

D R A F T

FOR DISCUSSION ONLY

# **RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROTECTION ORDERS ACT**

---

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

---

November 21-22, 2014 Drafting Committee Meeting

*With Prefatory Note and Comments*

*CLEAN DRAFT*

Copyright © 2014

By

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS

---

*The ideas and conclusions set forth in this draft, including the proposed statutory language and any comments or reporter's notes, have not been passed upon by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Conference and its Commissioners and the Drafting Committee and its Members and Reporter. Proposed statutory language may not be used to ascertain the intent or meaning of any promulgated final statutory proposal.*

November 6, 2014

**DRAFTING COMMITTEE ON RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF  
CANADIAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROTECTION ORDERS ACT**

The Committee appointed by and representing the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws in preparing this act consists of the following individuals:

PAUL M. KURTZ, 362 W. Cloverhurst Ave., Athens, GA 30606, *Chair*

DEBORAH E. BEHR, P.O. Box 20887, Juneau, AK 99802

ROBERT H. CORNELL, 573 Arkansas St., San Francisco, CA 94107

SIDNEY S. EAGLES, P.O. Box 27525, Raleigh, NC 27611

KAY P. KINDRED, William S. Boyd School of Law, 4505 S. Maryland Pkwy., Box 451003,  
Las Vegas NV 89154-1003

ELLEN C. LIPTON, P.O. Box 30014, Lansing, MI 48909-7514

FRANCIS J. PAVETTI, 18 The Strand, Goshen Point, Waterford, CT 06385

PAULA TACKETT, 7459 B, Old Santa Fe Trail, Santa Fe, NM 87505

ERIC WEEKS, Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, 210 House Bldg., Utah  
State Capitol Complex, Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5210

SUZANNE REYNOLDS, Wake Forest University School of Law, Campus Box 7206, Winston-  
Salem, NC 27109, *Reporter*

**EX OFFICIO**

HARRIET LANSING, 1 Heather Pl., St. Paul, MN 55102-2615, *President*

GAIL HAGERTY, South Central Judicial District, P.O. Box 1013, 514 E. Thayer Ave.,  
Bismarck, ND 58502-1013, *Division Chair*

**AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADVISOR**

MELISSA A. KUCINSKI, 2001 S St. NW, Suite 550, Washington, DC 20009, *ABA*  
*Advisor*

ALLEN M. BAILEY, 301 K St., Suite 401, Anchorage, AK 99501, *ABA Section Advisor*

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR**

JOHN A. SEBERT, 111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010, Chicago, IL 60602, *Executive Director*

Copies of this act may be obtained from:

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMISSIONERS  
ON UNIFORM STATE LAWS  
111 N. Wabash Ave., Suite 1010  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
312/450-6600  
[www.uniformlaws.org](http://www.uniformlaws.org)

**RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
PROTECTION ORDERS ACT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Prefatory Note.....	1
SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. ....	5
SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.....	5
SECTION 3. NONJUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN PROTECTION ORDER. ..	7
SECTION 4. JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN PROTECTION ORDER. ....	9
[SECTION 5. REGISTRATION OF CANADIAN PROTECTION ORDER.].....	11
SECTION 6. IMMUNITY.....	13
SECTION 7. OTHER REMEDIES. ....	14
SECTION 8. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.....	14
SECTION 9. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT.....	14
SECTION 10. APPLICATION. ....	14
[SECTION 11. SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.].....	15
[SECTION 12. REPEALS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.] .....	15
SECTION 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.....	15

# 1       **RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE** 2       **PROTECTION ORDERS ACT**

## 3 4       **Prefatory Note**

5  
6       The Recognition and Enforcement of Canadian Domestic Violence Protection Orders Act  
7 (“the act”) provides for the enforcement of domestic violence protection orders issued by  
8 Canadian courts. Reflecting the friendship between the United States and Canada, citizens move  
9 freely between the two countries, freedom that in certain limited circumstances can work against  
10 victims of domestic violence. Canada has granted recognition to protection orders of the United  
11 States and other countries in the Uniform Enforcement of Canadian Judgments and Decrees Act  
12 (UECJDA). By this act, enacting states accord similar recognition to protection orders from  
13 Canada.  
14

