## As Reported by the Senate Local Government, Public Safety and Veterans Affairs Committee

#### 132nd General Assembly

# Regular Session 2017-2018

Am. S. B. No. 7

#### **Senators Bacon, Manning**

Cosponsors: Senators Obhof, Beagle, Gardner, Uecker, Eklund, LaRose, Skindell, Huffman, Hite, Brown, Schiavoni, Hoagland, Wilson

### A BILL

То	amend section 2919.27 of the Revised Code to	1
	provide that service of a protection order or	2
	consent agreement upon a person is not necessary	3
	for the person to be convicted of the offense of	4
	violating a protection order if the person had	5
	actual notice of the order or agreement and the	6
	person recklessly violated its terms.	7

#### BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF OHIO:

<b>Section 1.</b> That section 2919.27 of the Revised Code be	8
amended to read as follows:	9
Sec. 2919.27. (A) No person shall recklessly violate the	10
terms of any of the following:	11
(1) A protection order issued or consent agreement	12
approved pursuant to section 2919.26 or 3113.31 of the Revised	13
Code;	
(2) A protection order issued pursuant to section 2151.34,	15
2903.213, or 2903.214 of the Revised Code;	16

(3) A protection order issued by a court of another state.	17	
(B)(1) Whoever violates this section is guilty of	18	
violating a protection order.	19	
(2) Except as otherwise provided in division (B)(3) or (4)	20	
of this section, violating a protection order is a misdemeanor	21	
of the first degree.	22	
(3) If Violating a protection order is a felony of the	23	
fifth degree if the offender previously has been convicted of,	24	
pleaded guilty to, or been adjudicated a delinquent child for $\frac{a}{a}$	25	
any of the following:	26	
(a) A violation of a protection order issued or consent	27	
agreement approved pursuant to section 2151.34, 2903.213, or		
2903.214 <u>, 2919.26</u> , or 3113.31 of the Revised Code <del>, two ;</del>	29	
(b) Two or more violations of section 2903.21, 2903.211,	30	
2903.22, or 2911.211 of the Revised Code, or any combination of	31	
those offenses, that involved the same person who is the subject		
of the protection order or consent agreement, or one ;	33	
(c) One or more violations of this section, violating a	34	
protection order is a felony of the fifth degree.	35	
(4) If the offender violates a protection order or consent	36	
agreement while committing a felony offense, violating a	37	
protection order is a felony of the third degree.	38	
(5) If the protection order violated by the offender was	39	
an order issued pursuant to section 2151.34 or 2903.214 of the	40	
Revised Code that required electronic monitoring of the offender		
pursuant to that section, the court may require in addition to	42	
any other sentence imposed upon the offender that the offender	43	
be electronically monitored for a period not exceeding five	44	

years by a law enforcement agency designated by the court. If 45 the court requires under this division that the offender be 46 electronically monitored, unless the court determines that the 47 offender is indigent, the court shall order that the offender 48 pay the costs of the installation of the electronic monitoring 49 device and the cost of monitoring the electronic monitoring 50 device. If the court determines that the offender is indigent 51 and subject to the maximum amount allowable and the rules 52 promulgated by the attorney general under section 2903.214 of 53 the Revised Code, the costs of the installation of the 54 electronic monitoring device and the cost of monitoring the 55 electronic monitoring device may be paid out of funds from the 56 reparations fund created pursuant to section 2743.191 of the 57 Revised Code. The total amount paid from the reparations fund 58 created pursuant to section 2743.191 of the Revised Code for 59 electronic monitoring under this section and sections 2151.34 60 and 2903.214 of the Revised Code shall not exceed three hundred 61 thousand dollars per year. 62 (C) It is an affirmative defense to a charge under 63 division (A)(3) of this section that the protection order issued 64 by a court of another state does not comply with the 65 requirements specified in 18 U.S.C. 2265(b) for a protection 66 order that must be accorded full faith and credit by a court of 67 this state or that it is not entitled to full faith and credit 68 under 18 U.S.C. 2265(c). 69 (D) If a person is charged with a violation of this 70 section, service of the protection order or consent agreement on 71 the defendant is not required to prove the violation if the 72 prosecution proves that the defendant had actual notice that 73 there was a protection order or consent agreement and proves 74 that the defendant recklessly violated the terms of the order or 75

<pre>agreement.</pre>	
(E) As used in this section, "protection order issued by a	77
court of another state" means an injunction or another order	78
issued by a criminal court of another state for the purpose of	79
preventing violent or threatening acts or harassment against,	80
contact or communication with, or physical proximity to another	81
person, including a temporary order, and means an injunction or	82
order of that nature issued by a civil court of another state,	83
including a temporary order and a final order issued in an	84
independent action or as a pendente lite order in a proceeding	85
for other relief, if the court issued it in response to a	86
complaint, petition, or motion filed by or on behalf of a person	87
seeking protection. "Protection order issued by a court of	88
another state" does not include an order for support or for	89
custody of a child issued pursuant to the divorce and child	90
custody laws of another state, except to the extent that the	91
order for support or for custody of a child is entitled to full	92
faith and credit under the laws of the United States.	93
Section 2. That existing section 2919.27 of the Revised	94
Code is hereby repealed.	95
Section 3. The amendments made by this act to division (D)	96
of section 2919.27 of the Revised Code are intended to supersede	97
the holding of the Ohio Supreme Court in State v. Smith (2013),	98
136 Ohio St.3d 1, so that unperfected service of a protection	99
order or consent agreement does not preclude a prosecution for a	100
violation of division (A) of that section.	101