

For Discussion  
on 8 January 2007

## **LEGCO PANEL ON WELFARE SERVICES**

### **Review of the Domestic Violence Ordinance**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

This paper briefs Members on the Administration's proposals to amend the Domestic Violence Ordinance (DVO) (Cap. 189) to render better protection for victims of domestic violence. Also set out are the administrative arrangements being pursued independent of the amendment exercise to provide better support to domestic violence victims.

#### **BACKGROUND**

2. Domestic violence is a subject of public concern. The number of first reported domestic violence cases to the Social Welfare Department (SWD) over the past years is on the increase:

- (a) the number of first reported battered spouse cases has increased from 3,034 in 2002 to 3,598 in 2005; with 2,068 cases recorded in the first half of 2006;
- (b) in respect of child abuse cases, there were 520 first reported cases in 2002, increased to 763 in 2005; with 387 cases recorded in the first half of 2006; and
- (c) with regard to elder abuse cases, there were 329 and 528 cases reported in 2004 and 2005 respectively; with 190 cases recorded in the first half of 2006.

Details are at Annex.

3. Over the past few years, the Government has put in place a series of preventive, supportive and specialised services to enhance support for victims of domestic violence and families in need. A total of HK\$1.33 billion has been allocated for this purpose this year. Also, we have strengthened inter-disciplinary collaboration to tackle domestic violence. In the coming year, we plan to devote additional resources to further strengthen the services and support for victims of domestic violence, including an enhanced 24-hour hotline in the SWD, a crisis support centre dedicated to victims of domestic violence and sexual violence, as well as enhanced support services for family members of victims, including clinical psychological support. We will also strengthen the functions of the refuge centres for women, continue to promote the building of community support networks, and reach out to vulnerable families to help address their problems at an early stage. All these are reflections of Government's commitment to combating domestic violence. We have reasons to believe that the upsurge in the number of first reported domestic violence cases is partly attributable to the resulting rise in awareness of the problem of domestic violence, and support and remedies available to domestic violence victims.

4. In parallel, Government has reviewed the relevant legislative framework, particularly the DVO, in order to enhance the prevention of domestic violence and to strengthen the protection to victims.

### **The Current Legislative Framework**

5. The legal framework dealing with domestic violence is made up of provisions in various pieces of legislation, imposing criminal sanctions on acts of violence, or providing civil remedies to victims of domestic violence.

#### *Criminal Legislative Framework*

6. The criminal legislative framework seeks to sanction all acts of violence, irrespective of the relationships between the abusers and the victims, and independent of where the violence act occurs. The framework comprises:

- ✧ The **Offences Against The Person Ordinance** (Cap. 212), imposing criminal sanctions on murder, manslaughter, attempts to murder, wounding or inflicting grievous bodily harm, exposing

child whereby life is endangered, ill-treatment or neglect by those in charge of child or young person, causing bodily injury by gunpowder etc, assaults occasioning actual bodily harm and common assaults.

- ✧ The **Crimes Ordinance** (Cap. 200), imposing criminal sanctions on acts of intimidation, arson, destroying or damaging property, and sexual offences including rape, incest, indecent assaults etc.

### *Civil Legislative Framework*

7. The civil legislative framework seeks to provide civil remedies to victims of domestic violence. The framework comprises:

- ✧ the **Protection of Children and Juveniles Ordinance** (Cap. 213), empowering the court to grant a supervision order or appoint legal guardian in respect of a child or juvenile who is in need of care or protection, i.e. a child or juvenile who has been or is being assaulted, ill treated, neglected, sexually abused, or whose health, development or welfare has been or is being neglected or avoidably impaired.
- ✧ the **Mental Health Ordinance** (Cap. 136), empowering the Guardianship Board established under the Ordinance to grant an order that a mentally incapacitated person be received into the guardianship of a suitable person or the Director of Social Welfare. The Ordinance also empowers the Guardianship Board to make an emergency guardianship order if it has reason to believe that the mentally incapacitated person is in danger, or is being or likely to be maltreated or exploited and it is necessary to make immediate provision to protect that person.
- ✧ the **DVO** (Cap. 189), empowering the court to grant an injunction order, on application by a party to a marriage, or a man and a woman in co-habitation relationship, containing any or all of the following provisions to –
  - (a) restrain the other party from molesting the applicant and a child living with the applicant;
  - (b) exclude the other party from the matrimonial home or from a

specified area; and

- (c) require the other party to permit the applicant to enter and remain in the matrimonial home or a specified part thereof.