15       Both the UECJDA and this act are part of state, federal, and international efforts to  
16 recognize domestic violence protection orders across jurisdictions. The United States has been a  
17 part of these efforts since 1994 with the enactment of the Violence Against Women Act, or  
18 VAWA,<sup>1</sup> in which Congress required states to grant full faith and credit to the protection orders  
19 of other states.<sup>2</sup> Many states enacted legislation recognizing the domestic violence orders of  
20 sister states,<sup>3</sup> and in 2000, the Uniform Law Commission (ULC) approved the Uniform Interstate  
21 Enforcement of Domestic-Violence Protection Orders Act (UIEDVPOA), encouraging states to  
22 recognize and enforce the domestic violence orders of other states.<sup>4</sup> In 2011, the Uniform Law  
23 Conference of Canada (ULCC) approved the UECJDA, which provides for the recognition of  
24 foreign protection orders – including those of the United States – unless the foreign state of  
25 origin has been expressly excluded from the provisions of the act.  
26

27       The Hague Conference on Private International Law is also studying the recognition of  
28 domestic violence protection orders across jurisdictions. In March, 2012, the Conference issued  
29 the *Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Civil Protection Orders: A Preliminary Note*.  
30 Through case studies based on actual incidents, the work illustrates the problems and dangers  
31 created in a world without cross-border recognition of domestic violence protection orders. The  
32 note also summarizes national protection order regimes and describes proposed and existing  
33 models of cross-border recognition, including VAWA, the UIEDVPOA, and the UECJDA. The  
34 Conference has released the responses to its *Questionnaire on the Recognition of Foreign Civil*  
35 *Protection Orders* in a *Summary of Member Responses and Possible Ways Forward*.  
36

37       The Hague Conference on Private International Law continues to study the advisability of  
38 drafting a convention on cross-jurisdictional recognition of domestic violence protection orders.  
39 In the meantime, this act takes a step towards recognition and enforcement of protection orders  
40 from other countries by providing for the recognition and enforcement of Canadian domestic

---

<sup>1</sup> Pub. L. No. 103-322, 108 Stat. 1902-55 (codified at various Sections of 8 U.S.C., 18 U.S.C. and 42 U.S.C.).

<sup>2</sup> 18 U.S.C § 2265.

<sup>3</sup> For a discussion of the various features of these statutes, see E. Sack, *Domestic Violence Across State Lines: The Full Faith and Credit Clause, Congressional Power, and the Interstate Enforcement of Protection Orders*, 98 Northwestern U. L. Rev. 827, 841-45 (Spring 2004).

<sup>4</sup> Unif. Interstate Enforcement of Domestic Violence Prot. Orders Act (amended 2002), 9 U.L.A. 28 (Supp. 2003) [hereinafter UIEDVPOA].

1 violence protection orders.

2  
3 This act draws from the UIEDVPOA and the UECJDA in its recognition and  
4 enforcement of Canadian domestic violence protection orders. The two Acts are similar in  
5 several important respects. Both recognize domestic violence protection orders without  
6 requiring that the party seeking enforcement register the foreign order. Likewise, both provide  
7 that a law enforcement agency or court respect a facially valid order until successfully  
8 challenged after the request for emergency action has passed.

9  
10 The UIEDVPOA and UECJDA differ in other respects, with the UECJDA providing  
11 more narrow recognition and enforcement of protection orders from other countries than the  
12 UIEDVPOA provides for orders from sister states. The more limited goal of the UECJDA  
13 explains its more limited approach. The UECJDA seeks merely to separate temporarily an  
14 individual at risk from another individual to avoid “the possibility of violence arising from a  
15 failure to act...”<sup>5</sup> In other words, the UECJDA focuses only on the emergency presented by the  
16 threat of violence from an individual who has been ordered to stay away from the individual who  
17 is now the subject of the threat. The UECJDA seeks to empower law enforcement in that  
18 emergency to take “cautious preventive action” that may be challenged by the parties “if  
19 subsequently viewed as inappropriate or inaccurate by either party.”<sup>6</sup>

20  
21 Because the UECJDA focuses on emergencies in which one party threatens violence to  
22 the other party, it recognizes and enforces only those parts of a foreign order that deal with

23  
24 (a) being in physical proximity to a specified person or following a specified person  
25 from place to place;

26 (b) contacting or communicating with, either directly or indirectly, a specified person;

27 (c) attending at or with a certain distance of a specified place or location; or

28 (d) engaging in molesting, annoying, harassing, or threatening conduct directed at a  
29 specified person.<sup>7</sup>

30  
31 The UIEDVPOA, on the other hand, recognizes all parts of the sister state protection order,  
32 including parts of the order relating to custody and visitation.<sup>8</sup>

33  
34 This act follows the approach of the UECJDA, recognizing and enforcing only the parts  
35 of the Canadian protection order requiring no contact. Other Acts and conventions deal with  
36 issues of custody between countries, specifically, the UCCJEA and its 2013 amendments that  
37 implement the Hague Convention on the Protection of Children. This act, like the UECJDA,  
38 pursues the narrower goal of addressing the emergency of threatened violence.

