"[...]in attempts to get the violence to stop or to stand up for themselves, [violent resisters] react violently to their partners who have a pattern of Coercive Controlling Violence[...]" <sup>24</sup>	Short-lived (un)equal and opposite reaction to CCV; the other side of the CCV coin.	Overwhelm- ingly perpetrated by women, particularly those feeling trapped in a CCV relationship.	Escalation from CCV CoH; killing of s COH can be the result of inability to safely separate by the VR.

<sup>23</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra 2*, pg. 482.

<sup>24</sup> Kelly & Johnson, *Supra 2*, pg. 479.