The DVO also empowers the court to attach a power of arrest to an injunction restraining the other party from using violence against the applicant or a child living with the applicant, or to an injunction excluding the other party from the matrimonial home or a specified area, if the court is satisfied that the other party has caused actual bodily harm to the applicant or the child concerned.

8. Aside of the above, the court has various jurisdictions under which to award injunctive relief from domestic violence. The first is under the divorce jurisdiction for the protection of married applicants as part of pending matrimonial proceedings. Secondly, the court also has an inherent jurisdiction for the protection of the legal or equitable rights of any applicants possessed of such rights which is now found in statutory form in relevant sections of the High Court Ordinance (Cap. 4) and the District Court Ordinance (Cap. 336). These sections confer jurisdiction on the High Court / District Court to grant an injunction where it appears to the court to be just and convenient to do so. A victim of domestic violence may seek protection under the law of tort (of assault, battery, nuisance or trespass).

## **REVIEW OF THE DVO**

9. The DVO has since its enactment in 1986 confined its scope of application to spouses, man/woman in co-habitation relationships, and their children under the age of 18. The legislation was introduced at a time when the increase in spousal abuse cases had given rise to great public concern, especially among the women's groups as most were battered wives cases. The aim of the DVO is to provide quick and simple relief to persons who cannot or do not wish to take divorce proceedings. The remedies available under the DVO are tailored around the circumstances surrounding such spousal, or quasi-spousal relationships, e.g. excluding an offending spouse from the matrimonial home thereby allowing the couple a period to "cool off" from continued tension and decide on way forward with their relationship; requiring an offending spouse having the estate or

interest in the matrimonial home to permit the other party to return and remain therein.

10. In reviewing the DVO, the Administration has drawn up the following criteria :

- (a) the statistics collected and the anecdotal experience of the Police and the SWD in handling domestic violence cases;
- (b) the existence of criminal and civil remedies under the current legislative framework to deal with the problem;
- (c) whether further legislation is strictly necessary and whether it is an appropriate means to address the problem;
- (d) the implications on other legislation, the legal system and other policies; and
- (e) the impact on family relations in Hong Kong.

11. Adopting these criteria, we have identified the following areas that call for improvements:

- (a) only persons in current spousal or co-habitation relationships can apply for an injunction order under the DVO for himself/herself or any child living together with him/her, despite the report of cases of violence that involve former spouses and former co-habitants;
- (b) only a child living with the applicant is entitled to the protection under the DVO;
- (c) a child cannot on his/her own apply for an injunction order under the DVO but has to rely only on action to be taken by the applicant;
- (d) the court has no power to alter an existing custody or access order in respect of a child when granting an injunction order excluding the respondent from the matrimonial home;
- (e) the court can attach a power of arrest to an injunction order only if it is satisfied that the other party has caused actual bodily harm to

the applicant or the child concerned;

- (f) restrictions are imposed on the court's power to issue exclusion order, in that the validity of the order is no longer than 3 months for the first instance, and that the order may be extended only once, for a maximum of another 3 months only; and
- (g) similar restrictions imposed as regards the power of arrest attached.

### **Proposals for Amending the DVO**

12. Against the above, we propose to amend the DVO to –

- (a) enable also former spouses, and a man and a woman in former co-habitation relationship, to apply for an injunction order under the DVO;
- (b) remove the requirement that the child has to be living together with the applicant for him/her to be entitled the protection under the DVO;
- (c) extend protection under the DVO to a child of the applicant or the respondent, whether biological, adopted or step child;
- (d) enable a “next friend” of a child under the age of 18 to apply for an injunction order on behalf of the child;
- (e) enable the court to vary any existing custody/access order in respect of the child concerned when the court makes an exclusion order under the DVO;
- (f) empower the court to also attach a power of arrest if it reasonably believes that it is likely that the respondent will cause bodily harm to the applicant and the child concerned;
- (g) remove the 3-month cap on the validity of the injunction order and permit extension of the injunction order for more than one time provided that the total period does not exceed a maximum of 24 months (to dovetail with the corresponding matrimonial or custody proceedings, which normally take about 18 to 24 months); and

- (h) remove the 3-month cap on the validity of the power of arrest and permit extension of the power of arrest for more than one time provided that the total period does not exceed a maximum of 24 months.