39  
40 This act follows the UECJDA and its more limited approach also on other issues.  
41 Because of the limits on enforcing the criminal orders of another country, this act enforces only  
42 Canadian *civil* orders. While the UIEDVPOA’s definition of protection orders includes certain

---

<sup>5</sup> Unif. Enforcement of Canadian Decrees and Judgments Act, note [8], p. 3 [hereinafter UECJDA].

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, note [6], p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> UECJDA, § 9.1.

<sup>8</sup> UIEDVPOA, Introduction. The UIEDVPOA does not enforce provisions related to support, however. *Id.*

1 criminal orders, such as anti-stalking orders, other sections of the UIEDVPOA recognize the  
2 problems inherent in enforcing the criminal law of a sister state.<sup>9</sup> The international setting only  
3 multiplies the issues; therefore, the act recognizes and enforces only Canadian civil protection  
4 orders.

5  
6 The act also limits recognition of Canadian protection orders to those orders that issue  
7 from courts. The UIEDVPOA recognizes protection orders issued not just by *courts*, but also by  
8 *tribunals*, including an “agency...or other entity authorized by law to issue or modify a  
9 protection order.”<sup>10</sup> Following the lead of the UECJDA, this act provides for narrower  
10 recognition, limiting the recognition of Canadian protection orders to civil orders issued by  
11 Canadian courts.<sup>11</sup>

12  
13 The act defines protection orders more broadly than the UIEDVPOA only in one way.  
14 The UIEDVPOA limits recognition to orders “issued... under the domestic-violence [or] family-  
15 violence, or anti-stalking laws” of the state that issued the order.<sup>12</sup> In this way, the act excludes  
16 orders that issue under more general statutes. The UECJDA has no such limitation, providing  
17 for the recognition of foreign protection orders “made by a court of a foreign state.”<sup>13</sup> The  
18 Canadian drafters concluded that specifying the type of statute authorizing the order was  
19 unnecessary in light of other limitations. Since this act recognizes and enforces only no-contact  
20 provisions in a civil order, further specificity seemed unnecessary and unwise. In light of the  
21 emergency setting in which enforcement questions arise, this complicated determination of  
22 Canadian statutory authority could defeat the purpose of the act.

23  
24 The act also provides uniform procedures for the cross-border enforcement of Canadian  
25 domestic violence protection orders. The act envisions that the enforcement of Canadian  
26 protection orders will require law enforcement officers of enforcing states to rely on probable  
27 cause judgments that a valid order exists and has been violated. The act, however, provides that  
28 if a protected individual can provide direct proof of the existence of a facially valid order, by, for  
29 example, presenting a paper copy or through an electronic registry, probable cause is  
30 conclusively established. If no such proof is forthcoming, the act requires enforcement if  
31 officers, relying on the totality of the circumstances, determine that there is probable cause to  
32 believe that a valid protection order exists and has been violated. The individual against whom  
33 the order is enforced will have sufficient opportunity to demonstrate that the order is invalid  
34 when the case is brought before the enforcing tribunal. Law enforcement officers, as well as  
35 other government agents, will be encouraged to rely on probable cause judgments by the act’s  
36 inclusion of an immunity provision, protecting agents of the government acting in good faith.

37  
38 The act does not require individuals seeking enforcement of a protection order to register  
39 or file the order with the enforcing state. It does, however, include an optional registration  
40 process. This process permits individuals to register a Canadian protection order by presenting a

---

<sup>9</sup> In another section, 3(a), the UIEDVPOA limits the enforcement of criminal provisions by requiring that a person (not just the state) have authority to seek enforcement of the protection order.

<sup>10</sup> UIEDVPOA, § 2 (8).

<sup>11</sup> UECJDA, § 9.1.