## **OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

13. In tandem, we are pursuing a number of proposals administratively and independent of the legislative amendments. They are (a) counselling programme for batterers; (b) consultation with the Judiciary Administrator on possible enhancements to the court proceedings to provide better support to domestic violence victims; (c) strengthened psychological support to children witnessing domestic violence and (d) strengthened publicity on remedies available under the current legislative framework to victims of domestic violence.

### **Batterer Intervention Programme (BIP)**

14. Batterer intervention is an important part of our strategy to prevent and combat domestic violence. To further promote the development of effective BIPs in Hong Kong, the SWD has since January 2006 introduced a pilot project on BIP, providing treatment to batterers joining the programmes on a voluntary basis, and batterers put on probation by the court.

15. So far, 11 counselling groups have been conducted with the participation of a total of 88 batterers, including five on probation order. We expect that by March 2008, upon the completion of the two-year pilot, a minimum of 27 counselling groups will be organized. The SWD will conduct a review of the BIP then with a view to identifying effective treatment modalities for batterers of varying backgrounds. The experience drawn from these projects will provide useful reference for defining the goals, contents and standards of BIPs. An advisory group, comprising local and overseas experts, local academics, psychiatrists, clinical psychologists and social workers as members has also been set up to advise the SWD on the implementation and evaluation of the project.

16. To promote the service and encourage referrals, SWD and the Hong Kong Family Welfare Society have conducted briefings for potential service referral agencies including SWD service units and NGOs at both

central and district levels. In early December 2006, SWD has arranged a briefing session with the Judiciary to introduce the pilot, so that the court may refer batterers under probation orders to attend BIP if it considers appropriate. A total of 32 judges and judicial officers attended the briefing and had a useful exchange with SWD. SWD will continue to promote participation in the BIP through different channels.

### **Establishment of a Specialised Domestic Violence Court**

17. There is a suggestion that the Administration should consider setting up a specialised domestic violence court to handle both civil and criminal cases relating to domestic violence.

18. We note that a number of overseas jurisdictions have developed different models of specialised domestic violence courts and are expanding the scale of their pilots. The UK, for instance, is implementing pilot specialised domestic violence courts in 25 areas. It currently operates two types of specialised court, involving not so much the existence of a physical courthouse or jurisdiction to deal with criminal and civil cases of domestic violence. Rather, it is concerned with the specialised way of dealing with domestic violence cases, including the clustering and fast-tracking of cases in the court, in which pre-trial hearings of domestic violence related criminal cases are grouped into one court session, as well as enhancements to court listing arrangements. We have raised to the Judiciary Administration the feasibility of introducing similar measures in the Hong Kong court system in the light of the experience gained by the UK and other jurisdictions. We will report further to the Panel when we have concrete progress on way forward.

19. In addition to the above, we also note that the UK has put in place other administrative measures to provide better support to domestic violence victims, including (a) enhanced partnership among criminal justice agencies, (b) early identification of eligible cases for fast-track handling, (c) strengthened training of personnel in the criminal justice system (including police officers and prosecutors), (d) better witness support and (e) improvement to court security.

20. In the Hong Kong context, we consider that many of such administrative arrangements are well worth exploring and we would further explore with relevant parties on way forward.

## **Strengthened Psychological Support to Children Witnessing Domestic Violence**

21. There is a suggestion that exposing a child to witness domestic violence should be regarded as a form of domestic violence and subject to criminal sanction. This proposal has read-across implications on cases involving other crimes occurring in front of the children. It also begs the question as to why one should single out witnessing domestic violence as a crime, but not other violence acts. We have reservation on legislating on that basis.

22. That said, we fully appreciate the negative impact on children witnessing domestic violence and a wide range of counseling and crisis intervention services are provided to the children in need by the Family and Child Protective Services Units (FCPSUs) and the Clinical Psychological Units of the SWD, including counselling services, statutory protection, residential child care services as well as psychological assessment and treatment. Apart from providing casework and clinical psychological services, the FCPSUs also work with clinical psychologists in preparing handbooks for the group activities of victims, abused children and batterers. We will also be allocating additional resources to strengthen the psychological support to victims of domestic violence, with particular focus on children witnessing violence.

## **Strengthened Publicity on Remedies available under the Current Legislative Framework to Victims of Domestic Violence**

23. The SWD is currently preparing an information kit to help victims of domestic violence understand their rights, the protection and remedies afforded by law, as well as the support services the Government providing. The information kit will be ready by March 2007 and will be distributed through SWD offices, NGOs, the Police, 18 District Offices, and if agreeable, also offices of Legislative Council and District Council Members etc.