<sup>12</sup> UIEDVPOA, § 2 (5). For some of the criticism of this provision, see Sacks, *supra* note 3, at p. 846.

<sup>13</sup> UECJDA, § 9.1.

1 copy of the order to a responsible state agency or any state officer or agency. The issuing  
2 Canadian court must certify the copy presented for registration. The purpose of these procedures  
3 is to make it as easy as possible for the protected individual to register the protection order and  
4 facilitate its enforcement.

1       **RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**  
2                                   **PROTECTION ORDERS ACT**

3  
4       **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.** This [act] may be cited as the Recognition and  
5 Enforcement of Canadian Domestic Violence Protection Orders Act.

6       **SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS.** In this [act]:

7           (1) “Canadian protection order” means a judgment or part of a judgment, an injunction,  
8 or other order issued in a civil proceeding by a court of Canada under law of the issuing  
9 jurisdiction which prohibits an individual from:

10                   (A) being in physical proximity to a specified individual or following a specified  
11 individual;

12                   (B) contacting or communicating with, directly or indirectly, a specified  
13 individual;

14                   (C) being within a certain distance of a specified place or location; or

15                   (D) molesting, annoying, harassing, or engaging in threatening conduct directed at  
16 a specified individual.

17           (2) “Domestic protection order” means an injunction or other order issued by a tribunal to  
18 prevent an individual from engaging in violent or threatening acts against, harassment of, contact  
19 or communication with, or physical proximity to another individual.

20           (3) “Issuing court” means the Canadian court that issues a Canadian protection order.

21           (4) “Protected individual” means an individual protected by a Canadian protection order.

22           (5) “Record” means information that is inscribed on a tangible medium or that is stored  
23 in an electronic or other medium and is retrievable in perceivable form.

24           (6) “Respondent” means an individual against whom enforcement of a Canadian  
25 protection order is sought.



1 (7) “State” means a state of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the  
2 United States Virgin Islands, or any territory or insular possession subject to the jurisdiction of  
3 the United States. The term includes an Indian tribe or band recognized by federal law or  
4 formally acknowledged by a state.

5 (8) “Tribunal” means a court, agency, or other entity of this state authorized by law to  
6 issue, modify, register, or enforce a domestic protection order.

### 7 **Comment**

8 In many ways, a Canadian protection order resembles a domestic protection order. The  
9 phrase includes an ex parte order that a judge might grant on behalf of the petitioning party and  
10 an order that a judge enters after notice to the defendant and a full hearing.

11  
12 Likewise, while the Canadian protection order recognized and enforced by this act  
13 focuses on keeping the respondent from physically contacting the protected individual, it is not  
14 necessarily so limited. This act enforces the parts of a Canadian protection order that prohibit  
15 the respondent from “molesting, annoying, harassing, or engaging in threatening conduct  
16 directed at a specified individual.” The respondent might engage in threatening conduct against  
17 a third person or the property of the protected individual as a means of “molesting, annoying, or  
18 harassing” the protected individual. Under those circumstances, the Canadian protection order  
19 proscribes more than physical contact with the protected individual.

20  
21 In other respects, the term “Canadian protection order,” at least as used in this act, is  
22 more limited than domestic protection orders. In the United States, protection order statutes give  
23 the judge a wide range of options beyond ordering the defendant not to contact or harass he  
24 plaintiff. The domestic protection order may provide for custody of the minor children, direct  
25 the possession of any animal owned by either party, order possession of a vehicle to the  
26 petitioning party, require the defendant to make rent or mortgage payments, etc. *See, e.g.,* New  
27 Jersey Statutes Annotated § 2C-25-29. In addition, because of federal legislation restricting  
28 possession of firearms by batterers, *see* 18 U.S.C. § 922(d)(8), domestic protection orders  
29 include provisions ordering the batterer not to possess firearms. N.J.S.A. §2C:25-29(b)(16).

30  
31 As explained in the prefatory note, this act provides the first international recognition and  
32 enforcement of another country’s protection orders. The UECJDA recognizes only the no-  
33 contact provisions of United States domestic protection orders, and this act takes a similarly  
34 limited approach to the recognition and enforcement of Canadian protection orders. The party  
35 who seeks the recognition and enforcement of a Canadian protection order may later seek the  
36 more comprehensive provisions in a proceeding for a domestic protection order.