## **PROPOSALS NOT PURSUED IN THE CURRENT LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENT EXERCISE**

24. Following the criteria as set out in paragraph 10 above, we do not propose to pursue the following proposals in the context of the

forthcoming amendment exercise:

**DVO to cover other Familial Relationships**

25. We have carefully considered whether the scope of the DVO should be extended beyond spousal/co-habitation relationships. In this respect, we note that:

- (a) statistics reveal that the majority of domestic violence cases are related to spousal and co-habitation relationships and their children under the age of 18. This empirical data and the severity of the problem it portrays serve to justify the provision of civil remedies to this particular category of domestic violence victims on top of criminal sanctions;
- (b) the above argument does not seem to apply to other familial relationships, or relationships between people in the same households. Interactions between family members who are not of a spousal or co-habitation relationship are quite different from those of spouses and co-habitants;
- (c) on cases of violence against a child including cases of violence between siblings, the court is already empowered under the Protection of Children and Juveniles Ordinance (Cap. 213) to, in respect of a child or juvenile in need of care and protection as defined in the Ordinance, appoint the Director of Social Welfare as his/her legal guardian, or commit him or her to the care of any person or institution;
- (d) on cases of elder abuse in the domestic context, statistics collected by the SWD reveal that the majority of the reported elder abuse cases involve spousal relationship, which is already covered by the DVO.

Also, statistics over 2004 to first half of 2006 indicate no sign of increase in the number of cases with the abusers being the adult son/daughters or adult sons/daughters-in-law of the elders. It has been put to us that the trend could be the result of under-reporting by the elders. We have no quarrel with this given our observation on the general reluctance of the elders to resort to legal action regarding their predicament, and their ultimate desire to stay or to

be in good terms with their adult children. Indeed, our angle is that this resistance to reporting may well extend to seeking injunctive relief under the DVO.

26. We have consulted the Working Group on Elder Abuse convened by the SWD (the Working Group), and the Elderly Commission (EC) on the possible case of extending the scope of DVO to cover parent-adult son/daughter and parent-adult son/daughter-in-law relationships. The Working Group generally considered that amending the DVO that way would not be an effective means to address elder abuse, as the remedy afforded by the DVO would focus mainly on separation but victims of elder abuse might still prefer to stay with the family. The Working Group was also of the view that legislation could not resolve family problems and might bring about adverse effect, making it more difficult to mend family relations.

27. The EC did not favour extending the scope of the DVO. Given the complex inter-relationships between the elders and their abusers and the cultural context of Hong Kong's society, members were mindful that many elderly persons were resistant to washing their dirty linen in the public, much less resorting to legal action against their grown-up children. The ultimate desire of many elderly persons is to stay or to be in good terms with their adult children. Enabling the elders to also seek an injunction against their adult offspring may aggravate the situation and cause an irreparable breakdown in family relationships. It may also add tension to in-law family relationships. The EC also noted with concern the prospect of the adult children making use of the provision against their elderly relatives. In not supporting any legislative amendments in that direction, the EC suggested the Administration to tackle the elder abuse problem by continuing to provide for and enhance the range of services and support for vulnerable elders in need, strengthen public awareness through community education, publicity and public education so as to promote a sense of worthiness among elders, and a social climate of caring for the elderly.

28. Having regard to the above considerations, and the fact that any acts of violence are already liable to criminal sanctions irrespective of the relationship between the abuser and the victim under the relevant ordinances, the Administration does not propose to expand the scope of the DVO to cover other familial relationships, or relationships between people in the same households.

## **DVO to Cover Same sex Relationship**

29. There is a suggestion to enable same sex couples to apply for an injunction under the DVO. In Hong Kong, a marriage contracted under the Marriage Ordinance (Cap. 181) is, in law, the voluntary union for life of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others. Our law does not recognize same sex marriage, civil partnerships, or any same sex relationships. Recognising same sex relationships is an issue concerning ethics and morality of the society. Members of the public in addition to the Government have a steering role to play in deciding the way forward. The proposal will also carry read-across implications on other policy and legislation. We will not propose any change to the DVO to avoid incompatibility with other legislation.

30. As mentioned above, any acts of violence are liable to criminal sanctions irrespective of the relationship between the abuser and the victim under the relevant ordinances. In addition, a victim of domestic violence who falls outside the scope of the DVO may seek protection under the law of tort or inherent jurisdiction of the court. Persons in same sex relationships who suffer from domestic violence can seek legal remedies as necessary.