37  
38 Moreover, under the UIEDVPOA, “protection orders” include a narrow category of

orders in criminal proceedings.<sup>14</sup> This act limits Canadian protection orders to orders issued in civil proceedings. By defining “tribunal” to include an entity authorized to enforce a Canadian protection order, however, the act recognizes that a tribunal may include a court that imposes a criminal penalty for violation of a Canadian protection order. Most states provide that the violation of a protection order is a misdemeanor. See, e.g., N.C. Gen. Stat. § 50B-4.1(a) (2013) (“Except as otherwise provided by law, a person who knowingly violates a valid protective order entered pursuant to this Chapter or who knowingly violates a valid protective order entered by the courts of another state or the courts of an Indian tribe shall be guilty of a Class A1 misdemeanor.”) The drafters of this act encourage states to provide similarly for violations of a Canadian protection order.

Also, a Canadian protection order includes an order modifying a previous order. A modified order, therefore, is enforceable under the act in the same manner as a newly issued order.

The terms “protected individual” and “respondent” refer to the relief sought by a party in the action brought in the enforcing state. The act recognizes that neither the protected individual nor the respondent may have been a named party in the action brought in the issuing court; the act applies to individuals meeting the definition of protected individual or respondent whether they were named in the caption or the body of the protection order. The “protected individual” may be a child, for example, for whose sake a parent is seeking to enforce the Canadian order. The act also recognizes that the parties may have been called by different terms, e.g. plaintiff, defendant, or petitioner, in the issuing court.

### **SECTION 3. NONJUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN PROTECTION**

#### **ORDER.**

(a) If a law enforcement officer of this state determines that there is probable cause to believe that a valid Canadian protection order exists and that the order has been violated, the officer shall enforce the Canadian protection order as if it were an order of a tribunal.

(b) Presentation of a record of a Canadian protection order that identifies both the protected individual and the respondent and, on its face, is currently in effect constitutes probable cause to believe that a valid Canadian protection order exists. Presentation of a certified record of a Canadian protection order is not required for enforcement.

(c) If a Canadian protection order is not presented as provided in subsection (b), a law

---

<sup>14</sup> UIEDVPOA, § 2 (5).

1 enforcement officer of this state may consider other information in determining whether there is  
2 probable cause to believe that a valid Canadian protection order exists.

3 (d) If a law enforcement officer of this state determines that an otherwise valid Canadian  
4 protection order cannot be enforced because the respondent has not been notified or served with  
5 the order, the officer shall inform the protected individual of that fact and inform the protected  
6 individual that the respondent will be informed of the order. After notice to the protected  
7 individual, the law enforcement officer shall inform the respondent of the order, make a  
8 reasonable effort to serve a copy of the order on the respondent, and allow the respondent a  
9 reasonable opportunity to comply with the order before the officer enforces the order.

10 (e) Registration or filing in this state of a Canadian protection order is not required for its  
11 enforcement under this [act].

### 12 **Comment**

13  
14 This section implements the core purpose of the act. The enforcement procedures in  
15 subsections (a) and (b) rely on the sound exercise of the judgment of law enforcement officers to  
16 determine whether there exists probable cause to believe that a valid Canadian protection order  
17 exists and has been violated. These procedures anticipate that there will be many instances in  
18 which the protected individual does not have, or cannot, under the circumstances, produce a  
19 paper copy of the Canadian protection order.

20  
21 Subsection (b) establishes a per se rule for determining probable cause of the existence of  
22 an order. If the protected individual presents proof of a facially valid order, the order should be  
23 enforced. The protected individual may provide this proof with a paper copy of a Canadian  
24 protection order (which need not be certified) or through an electronic medium, such as a registry  
25 of Canadian protection orders. In determining whether there is proof of a facially valid order, a  
26 law enforcement officer should search a registry of orders, if possible, using an electronic or  
27 other medium.

28  
29 This section applies with equal force to orders written in a language other than English.  
30 As of this date, the province of Quebec does not issue protection orders. Conversation with  
31 Darcy McGovern, Member, Uniform Law Conference of Canada, March 21, 2014. For this  
32 reason, there may be few Canadian protection orders in a language other than English.