## **Definition of “Molest” Vs “Violence” in the DVO**

31. At present, the DVO offers victims of domestic violence relief from molestation. The term “molest” is not defined in the DVO. There are calls for Government to define “domestic violence” in the DVO, and put beyond doubt that “violence” includes physical abuse, psychological abuse and sexual abuse.

32. Though we do not have a statutory definition of “molest”, according to the Department of Justice, decided court cases make it clear that the concept is wide, extending to abuse beyond the more typical instances of physical assault to include any form of physical, sexual or psychological molestation or harassment which has a serious detrimental effect upon the health and well-being of the victim. The concept also covers the threat of any form of such molestation or harassment. Information gathered from the Judiciary also reveals that the court has granted injunction on application under the DVO on the grounds of the three different forms of abuse. In other words, the existing law already

applies to psychological abuse, in addition to physical and sexual abuse.

33. Also, we note that the Family Law Act 1996 in the UK, to which the DVO resembles, similarly provides for the grant of a non-molestation order by the court. The term “molest” remains undefined in the UK legislation. As there are abundant court cases already built up both locally and in the UK with regard to the interpretation of the term “molest” and the application of the DVO, and as legal advice and the Judiciary’s case record has confirmed that the existing DVO already applies to physical, psychological and sexual abuse, and the threat thereof, we do not see the case for pursuing a definition on “violence” in the DVO.

### **Criminalization of Domestic Violence**

34. We do not see the case of criminalizing “domestic violence” since, as detailed in paragraphs 5-8 above, legislation already exists to enable domestic violence abusers to be prosecuted for acts of violence.

35. As to suggestion to bring under DVO the relevant criminal provisions against acts of violence, we consider the proposal fraught with legal difficulties. The DVO is civil in nature and incorporating criminal provisions will add complication to the legislation. As a matter of principle, our criminal law in the area is based on the criminal acts themselves, irrespective of the relationship between the culpable party and the victim, or the context in which the acts of violence take place. Including criminal provisions dealing with acts of violence between people with domestic relationship in the DVO is a deviation from the existing practice. It may also give rise to unnecessary duplication and complication to our current legal system.

### **Criminalizing Stalking in Domestic Context**

36. There is a suggestion for the DVO to be amended to criminalize domestic stalking pending the Administration’s review of the proposed anti-stalking legislation.

37. Our considered view is that, as a matter of legal principle, the law should be coherent and self-consistent. If it is decided that stalking behaviors should be penalized as a crime, all stalking behaviours, whether in domestic or non-domestic context, should be subject to the same treatment and liable to the same level of criminal sanction under the law.

In the same vein, victims of stalking, whether in domestic or non-domestic contexts, should be entitled to the same level of legal protection. In addition, the proposal may also give rise to significant enforcement problems. If the law makes it an offence for stalking behaviour whereby the stalker and victim should have some form of domestic relationship, when the Police receive a complaint, the frontline police officers will have to ascertain the relationship between the complainant and the alleged offender before they can take any further action under the proposed provision. This will lead to significant enforcement difficulties.

38. In view of the above, we consider that it is neither appropriate as a matter of principle nor practical from the enforcement perspective to single out domestic stalking and legislate against such activity individually.

## **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

39. We have consulted the Subcommittee on Strategy and Measures to Tackle Family Violence established under the Panel on Welfare Services at their meetings held in May, June and September 2006 on the proposed amendments to the DVO. The latter two meetings were attended by deputations from the social welfare sector, women's groups and other stakeholders. Whilst generally supporting the Administration's legislative proposals as set out in paragraph 12 above, some Members have requested the Administration to consider further extension of the scope of the DVO to cover other familial relationships.

40. We have also consulted the Social Welfare Advisory Committee (SWAC), the Women's Commission (WoC), the EC, representatives of the District Fight Crime Committees, and the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the District Councils on the legislative proposals. Also consulted were the two Working Groups on Elder Abuse and on Combating Violence and the Committee on Child Abuse under SWD respectively. Parties consulted were generally in support of the Administration's legislative proposals.

41. Specifically, SWAC considered that the Administration should approach the overall policy and measures to better prevent and handle domestic violence in a pragmatic way. WoC recommended that the Administration should take a pragmatic approach in taking forward the law

reform, tackling the more straightforward proposals first and considering the more controversial issues at a later stage. The detailed views of the EC and the Working Group on Elder Abuse have been set out in paragraphs 25-26 above.