33  
34 Subsection (c) concerns the situation in which the protected individual cannot present  
35 direct proof of the Canadian protection order. In this situation, law enforcement officers are

1 expected to obtain information from all available sources, including interviewing the parties and  
2 contacting other law enforcement agencies, to determine whether a valid protection order is in  
3 effect. If the officer finds, after considering the totality of the circumstances, that there is  
4 probable cause to believe that a valid Canadian protection order exists and has been violated, he  
5 or she should enforce the order. This probable cause determination must meet the constitutional  
6 standards for determining probable cause. If it is later determined that no such order was in  
7 place or the order was otherwise unenforceable, Section 6 protects law enforcement agencies,  
8 officers, or other state officials for actions taken in good faith.

9  
10 Subsection (d) provides that if a law enforcement officer discovers in the course of a  
11 probable cause investigation that the respondent has not been notified of the issuance of or  
12 served with an otherwise valid Canadian protection order, the officer must inform the respondent  
13 of the terms and conditions of the protection order and make a reasonable effort to serve the  
14 order upon the respondent. The respondent must be allowed a reasonable opportunity to comply  
15 with the order before the order is enforced.

16  
17 Subsection (e) makes clear that if a state either adopts its own process for the registration  
18 or filing of Canadian protection orders or adopts the process provided in Section 5, the state may  
19 not require the registration or filing of a Canadian protection order for enforcement.

## 20 21 **SECTION 4. JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT OF CANADIAN PROTECTION**

### 22 **ORDER.**

23 (a) In this section, “mutual Canadian protection order” means a Canadian protection  
24 order that includes provisions protecting both the individual seeking recognition or enforcement  
25 of the order and the respondent.

26 (b) A tribunal may enforce provisions of a mutual Canadian protection order that  
27 protect a respondent only if:

28 (1) the respondent filed a pleading seeking a protection order from the issuing  
29 court; and

30 (2) the issuing court made specific findings that entitled the respondent to the  
31 issuance of a Canadian protection order.

32 (c) A tribunal may issue an order enforcing a valid Canadian protection order on  
33 application of a person authorized by law of this state other than this [act] to seek enforcement of

1 a domestic protection order.

2 (d) In a proceeding to enforce a Canadian protection order, the tribunal shall follow the  
3 procedures of this state for the enforcement of a domestic protection order.

4 (e) A Canadian protection order is valid if it:

5 (1) identifies a protected individual and a respondent;

6 (2) is currently in effect;

7 (3) was issued by a court that had jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter  
8 under law of the issuing court's jurisdiction; and was issued after

9 (A) the respondent was given reasonable notice and had an opportunity to  
10 be heard before the court issued the order; or

11 (B) in the case of an ex parte order, the respondent was given notice and  
12 had or will have an opportunity to be heard within a reasonable time after the order was issued,  
13 in a manner consistent with the right of the respondent to due process.

14 (f) A Canadian protection order valid on its face is prima facie evidence of its validity.

15 (g) Absence of any of the criteria under subsection (e) for validity of a Canadian  
16 protection order is an affirmative defense in an action seeking enforcement of the order.

#### 17 **Comment**

18  
19 Subsections (a) and (b), adapted from the Violence Against Women Act, 18 U.S.C. Sec.  
20 2265(c), address the enforcement of Canadian mutual protection orders that contain provisions  
21 protecting both the protected individual and the respondent. Provisions of a Canadian mutual  
22 protection order issued in favor of the respondent will not be enforced without proof that the  
23 respondent filed a written pleading seeking a protection order. If a respondent can prove that the  
24 respondent made a specific request for relief and that the issuing court made specific findings  
25 that the respondent was entitled to the requested relief, the protection orders may be enforced  
26 against the protected individual.

27  
28 Subsection (c) addresses judicial enforcement of provisions in Canadian protection orders  
29 dealing with no contact. In limited circumstances, the tribunals of enforcing states must enforce  
30 the specific terms of a Canadian protection order even if their law would not allow the relief in

1 question. For example, if the law of the issuing court allows protection orders to remain  
2 effective for a longer period than is allowed by the enforcing state, the tribunal of the enforcing  
3 state should enforce the order for the time specified in the order of the issuing court. In a  
4 proceeding to enforce the substantive terms of the Canadian protection order, however, the  
5 tribunal of the enforcing state shall follow its own procedures.

6  
7 Subsection (c) also provides that any person authorized by the law of the enforcing state  
8 to seek enforcement of a domestic protection order may seek enforcement of a valid Canadian  
9 protection order in the enforcing state. This provision recognizes that states frequently authorize  
10 public agencies and officers, such as a local prosecutor, to bring enforcement actions on behalf  
11 of a protected individual. The act, however, in recognizing the importance of these agencies and  
12 officers, should not be interpreted to mean that states, and their agencies and officers, are  
13 required to bring these actions when possible.