#### **NEXT STEP**

42. The Administration is preparing the Amendment Bill and aim to introduce the bill into the LegCo in the current legislative session.

**Health, Welfare and Food Bureau**  
**December 2006**

**Statistics on Domestic Violence Cases**

**Statistics on First Reported Battered Spouse Cases**

*(Source: Central Information System on Battered Spouse Cases and Sexual Violence Cases)*

**Abusers' relationship with the victim**

<b>Relationship with victim</b>	<b>No. of abusers (2004)</b>	<b>No. of abusers (2005)</b>	<b>No. of abusers (2006 Jan- Jun)</b>
<b>Husband</b>	<b>2752 (81.6%)</b>	<b>2879 (80%)</b>	<b>1568 (75.8%)</b>
Wife	346 (10.3%)	405 (11.3)	259 (12.5%)
Male cohabitant	127 (3.8%)	128 (3.6%)	97 (4.7%)
Female cohabitant	14 (0.4%)	14 (0.4%)	19 (0.9%)
Separated husband / former husband	62 (1.8%)	81 (2.3%)	46 (2.2%)
Separated wife / former wife	12 (0.4%)	9 (0.3%)	7 (0.3%)
Boyfriend	50 (1.5%)	67 (1.9%)	65 (3.1%)
Girlfriend	8 (0.2%)	15 (0.4%)	7 (0.3%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>3371</b>	<b>3598</b>	<b>2068</b>

### **Statistics on First Reported Child Abuse Cases**

(Source : Child Protection Registry)

#### **(A) First reported child abuse cases (2004-2006 Jan - Jun)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006 (Jan-Jun)</b>
<b>No. of victims</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>763</b>	<b>387</b>

#### **(B) Abusers' relationship with the abused children**

<b>Relationship with victim</b>	<b>No. of abusers (2004)</b>	<b>No. of abusers (2005)</b>	<b>No. of abusers (2006 Jan – Jun)</b>
<b>Parent</b>	<b>382 (65.1%)</b>	<b>454 (63.6%)</b>	<b>241 (65.9%)</b>
Family members	30 (5.1%)	24(3.4%)	13 (3.6%)
Step-parent	23 (3.9%)	36(5.0%)	14 (3.8%)
Relative	25 (4.3%)	33 (4.6%)	12 (3.3%)
Friend / Family friend	29 (4.9%)	35 (4.9%)	30 (8.2%)
Care giver	18 (3.1%)	20 (2.8%)	6 (1.6%)
Teacher / Tutor / Coach	15 (2.6%)	15 (2.1%)	7 (1.9%)
Co-tenant / neighbour	12 (2.0%)	16 (2.2%)	5 (1.4%)
Unrelated persons	53 (9.0%)	81 (11.3%)	38 (10.4%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>366*</b>

\*Note : The number of abusers and the number of child victims may not be the same because there could be more than one person abusing the child or more than one children being abused by an abuser.

### **Statistics on First Reported Elder Abuse Cases**

*(Source: Central Information System on Elder Abuse Cases, in place since 2004)*

#### **Abusers' relationship with the victim**

<b>Relationship with Victim</b>	<b>No. of Abusers (2004)</b>	<b>No. of Abusers (2005)</b>	<b>No. of Abusers (2006 Jan - Jun)</b>
Son	46 (14%)	57 (11%)	16 (8.4%)
Daughter	13 (4%)	8 (2%)	7 (3.7%)
Son-in-law	0 (0%)	3 (1%)	1 (0.5%)
Daughter-in-law	37 (11%)	16 (3%)	8 (4.2%)
<b>Spouse</b>	<b>215 (65%)</b>	<b>226 (43%)</b>	<b>124 (65.3%)</b>
Grandchildren	5 (2%)	7 (1%)	2 (1.1%)
Relative	3 (1%)	11 (2%)	1 (0.5%)
Friend / Neighbour	3 (1%)	129 (24%)	15 (7.9%)
Un-related person living with the victim	1 (0.3%)	21 (4%)	5 (2.6%)
Domestic helper	0 (0%)	37 (7%)	7 (3.7%)
Agency staff providing service to victim	1 (0.3%)	3 (1%)	2 (1.1%)
Others	5 (2%)	10 (2%)	2 (1.1%)
<b>Total</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>528</b>	<b>190</b>