14  
15 Subsection (e) requires that, to be valid for the purpose of enforcement under this act, a  
16 Canadian protection order must be “currently in effect.” This provision includes orders that have  
17 been modified; the modified order is the order currently in effect. While the act requires that a  
18 Canadian protection order, to be valid, identify the protected individual and respondent, merely  
19 technical errors, such as an incorrect spelling of a name, should not preclude enforcement of the  
20 order. The question of the validity of an order is a question of law for the court of the enforcing  
21 state. Once an order is adjudged valid, the proceeding shall be governed by the established  
22 procedures of the enforcing state.

23  
24 The respondent’s constitutional right to due process is protected by the opportunity to  
25 raise defenses in the enforcement proceeding, as provided in subsection (e)(3). If, for example,  
26 the respondent was not provided with reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard by the court  
27 that issued the protection order, the enforcing tribunal may not enforce the order. Thus, the  
28 cross-border enforcement of a valid Canadian protection order, even without a prior hearing,  
29 does not deprive the respondent of any rights to due process because the respondent was  
30 provided with reasonable notice and opportunity to be heard when the order was issued.

31  
32 The enforcement mechanisms established by the act do not require the presentation by  
33 the protected individual of an authenticated copy of the Canadian protection order. By enacting  
34 this act, states have chosen to recognize and enforce Canadian protection orders.

## 35 36 **[SECTION 5. REGISTRATION OF CANADIAN PROTECTION ORDER.]**

37 (a) An individual may register a Canadian protection order in this state. To register a  
38 Canadian protection order, the individual must present a certified copy of the Canadian  
39 protection order to[:]

40 [(1) a tribunal responsible for the registration of domestic protection orders; or]

41 [(2)] [an agency designated by the state], which shall present the Canadian

1 protection order to [the tribunal responsible for the registration of domestic protection orders].

2 (b) On receipt of a Canadian protection order, the [tribunal responsible for the registration  
3 of domestic protection orders] shall register the order in accordance with this section. After the  
4 Canadian protection order is registered, the [responsible tribunal] shall provide to the individual  
5 registering the Canadian protection order a certified copy of the registered Canadian protection  
6 order.

7 (c) The [tribunal responsible for the registration of the Canadian protection order] shall  
8 correct or remove a registered Canadian protection order in accordance with law of this state  
9 other than this [act].

10 (d) An individual registering a Canadian protection order shall file an affidavit of the  
11 protected individual stating that, to the best of the protected individual's knowledge, the order is  
12 currently in effect.

13 (e) A Canadian protection order registered under this [act] may be entered in a state or  
14 federal registry of protection orders in accordance with applicable law.

15 (f) A fee may not be charged for the registration of a Canadian protection order.]

16 **Legislative Note:** *This section is bracketed because a state may prefer to use its existing systems*  
17 *of registration to register Canadian protection orders. While enforcement of a Canadian*  
18 *protective order does not require registration, it is highly desirable that a state provides an*  
19 *optional registration process. A registration system supplies law enforcement officers and*  
20 *agencies more accurate information, more quickly, about both the existence and status of*  
21 *Canadian protection orders and their terms and conditions. An enforcing state may facilitate the*  
22 *collection and dissemination of this information either by establishing a central registry or by*  
23 *providing a process by which information regarding registered orders is distributed to law*  
24 *enforcement officers and agencies across the state.*

25  
26 *While law of this state other than this [act] governs management of state registries, an enforcing*  
27 *state should strongly consider keeping these protection orders under seal when implementing a*  
28 *registration system. The purpose of more effectively protecting victims of domestic violence will*  
29 *be undermined if respondents can use the process of registration to locate the very people who*  
30 *are trying to escape from them. In addition, the Violence Against Women Act prohibits states*  
31 *that provide for the registration or filing of orders from notifying other states of the registration*

1 *or filing of the order without the permission of the individual registering or filing the order.* 18  
2 *U.S.C. § 2265(d).*

3  
4 **Comment**  
5

6 Subsection (a) provides that any individual, including a potential respondent, may  
7 register Canadian protection orders. Subsection (a) also requires that a person seeking to register  
8 a Canadian protection order must present a certified copy of that order. The copy must be a  
9 writing on paper, thus exempting this requirement from the provisions of the Uniform Electronic  
10 Transactions Act.

11  
12 Subsection (c) provides that if the state has registered orders that are no longer in effect  
13 or are inaccurate, these orders must be removed from the registry or, in the case of error,  
14 corrected. Each government's law regarding the management of records governs the precise  
15 method of how state and federal registries manage their registries, including the deletion of  
16 inaccurate information.

17  
18 [Add comments for subsections (b), (d), (e), and (f).]  
19

20 **SECTION 6. IMMUNITY.** This state or a state agency, local governmental agency,  
21 law enforcement officer, prosecuting attorney, clerk of court, or state or local governmental  
22 official acting in an official capacity is immune from civil and criminal liability for an act or  
23 omission arising out of the [registration or] enforcement of a Canadian protection order or the  
24 detention or arrest of an alleged violator of a Canadian protection order if the act or omission  
25 was a good faith effort to comply with this [act].

26 **Comment**

27 This section grants immunity from criminal or civil liability to states, state and local  
28 governmental agencies, and all state and local government officials acting in their official  
29 capacity for acts or omissions done in good faith in an effort to comply with the provisions of  
30 this act. Immunity for the enforcement of Canadian protection orders does not preclude state  
31 and local governments from using personnel and other internal sanctions in order to prevent and  
32 punish actions that, in the absence of this immunity provision, would have rendered the  
33 government agencies, officers, or officials civilly or criminally liable. Also, a state may, if it  
34 wishes, substitute its own immunity provisions, so long as law enforcement officers, agencies, or  
35 other officials involved in the registration or enforcement of Canadian protection orders, under  
36 the immunity scheme chosen, are not dissuaded from enforcing such orders because of the fear  
37 of potential liability.  
38  
39



**SECTION 7. OTHER REMEDIES.** A protected individual who pursues remedies under this [act] is not precluded from pursuing other legal or equitable remedies against the respondent.

**Comment**

This section clarifies that the protection orders enforced under the act are not the only means of protection available to victims of domestic violence. Other legal remedies, such as tort actions and criminal prosecution, are left undisturbed by this act.

**SECTION 8. UNIFORMITY OF APPLICATION AND CONSTRUCTION.** In applying and construing this uniform act, consideration must be given to the need to promote uniformity of the law with respect to its subject matter among states that enact it.

**SECTION 9. RELATION TO ELECTRONIC SIGNATURES IN GLOBAL AND NATIONAL COMMERCE ACT.** This [act] modifies, limits, or supersedes the Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001 et seq., but does not modify, limit, or supersede Section 101(c) of that act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7001(c), or authorize electronic delivery of any of the notices described in Section 103(b) of that act, 15 U.S.C. Section 7003(b).

**SECTION 10. APPLICATION.** This [act] applies to a Canadian protection order issued before or after [the effective date of this [act]] and to a continuing action for enforcement of a Canadian protection order commenced before or after [the effective date of this [act]]. A request for enforcement of a Canadian protection order made on or after [the effective date of this [act]] for a violation of a Canadian protection order occurring before or after [the effective date of this [act]] is governed by this [act].

**Comment**

The provisions of this act apply to all requests for enforcement of Canadian protection orders, both continuing and newly filed, made on or after its effective date. In addition, the

1 provisions of this act apply to the enforcement of Canadian protection orders issued before the  
2 effective date of this act and to requests for enforcement of Canadian protection orders in which  
3 the alleged violation took place before the effective date of the act.

4  
5 **[SECTION 11. SEVERABILITY CLAUSE.** If any provision of this [act] or its  
6 application to a person or circumstance is held invalid, the invalidity does not affect other  
7 provisions or applications of this [act] which can be given effect without the invalid provision or  
8 application, and to this end the provisions of this [act] are severable.]

9 **Comment**

10  
11 One of main purposes of this [act] is to provide a mechanism for the cross-border  
12 enforcement of Canadian protection orders that does not rely on any federal mandate. By  
13 enacting this [act], a state is exercising its independent authority to recognize and enforce  
14 Canadian orders that the state would not otherwise be required to enforce under the Constitution.

15  
16 **[SECTION 12. REPEALS; CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**

17 (a) . . . .

18 (b) . . . .

19 (c) . . . .]

20 **SECTION 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.** This [act] takes effect ....